

**WHOIS Survey Drafting Team
TRANSCRIPT
Thursday 06 October 2011 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-survey-dt-20111006-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Attendees

Susan Prosser - RrSG
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar
Michael Young – Individual
Avri Doria - NCSG
Anne Naffziger - IPC
Steve Metalitz - IPC

ICANN Staff

Liz Gasster
Steve Sheng
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Wendy Seltzer
Don Blumenthal – Ry
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC

Coordinator: The call is being recorded.

Natalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the call of the WHOIS survey working group on this 6 October 2011.

On the line today we have Avri Doria, Anne Naffziger, Michael Young, Steve Metalitz, Wilson Abigaba and Susan Prosser. From staff we have Liz Gasster, Steve Sheng, Berry Cobb and myself Natalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Don Blumenthal, Cintra Sooknanan and Wendy Seltzer.

I will ask you to please state your name for speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Michael Young: All right, thank you very much. It's Michael Young speaking, I'd like to start by always welcoming everyone to the call and thank you for your time and your participation.

So let's start with doing a little agenda bashing because we didn't create a formal agenda for this call. I'm going to suggest a framework and then open out to the group and see if anyone wants to add any items.

I suggest what we do is to start with is a recap of activities to date. For those that aren't as familiar or have not recently reviewed the schedule, the way we're scheduling these meetings and how they're working into our work plan.

We'll do a little recap of that as well, just to make sure everyone's clear on that and right now I guess that's it for me. I'd like to open up and see if anyone wants to add anything. Liz, I guess you want to do a formal...

Liz Gasster: A couple items you know to update at the appropriate time too on the council's action today to approve the charter, etcetera. And I (unintelligible) to on the right of the Adobe Connect.

Michael Young: Give that's the latest news do we want to start with that? Why don't we kick off with those items Liz.

Liz Gasster: Thanks. As you know the review and consideration of the working group charter was delayed for one council meeting and the GNSO council did meet today and approved the charter for this working group as you've seen before with a very minor correction to the charter confirming that the dates for final delivery of the end report would be targeted at October of 2012.

And in light of this we're going to send out a call for additional volunteers, it's kind of officially a working group now with the charter. It will take some period of time for you all to conduct this work and I think additional volunteers may be welcome.

So we've asked the secretariat to make an additional call for volunteers, thinking to run that for a couple more weeks.

And that might be helpful for the sub teams so if no objection I drafted a brief announcement on that score and Michael you can decide as a group if you want to go ahead and do that.

But I'm assuming that would be useful and then I did want to note also that there was another resolution today on a different matter. It has to do with the recommendations that came out of a registration abuse policy's working group that specifically the council today agreed to ask this group to consider a particular issue that emerged from that report.

And if you look over at the notes on the right you'll see that I just pasted in that resolved clause. It's in response to WHOIS access recommendation number one. They're asking this group to consider including the issue of WHOIS access as a part of the survey that it has been tasked to develop.

So the - I've also provided a link to the report that tells you more about the context of that recommendation. It's my sense that that particular requirement

was actually you know probably called out already in the service requirements report that Steve Sheng wrote in 2010.

Though I think it's important to - for this group in doing the survey to make sure that you're - that everyone's in agreement on how you define access, that's probably an item for (Burner)'s group you know to make sure that this element is included.

So that's a substantive request on the part of the council now to this group to please make sure that this element of access is also included in the survey and that subgroup I assume would look into that.

And I think that's all. Oh and we have tentatively we have a meeting time in Dakar for 8:00 to 9:00 am local time on Wednesday assuming again that this group wants to meet at that time.

But this is just a general announcement to let you know that time has been allocated for this group to meet and that would be an open working group meeting to include any participants in the conference who are interested in attending your meeting. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay. Liz I have a question, about the WHOIS access for this working group but I'll start with my question then open it up to anybody else's because we're probably - we probably all have the same question.

When they refer to WHOIS access without going in and reading these documents which I'm sure you're already intimately familiar with are they referring to the ability to have granulated WHOIS access based on you know authorization levels, that sort of thing?

Whereas you know one body like law enforcement might have a certain type of guaranteed access in the general population than others? Is that what they're referring to?

Liz Gasster: I will cut and paste the specific text in the report into the script but I don't really want to try to...

Michael Young: Interpret it?

Liz Gasster: Interpret it because I do think that is an issue. I thought it was - and we could ask you know the staff person who supported that group or the council liaison for that group to give their insights too.

But I think that would be worthy of your assessment or the subgroup's assessment, you know what was meant.

