WHOIS WG Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 30 April 2012 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 30th April 2012 at 1900 UTC. 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-20120430-en.mp3

Attendees
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC
Susan Prosser - RrSG
Michael Young - Individual
Anne Naffziger - IPC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Don Blumenthal - RySG
Avri Doria - NCSG
Wilson Abigaba - RrSG

ICANN Staff
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology: Wendy Seltzer - NCSG (connected at first then lost cell signal for rest of the call)

Coordinator: 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois call on the 30th of April, 2012. On the line today we have Cintra Sooknanan, Ann Naffziger, Steve Metalitz, Wilson Abigaba, Avri Doria, Michael Young, Susan Prosser and on the Adobe room Don Blumenthal. We have received no apology for today. And from staff we have

Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Don Blumenthal has just joined the audio bridge.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michael Young: All right, thank you, everyone, for coming to the call. Glad to see the great attendance today. And, you know, we've made some good progress in the last couple of weeks. So let me just open it up for some quick agenda bashing; if you look at the agenda on Adobe Connect on the right hand side and the lists of the things we're going to go through does anyone want to add anything to that agenda today?

Okay hearing nothing we'll jump to it and ask Berry to kindly please go through the action items.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you, Michael. This is Berry. First one is the scheduling of the Whois Survey road show or Webinar. And basically we were going to get with Don to maybe try to finalize what we want to accomplish here and then we can look at getting it scheduled depending on our - or when we submit the survey and open up the public comment session and those kinds of things.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...carry this to the end.

Michael Young: Berry, on that action item Don and I talked today - just to clarify what was going into the WebEx based on conversations on the last meeting. So I think we're all aligned now with what the group wanted to do which was, you know, just reiterate was to clarify - give a clear message about what the survey's about that we're focusing on functional requirements and not policy issues. That's, you know, another conversation.

And that we're looking for feedback in the public commentary period to see if we've, you know, missed any obvious questions that people think should be asked. And if any of our questions are not clear to people do they have any suggestions on how to improve them.

Berry Cobb: And do we have a timeframe for when we want to conduct these Webinars?

Michael Young: Ideally - like you said I think it should coincide with the public comment period so we could start the - I think it would be good personally - and I'd love to hear what everyone else thinks but I think it would be good to do the first Webinar on the date that the document is posted for public comment so that after the Webinar people can immediately go and start posting comments if they so feel inclined while it's fresh in their mind.

And we were going to do a couple of them at different timeframes so if we do them relatively close together, Berry, then, you know, we get all the Webinars done in the first week or so of the public posting. I think that would be effective. What does everyone else think?

Avri, I see your hand up. Avri, are you there?

Avri Doria: Oh yes, I'm here. I didn't hear you call on me, sorry. I was probably pressing the mute off at the time. I would actually suggest - I think it's a good idea to have it coordinated with the documents going out but I would give those who do like to read things first a chance to have read them.

So as opposed to doing it the first day I might recommend waiting a few days and doing that because there are - you're right, there are many people who won't read a thing until they've heard about it. But there are some few who will read. And so if you give the three days of forcing function and get it read so that you can then ask pertinent questions I think that might be good. But I think doing it coincident with the release is a good idea. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay I think that makes a lot of sense. So if we, you know, released it and then, you know, maybe four or five days later did the first Webinar and then a few days later did the second one.

Berry Cobb: And, Michael, this is Berry. So looking at our milestone schedule down on the lower right if, you know, basically the third bullet we have are Webinars scheduled just for May 2012 and we have the draft survey for 14-May. If we think that we can make that schedule then we could look at the first Webinar being roughly like the 17th or 18th of May and then we schedule from there.

Michael Young: I think that makes sense. I guess the question is, Don, do you think you could be ready for then?

Db: I could be ready. I will be traveling those two days though. I don't know how available I'll be.

Berry Cobb: I'll tell you what, I'll send out a Doodle just for the few of us that will be doing the Webinar and we'll put together a couple of dates that make the most sense and accommodate and then we can go from there.

Db: Okay.

Michael Young: Yes, I don't think there's...

Berry Cobb: And in the meantime...

