

WHOIS Survey Working Group TRANSCRIPT

Monday 06 February 2012 at 2000 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-20120206-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees

Avri Doria - NCSG

Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC

Susan Prosser - RrSG

Michael Young - Individual

Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC

Stephen Van Egmond - Individual

ICANN Staff

Berry Cobb

Glen de St Gery

Liz Gasster

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Don Blumenthal

Coordinator: You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tanya). Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is the WHOIS call on the 6 of February 2012.

On the call today, we have Wilson Abigaba, Cintra Sooknanan, Susan Prosser, Michael Young, Steven Van Egmond, Avri Doria, and Wendy

Seltzer. So, on staff, we have Berry Cobb, Glen DeSaintgery, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

We have an apology from Don Blumenthal.

I'd like to remind you all to speak your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much.

Michael Young: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Nathalie.

Michael Young: Hi, everyone. Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: No. Please, go ahead.

Michael Young: All right, I'm just going to do my usual. Thank you everyone for your time and effort in attending. And I was just going to throw out the agenda bashing. Berry to start with. But Berry, can we also ask a question of everyone? Can you put your hand up if you need to leave the call early today so that we make sure that if we have things you're coping with we do them first in priority? Okay, I don't hear anybody. If anyone does, that's just for anyone, please just interrupt the call, and we'll priority your work elements first. Oh, I see Wilson.

Woman: Early as against what deadline?

Michael Young: We have 90 minutes scheduled for the call.

Woman: Thanks.

Michael Young: Wilson, I see you put your hand up. So, you need to go a little earlier than that. I realize it's late at night there too. So...

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, but I will (unintelligible) for like 45 minutes.

Michael Young: 45 minutes? Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: So, a little - 45 minutes, yes.

Michael Young: So, I'm just looking at the agenda here, Berry, just to make this - I think we have Wilson fairly high up in the action item review list anyways, so when we go through the action items and we hit Wilson's, why don't we go to his review for the ideas (unintelligible) over the last couple of weeks?

Berry Cobb: All right, great. Thank you. So, in terms of our outstanding action items, action item 1 which is assigned to me or ICANN staff. Basically, we were talking about how we could go about performing a roadshow. We surveyed representatives from the SOs and ACs. It seems like the best course of action would be to conduct two webinar sessions. We haven't had the schedule yet, and I imagine probably after our call in the next two weeks we'll have a better idea of comfort level of where we're at with this survey. And when we get a good target date in mind, then we can get those scheduled.

But the feedback we received is basically that we conduct two sessions to try to accommodate the varying time zones, probably scheduled for 60 minutes apiece. And right now, if you'll notice on the bottom right-hand corner, I've updated our milestones that we're trying to hit. Right now, I just kind of tentatively put out there the last week of February or the first week of March. And again, when we figure out what we're going to do with the survey, then we can go from there and get those scheduled.

Michael Young: Okay. So, Barry, how many - do we have one more meeting before Costa Rica, I think?

Berry Cobb: That is correct. Let me look at the calendar real quick. That would be actually two meetings. We have one scheduled for February 20 and then March 5, so the week before Costa Rica. So we've got two sessions left.

Michael Young: That's good. Okay. So if we - just trying to think ahead a little bit on overall scheduling. If we want to - what's our limit if we want to post something for public comment just prior or even during the Costa Rica meeting?

Berry Cobb: Basically, once we've nailed down our draft, then I'll submit the form to open up the public comment period. The structure has changed recently. It's a minimum of 21 days for the open comment period, and then a minimum of 21 days to respond to comments. I think since we would like to think this open through Costa Rica, we'd probably maybe even look at going for 30 days in the initial period of comments. So again, once we're ready to go, then I'll submit the forms and we'll get that opened up.

Michael Young: Okay. And is there a point to doing the webinars? I would think we should align scheduling the webinars with kind of around the time that we've posted it for public comment, so we can walk people through and introduce and familiarize themselves.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. Right now, in the milestones area, you know, tentatively we have that we would submit the draft survey on the 1st of March, you know, or the 5th of March after our second session before coaster Rica. And, you know, I think we'll really have a better idea of those dates after we meet again on the 20th.

Michael Young: Okay. So if we submit it then, would you suggest that we do the webinars after coaster Rica or what are you thinking?