And I think that's going to be an issue for other elements too because they are derived from these other policy activities, that's something that I think is going to be very helpful for the group that is kind of outlining the survey elements to think about how to define and explain.

Michael Young: Right, I hear you and I understand you want the working group to determine that.

Liz Gasster: I'm happy to offer a staff view of it but I just want to before I do it ask those who are most familiar with the - like Marika who supported that group and I have not had a chance to do that yet.

Michael Young: Right, I guess...

Liz Gasster: Yep, I mean (unintelligible) which I don't feel equipped to do.

Steve Metalitz: Michael this is Steve Metalitz, can I get in the queue please?

Michael Young: Absolutely Steve, why don't you shoot and then I have a clarifying question afterwards.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I pasted what I think is the recommendation that's referred to in this resolution in the chat and it says GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable and forcible and consistent fashion.

There's also a sentence about how such might be related to other WHOIS efforts such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN's new affirmation of commitments.

I'm not sure how that second - how we would tackle that second question because the report of that review team will be out very soon. In fact it has to complete its work in two months.

And the first one I'm not sure whether we're being asked to survey about what research is needed or some other topic.

Michael Young: Right. That's a very good question Steve. You know I'm going to add on top of your question, this leads me to ask should we be putting - and this I guess is a question to Liz for her guidance but should we be - I mean our purpose or our charter is to develop requirements, not to judge whether or not you know requirements leads to functionality of a system.

And it's not our purview to decide whether or not that functionality is right or wrong or should be available or not available.

It's our job to survey and ask the community whether or not they think the requirements are valid and the functionality should be included.

After that there's still the question of whether or not you know a particular requirement or functionality is mandatory on a policy level of people who are operating WHOIS servers.

So that's a whole 'nother question and I worry Steve as you pointed out that this question kind of leads us into that, you know whether or not it should be you know required or not in terms of being - you know just because the functionality is there in a system doesn't mean you have to - you know whether or not you use it or not is a whole 'nother policy question.

And I don't think we should be as a group that's our purview to be pulled into that particular question. Liz, Berry do you guys have some thoughts on that?

Liz Gasster: Tell me it's sort of - can you just restate the question?

Michael Young: Sure, okay my question is building on top of Steve's well placed comments is in view of our responsibilities as a working group which is to survey and I'm - you know I'm summarizing this but basically our responsibilities are to take an existing set of requirements that have been named to you know do a health check on stakeholders and make sure that they don't want to add or update or clarify those requirements.

And then once we've done that basically go out to a community survey and ask the community what they think of those requirements, do they agree with them, do they think that they're valid and help prioritize their importance in terms of urgency.

And then bring those answers back with hopefully some gained wisdom that we can provide some contextual recommendations as well as raw data back as an answer in a report.

I worry that this question is also leading us to try and answer you know - say you put up a new WHOIS service with 15 requirements and calculate it that come out of this work.

There's still another question of whether or not you know there's - you know ICANN mandated or other bodies mandated in illegal environments or

otherwise mandated requirements to turn on and off you know functionality associated with those requirements.

You know and I don't think it's our purview to answer the question of whether or not that functionality should be turned on or off. And it seems like this question is leading - this request from the council is leading us a bit into trying to answer that question in the survey.

And I think that they're two separate - two very separate lines of questioning.

Liz Gasster: Well I'm not sure I understand that question if it's being asked of staff, I guess I generally agree that you know we're not making judgments about the requirements.

You know I'm just looking at the purpose of the working group as posted in the notes that it's to estimate the level of agreement that the conclusions and the assumptions and the inventory have in the ICANN community.

So I'm not sure this particular access element or requirement, I'm not sure it's any different from any of the other elements or requirements in the report.

And I think the report includes access, various aspects of access because we know access can include multiple things, the reliability element, you know just looking at what Steve Metalitz has cut out from the original report.

So I'm not sure I really see a distinction here in the requirements, it would seem to me we would want to solicit the community's views on all about I'm wondering if the distinction you're making has to do with technical requirements versus a policy.

You know the turning on and off has more I think to do with the policy perhaps than do you want to build in this capability or that capability to...

Michael Young: You've got it, that's exactly what I mean.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah, so I think we're all about our group is all about answering the questions of whether or not you even build it or include it in you know looking at WHOIS as a product as I tend to do.

Is it part of the WHOIS functionality at all, yes or no? And that's the question that we're trying to answer. Whether or not you turn it on or off, that is a question of policy.

Liz Gasster: And I'm showing Avri has her hand raised.

Michael Young: Yeah, Avri do you want to add to that or tell me I'm off beat or what have you?