Michael Young: Yes, Berry, I don't think there's any harm - I mean, if it got posted on the 14th and the first Webinar was the 20th or something like that anyways, you know, I don't think the matter of two or three days either way is tragic. So if we can, you know, the most important thing is that Don can get and participate in giving the Webinar.

Berry Cobb: Excellent. Well I'll start getting the paperwork together for the public comment period to get that submitted. And I'll also be doing - in parallel getting the Webinar thing scheduled.

Michael Young: Great.

Berry Cobb: Any more questions about the first action item? Okay second action item was to complete the draft survey, 8.4, which I submitted to Michael. And that's complete. Third action item was to send an email out to the group for volunteers for the test survey. And that's complete.

    And I've got a list of participants here which I'll paste into the window. Hopefully that comes out legible and - it didn't break too well but we have nine persons in our test control group - maybe eight...

Michael Young: I've got a couple more for - oh you got Michele in there. I have to confirm with him; on Wednesday morning I have a call but I think we'll get Jim Galvin in there was well.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I've got Jim. I'm sorry that that list didn't come out very good. But we've got Michele, (Bob Brashitz), Dan Seymour, Don Blumenthal, Jim Galvin, Nicholas Adams, Steve Sheng, Francisco Arias and David Piscitello.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I make a comment on this?

Michael Young: You - absolutely, go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I'm not sure that - I mean, I think it's fine to have ICANN staff, you know, take the survey and get their reactions but I don't think that will tell us very

much. Those three people are extremely deeply involved with these issues and unless we are only expecting people who are that involved with these issues to respond I'm not sure that's going to tell us too much.

Michael Young: I agree, Steve, but I don't think there's a limit to this list. So if we can - if we can get some more volunteers, if you can reach out and help us get more volunteers then that would be fantastic.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I've sent a couple of those names in but I'll try to see if I can get anymore.

Berry Cobb: And, Steve, if it'll make you feel any better one responded back asking what the WSWG was.

Steve Metalitz: All right.

Berry Cobb: So all right well we have a good list started. Definitely I think it's going to - if I'm understanding correctly we want our test control group to actually take the survey through the tool; that is correct or is that a fair statement?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes, we'd ideally like it to go through the tool but I guess can you have an action item to follow up and - with Wilson and see if that's feasible, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Wilson is on the call. And...

Michael Young: Oh I see him now, okay.

Berry Cobb: Yes, and I don't have it listed as an agenda item but maybe we can add that under the new business as to talk about getting the survey loaded into the tool and what the requirements and timeframe might be for that.

Michael Young: Okay so let's add that to the agenda and circle back. Well actually - Wilson often can't stay the entire call; we can we just insert that and ask those questions now? I don't want to derail this but at the same time I want to be sensitive to - I know - I think it's really late for Wilson if I remember correctly.

Berry Cobb: Go for it.

Wilson Abigaba: Hello?

Michael Young: Hi Wilson.

Wilson Abigaba: Hi. This is Wilson. Hi. I'm on the call but I'm sorry I didn't listen to the question you want me to answer right now. Could you please repeat it?

Michael Young: Sure so...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes. The question is we're compiling this list you see in the left hand corner of beta testers or beta survey takers. And we'd like them ideally to actually take the survey in the survey tool. Do you think it's feasible to get it loaded up soon?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes that's possible.

Michael Young: Perfect.

Wilson Abigaba: That's possible.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Berry Cobb: And so, Wilson...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: I'm sure I can (unintelligible) it one day after it's given to me.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. So basically what I have - this is Berry - what I have listed in our milestone list is that by the 7th of May that we could try to have our survey - draft survey loaded into the tool so that's approximately eight days from now; that'll be enough time for you?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes that is enough time for me. If you could provide me the confirmed survey questions maybe in two day's time then I can make it this week.

Michael Young: Excellent.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: Anne, you have your hand raised?

Anne Naffziger: Yes, I apologize if I don't recall from the last meeting but is there some standard language or - that you'd like us to be using to go out and solicit folks? I can certainly try to get some people from my (INT) sub committee to participate. But I'm wondering if there's a - a sort of party line that you're wanting us to use or we can just do our broad brush at what we're looking for?

