

**WSWG Technical Survey Requirements Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 01 June 2012 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

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.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Would you like me to do a quick roll call for you, Berry, Don and Michael?

Don Blumenthal: Sure, that would be helpful.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have got a few people on the call. We have (Yaholvy Atoin), Berry Cobb, Reg Levy, Don Blumenthal, Chuck Gomes and Michael Young. And for staff we have Liz Gasster, Nathalie Peregrine, myself, Glen de Saint Géry and Gisella Gruber. Thank you very much, Berry or Don or Michael. Please say your name before you speak for the transcription purposes. Thank you, over to you.

Don Blumenthal: I appreciate it. We're going to - what probably works best and it seemed to be that way this morning is we'll go through the formal presentation, as participants to hold questions or comments until the end. Going to say please

use the hands up button in Connect - in Adobe Connect for - to say something but I see that - it looks like the connection problem we had has resolved itself looking at the list of participants so hopefully it'll stay that way just focus on the chat room icon there.

In any event my name is Don Blumenthal. I'm with the Public Interest Registry - do policy work and have been involved in Whois efforts since I was with the Federal Trade Commission, US FTC, in 1999 when we sent comments to - during the formation of ICANN raising issues about accuracy and availability of Whois data.

Thirteen years later still wrapped up in Whois issues and a lot of them are the same and some new ones. But kind of come by this semi-honestly. Been working with the group since the beginning.

What I want to do is go through these slides, kind of give some background and then give you an idea of what the survey is all about for people who haven't seen it.

I'm going to apologize in advance; I found out in this morning's session as usual I run a little bit stream of consciousness in presentations; been known to drive my students absolutely insane. So if I kind of get off onto something that's not quite in the slides chances are it'll be there I've just kind of jumped the gun and you'll see it in a minute. A way of life.

To begin with, as I mentioned, I want to do a background on what the working group has done. We've been around - I was surprised when I was leafing through some documents this morning some of the initial documents go back to last June so it's been a lot of work, a lot of effort, a lot of time and we have finally gotten to the critical point of issuing a survey.

I'm going to go over the survey and its segments; I'm not going to go through question by question or we'd be here for a few hours. And in the middle there

I'm going to ask Berry to bring up - to bring the survey tool up just to give an idea of what the types of options are; not any specific questions.

I'm having trouble with the mouse so I hope to not do that slide jumping. Generally this whole process started just about three years ago, I hadn't even focused on the math there. The GNSO Council asked the policy staff to put together a list of technical requirements or potential requirements for Whois services.

There have been suggestions for a long time that, you know, there were problems, that there were deficiencies in the current service. You know, after all - and this is an ongoing battle - as to what Whois should even be doing or shouldn't be doing. You know, fundamentally it was designed for something very different from what it's usually used for now.

You know, way back when it was set up just as a system for administrators to get in touch with each other when there was a problem. But the fact is the commercialization of the Internet changed requirements significantly. You know, needs for the ability to get in touch with owners of domains or administrators of domains.

The system didn't keep up. Whois - the original Whois just for network contacts became the base for just any types of - or attempts to reach the Whois owners or administrators for any reason related to the domains that there were a lot of concerns being raised that the system was deficient.

At the same time a long the way have been a lot of proposals raised for different uses of Whois and for different possibilities of how to manipulate or access Whois data. These are fundamentally technical requirements and they're requirements that again fundamentally come down to policy issues.

Should there be, for example, tiered access or, you know, other methods than the typical batch or just Website access. And even though these are

really policy questions, should something be allowed, the survey is designed or the request of 2009 was to - well let's at least look at technical requirements for a database system so that it could be used should policy decisions be made to implement one or another feature - one or another requirement.

The request was made in 2009. The final report was issued by staff about a year later in July of 2010. And then in 2011 the GNSO Council started well what technically was a drafting team; we weren't a WG yet, we were a DT. The idea was to develop a survey to ultimately come up with an idea of what the community sees as possible requirements in the Whois system.

In the first instance you issue a survey and get responses. And then the next instance, as the slide suggests here, to try to get an idea of a consensus of what should be, what requirements should be met by the Whois system as it exists potentially now but I think more realistically as changes are made, as systems and protocols develop.

