WHOIS Survey Drafting Team (Chair and Vice-Chairs) TRANSCRIPT
Friday 30 September 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.

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-survey-dt-20110930-en.mp3

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Werner Staub - CORE
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar
Michael Young - Individual
Don Blumenthal – Ry

ICANN Staff
Liz Gasster
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Steve Sheng

Avri Doria

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's Chair and Vice Chairs, call of the Whois Service Requirements Survey call we have Michael Young, Don Blumenthal, Werner Staub, Wilson Abigaba. And from staff we have Liz Gasster and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Michael.

Michael Young: Hi everyone and thank you for coming to the call; I appreciate your time and your effort. We are now a little bit further behind, I guess we'll do a little introductory on where we seem to be. And, Liz, correct me if I get anything wrong.

But we kind of hoped at this point that our draft charter would have been approved by the Council but there's a little bit of a concern on the registrar's side. So they've asked for more time to review.

And, Liz, can you provide a little bit more of the expectation of what will happen with that and what the outcome likely will be?

Liz Gasster: I have not heard anything more about their concerns or that they continue to have concerns. I am going to follow up with Tim Ruiz before the call. But the postponement is something that is sort of typical Council policy if requested by an Council member to give them more time. So I think it's just - probably just routine and that they'll vote in favor of the charter on the next call which is the 6th - Thursday the 6th.

Michael Young: Okay. So do you think it comes down to that not everyone had a chance to review it really and that's where the list - the delay come from more than anything?

Liz Gasster: Primarily but I think also the registrars have had continuing concerns about all of the Whois studies. Whether they'll provide meaningful information, you know, to inform future policy. And Tim specifically raised, you know, the issue that this is, you know, a bigger project than was first envisaged by the Council. And I believe it is a bigger project that they originally envisioned.

And so I thought it - I do think it was important to clarify that this work, you know, will involve not only execution of the survey but subsequent analysis of the survey by, you know, someone. So Tim did, you know, he did note that

we were converting from a drafting team to a working group and that there is a more substantial timeframe for deliverables.

And the rigor that Chuck Gomes and Avri Doria recommended initially, which is something that I think this group has concurred with and wanted to stay true to, you know, in terms of for example having that independent assessment of the survey, you know, as well as having the Council review the survey before it goes live were things that several thought were, you know, quite important and, you know, would add to the acceptance of the outcomes and the quality of the outcomes and that that was important to do.

So I'm hoping that that's...

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: ...just informational. It is important for the Council to appreciate fully, you know, the extent of the work that they request when they do request it. And sometimes it requires some scoping on the part of the drafting team to size the amount of work and make a recommendation for how that work, you know, would be handled.

Which was the case in this case where the group got together and, you know, clearly recognized that there's work after the survey is done and that there was sort of a gap between what the Council instructed this group to do and what would ultimately have to happen which involves, you know, doing that extra analysis.

Which, you know, from my perspective on staff it would be I think if the community, you know, you all, create the survey and execute the survey it would put us in a bit of a difficult position to have to analyze the survey without your input or, you know...

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: ...active involvement. So, you know, from a staff perspective I certainly supported this notion that the group remain in existence or get reconvened to do the analysis as well as the development of the survey which was, you know, part of Tim's brief comment.

So it was just a brief comment in the course of the meeting last time. And I have every reason to think it'll get supported at the next call.

Michael Young: Okay. One of the things I wonder, Liz, if there's some concerns - I mean, what's different about this Whois work as compared to, you know, the previous efforts to some degree is that we're, you know, the subject matter here, the survey is about Whois requirements.

And, I mean, we've actually - the fact that this - we've proposed something that is thorough that should really support the bottom up multi stakeholder approach quite readily and well do you think there's some concern or fears that some of the, you know, next steps - obviously beyond the scope of this group but, you know, the results of our work may lead to ultimately PDP requiring one or more of these requirements to be, you know, on a mandatory basis.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...say Whois to a GNSO community that's what people worry about. So I mean, that's the - to me that seems clear. But another - I think benefit to this group or distinction between - an important distinction between this group and the other Whois studies, which I would also make on the next call if need be, is that this group is really picking up where the Whois service requirements report left off.

That was previous work that the GNSO Council requested. And...