Berry Cobb: It's really up to you, Michael. And I think, you know, you were going to bring Don along as well to help in the roadshow, so it's...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay. Well, let me get with Don offline, because he is not able to attend the calls right now. I guess they conflict with some teaching session he does. And also, I mean, if he's too conflicted, then it may look to see if I can get some more help from Susan. If you're willing, Susan.

Susan Prosser: Yes, I am here for you normally, Michael, when I can talk.

Berry Cobb: And Michael, to your point, you know, I think if we tried doing the webinars on the 5th of March, will probably not have as much of attendance as everybody is going to be looking at other public comment periods and absorbing a lot of information. So it would probably be best if we did it at, you know, post Costa Rica. But we'll see where we are with the survey.

Michael Young: Okay. Well, why don't we plan to do that? We could even - if we did do a public meeting in Costa Rica, we could even kind of do - you know, present the content that we'd put in the webinar anyways for the first time there. We could post just before Costa Rica, and in the public meeting forum, we could basically give - I mean that would be the first, effectively, like a, you know, live webinar, if you will.

Berry Cobb: Okay, all right. Well, per last call or last two calls, I thought we decided we weren't going to do a public session, so that's been taken off of the schedule.

Michael Young: Okay. No problem. I wasn't sure whether or not we had left open as an option. The webinars are fine. So let's just try and get it posted before the meeting and allow some of us to go around and socialize it with the various groups that we work with and then get people interested in attending the webinar.

Berry Cobb: Sounds like a plan.

Michael Young: All right. Does anyone disagree with that? Is that all right with everybody? Okay. So our plan is basically get it posted before Costa Rica, the first version, and then all of us, you know, work our circles to try and socialize it a bit, and then encourage people to attend the webinars that will happen after Costa Rica so that they understand a bit better what we're up to and what the survey is about.

Berry Cobb: Very good. Okay. So the second action item was mine, and that was basically just to send out a doodle poll for the new schedule which we have now. I will consider the complete.

Third action is to Wilson which is - it's kind of a hybrid action item. I think that the one is, you know, still how we are going to handle comments within the survey. And then the second portion was the structure of the survey itself in terms of how we mold the questions that we have here. So I'll turn that over to Wilson. I'll turn it over to Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. I'm sorry. I just did something in the chat, but it's not (unintelligible). I was trying to (unintelligible) what I want to talk about. Okay. Regarding the question types, I have whittled down on mainly five question types -- multiple choice, (unintelligible) boxes, radio boxes, you know, the ones we have by (unintelligible). Then the checkboxes where you can choose one - more than one answer or - and can also limit how many answers you will see and what you choose. For example, if there are five, and want - just want to choose only two, you can also do that.

Then the ranks just a scale of 1 to 5 or scale of 1 to 10. Then the dropdown menus. And then the text boxes where you can type anything. And just like what (unintelligible) limit the character to maybe to 400 or 150 or 75 for each particular (unintelligible).

These are the five I've thought about, and I think they encompass (unintelligible). Unless they really did need, I would recommend that you go with only these five because it helps in the setting up the survey and the analysis. And also, in (unintelligible) around the same thing then what I - I would recommend that we limit the type of questions we have to only these kinds.

Then the other thing I was also able to initiate on the (unintelligible) and look for having the (unintelligible) we shall be able to have them in HTML, so we can actually put HTML in the (unintelligible) make something bold and italic and all that if we need to. Then I'll also need to (unintelligible) reduce the open-ended questions -- questions that require someone to check. We should aim at reducing them as much as we can (unintelligible) analyze them.

Then someone had also raised a question regarding whether (unintelligible) questions (unintelligible) dropdown or some kind of auto-field which lists down the answers (unintelligible) so that someone can be able to enter around the same comments or other. (Unintelligible) that one, it may not be possible for the text fields, but it's possible for the (unintelligible), answers (unintelligible) by a single (unintelligible). In HTML, we have (unintelligible) and textboxes and text fields. It's possible (unintelligible), but I'll (unintelligible) on that as I go along. But it's possible the questions we have (unintelligible) this one.