Michael Young: Anne, it's Michael. I think, you know, you know who your audience and the right - the most effective way to communicate with them. Because I know that I actually didn't cut and paste my emails to different people because I, you know, I'm familiar with communicating successfully with them. So if you think that there's - I think you should use your own judgment really and try and entice them in the best way you think will work.

Anne Naffziger: Okay, great thanks.

Berry Cobb: Okay this is Berry. I'll continue on with the action items. The fourth one was the call for comments about the R9 inclusion and possible questions. I sent that email out and we did receive a little feedback. And Michael also added some material into the R9 section of the version 9 of the survey.

                Action - Action Item 5 was to complete version 8.5. And Michael reviewed through the survey, added - or highlighted technical terms within the survey that require hover definitions. He made changes to R3 and to R8.1. The only question I have, Michael is you highlighted the terms that need the hover definitions but they don't have the definitions; how do you propose we get those so that Wilson can load those in too?

Michael Young: I will write them in the next couple of days. I just did the highlighting to make sure that everyone agrees I got all the ones that should be defined. And then, you know, it's a matter of a little bit of editing work for me just to write up the definitions for all those.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Great, thank you.

Michael Young: And just to be clear to everyone I did do some word-smithing or editing, you know, a few grammatical corrections, that sort of stuff as well through some of the other questions just here and there.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Action Item 6 was to Michael and I. And we didn't really get this complete but with Avri being on the call I think we can accomplish this one. And that's the use of indifferent versus the question as relevant. And why don't we go ahead and discuss this now? I'm going to move down to R6.A.

                And, Avri, I'm not sure if you had a chance to listen or review the transcript from the previous call but there was concern about the quantity of questions. And while I think most in the working group agree that the question is relevant

section that you included in your R6.a and R6.b that it was important but it added to the length of the survey.

And so one of the things that the group had come up with is possibly exchanging that with the use of indifferent as an option especially on the yes/no question format.

And so when I was going through to edit version 8.4 we came to your section, you know, the general gist is that we would try to remove the question that's relevant and then I add the question here which is per my comment over to the right.

Option 3 through your standard template is don't have an opinion either way. Is that accommodative enough or does that contain enough meaning that is equivalent to the use of indifferent? And if not should an Option 6 be added here that we need that.

Avri Doria: Yes. Hi...

Michael Young: So, Avri, what do you think?

Avri Doria: Yes, it's totally different. So if you guys want to remove this go ahead. But to say that you - in other words it really was going for - and perhaps if it had gone through the whole questionnaire it might have made more sense as opposed to just having it for this question.

                   But basically in these kinds of questions there's really two issues. There's one, do you agree, do you disagree, whatever. And, two, does it matter? So there's a lot of things where somebody says do you agree that it's better to have tea at 40 degrees than at 30 degrees? I'll have an opinion. Someone will say and this is issue important? And I'll say no.

And so basically that bivariate nature of a question is yes you said everybody said they absolutely disagreed with this but absolutely nobody thought it was important was a way of weighting the decision.

Now that's a particular way to do things. So when I first wrote the questions that's the way I wrote it because I'm always interested both in the opinion of the fact and the opinion of the relevance or importance.

We didn't do that elsewhere and so perhaps just doing it on one question doesn't make a lot of sense. On the other hand just doing it on one question becomes experimental to see what kind of answers one gets. I won't act all offended and storm out of the room if you guys say it's too long, we're not doing that elsewhere, take it out. But I do believe it has a reason.

Michael Young: Avri, we all felt it was useful information to have. So we all agreed with you there. What we were struggling with - and a number of people raised this and I think it's factually true is - it's too much visual information and it's too repetitive. And some people may not complete the survey just because of that.

If we had a - if we were talking maybe a 10-question survey we could probably - the survivability of people finishing the survey even with that additional questions relevant thing would probably work okay. But it's too big of a survey for probably people - we want to minimize and keep the momentum going through the questions for them.

So our idea was to try and capture a little bit of information anyways which is why we - in the other questions added an indifferent element. And I'm wondering if it would capture at least a little bit of - it wouldn't capture what you're trying to capture here but maybe a bit of it is if we added a number six that said this question - this question doesn't matter.