You know, I think the - really the main word in this title and the main word in this slide and maybe behind the whole presentation is this word, important. Sometimes there is a tendency to look at Whois efforts, particularly by those of us who have been involved in them for years, to just get the feeling of oh no not another one.

I don't think that's a fair statement in general. The ones I've been involved with - the more policy efforts have all had very specific reasons for their implementation. But the fact is that this - I think this effort is particularly important because it's different.

It really look at a broad range of issues to try to determine what the community - the GNSO community specifically would like to see in the Whois system. It provides the opportunity again both to see generally what people want and then to gauge the level of agreement.

Now this is in on sense a very broad effort. It really - it looks to engage all of the GNSO community. And when I say that I mean the difference, you know, the GNSO interest groups or stakeholder groups rather such as Registry Stakeholder Group that I work with, constituencies such as the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Business Constituency, the no profits, just every possible stakeholder - with a small S - that you might find within the ICANN community.

But at the same time it can be seen as fairly narrow because these questions are relatively pointed. And they're designed to gauge requirements for specific features. So that combination, I think, is unusual.

And I think this delving into the real details of Whois is well certainly unprecedented in my time being involved with PIR and is really the way for the community, individuals or individuals acting on behalf of their constituencies, to have a part in what's next for Whois; have a part in adapting what's been in place and truly making it useful given the realities of what the Internet has become and what around 1994 when commercialization began.

Now I think the survey will be useful not only for say within ICANN in a - it's always dangerous to do what I was about to do. It's useful for, say, the general constituencies of ICANN but in addition it will be useful for other groups.

You know, IETF is part of ICANN; the fact is it works in a different way. It has a very specific mandate. And I can see the survey results being useful in efforts to look at protocols. These efforts are ongoing and I suspect they'll continue for a while.

Now it's important to remember, though, you know, I just mentioned one application. It's important to remember, though, that what we're doing is a

technical inventory. It doesn't set up policies; we don't intend to suggest policies. We don't intend to suggest operation rules.

The idea is to come up with a report that will say this is what the community thinks should be in the Whois database system; what the technical requirements should be for serving data up and what kinds of data. How it's used later, for example, tiered access or something like that, policy - privacy and proxy services - those are later questions; what to do with the data, those are policy questions or operational questions.

Sorry about that. Have to figure out where I just was and get back there.

Now most recently - and like I said if we started as the DT - the Drafting Team - we ultimately became the Working Group. The bunch of us and we cover pretty much all constituencies and stakeholder groups that you can think of in ICANN or at least the GNSO side - I said we wanted responses from everybody but the fact is our working group - our drafting team has representatives of the stakeholder groups, had representatives of the constituencies, there's been GNSO and Business and also we've had ALAC participation.

But we began as a drafting team with the idea of just drafting a survey. Over time there were some decisions, ultimately, or suggestions and ultimately ratified by the GNSO that we broaden our mission. We're not only going to draft but we are going to shepherd the analysis of the survey results.

Our initial draft of the survey is online as you - or the initial report is online for you to examine. And then obviously if you know about this session you know that there's a draft of a potential survey online.

Now we split the survey into 13 sections. There's over 60 questions. I'm not sure about the specific - what the final number was. There was a lot of back and forth toward the end.

The public comment session opened on May 30. And we really encourage your comments or comments of anybody else that you can think of. There's just so much a small - or comparatively small bunch of us can come up with and to (guess) and decide (unintelligible) to examine isn't that necessary to cover. Like I said I'm not doing well with the mouse today.

This is a cover, you know, just obviously a screen snap of the survey tool. Excuse me. It's not very readable. Maybe I should say it's not readable at all unless you've got a nice large 20 or 23-inch monitor. I'm working off my 13-inch laptop.

What I think would be useful to - before we get started is ask Berry to kind of take over the screen here and click through a couple of screens of the survey tool not so much to see the content - you may not be able to read it - but to see how we have it set up; the different methods of input that are provided by the system to give credit - Wilson Abigaba is responsible for this data survey tool and did a really fine job of taking things from PDF and putting them into a useable online process.

Berry.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Can you see my screen okay?

Don Blumenthal: No I'm still looking at the slides.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...this morning.