And then, the other thing apart from this action is that I'm getting worried the questions are becoming too many and may take over 15 minutes or 20 minutes for someone to actually fill in the entire survey and give us their answers. I think, in my opinion, we should aim at reducing the questions as much as we can - the number of questions as much as we can, because it becomes too long and takes (unintelligible) answers that you want from the respondent.

Michael Young: So, in terms of length - I'm getting an echo here. Can people mute if they're not talking? There we go. That's better.

So, Wilson, the question I had, do you think we'll be too long if we're allowing people to opt out of questions? So we talked about giving people a selection on each question, you know, basically that they'll pass on the question. We anticipated that because some people find certain questions way too technical for them to have a coherent answer.

Wilson Abigaba: What do you mean by "opt out". We can make some questions mandatory or not mandatory.

Michael Young: Well, no, I mean - wow, I'm getting a real echo still. Maybe I'll - why don't you continue. I'm going to dial back in again. See if it's on my side. No, it's gone again now.

Berry Cobb: I don't think it's you, Michael.

Michael Young: So, I'm being told it's from your line, Wilson. Okay.

No, I'm saying that we need to allow, just to be fair, on every question we need to allow an opt-out option. Some people - people tend to use that opt-out option of the question we anticipate if they are - you know, they don't understand it for some reason. We anticipate that usually being because it's too technical for them, but also maybe because if somebody doesn't necessarily have a good history of, you know, policy or operational practices or behaviors around WHOIS and just us understand the question.

So, you know, if we anticipate that, you know, the average surveyor, I would say, may opt out as much as 20% of the questions, are we still too long?

Yes, it's better, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, (unintelligible) I didn't hear the question well. Could you please repeat, because I didn't hear the question? I was (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Sure. Can you put your on (unintelligible)? Okay, let me try one more time here.

So what I'm saying is that we had agreed on earlier calls that we would allow people to opt out of certain questions or any of the questions, actually, shouldn't say certain questions. They could opt out out of any of the questions if they didn't understand the question. So if we anticipate the average person taking the survey only completing 80% of questions, do you think we're still too long?

Wilson Abigaba: Regarding that, opting out, I don't exactly what you mean by opting out, because one, we could put an option of, say, I - something - not - okay, not (unintelligible) answer the question, but something more polite. An option (unintelligible) something more polite meaning that they don't want - they cannot answer the question. Or we can actually put "I opt out of this question." But either way, it would be hard being able to read the question, meaning that they have to think about it. And that (unintelligible) on taking the survey and also on the number of questions.

Michael Young: Wilson, I'm just typing it answer here because of the phone line issues.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, I'm reading the comments.

Berry Cobb: Basically - this is Berry - we're trying...

Avri Doria: Yes, can I speak (unintelligible). This is Avri.

Berry Cobb: Yes, go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that what's coming out of all this is that there are - it's a good idea to give every question some way of saying "I have no answer. I don't have a preference. I don't." So the no choice option, and I think, you know, as was said there, where there is true and false, you add a "Don't know." Where there is a multiple choice, you add a "No opinion."

And it's not really an opting out and - but the question becomes, are we doing it where everybody has to answer every question and therefore there is a "Don't know, don't care," answer, or are we saying that we're doing a survey where you answer the questions you want to answer and you ignore the others? And I don't know if that's a decision that's been made. I don't remember it. Thanks.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, so (unintelligible) answer the question in more than one fashion, but that poses a challenging on implementation. Because they are not logging in, we are not keeping their profile, so it's difficult to know - to track down the person - when the person comes back - comes to log in again from a different computer, we cannot know whether they had actually filled in some answers or not. Unless we try - we tell them to save the questionnaire and then we give them a code. Would that be an option?

Michael Young: It could be, but I - you know, I don't think people would likely do that much work, in all fairness, to save a code and then come back again. I think probably once they've abandoned the survey, they'll - it'll say abandoned. I mean that's typical in these things, and it's typically what I would personally do, you know, unless I had a very compelling reason to go back and complete a survey.

Avri is saying she can use the code and come back and finish. Well, maybe everyone is different. Wilson, if we can offer that option, we should. Doesn't hurt.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. We can do that. But me, I would think (unintelligible) want to make the survey (unintelligible) to come back later. I don't think it should be that long. I'm not sure, but that's my opinion.