Avri Doria: I have absolutely no objections to doing that.

Michael Young: Okay so - so there you go, Berry. I guess we'll drop the question is relevant section, add a number six that says this question doesn't matter.

Berry Cobb: Right - understood. Let me take that down.

Avri Doria: If that's what you did everywhere else than that'd be consistent, you know.

Michael Young: Yes, what we did everywhere else was add a yes/no/indifferent. We're just (Berry-ing) this a bit to make sense with your 1-5, right?

Avri Doria: Right, I see, yes because I guess I came in when I proposed questions differently than others had. Story of my life.

Berry Cobb: And so for the text for that question doesn't matter is sufficient?

Michael Young: Sorry, Berry, I don't understand your question.

Berry Cobb: So to add an option six here; the text for that option is question doesn't matter?

Michael Young: Yes that's right.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Michael Young: The question doesn't matter. So at least we know if they think that this is an irrelevant or silly question.

Berry Cobb: Right, great. Okay Action Item 7 was to identify draft survey test takers. We just talked about that. And complete. And then lastly Action Item 8 was to create a first draft communication to the Council stating the working group's intention for the independent review. And Michael did send some language for that. And I'll cut and paste that into here.

And I believe that the next step is that we'll draft - send this over to Wendy to communicate to the Council this message. I'm not sure - what I'll have to check with internally as I - within ICANN is whether an email message to the Council will be sufficient or if it actually is worthy of being in the - being an agenda item on the next GNSO Council call.

Michael Young: I just want to note that the first sentence without the commas is a run-on sentence so we need to add our commas back in.

Berry Cobb: Yes, will do. Okay that takes care of our action items. I think we can move over to the agenda now.

Michael Young: Okay. Berry, I just wanted to ask is everyone okay with the language there for communicating to the Council? Does that capture what we discussed?

Db: This is Don. It's fine with me.

Michael Young: Okay great. I'm not hearing...

Steve Metalitz: Michael, what are you referring to? Is this just the - what Berry's just put in the chat?

Michael Young: Yes, yes. This was the communication basically to Council saying given that we're now publicly posting this and we're doing the, you know, the Webinars and so forth seeking public comment feedback that that supplants the need for getting a - our original plan was to get a third party paid consultant I think to review the questions and give us feedback.

But now we're going out and we're getting a broader - we've got beta testers, we've got, you know, public comment and we've got, you know, a mechanism to encourage people for the public comment.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. All right I'm not hearing any other comments so let's get back to the agenda. So going through the action items I guess we want to go through the latest draft. Berry, do you want to take us through the targeted changes?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So the first section is the profile question area of the survey. The only thing that was changed through here - and just so that people are aware anything where there's a yellow highlight is a candidate for a hover box for a definition. But the only change in this area was Question Number 10 which is how did the participant become aware of the availability of this survey? And that's something that we had talked about on the call two weeks ago.

Then we'll go ahead and move into the action survey itself. And by last count I believe we're at 74 questions now.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I ask a question about that Number 10?

Berry Cobb: Please.

Steve Metalitz: Assuming that we're going to ask the stakeholder groups and constituencies to promote the survey once it's ready to be promoted we might want to have that as an option too - that they heard about it through their stakeholder group or constituency.

Berry Cobb: Right, I think that was maybe the intent for the word of mouth of the ICANN community meeting. But I'll make that clearer and break it apart between the ICANN meeting or stakeholder group slash constituency meeting.

Michael Young: Yes, I think that's a good idea to do that, Berry, because to Steve's point it would be interesting to know how, you know, how many people find out about things through, you know, their stakeholder meetings and so forth - or their stakeholder communications.

I mean, despite, you know, the amount of time I've already been around this community I find that I, you know, I'm on the RySG mailing list so I find it very useful just to keep track of things coming out of interest from the Council and so forth rather than going and, you know, checking various Website and being on too many mailing lists; it's just convenient. So be interesting to see if that's becoming the norm.