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: ...it was really - the onus was on the GNSO Council when it made the decision to convene this drafting team to take action in some way on that report that it was a report that was requested in 2009, May of 2009, it was completed in 2010 after, you know, substantial community review, you know, an interim report, a draft report, you know, a draft final report.

And, you know, it languished for a while but I think the GNSO felt that it was timely to act on this report and that this group is really just an out-growth of that rather than a new initiative; it's very much, you know, just a next step to try to make that report meaningful or put that report into context, into a global context of, you know, how does the community view each of these proposed requirements.

So rather than being a new initiative I think it very much is a continuation of something the Council already has invested, you know, a lot of staff resource and time and community resource and time into.

Michael Young: Okay. Thank you, Liz. Does anyone have any other questions for Liz? Okay hearing none I'd like to go to agenda-bashing and ask if anyone would like to extend or add to the draft agenda? Okay I'd like to actually add to the draft agenda if that's okay?

I think I'd like to add probably after the third point a thrust to - go to the co chairs and get an update as to where they are in - with their groups, you know, have their met with their group and if so where are they in their project planning and their work scope planning.

And then additionally I think also to insert before us deciding on a target or objective Dakar I'd like to update the co chairs and talk a little bit about what's going on in the ITF we're discussion lists which I think a couple of you are on already anyways.

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...just a question. On the Adobe Connect I see the draft agenda for 21st July, is there something wrong here?

Michael Young: I think that's meant for today isn't it Liz? But it's the wrong date.

Liz Gasster: That's old actually too. That was for the previous meeting, sorry.

Michael Young: Oh okay, I just assumed it was the wrong date, okay.

Liz Gasster: If - it's actually - I can leave up the part I import Part B although I think it's changed slightly.

Michael Young: Okay, all right so...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Yeah, sorry.

Michael Young: So I think we still need the part that was valid on there was the Dakar objectives. We've had a little update on where the Council is at. I added my two points I want to cover. Was there anything else anyone else wanted to cover?

Werner Staub: Not right off.

Michael Young: Okay. So why don't we go around the circle and ask people to talk about where they're at with their teams? And, Warner, you want to start just pulling someone blindly out of the...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...actually I haven't been able to do anything up to now with my team at all so I haven't progressed in the - I know that - who the members of the team are, they're not many actually. But I haven't - I have actually waited until we have a chair meeting to do the next step. And these last couple of weeks were so intense that it wasn't actually fully available for - even my day job.

Michael Young: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...one of the concerns I have for actually for the (unintelligible) because of the ICANN new gTLD program many of us are extremely, you know, tied up with things that we haven't quite expected to be (unintelligible) now proven to be.

Michael Young: No I completely understand. I share the same struggles as the rest of the teams here. So well so let's jump to Wilson and, Wilson, where are you at?

Wilson Abigaba: Excuse me. Myself I - we haven't yet done much in our subgroup. But mainly because firstly need to hear from the Group 1, that's the question, before we engage the (unintelligible) the tools and the - planning the specific tools and how to get the - how to get the questions to the respondents.

I think most of all it comes from Group 1 but (unintelligible) maybe meet in a week's time or (unintelligible) about how - what we can do before Group 1 gives us any set of a persons.

Michael Young: Well I guess - I guess that's a good question. There's some of the work that is linear. However I think that there can be a fair bit of work done, you know, whenever you have open time to do it, Wilson, in terms of investigating a mechanism and appropriate tools.

One of the other objectives of Group 2 is to kind of work through how we can structure the physical nature of the survey in order to - with the tool in order to capture the kind of response because we want to figure out a mechanism as well with the survey to allow us to develop some kind of prioritization back from the questions, right?

So I guess for now what you could do is start looking at mechanism tools and methodologies of distribution.

Wilson Abigaba: Well, okay, because I thought of that next (unintelligible) by mail next week to discuss about that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: I mean, as we, you know, (unintelligible) thanks.

Michael Young: Yeah, and you may want to do some, you know, to take some tools - some available tools out there now and run trials on them, right, and see what you think of them. There's a number of survey tools out there as well.

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah probably like, yeah, Survey Monkey or Google or to the Google Spreadsheets...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Wilson Abigaba: ...Google Docs...