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: So on the length issue, I'll volunteer and Berry can put me down for an action item to go through all the questions and also try and do initial timing on what we've got so far, also see if there're any obvious consolidations that we can do of questions. But Wilson, I think the next step for us is for you to actually give us - you talked about some formats, if you could actually give us specific examples of formats that we can choose from, I think we need to go through and move all our questions into these common or, you know, approved formats.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, yes. We can do that. But okay, I - okay, I'm sorry. I didn't complete (unintelligible) putting these questions inside the survey tool I have come up with. But as I said to Don, I (unintelligible) which kind of (unintelligible) to do that. (Unintelligible) question number 1, I can (unintelligible) question number 1. Which of the following terms (unintelligible) survey?

And then say that (unintelligible) size of the organization is the number of employees, your staff, and the number of members. The (unintelligible) employees or members, what is supposed to be there? And then should someone filling in something or what, and then we have these multiple choices. I'm not - I wasn't sure if we could put this question in this survey for using this format, because (unintelligible) employees or members (unintelligible) another question (unintelligible) or it was just misplaced.

Michael Young: I think what you - I mean, I'm looking at number one, and I see what you mean with the incoherence of that, right, because you don't want to free-text

the answer on size of employees or members and then a selection on type of user, right? So, I think you have to assume, Wilson, to create - give us three or four formats that are easy for us to consume the data back from, and leave it to us, as the authors of the questions, to have to find a way to fit our questions into those formats.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay, okay. (Unintelligible) the four types with some examples.

Michael Young: Right, perfect. And then, so that everybody else, if we have an issue with any of those formats, we feel there's another format that's really important that we're missing, then we can have that discussion on the list with you, Wilson, and say, you know, "We need a fifth format really badly," or, you know, "Format number 3, if we could change it a little bit, would be much more effective." So let's just to that part of the discussion on the list. So the sooner you can post that to the list, the quicker.

And Berry, if we set it as an action item to get that decided on and people to format their questions into those formats for the next call, then that's a worthwhile amount of work to get done before the next call.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. Yes, since the - we have only one more call that we can (unintelligible) submit a draft survey, I will (unintelligible)...

Michael Young: We have to calls, Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: What dates?

Michael Young: Wilson, did you hear me?

Wilson Abigaba: You said we have two calls. I don't know which dates.

Michael Young: The last one is March 5.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes. And then there's 27 - there's one on 27th of February. Is that right?

Michael Young: Berry, what was the actual date of the one in February?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. We have a call on 20th of February and the call on 5th of March.

Michael Young: Right. So Wilson, if we can get the formatted questions in the next, you know, two or three days from you, then that gives the rest of us enough time to format or questions into those new formats, you know, as well as debate the formats a little bit if we need to. And, you know, that gives us a coherent and consistent structure for the survey questions that we've done so far the next call which will be a great place to be. And then we have two weeks to continue to clean at that and check time and maybe consolidate some of the questions so that by the - you know, two calls from now, we should be at a point where we have at least, say, a coherent draft that we could publish for initial feedback on.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. I'm going to submit the question types after this call. And I will request the team members to change their questions to this format, and if they can, (unintelligible) questions so that we can have the draft serve them at the next call. We shall have adequate time to make changes to it and have it ready for (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay. And did you - you've got is an action item to also look at the survey tool to be able to handle what Avri has been talking about with the - with being able to receive the code either on screen and/or an e-mail message to continue the survey?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, that's one I can answer right now, that I will be able to (unintelligible) that. That is emitting a code and also (unintelligible) for those who wish to complete the survey later, they can do that. That - I'll do that. I'll (unintelligible) that.

Michael Young: Great, thank you.

Wilson Abigaba: So - okay. Me, I'll be leaving the call in 30 minutes from now, but I just want to remind members to, when they send the survey questions, to please respond, and I'll be counting on Berry Cobb to compare the questions again according - to provide the compiled questions according to the new format (unintelligible) maybe by February 13 -- February 13 is next Monday -- so they can have time to put them in the survey tool and have them ready for the 20th.

Michael Young: Great, thank you.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. Thanks.

Michael Young: Berry, I've been watching the screen. I see you seem to have captured everything here, so that's great. I think we can - Wilson, was that it? Should we move onto the next action item?