Berry Cobb: Yes, it worked just fine. Can others see my screen or are they still seeing the slides as well?

Don Blumenthal: Did I put everybody else to sleep?

Woman: Now it's sharing.

Berry Cobb: Now it is? Okay.

Don Blumenthal: There we go. Yes, as you can see this is a combination of - the easy thing, just check one, check another. There is room for freeform commenting or freeform response both at the bottom or the side. We've got pull down lists so they can choose one of any preset options. Just one other - yes, a ranking type input.

There are a lot of questions - there's not a lot of - well I think it will turn out to take less time than people would expect by seeing the initial set of information. If you notice on the - could you scroll up, Berry? Over on the right there's a system for jumping to the different sections also to make navigation easier.

Why don't we go back to the slides? Okay appreciate it. The survey is, as I mentioned, split into a number of sections. I don't know if this problem is my hand or the fact that the battery in the mouse is dying. I forgot to replace it after this morning's session.

We begin by just a profile. You know, we're asking for information, say, about you in general to get an idea of our survey population. We're not going to get into really detailed issues. This is going to - this should pass even the EU definitions of privacy protection.

The first set of questions talks about just basically issues related to just providing both an accessible and parsable list of domains. Well what's needed in order to have domain names out there, have systems be able to manipulate them and make use of the information.

Second level is just trying to come up with a standard query structure. We can put all the - not we - the system can have all the information but if there's no standard way to get to it you just have a hodge podge. And in terms of a unified Internet it's - I'm not sure it's useful to have different query set ups for each different registry or each different registrar. So the second level is to define some kind of standard query set up.

And follow on to that is okay how do we provide it, how do we define queries? Okay you've got to have data before you have questions. So the next step that we want to know about is defining a standard data structure itself for Whois responses. Once the query has been submitted what does it look like when it comes back? How is it set up when it comes back?

Section 4 - and this is a - it's a long time frustrating issue just in general on the Net is coming up with set of standardized error messages but more importantly how to handle error conditions. There are a lot of error messages out there that are familiar to people. You go to a Website and you see 404 if you know the code set you know what that means.

But what's not necessarily so standard is what message is delivered under what set of errors. But again I'm using examples from outside Whois but it's the same situation. Having error message so you know what they mean. And if you've got an expectation that they're - that when you get one it really tells you what the problem is.

Section 5 involves just submitting queries - the process. After that we kind of get into coming up with a data model. Again you can have the information sitting there but in terms of having a coherent system or cohesive system it's best to have some kind of overarching data model to keep some consistency.

Number 7 is an issue that obviously is getting a lot of attention these days, the whole area of internationalized or internationalized domain names. And along with that this isn't only limited to IDNs but the whole issue of having

internationalized registration data requirements - they go hand in hand to some extent but there are different considerations.

Section 8 is - it's involved with defining an authentication framework. And I think the next three - well just from number you know the next three go together. But beyond that there's certain policy discussions over the years that need - that would need changes to the system to implement and apart from those discussions they're worth raising; do we want to authenticate and how do you authenticate requests - people who are requesting data.

And beyond that, well, how do you authorize people to get it? And then defining a framework and a predefined set of metrics for those processes. To me this is one of the best examples of how policy versus survey questions - the survey requirements process come together.

What we want to do is ensure that the Whois systems, as it evolves, has the ability on a standard basis across the Whois universe to be able to do things, produce results that might be requested or required by some kind of policy determination.

Question 9 kind of overlaps a policy issue that's out there currently. It's just the extent to which all new TLDs should or all TLDs should operate a thick Whois. And that's in the new registry agreement - or proposed in the new registry agreement but there are issues involved in how to make it happen.

Number 10 is a Whowas system. And again this is an old issue; been around as long as I've been working on these issues of well we know who owns a domain now; what about who used to own it? And that might be useful for businesses, for law enforcement, for consumers.

I mean, it's not in place now but if there's a policy decision it should be what should it be able to handle. What requirements should be in place in case the requirement comes down that there be a Whowas system or in case a

number of companies - registries or registrars - decide to put them in place have this baseline so that they operate consistently.