Avri Doria: I would never tell anyone they were off beat, it's not polite on a phone call. I think that what you're getting to is the space between the things.

First of all I didn't realize that we were deciding anything other than the framing of questions and what we thought the responses indicated.

I didn't actually think we were deciding on any requirements per se but only posing questions. That being the case I would think almost any capability that would need a policy enabler is something that we would want to create a proper neutral you know well balanced set of questions about.

So - but I - as we start to talk about are we making decisions on anything, I thought the only thing we were making decisions on really was the question.

Michael Young: I apologize if I misspoke, I absolutely agree with you. Our responsibility is to voice other people's or other parties' feedback and concerns.

And help facilitate that, so you know we have two sides to that, we have to revisit the stakeholders and ask them to take a last look at that list of requirements that we have already and see if they feel that something should be added or refined on it.

And then we have to go to the community and ask them to derive clear cut meaningful questions based on those requirements to ask them what - to help them decide or give us rather the community's deciding for us here in this case or at least voicing their opinion on what they think of these requirements, right?

That's really the task, we're a facilitator.

Avri Doria: I'm still confused and please pardon me for being confused, because it sounds like we're creating a set of requirements and asking them about them as opposed to us asking questions about a possible set of requirements.

I don't know if I'm being good at differentiating the two but in one there's a set of requirements and then do you agree with these or not, and another set there's a large basket of things that may or may not be requirements.

And in fact if you're going to make a proper test you're probably even throwing in some you know questions that are almost not relevant just to make sure that you've got you know proper metrics and such.

So that - and you're just trying to figure out from asking questions about a possible set of requirements, some of which may or may not be requirements that people have asked, whether - what rating or what measure these have in terms of being appropriate or not.

But that there's no coming out of the end saying yep, we have found out that these are the requirements that people want.

Michael Young: I'm in complete agreement with you on that.

Avri Doria: Okay so I wasn't understanding, thank you.

Michael Young: No, we have been given a set of requirements to start with. You know when we talked about this at the beginning of the group we agreed that it's been a while since that list was written.

So we'd like to go back to the - at least the original stakeholders that contributed to that list.

And ideally if we come up with more stakeholders with expertise in this space that care to comment, review on those existing list comment on them and hopefully enhance the questions that we ask of the general bigger community that the survey is going to.

You know we don't want to - I mean the first time that report was done there's always the chance that you know some of the stakeholders weren't necessarily paying enough attention at that time or have considered some things or learned some things since then as well.

So we just want to see before we go the effort of the survey, we want to make sure we were surveying on the most updated information available to us. Does that make sense?

Avri Doria: Yep, I think.

Michael Young: Okay. So we're all on the same page I believe. Does anyone - so let me go back to the original question, Steve go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: yeah, thank you. Yeah, I guess I'm going back to it too, I mean so we have this paragraph here from the GNSO council and I guess this was part of the

resolution when it was first introduced and I don't know, put two and two together I guess to try to find out if this could be clarified.

But anyway we are where we are. And so the question is what should we do with this? I mean for one thing this resolution seems to ask us to decide first whether we can take this issue on board in our work.

And then tell the council if we can't. I think that actually may be kind of difficult to do, you know Liz may be right that we embrace some access issues in the survey questions that we eventually come up with.

But I'm just not sure what we're supposed to with it at this phase. And then I see in the chat that Steve - first that Berry said he was a member of this working group that developed this recommendation and that - and Steve has posted some more of the text.

So maybe it would be useful just so we have a little better understanding of what the council might have asked us to do if the staff could just kind of compile the resolution here, the recommendation and the background material on the recommendation that appears in the registration abuse report.

And circulate that to everybody so we have a little better sense of what we're being asked to do here. I don't know whether we can give the council the answer they want as quickly as they seem to want it.

But we all need to look at this and kind of think about it a little bit I think.

Liz Gasster: And Michael it's Liz, I mean staff is happy to do that if the group would like. I would have loved to have done it for today's call.

Michael Young: You know I'll join Steve in saying that I would like to see that, so if others in the group are in support of that, let's ask it this way, does anyone object to that?

Okay so yes Liz that would be extremely helpful. And I'm going to suggest that what we do is table this, we're so close to Dakar maybe we can table this as one of the follow up items for us at the Dakar meeting.

That hopefully would give us all enough time to familiarize ourselves with the materials and be able to have a meaningful discussion. My gut feel without having gone through all the materials in detail and thought about it, but my gut feel is that we would need to find some way to fit this request logically in to our existing mandate.

I'm very loathe to adjust our mandate because it's already a complex one and challenging and you know I think we all agree to work on a particular you know effort and this would change the effort in a significant way.