Berry Cobb: Great, Michael. This is just basically the last two is, you know, into the survey question form itself, the working group to continue working on their questions, and then mine was to send out the next survey version which, you know, those will carry over again, so I think we're done - are complete with the action items.

Michael Young: Okay. So we may not need the 90 minutes today hopefully. I guess I saw there were some submittals from Steven Van Egmond, and I think we had some questions that people dropped off the call last week that we probably should go through, and then we are premature wrap for this meeting.

Berry Cobb: And we also had Avri submit updates to her to questions as well.

Michael Young: Great, great. Do we have Steven on the call?

Steven Van Egmond: Yes you do.

Michael Young: Great. Steven, you want to do yours since you are at the top of the document?

Steven Van Egmond: Yes, I do. I'll put on speaker here, all right. Well, at the very top is not my maybe survey respondent profile. I did suggest a additional to questions -- these appear on page 2 -- which qualify whether or not the respondent maintains a WHOIS service for a registrar, registry operator, or RIR. And if so, where that software came from.

Michael Young: Okay, that's useful. Great.

Steven Van Egmond: Yes. And the rewritten questions I provided begin on page 3 which point out, again, the requirement R-1, and have two questions related to that as - leave to others to comment if they feel like it. Basically, we feel into whether or not their existing use-case is, so whether they've written their own WHOIS clients, and they would use a publicly-operated listing - publically-accessible and machine-parsable list domain names or IP locations of WHOIS servers.

The formatting sort of ate some of the distinctions I had between questions, so if you look for pairs of square brackets, that's where new options begin. So the first group should have three - no, first group should have five. And the second question should have one, two, three options as well.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. That's my bad. I'll update the Word document. I think that something got lost in translation when I converted it to PDF. But yes, I'll make sure that those options get carried - returned down.

Steven Van Egmond: Thank you. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Steven Van Egmond: And aside from the update to question 1, there are also some updates on page 18 of the PDF regarding requirement 8.1. There are four questions in total - I'm sorry, for questions related to that requirement. And Berry, just to point out, there are similar formatting issues here as well.

And what I did compared to the previous round of questions was to provide some specifics. So like what seemed to be fairly responsible specific (unintelligible) choices. So, for instance, (unintelligible) question 4, method of providing elevated access rights.

Michael Young: Steven, I'm looking at 1 here. You might want to address the second bullet point that says, "Yes, as a law (unintelligible)," not be as specific. Just say, "As a member of a law enforcement agency."

Steven Van Egmond: Okay.

Michael Young: Because they may not technically be an officer.

Steven Van Egmond: Right. (Unintelligible)?

Michael Young: I'm just reading through these. I'm sure everyone else is too.

Berry Cobb: And Michael, this is Berry. I can go ahead and make this change for you, Steven. Would you say just "as a member of law enforcement"?

Steven Van Egmond: Correct.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: "Of a law enforcement agency" I think is kind of the terminology that people have been comfortable with recently.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I've made that change on the master.

Steven Van Edmond: Okay.

Michael Young: Steven, on number 2, are we - "your access rights are circumscribed, please describe the constraints you operate under." Do we need to boil that language down a bit more so they understand that - you know, we are assuming they understand what we mean by access rights?

Steven Van Egmond: Well, this is all within the context of requirement 8.1. So we're talking about accommodate anonymous access...

Michael Young: Yes, but...

Steven Van Egmond: Hmm?

Michael Young: But these people never would have probably read the report.

Steven Van Egmond: Right. That's what the preamble above question 1 is intended to describe.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steven Van Egmond: Berry, my suggestion may be to bold the phrase "elevated access rights" in that paragraph.

Michael Young: Yes, maybe "elevated access rights", "no constraints for elevated access rights", to tie it back to the top paragraph repeatedly, so they know exactly what you're tying back to.

Steven Van Egmond: Mm-hm, correct.

Michael Young: Yes, it's a good idea. Okay.

Berry Cobb: I made those - I bolded it and expanded it to "elevated access rights".

Michael Young: All right. If anyone has any ideas, I mean I'm going to go through all these questions and just think about, you know, tweaking wording to, I guess, make the newer - not necessarily the newcomer to WHOIS but maybe the new work, or two WHOIS, make some of this stuff a little more understandable to them. Of course, we will do the popup windows with, you know, explanations and so forth, but anyone that has an simplification or making these easier to comprehend is most appreciated.