And then finally just - there's a section of questions that are kind of specifically aimed at registrars and registries and their view of what's required and how the system would operate. That's a general, to be honest, well, I'm sorry, we should get into the process.

We will review the public comments and I assure you we will. There'll be a proposed final draft. The survey will be released for 30 days. We'll look at the results to do some final report and following the usual process submit it to the GNSO Council.

The survey itself, you can see the link there, link to our wiki and a link below that to the comments post that again you've probably seen if - since you're here.

Here is, again, the link for the survey. That's not a typo in the middle there; I had not even really looked at the - at the URL until the first presentation. It is dotUG; that's not a typo for dotOrg. Please take the survey, give us your comments on it and encourage other people that you know who might be interested to do that. The more we get the better the final survey will be and the better it is the better the final product will be.

Appreciate your attention - the little burps with the slides there. Glad to take questions.

Yes, (Yaholvy).

(Yaholvy Atoin): Can you hear me, please? Can you hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, now you just came in. Yes, we can hear you.

(Yaholvy Atoin): Can you hear me?

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

(Yaholvy Atoin): Just a clarification is this a comment period about the survey or it is a period to take the survey? That is the what I want to know now. You wanted the people to comment the survey or to take the survey?

Don Blumenthal: No the URL and the - the URL in the announcement - well okay let me answer that a little more simply than I was going to. What we've posted now is a draft survey. And what we're looking for is comments on what we posted. We'll take those comments and use them to adjust this draft. The next thing that comes out will be the final survey that we'll analyze.

At this point it's just please take the survey for purposes of telling us what you think of it; what we should add, what we should take out and whatever else strikes you as appropriate.

Michael Young: It's also - it's Michael Young speaking - it's also posted as a typical public comment period piece. So we've posted a finite copy - text copy for comment. And if you follow the link that you see in the presentation while here you can actually participate in a temporary survey system we've put up to get some more dynamic feedback where you can.

But you - if you simply want to post some public commentary after looking at the survey statically then you're welcome to do that.

Don Blumenthal: Right, I'd forgotten that part. Thank you. Chuck. Chuck, are you on mute?

Chuck Gomes: Yes I was intentionally because I had to answer the door.

Don Blumenthal: Oh okay. I know that routine.

Chuck Gomes: I hustled back so let me - thanks and...

Don Blumenthal: And you're working from home.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, yes, that's correct - and in my home office; that's where I actually work as you know. Okay so my first question is is this - ultimately when this survey is finished and it goes out to people am I correct in understanding that it's just intended to be completed by technical folks?

Michael Young: Don, you want me to take that one?

Don Blumenthal: Sure, I mean, I don't know...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...response but sure.

Michael Young: And passionately - Chuck, no, it's meant to be taken by anybody. And what we've done with the more technical questions if we've created hover buttons above the terms that people might not be familiar with in an attempt to help the less technical be able to answer the questions. Although, you know, quite admittedly some of the questions may be - even with some assistance may be too technical for everybody to answer.

Chuck Gomes: I would agree with that. The - and I would say that there's also questions that technical people won't be able to answer without going to somebody else on their team because they're policy-related or they're legally-related or even, you know, legally within a particular jurisdiction some of the things with regard to privacy and stuff like that.

So my impression of the survey is that it's - it's going to be difficult to find any one person who could answer all the questions.

Michael Young: We absolutely agree - in agreement with that. That's one of the reasons we developed some questions at the beginning for people to self-categorize both their, you know, experience set, background and interest to help us understand the nature of how they may have answered some of their questions when we try and sort through the data and produce a report on it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes no - thanks, Michael. The - so in the final survey then is the intent then that depending on how you answer the first - the questions on probably the first page then only a subset of the questions will come up for those type of people?

Don Blumenthal: I don't - no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's what I wanted to know. So you would need then to make it clear to people that they can - if not skip questions just pick the no answer in cases where there is a no answer and there are quite a few of those where there's a no answer option and that helps.

The - Don, I hope I'm wrong but I think your statement that it'll take less time than you think - I guess it depends on how much time you think it'll take.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, good point, yes.

Chuck Gomes: But...

Don Blumenthal: I'm just concerned that it's going to look very daunting and...

Chuck Gomes: It is daunting.