Michael Young: And...

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah (unintelligible) all of them I know sort of format of the question before we agree on which tool to use.

Michael Young: Yeah. Okay. And then, Liz, is there any standard ICANN tools that we can make use of for this mechanism that you guys already have contracted or, you know, available?

Liz Gasster: In terms of survey tools?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, we've used Survey Monkey the most I think. I'm going to - I told Steve Shang he didn't need to be on this call and this is a good question for him so let me double check that and I will post the answer to it.

Michael Young: Okay. Great. So, yeah, I mean, Survey Monkey was probably one that all of us would jump to first anyways to look at being...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...an ICANN survey for the ASO review (unintelligible) really easy to respond, it's a single page you can go either the long page if it's much easier to use than those surveys that have many, many pages, you know, and don't allow you to go back.

                 So I like the simplicity of that tool. It's probably something to look at using the example of the ASO review survey.

Michael Young: So if we could find that example, Warner, and send that to Wilson that would be great.

Werner Staub: I'll do that.

Liz Gasster: I think one issue that I was just hearing about with regard to surveys when you go back - like if you can't finish the whole thing in a sitting and you need to go back is that there has to be a way for the survey to remember you. And

sometimes, depending on how you set it up, there can be privacy issues associated with that.

Michael Young: Yeah, I guess that is - so, Wilson, I guess that's an issue for you to look into, right? Can we issue some kind of session ID for people and still truly maintain anonymity because usually when you even issue a temporary anonymous user ID it's got to be confirmed through an email account.

Liz Gasster: And I just...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: ...in the case of the (ASO) survey what they did was to have it on a single page so there was never any need to go back until, you know, then finally - (unintelligible) itself which remains (unintelligible) the responses and then you finally press okay that's it. There wasn't any reason to go back it was actually...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: So the full - the single page note was helpful in that respect.

Michael Young: Yeah. Warner, I guess what happens if, you know, I'm sitting there and I'm, you know, like the rest of us at our day job and I start to fill out the survey and I get distracted from, you know, by my day job and, you know, I end up shutting the session down, closing the browser or something incidentally and I don't have a, you know, some kind of - at least anonymous user ID to go back in with.

Werner Staub: Yeah.

Michael Young: I think that's the...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...one page will really depend on the number of questions.

Michael Young: Yeah. This is probably going to be a lengthy survey. And - but so I guess that would be a nice objective in the tool if we can do it; if we can allow people to be able to complete it in more than one session or sitting rather and remain - retain their anonymity that would be fantastic. I don't know that we can guarantee that. But it's worth looking into if you could, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, just repeat that again?

Michael Young: Pardon me?

Wilson Abigaba: Mike I beg your pardon, Michael.

Michael Young: Yes, I was saying if you could when you're looking at the tools see if it's possible some way to allow somebody who's taking the survey - they're trying to take the survey anonymously; if they can't finish the survey all at one sitting if there's some temporary way - if there's some way to give them an anonymous identification to allow them to log back in at a later time and complete the survey that would be fantastic if there's an...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...if we can come up with a reasonable mechanism.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay sure. Oh okay we'll consider it.

Michael Young: Okay. And what Warner was saying - this is important - is that if the actual way the survey is structured is if it's ultimately a single Web page then it

allows them to basically scroll back up to previous questions if they change mind as a result of questions lower in the survey might make them change their mind on earlier responses that they gave.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: But that's actually a mechanism. I guess really the requirement would be that if I'm on, you know, say there's 50 questions in the survey and I'm on Question 40 and my answer to Question 40 makes me think I should also change my answer that I've already done on Question 20 then I have the ability to go back to Question 20 and adjust my answer. That would be the requirement.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, yeah, we shall consider that and possibly even if there are many pages we shall also have (unintelligible)...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Wilson Abigaba: If the page - if the whole page doesn't (unintelligible) if the whole page doesn't (unintelligible) it makes it faster and also easier for the respondent.

Michael Young: Right exactly.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay but (unintelligible) on the number of questions there are so many then (unintelligible) many pages but not to discourage the respondent that there are so many that it take much of his or her time...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Wilson Abigaba: ...but also be in terms of (unintelligible). Okay.