Steven Van Egmond: Yes.

Michael Young: Like that's going to be a specific - once we get these formatted into the right - Wilson's formats, I think, you know, the next two-week period, we're going to give that as a piece of homework to everyone to go through and see if we can't simplify language. Everyone take a shot at it (unintelligible). It's challenging with these to make them easier to comprehend. Anything else, Steven?

Steven Van Egmond: That's all.

Michael Young: Okay. Thank you.

Steven Van Egmond: Unless anyone has any other comments or any other questions.

Wendy Seltzer: This is Wendy. I just threw a question into the chat where it seems that the fourth question here is addressing the person on the other side of the transaction from the previous three questions. Probably, "Describe your preferred approach for gaining or receiving authenticated access rights."

Steven Van Egmond: Right, yes, that would make sense. Thanks.

Michael Young: Good catch, Wendy. Thanks. Okay. Anything else for Steven?

Okay. Berry, who's the next logical person to go to?

Berry Cobb: Avri had submitted her questions for requirement number 6.1, I believe, and 6.2, if I got those numbers right.

Avri Doria: A.

Berry Cobb: Or 6A, that's right, my bad.

Avri Doria: 6A and B, right. Okay. This is Avri. I didn't do that much. I just added - instead of being very shorthand about these. These end propositions would have a 5 scale. I broke it out as everyone else did and so it was visible. And I didn't change the text in them much. I think a couple of them I tried to core - I mean I tried to make it a little clearer but not a lot.

What I did add, and I don't know if this is an notion that's accepted or not, but in addition to a statement, you know, on data being extensible, I am also asking is this issue even relevant to you. Now I don't know how that fits into that testing methodology and we'll have to see, but what that does is it produces - if you take two things together and you find that someone strongly disagrees with the statement but thinks the question it is totally irrelevant, it means less than, you know, sometimes other comments they may make. It's an extra dimension.

I don't know if it's worth doing, but when I was going through the questions and I remembered our discussion last time where it seemed that some of the questions people would say, "Yes, I understand this, but why are you asking me this? What's the relevance? And is this relevant to our scope? Is this whatever?" And I was thinking, as opposed to us making those judgments, we can actually put that in the questionnaire and find out what topics are totally irrelevant to the community we're approaching. So that's about what I did.

Michael Young: Okay. Avri, that's great. I would almost call that like a control group question.

Avri Doria: It is - it's not quite a control group, but yes. It has that similar sort of mechanism because you - when you start digging deeper into the responses, you can get to play with, you know, the question choice as influenced by its relevancy weight and that. But I don't know how much sense it necessarily makes doing that in one section versus others except as a test on how various testing methodologies work in this group that becomes a piece of metadata information we get out of this exercise. However, while I was doing it, that's what I thought.

Michael Young: So the question is then - that comes to mind then is, that you already raised, is, do we add this to - this type of control question to every section?

Avri Doria: Or do you added to just one or two questions in every section? Or do you make it a section-wide question? And that is a possible question, yes. Is it?

Michael Young: Yes.

Avri Doria: Again, there's any number of ways to do it if you decide to do it through the test without insisting on it at each question.

Michael Young: Yes, yes, I think if we tried it in - I think, in terms of, you know, not making the survey too long, the most frequent - frequent we can introduce it, the rate of frequency would be the section. Yes. Okay.

Avri Doria: But that's - so that's what I was thinking, and that's - but I stayed in that same sort of style of make a declaration and find out whether people agree or disagree and to what degree. And then using the free point, "Don't have an opinion either way," as - in this case, as that's the opt-out.

Michael Young: Right.

Avri Doria: Don't know, don't care, you know. I don't have an opinion. And that could be any number of reasons that doesn't really matter. When it's coupled with a "Question is irrelevant," you know, then you also get some different kind of views. But that's - so that's what I did in terms of working the question. I think I added one or two at the end of 6 B also that hadn't been there. I had been sort of quick about it.

Michael Young: Okay, great. So, you know, I suggest we - I'd like to think a little bit about what you've introduced here, Avri, and I'm sure everybody else wants to a little bit. But my inclination is to see if we can't introduce that on a per-section basis. So I ask everyone to think about that because - and I'm going to think about it a bit more, but I really have an inclination to want to do that. Okay. Any other questions for Avri? Great work. Thank you, Avri.