Having said that we can probably I think I already can see possibly ways of picking out portions of this and keeping it constrained to the requirement side of the discussion versus you know the policy side.

That would be great if everyone could read through the materials once they're available, throw their comments to the list and hopefully by the time we complete the discussion in Dakar we've actually you know we might have already made a de facto decision across our conversation on the list.

It would be nice then just to be at a point where we're just ratifying what we want to do about this. Does that make sense everyone? I don't hear any objections so I'll take that as a yes.

So we have our first formal agenda item on the Dakar meeting Liz. There we go.

Liz Gasster: Yes, thank you. Great.

Michael Young: Okay. Any other questions on this or anything else that Liz reviewed?
Hearing none let's - I'll just do a quick recap of activities over the last few weeks. We did not get as much progress in the subgroups as I had hoped.

A lot of that had to do with you know a little bit of I think people waiting to see what would happen with the approval of our working group was you know probably an influence on that and that's also been a very busy time period for everyone in the industry given the changes going on.

Wilson has reported back to the list and I did note Steve your email had indicated that something misfired in the communications in terms of you attending that meeting.

And that's a shame, I hope you and Wilson can connect and get caught up. But I think it's a good example that we all have to be very careful to make sure that we've notified you know members of a group like that, a subgroup that's going to meet on a call.

And you know it's always difficult if someone accidentally gets overlooked or missed, it's hard on all of us.

So let's all be careful about that please going forward. Yeah, I see Avri you've got a note there too, exactly.

And I don't think (Burner) was able to organize his subgroup meeting, nor do I think (Don) organized his, so there was actually only one formal subgroup meeting that occurred.

So everyone just to be clear to everybody and that's actually a little disappointing, I will be reaching out to Susan - yes you are in that same group so Wilson there's another note, you're clearly having some communication issues with your working group members to get a hold of them.

So I trust you to look into that. We need to get some momentum going on the subgroups, the tasks that they need to knock away right now is just basically building their project plan and their scope of work.

And making sure that we bring that back and that the entire group is okay with each subgroup's plan going forward. At that point we can move in to our intended schedule which was to run subgroup meetings every two weeks and alternating weeks to do a chair meeting to make sure that we're cross communicating constantly between what the subgroups are doing.

And then just to recap what we're planning to do is every third of those chair meetings, becomes a general meeting where we update everybody that wants to come.

And once we get through the subgroup work and we've completed that our plan is to go to full working group meetings from that point on.

And that's after we basically complete the scope of work as we have listed out in the charter now for each subgroup. Okay is there any questions on that? Okay. I would appreciate it that Steve, Susan, anybody - Avri, anybody that's feeling like they're you know not being utilized for whatever reason, a communication error what have you, please reach out to me.

I want to - you know one of my jobs as the chair I see is to facilitate thins and to make sure that everybody is engaged and communicating effectively and successfully.

So don't hesitate to put the touch on me and I'll do the running around and making sure everything gets resolved in that regard.

Okay, I don't have anything else in terms of the updates. I'll open the floor and see if anybody has any questions or comments. Hearing none, I'm just

going to throw out a quick little note of appreciation for Avri, clearly you joined the ITF group, the (weirs) group.

I really appreciate your comments there, that was fantastic.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Michael Young: It's really important I think for us to try and - this particular group needs to bridge and form relationships with the technical community that's actually trying to execute on these type of things.

So that's fantastic.

Avri Doria: Thanks, I mean as someone who's been an ITF participant for over 20 years it easy to do.

Michael Young: Well you know we look toward your example and from a previous call just to let you and everyone else know I - and you guys know ahead of (Don) because I haven't been able to complete a call with him, but we're going to ask (Don) because it falls most naturally in his subgroup's area of responsibilities in terms of checking in with stakeholders.

But we're going to ask (Don) to make a formal communication to that group explaining what we're doing as a working group and also pass on to them the requirements document and make sure they're aware of that document and that everyone on that list has read it.

Can't hurt. So okay, Liz I don't have anything else, we haven't had any questions from the open mic so to speak so we might as well wrap it up and use people's time effectively.

Liz Gasster: Very good, thank you very much.

Steve Metalitz: Michael is the next meeting of this group at Dakar?

Michael Young: That's correct. I am going to see if we can't get our - (Don) and (Burner) to get their subgroup meetings kicked off before then so that we can discuss hopefully their progress and some (definement) around their scope of work for those groups.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Michael Young: All right, thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you, bye bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Natalie Peregrine: Thank you Tonya, you may now stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END