Michael Young: Exactly. I think one of the goals around the survey tool is that it's easy enough to use, you don't get a high abandonment rate while people are doing the survey.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: And then the other thing would be, you know, what - not just the answers to the surveys and how we can access the data when the surveys are all done which obviously we'd love to have lots and lots of features and options for retrieving the results of the survey and examining and automated reports and all kinds of - and graphs and lovely things from our answers.

                   But, you know, also I think we'd like to know what other tools or capacities or capabilities the survey system has that might be beneficial for us. Anything that we, you know, bells and whistles that we didn't think of that might end up making this easier to deal with such as a report on abandonment rate would be I think really interesting for us.

                   So not only do we want to see how many people finish the survey but if we can see that, you know, out of 1000 people who actually started the survey and we saw that, you know, 60% of them abandoned the survey we know we didn't write a very easy to use survey and people got bored and left.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay we shall consider it, we shall - from the survey itself (unintelligible) be able to know how many - like how many attempted to open the page but did not start the survey or how many - as (unintelligible) but completed. And from the results we shall (consider) to make them - like to be able to export them in some other format such that they can easily be imported into other programs for (unintelligible) reporting.

                   For example you can export to Excel and then have the charts and all that. But (unintelligible) we can get as many reports as we can from there but also...

Michael Young: Right.

Wilson Abigaba: ...export them in different (unintelligible) like (SPS) or Excel for more advanced reporting.

Michael Young: Right exactly, exactly.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: And it'd be good for the abandonment rate if they actually gave statistics as to which questions they walked away at because, you know, the more information we have the more we can kind of try and derive why they didn't finish the survey. You know, everyone left at exactly the same question then you can postulate that it had something to do with that particular question, right?

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. At this point can I ask okay but the person or the question can really be postponed later. If we like when we've launched the survey and maybe after one week we're alerted there's a problem, most people are stopping at Question Number 5 or most are getting (unintelligible) can we modify it and - can we modify it either silently or - modify the survey when it's running if we realize there's a problem with it.

Michael Young: Well I think that in the process we described we want to have a - almost a test group or an initial takers group. We talked about that. Maybe the council members themselves would be a test group.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah. Some type of beta group would be useful for us to understand, you know, A, is the survey in a structure that people are completing it? And, B, the other thing we were worried about when we talked in earlier calls was

whether or not people trying to test basically do a sanity check on the survey questions and try and make sure that people understood what we were actually asking for on each question. So that was the other point of concern we had.

And that's also when we started talking about having a third party review the survey independently and give us feedback on it whether or not we'd done a good job suggesting modifications or improvements.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Wilson Abigaba: That's true.

Michael Young: Okay? Does anyone have any - Wilson, do you have any other questions?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Michael Young: Does anyone have questions for Wilson? Okay. So...

Wilson Abigaba: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...at any time really.

Michael Young: Absolutely, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Did you have anything else that you wanted to ask now?

Werner Staub: I'm sorry - Don - I forgot to - there's a question...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: There's a question that I already should have which is the kind of responses -
                  the kinds of questions that you can ask because that will of course affect the
                  offering, you know, of...

Michael Young: Absolutely, yeah.

Werner Staub: And I assumed that we have a consensus that it would use essentially only
                  questions that can be responded to with the check boxes; no other forms of
                  response or maybe at some point an open question but these would actually
                  require man power to interpret...

Michael Young: Right.

Werner Staub: ...or do we have a different list?

Michael Young: I think ideally we would like to have absolute answers where they select a
                  box, yes. I think to be fair though we have to allow some form of commentary.
                  I don't know if maybe what we do is we allow a single comment box at the
                  end of the survey that if people want to talk about additional issues or items
                  they can do it in a single comment box which I think would be easier for us to
                  process than if we allowed say a comment box on every question.

                  The other thing, Werner, that I think we need is and, you know, we're leaving
                  this to you really help derive in your group and that is we need some way -
                  some feedback mechanism to kind of prioritize how important they think the
                  requirements are, what order of urgency and importance; not just importance
                  but urgency because they can be two different issues.

And so I don't know if we ask that specifically in the questions. We could make that questions themselves or we could actually - you know, when you're answering the question it could be a twofold answer. You could have, you know, A, B, C and D and then on the bottom of the question you could have like a 1-10 how important was this question to you priority scale.