Berry, who - do we have anything else left in here? I know we had some stuff from Steve, but we don't seem to have - do we - I don't think we have Steve on the call today.

Berry Cobb: That's correct. Yes, that's - R-7 is basically our only gap with respect to the IRD requirement. And definitely I believe we need Steven here to discuss the issue. Perhaps we can try taking it back to the list. I can re-forward his e-mail out, and we can see if we can draw up some discussion.

Michael Young: Okay, good. So why don't we take it back to the list then? And I'm also going to phone - try and phone Steve offline and see if he can walk me through this, because I know he did try and give a pretty good explanation in his initial e-mail, but I - to be honest, I'm not sure I'm grasping it in its entirety. So I personally need a little bit of help wrapping my head around all - you know, his - that whole series of points there. Okay.

Now Cintra made some changes, Berry, to my questions, tidying them up and making them clearer. I think they got absorbed in to this version. I remember seeing it go to the list.

Berry Cobb: I think I got them in here. Can you recall which requirement that was?

Michael Young: Cintra's on the call now. Maybe she can lead us on this.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi. Thank you. This is Cintra. I sent my e-mail on the 24th of January. So I'm just trying to go back to that right now. I don't know if you want me to run through the changes, because it will take me a short time just to open it up, or if we want to just to a comparison.

Michael Young: It's up to you, Cintra. If you wanted the feedback from the group, that's fine, or we can just make sure to ask people to review it and follow up with any questions, however you like.

Cintra Sooknanan: I think so, because my changes was for all these actions, not just yours.

Michael Young: Right.

Man: And this is...

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes. Just an interest. Sometime maybe it will be best, you know, that each person just, you know, review their section and see if it makes sense or not, and that's fine whether we decide to take it on board or not.

Michael Young: In looking at version 6, does it look like your changes got absorbed into that? Because I think you put out yours as version 5.5 or something like that.

Cintra Sooknanan: I put it out as "PS edit" or something like that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: But I - what I will do is I will review this after the call. And if there is any (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Great. So while we're on the topic of getting editors really, so once we get these questions formatted into a common format that Wilson's going to lead us on, the next call I want people to think about, because I need a couple of volunteers to work as primary editor and secondary editor to go through and adjust just the language flow, not changing the nature of the questions but, you know, as an editor going through and giving them a consistency and a common voice, so it's - it doesn't sound like, you know, we're switching authors every three questions but that they sound a little more consistent.

So, Cintra already kind of took a tactic of clarity and going through and editing all the questions. So hopefully, Cintra, you can be one of the volunteers.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, I'll be happy to fill that role. Thank you.

Michael Young: Great. So I'll let people dwell on who's going to, you know, put their hand up. Obviously, I'm going to go through everything, but I want, you know, a couple of people independent of me please.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I bring up another issue? I have my...

Michael Young: Absolutely.

Avri Doria: My - but my hand is not up to be a volunteer to be an editor, because I'm not doing that. In fact, I'm doing something far more insidious.

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: I'm suggesting another activity, and I'm actually going to volunteer at least one person not me for it.

Michael Young: Okay.

Avri Doria: One of the things that a survey or a test can use is a - someone to actually test testing it. And before - and so I'm wondering if it's possible to find a couple people who volunteered for this group at large but haven't been involved in the question building, that after the editors have done the pass, to actually sit down and take the thing and jot down notes on what worked, what didn't work, but to actually - obviously, not using the online mechanism, just using scratch paper. But actually take the thing not having read it, not having contributed to it, not having edited it, you know.

So, for example - and we have some - I was looking at people like perhaps Don who can't it to the meetings, so therefore has missed all of these discussions becomes an excellent candidate for testing the test and testing the survey. So as I say, it's terrible to start out saying, "I don't volunteer," and here's something that someone else could be volunteered first, but that's what I (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Avri, I think that's a great idea. We did plan into our overall project plan to have a kind of a - not this early in the process, but later on we were going to do a more formal round of kind of a - you know, a beta run of the survey.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Michael Young: But this is awesome as part of the editing process. I think it's a great idea. So - and will certainly strengthen even the first preliminary draft. Yes, let's do it. So Don sounds like a - especially since he's not on the call. I love volunteering people who are not on calls. It's great fun. So we'll see if we can get Don to do it. I'm sure he will. Is there anyone else you had in mind, Avri?