Don Blumenthal: ...unless there's a lot of research involved, you're right from that standpoint.

Chuck Gomes: So people are going to have to be highly motivated to spend the amount of time it's going to take to do this survey. I personally think it's really important -

and I obviously went through it just for comments so far. And I would go through it although I'd have to skip a lot of the technical questions.

But I would probably do the survey with maybe some other people from the organization - from VeriSign just to help me get through some of it. But I think a big challenge is going to be to get people to spend the amount of time that is needed.

I absolutely recognize the criticalness of it. But I know that people are busy. I know that technical people are busy and so forth. So to get them to spend the time I think we're going to have to consider how we really motivate them to do that. It's one thing to do a 10 - even a 10-20 minutes survey; most of us probably shy away from those. This one I would say is going to be three times that at least.

Michael Young: Right. Hey, Chuck, it's Michael speaking. Ask you a couple questions back. Do you think we should include a opt out button, if you will, on every question consistently? And, two, I just want to encourage you if you come up with any ideas on how to encourage people to complete the survey perhaps having the opt out button will, you know, shorten it dramatically for some people so they'll just pay attention to their subject matter area where they have an expertise. But if you come up with any other ideas we'd really love to hear about them.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I don't have any ideas that I think will really work great right now but I'll be giving that some thought because I think it's really important that you get the data you're looking for. It may require a targeted outreach for people to complete it.

Like for example - and I haven't really thought this through a lot - but like for example within the Registry Stakeholder Group maybe we need to organize ourselves and try and give good feedback. And I think maybe other SGs and constituencies can do the same. There will be some that are more motivated

like I think your intellectual property people and law enforcement will be motivated.

But it is going to be a challenging task. And I think we really do need to spend some time focusing on how we can - I mean, just making it available I don't think is going to get your results because it is a daunting task; important but daunting. And so I do think it's worthwhile to spend some time focusing on how to really get the results.

I can tell you guys worked really hard on it. And no criticisms of the questions that are being asked but it's going to take different areas of expertise. But anyway I'll leave it at that because I did insert some comments. There are places where you didn't have a no answer or didn't have an other option that I suggested you probably need one there because there's always an other.

And if people get stuck and none of the choices work they're probably going to back out of it. So anyway but thanks, guys, for all the work on this. I do recognize the importance and compliment you on what you've done.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate that. One follow up request, you know, you're right, some of the questions butt up against policy. In some of the questions it was very hard to craft - to try to avoid that. If you could it would be real helpful to point out which ones you see as possibly presenting policy considerations or the legal...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, what I can do, Don, is go - I'll have to go - I didn't do that in the comments I put so I can - I'll try and find time in the next week or so to go back and identify ones that require policy, which ones require maybe even legal expertise. I could probably - it'll still take quite a bit of time to go through all 13 areas but I'll try and do that.

By the way to do that you have to answer the questions at least on the first page because if you leave any blank it won't let you go on. So one of the

difficulties that I found - I tried to just skip through the questions and put comments at the bottom...

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...didn't work; wouldn't let me go on until I answered...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: That's interesting.

Chuck Gomes: So that's a problem with doing that right now. So I had to put an answer at every question before it would let me go on.

Michael Young: Yes, we could probably do something about that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: That would be good, yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So okay thanks, guys. I'll let other people talk.

Don Blumenthal: Thanks for your thoughts, Chuck. (Yaholvy).

(Yaholvy Atoin): (Yaholvy) speaking. Thank you (unintelligible) very clear. My question - I would like to know the way people are meant to take the survey (unintelligible) one time or be able to do it like they do a portion today, they can save it, they can come back another day and continue. So can it be - would it be possible (unintelligible) to take it or once you take it you have to finish everything? (Unintelligible) but I just want to (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: Excuse me. Sorry about that. I believe there is a save feature in there. Michael?

Michael Young: Yes, there is, Don. We discussed that. You'll be able to save your session and come back and complete the survey at a later time if you want to.

(Yaholvy Atoin): Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, I thought that was the case but when I went through it I just kind of sat back and tore through and didn't bother to...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I'm not sure we have it on right now in the trial version that we have up but the plan is to have it in the final version.

Don Blumenthal: Fair enough. Are there any other questions?