And, you know, they can answer that on a 1-10 scale or something like that. So that's at least something to think about. But that's really something we need your group to make some suggestions on.

Werner Staub: Okay. Actually we may have some - need some kind of interaction that we go on proposed questions and check (unintelligible) with the help of Wilson's group to see, you know, we should actually change the question rather inclined to (unintelligible) actually idea.

Michael Young: Right, right, okay. Shall we move to Don? Is there any other questions on what Wilson had been saying and now what Werner was talking about? Okay, Don, do you want to tell us where you're at?

Liz Gasster: I think Don had to drop off.

Michael Young: Did we lose him?

Liz Gasster: No I think he had to drop off. I think something must have come up.

Michael Young: Oh that's really unfortunate. Okay.

Liz Gasster: See, he has a note in the chat.

Michael Young: Oh I missed that. Oh I see that now, yeah. Shoot. Okay, Liz, what I'll do - guys, what I'll do is I'll phone Don because I'm going to talk about - let me give you a little update what's happening on the weird group list WEIRDs

group list and - because I was going to actually - I think there was an action item for Don derived out of that if everyone - if no one has any objections.

But let me talk to the issue. The WEIRDs group, just to reiterate in case not everyone's familiar with it but I think you all are, the WEIRDs group is a - right now is a pre-working group discussion list in the IETF circle. And it's discussing from a technical group perspective Whois (requirements).

And the list actually has got a few what we call Internet draft IDs that people have submitted around their concepts of what's needed for kind of next generation Whois considerations. And the list was - the purpose of the list was to generate some discussion around these Internet drafts - these IDs.

And I think it would be - it would not hurt for all the chairs in this group to read - or at least attempt to because some of them are a little thick - but at least read the introduction sections or the summary sections of each of those IDs to get an idea of where the pure technical community is going from their perspective.

They have a very different additional set of viewpoints on Whois because Whois within ICANN circles is really thought of as a registry side product and a technology entity; it's also thought of as not just names but also a numbering Whois system, in other words you use Whois to look up associations, who's responsible for IP addresses on the Internet.

So that adds another dimension of requirement or concerns about Whois services and it opens all kinds of questions such as, you know, should there actually be the equivalent of a Whois service that's oriented and just deals with IP number? And then another Whois service type of Whois service protocol that's just dealing with the point of view from domain registries.

And I...

Werner Staub: Michael?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: So this is spelled - the acronym that you had pronounced in a working group name because...

Michael Young: It's exactly - it's like the word weird - W-E-I-R-D-S.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah...

Werner Staub: So the WEIRD - but if you type it into - if you could type it into the chat that would also make it easier for everybody...

Michael Young: Yeah, yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...you know what, I'll get some link information to everybody and send it to the list, okay, as well. You see it? Don't ask me what it stands for; I don't remember. And they always like to come up with these clever names that spell funny abbreviations, acronyms. I think people like to have a little fun with these things.

So what's really interesting about the discussion in the group - yeah, there you go, you found it. Werner, would you mind sending that actually to the mailing list? Just...

((Crosstalk))

Werner Staub: I'll do that...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: That'd be great. It wouldn't hurt for all the chairs to join that mailing list. Like I said there's a lot of traffic on it. The discussions go sideways a fair bit and get quite technical. But, you know, every once in a while someone pulls it back to the actual requirements discussion, not necessarily the how are you going to technically do this.

And that's actually at a point they're at right now. Andrew Sullivan who is a fellow I worked with for some years at AFIFLIUS and has worked in our industry for a long time and he's with Steve Crocker's company now who's name now escapes my mind.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: What was that?

Liz Gasster: Shinkuro?

Michael Young: That's it, thank you, Liz, yeah. So he's working with Shinkuro and anyway he's on this list and he's written a draft charter and - that he circulated to the list just the last couple days in anticipation of trying to file a formal BOF which in the IETF is called the - it's short for Birds of a Feather meeting. It is kind of the kickoff meeting where people basically vote on whether or not they're going to initiate a working group on something.

And his draft is important because it states some basically prioritized requirements for a new - or a next generation Whois service. And so they're kind of rolling ahead of where we're at. And there's no overt coordination or interaction although Steve Shang and some others are monitoring the group, Liz.