Avri Doria: No. He was the person that - I don't - he someone that I know was in this group and wasn't able to attend these meetings. And therefore I am not even

really sure I know who all else is in this group other than people that have participated in this meeting. So, no. I would suggest going through, you know, someone like, you know, Berry or someone else, who knows everyone that's in the group, perhaps help you come up with a couple victims and see if they are interested based upon - or who had a genuine volunteer, but for whatever reason weren't able to get into it.

Michael Young: Right. And I - you know, a couple of people that outside the group that come to my head that I'm sure we could get to put a little time into this, Berry, is maybe even getting Dave or Francisco to take it and give their comments, because this - WHOIS has been near and dear to their hearts lately. You know, they're a little more biased towards the technical side of things though, but it'd be interesting. And so we - Berry, you and I can take that offline and try and find another body or two.

Berry Cobb: Very good.

Michael Young: Thanks, Avri. Great idea.

Avri Doria: Sorry. You're welcome, but sorry that I just made work for other people.

Michael Young: I'll pass on your apologies to them.

Avri Doria: I'm sure some day it'll come back at me. You know, work, and all that.

Michael Young: Yes, yes, yes, I think it's inevitable. It's probably already hit you a few times. Okay.

Cintra, it looks like she lost her connection. Oh, I can see. I don't know if we can do anything for her, Berry.

So, it looks like I don't think we have any more questions to go through unless I'm missing something. Berry?

Berry Cobb: In terms of the latest updates, that's all that we've gotten so - thus far.

Michael Young: Okay. And we've got a good collection of action items to do for the next call, and we have some preliminary work that we've already kind of defined for the following two-week period to take us to - get us to a point where we can have the first draft to put up for public comments after March 5. So I think we're in fairly good shape for this call. Berry, do you want to - well, let me just open up to everyone and say - just open up for new business and see if there's anything else anyone wants to bring up that we haven't had all the agenda today.

Okay. Hearing nothing. Berry, can you just walk us through the action items real quick, and we'll wrap the call.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Michael. This is Berry. Basically, we have seven new ones that were created today. The first one is up to you, Michael, and I think you were going to take a stronger look at the survey and look at the length. And there was something else that you were - I think and also in terms of some of the language, you were going to maybe take a look at.

Second item is out to Wilson, and he'll provide - I think, he'll, at the end of this call or the next day or so, provide examples of the survey question types that will in turn provide an action for the entire team for the requirement assignments for each one of them to mold their questions into those available question types.

A fourth action item is out - will be out to Wilson, and he's going to submit the information about the survey code capability and, you know, basically, the code will be loaded in e-mail form.

The fifth action item is out to the entire team for the team to consider whether the question is relevant for either per section or per question.

Sixth action item is I'll send out a respond back from Steve Metalitz of response regarding R-7 and the IRD, and we'll hopefully try it and whether it should be used in the survey or not. And hopefully, we'll garner up some dialogue on the list.

And then the last action item is for us to find a few persons to maybe sign up for testing the survey.

Michael Young: Right. And then, Berry, just to kind of - it's not an action item, but just again, to give people a heads-up. We nail this away in the next two weeks. The following two weeks, we're going to be obviously getting a couple of our editors. We have one so far, so I'll have to identify another one by the next call, and myself as well. So three of us will be going through trying to give a common voice to the questions so they sound a little bit more consistent. Yes, that's great to add that -- identify an editor.

And then, we're going to have our poor volunteered workers -- indentured workers -- to go through and take the survey and give us some notes back. So, fantastic.

All right. Now we've gone through the action items. Anyone want to add any action items? Did we miss anything? Okay, hearing nothing. We got the call done in an hour today instead of 90 minutes, which I think is a good sign. We're getting relatively efficiently.

And Berry is going to wrap the call. I just want to thank everybody for their time, effort and volunteer work. It's really appreciated. It makes a big difference during this strait. And, you know, it's hard to get the time of people that are knowledgeable like yourself, so thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, everybody. Appreciate it.

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

END