(Yaholvy Atoin): Yes please.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

(Yaholvy Atoin): (Yaholvy) speaking. (Unintelligible) question, you are talking about Whois and then I want to know if this work your group is doing is to improve Whois. My understanding is that some people would like to go another protocol. So the work that you are doing is to improve Whois or to - this will take you to a search where you would decide to do something different or just to improve the current protocol that is Whois - that is my question.

Don Blumenthal: Okay the IETF WEIRDS group - and that's an acronym, and I don't remember exactly what it stands for - but there is an ongoing group within the IETF that's looking at protocol changes for the standard Whois protocol.

Again that would be the technical side thing. What we're looking at here is the service requirements; what would be the elements of Whois that would be put

in place using this - using the protocol however it develops. So there are kind of - there are separate but parallel efforts. I really think what we come up with could help guide the protocol writers - developers. Does that answer your question?

(Yaholvy Atoin): Yes, yes (unintelligible) thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay great. And at least Michael and I are kind of sitting on the side and watching the WEIRDS process because it's - both for itself and our interest but it - sometimes it gives ideas to...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: It's - you know, it's Michael speaking - it's a really interesting process in the WEIRDS group because, you know, there's a lot of creativity going on and, you know, the conversation all of a sudden swings back towards, as Don says, you know, consideration for, you know, what requirements and what functionality are they really trying to solve for.

So you'll see a bunch of technical people discussing a particular portion of the technical problem in detail, stop suddenly in the middle of debate in that list and turn around and say wait a second what are we trying to solve for again? So it reinforces the importance of a survey like this to give them clear information to help them focus their efforts and their work.

Don Blumenthal: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I wasn't going to jump in again but I thought I'd better. The more I think about it - and I'm going to continue to mull this over as I know you guys will as well. The more I'm thinking about it the more I'm thinking that you may need to divide the survey up to particular targeted groups like policy, like legal, like technical. And you might have more realistic chances of getting people to focus on it because that will make it a lot easier.

Now I - that may be a daunting task, I don't know. But I think that's one way that you might get better results. You're still going to have to do a lot of motivating I think but - and come up with other ideas. But that may be one way that makes it a little less daunting. Because if it's in your area of expertise you can do it much more quickly which is I think what Don was getting at. If it's not it really slows you down so even if you're just clicking a bunch of no answers. So - anyway that's what I wanted to share.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, appreciate it definitely. (Yaholvy).

(Yaholvy Atoin): Yes, (Yaholvy) speaking. Just would like to know if there is a plan to have the survey in (unintelligible) languages too in the future? (Unintelligible) ready to report if it would be available in other languages too? Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Very interesting thought. I can't say there's a plan to...

(Yaholvy Atoin): Hello?

Don Blumenthal: ...but I think it is a very interesting idea.

(Yaholvy Atoin): You didn't get my question?

Don Blumenthal: No I did. I said I can't say there is a plan to do that but I think it's a very worthwhile suggestion.

(Yaholvy Atoin): Yes, okay. Any other questions, follow ups, comments? I'm just scanning down the chat to make sure I didn't miss anything. Okay well if there aren't any at this point any final thoughts, Michael?

Michael Young: No I just wanted to thank everyone for coming to the presentation. And I know a lot of you represent various stakeholder groups or are well connected in the community so I really appreciate you, you know, passing on what

you've learned today to others and encourage them to comment on the draft survey.

Originally we weren't planning on a public comment period and Chuck, to kind of your earlier point, our real effort with this was to, you know, make the survey as effective as possible; also to, you know, feedback from stakeholders on maybe some key questions that they feel that we might have missed.

And then, you know, also through this process just build in a larger than typical awareness for ICANN - ICANN sponsored to ICANN-centric surveys. You know, because doing a long comment period and having a lot of discussion about it means that, you know, as we all know a lot more of the community will have awareness so by the time we put out the final survey hopefully we'll get a larger than average response rate.

So I do thank everyone and I encourage them to help us spread the word about this and increase awareness of the, you know, what we're trying to do here and that there will be a final survey out near the end of the summery for them to take.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Okay - looking again, no. I don't see another hands up in the room so again thanks very much for your participation. It's really helpful. We can end the call.

END