There's no formal interaction or requirement for them to look at the requirements in the report that we're dealing with. Nor is there any requirement or induction of the results we find from the survey driving their prioritization.

So the only way the IETF works is if you get into the working group and you try and convince the working group or influence them as to, you know, as an individual because it's the way it's structured as to what you think the priorities should be or the work or - once you get into the work how you actually solve things technically. Okay?

And I think it would be good for - Don's group was actually supposed to be in charge of, you know, circling back to stakeholders. So I would think this would fall into his area of responsibility.

I think it'd be good for Don to - who is on that list - I asked him to do that some weeks ago - asked him to introduce what we're doing to that group and make sure that he draws a link in that mailing list back to the requirements report so that people in that space are at least aware of what we're doing and we can hopefully form some kind of voluntary cooperation in the efforts.

Does everyone think that that's a good idea?

Liz Gasster: What do you - just to - could you elaborate on how you see the cooperation like the timing in particular? And the - where...

Michael Young: Well...

Liz Gasster: ...the overlap is?

Michael Young: I think the cooperation would be in the sense that they're already in this draft charter, Liz, doing an abbreviated or short list of requirements. So I'd love the

group to look at the entire list of requirements that we have thus far which is far more extensive.

And also give some community - some reasoning why different parts of the community need or want those requirements or capabilities rather so that that group in turn can use that and see the whole picture. It may affect their own shorter list of requirements and priorities and may pull in something off our list that they would have overlooked.

Liz Gasster: And by list do you mean the report itself or do you mean what the survey ultimately looks like?

Michael Young: We don't have the survey done yet...

Liz Gasster: Right.

Michael Young: ...so the best we can hope for is to share the report with them and at least have them review what' available right now.

Liz Gasster: Okay thank you.

Michael Young: Which I think is better than us doing nothing.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, definitely. I just wanted to understand, you know, what your image of it was.

Michael Young: Yeah, yeah. What does everyone think? Are they comfortable with that? Are they okay with us reaching out and just saying, you know, this is what we're working on, this is what we're doing, this is the report we're going from and we think it might be useful for you as a group to review this.

Werner Staub: I think this is very important for us to do because we should not get stuck in the perception of Whois studies inspired by the very old protocols used and

the limitations that should have been overcome a long time ago. So I think this is very timely.

Michael Young: Okay. Great so, Liz, just for the record I'm going to - Wilson, are you okay with this as well?

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah, I have not issues at all. Good.

Michael Young: Okay. So then for the record, Liz, I'm going to request that Don do that. You know, and of course I'll ask the same question of Don to make sure he has no objections as well.

Liz Gasster: And you may want to just post it on the list too in case the, you know, subsequent...

Michael Young: The greater...

Liz Gasster: ...others in the groups...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...have any further thoughts.

Michael Young: Yeah, I'll do that; that's a good idea.

Liz Gasster: Since this is a Chair's call they may.

Michael Young: Yeah. We're not, you know, I'd be very clear, we're not telling them what to do or that they should include these requirements or that all these requirements are of equal rate or prioritization or any of that; we're simply trying to make them aware of it, ask them to review it and see if there's anything that they feel should be considered in it.

Okay. I think it's very important - I mean, I think it's valuable to the community that there is autonomy and independence in groups like the IETF. But I, you know, there wasn't maybe as much structure when the (IRIS) exercise went through between, you know, coordinated GNSO-related efforts and what was happening in the IETF on the last time people tried to update the Whois service protocol.

And, you know, we ended up with something that really didn't get industry adoption. So if we can do something to help guide the process to be a more proactive communication as both sides work on the issue then hopefully we may end up with a proposed piece of work that is tenable to, you know, the vast majority of the invested stakeholders. Okay.

Let's talk about - I don't know - let's talk about briefly about Dakar. I don't know that we are going to be in a position to have any of the milestones knocked off before Dakar except - when is the next GNSO Council meeting? Is there one before Dakar?

Liz Gasster: Yeah it's the 6th.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Michael Young: So maybe we'll have approval by then.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I would hope.

Michael Young: Yeah, I would really - maybe as a reasonable target by Dakar even if you don't have full approval from your other team members perhaps we could at least from each co chair have a draft of their scope of work and their proposed project plan by Dakar - by the Dakar meeting. Does that seem reasonable?

Werner Staub: Okay you say a scope of work?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Werner Staub: And a milestone plan, etcetera.

Michael Young: Correct. You know, ideally with, you know, approved by your team members but if not that's - at least we have the draft to start considering. Is that okay Werner?

Werner Staub: Okay, would you be available? I sent you (unintelligible) discussed and indeed was shared possibly privately (unintelligible) an idea that, you know, so we're trying to tune it a little bit in addition to (unintelligible). Would you be available for that?

Michael Young: Yeah I - absolutely I'm available to all of you as you need me to be.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: For sure. Wilson, is that doable for you?

Wilson Abigaba: No it's not, I'm okay with it.

Michael Young: You're okay with it? Okay. All right. So I guess we'll have to check with Don outside of this call. But at least even if we get two out of three done before then as a draft anyways I think that's - it will give us some - a firm - something material to discuss and start working through in the Dakar meeting.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And then, Michael, if I could?

Michael Young: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: In Dakar I did - I think obtained a room for a meet - a working group meeting if we would like one on the Wednesday.

Michael Young: Okay. What time on the Wednesday?

Liz Gasster: I think 8:00 am.

Michael Young: Dakar time. That's fine for me. Werner, can you do that?

Liz Gasster: And it's not necessary but because our scheduling is such where we need to put in a request I wanted to quickly do so in case the group, you know, thought that it should meet there; if enough of you were going to be there.

Werner Staub: Sorry I just had some noise that prevented me from understanding what Liz just said.

Michael Young: We're looking at eight o'clock for a 8:00 am the Wednesday morning in Dakar for a working group meeting. Do you think that's something you could attend, Wilson and Werner?

Werner Staub: Wednesday morning (unintelligible) is okay.

Michael Young: Wednesday is usually good for me.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. For me I would only attend that because I want to be in attendance for this meeting.

Michael Young: Okay does that time work for you for remote participation?

Wilson Abigaba: Yeah it does (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay perfect. Okay. So, Liz, why don't we put that to the group then and suggest we're going to try and do a meeting there. And if we - for whatever reason we don't get enough attendance to make it worthwhile we'll cancel it at that point.

Liz Gasster: Very good.

Werner Staub: It would coincide with the GNSO Council meeting?

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: The GNSO Council meeting is in the afternoon on Wednesday.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...preferring afternoon sessions to the morning sessions that were previously always reserved for the GNSO Council.

Werner Staub: Well we don't have a detailed schedule of the Dakar meeting yet so it maybe a little bit, but we have to take chances and possibly adjust the meeting.

Michael Young: Yeah, I mean, Werner, I think we'll just book it and if too many of us end up with a conflict to make it worthwhile then we can cancel it.

Werner Staub: Yeah, I agree.

Michael Young: Okay. All right I think we covered off everything that we suggested at the beginning of the call that we should talk about. Does anyone want to add anything more?

Wilson Abigaba: Nothing from me. I'll just wait for the summary of what we discussed for my group and send it to my group members and group team.

Michael Young: Perfect. And, Liz, did you - Werner, did you have anything else?

Werner Staub: Not at this time. But in the context of the work item we have I'll get in contact with you. So if that's okay I'll send you an email and possibly, Mike, we can chat about it.

Michael Young: Absolutely. And we can figure out a time and have a call and talk through it.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. Liz, did you guys have anything more?

Liz Gasster: Nope, nothing else for me.

Michael Young: Okay. Liz, I just want to, you know, already, I mean, we've always had in these groups fantastic support from ICANN staff. I've never been disappointed in this regard. But particularly this is a complicated one and I know you've - I can see that you're running around really helping make this one become a functional effective group.

                   So I really appreciate that and everybody else who's pitching in as well. I know there's a few people in the background there helping with this one.

Liz Gasster: Our pleasure. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. All right so with that I think we should wind up the call.

Liz Gasster: Thanks everyone.

Werner Staub: Thank you very much.

Michael Young: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, everyone. Have a good weekend.

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: Thank you.

Michael Young: Bye.

END