Berry Cobb: All right and I've taken note of that. Okay let's move down to R1. And I don't believe that there were any large changes to this one. And I'm having to switch back and forth from my redline version.

So there were a few just word edit changes here for this first question. Cintra did bring up a while back - she made the suggestion that this question should be broken up into two questions. I'm not sure if the working group agrees with that or not so we'll open that up. I would have to agree that these options here are a little confusing I guess.

Michael Young: Yes, I would agree that this question is - could use a bit of a recrafting. I'm happy to take a shot at doing that editing if no one has an objection to me trying to split this up.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I had one other comment on this aside from that which was - well it now says which will be operated by registrars - registry operators. Are we talking about Whois servers that will be operated or the publicly accessible and machine parsable list that will be operated?

Michael Young: That's part of the awkwardness of the question. I'm not - I don't think it reads cleanly. So I think what it's trying to say is - I think what it's trying to ask is should there basically - number one, the first sentence is identifying - trying to say there - should there be - is there a need for a machine parsable list of domains or IP locations and Whois servers and those Whois servers are operated by registrars, registry operators and IIRs.

Not that the registrars, registry operators and IIRs are operating the list. In fact it's silent on the list who operates the list.

Steve Metalitz: That's kind of how I read it but it could be interpreted either way.

Michael Young: Yes, I agree. So when I - I'll rewrite it to try and make that clear, Steve.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. And, Michael, I think - I'm keeping track of our action items and we'll kind of follow the same format. I'll have several actions to do to the next version. I'll make those changes and then send it over to you and then you can (do that) cleanup.

Michael Young: Sounds good.

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right the R2 section - let's see what's changed here. Basically there were no changes to R2 other than highlights of possible hover definitions. And Cintra did have a comment here about whether the survey tool can merge the questions so that they are picked in order of preference. And so would you care to expand on that a little bit?

If you're speaking you're on mute.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, thanks, I'm off mute now. This is Cintra. Okay so Question 2 talks about what is a benefit (with) query standardization affect for you, right, pick one or more. Then Question 3 says select the single most important of the two elements to you.

But it says A, B, C, D and there are actually A, B, C, D and E in Question 2 as well as that A, B, C, D and E are not defined. So I was wondering actually if there's any way to kind of merge Question 3 into Question 2 to say pick one or more in order of preference perhaps. Does that make sense?

Michael Young: Well I guess that's - I think so. I guess the question would be for Wilson can we do that?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) ranking question.

Michael Young: Yes, I mean, can I - can I only - can I choose to select two out of the five and just rank two of them and ignore the other three? Wilson, can you comment on that?

                   Berry, is there any way for us to know whether or not Wilson's hearing us?

Berry Cobb: Let me see if - he's - nope, he's still connected. Wilson, are you maybe on mute?

Michael Young: Okay why don't we just have that as an action item...

Wilson Abigaba: Hello/

Michael Young: Oh there he is, okay. Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Michael Young: Did you catch that question?

Wilson Abigaba: No I did not because (unintelligible) recognize.

Michael Young: Okay. So the question is on - in Section R2, Question 2 and 3, rather than have three we were wondering if we can just have Question 2 and have people rank Question 2. But do they have to rank all of them? What if they just want to say that two of them are interesting to them and rank, you know, two of them, for example, and leave the other three blank? Would that be possible?

Wilson Abigaba: Let me look at that question right now (unintelligible). You said it's question what?

Michael Young: It's in Section R2, it's Question 2 and 3. Specifically Question 3 is trying to rank Question 2. But we'd like to have just a single question where you can rank Question 2. But people answering the question - Question 2 may not even want to select all of those options; they may want to select two or three of the options...

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes. And so...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) do that. Yes, please also add it as an action item on my part.

Michael Young: Great, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: So this is Berry. So if I understand that correctly that's - that is capable of being done? And so Section 3 - or Question 3 will morph into Question 2? Michael, are you there?

Michael Young: I am, sorry, what did you say, Berry?

Berry Cobb: So if I understood that correctly that functionality is there and so Question 3 will migrate into Question 2?

Michael Young: Disappear. Yes, that's right.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: Sorry, I was typing to Avri. And I'm not one of those people that can actually type one thing and use my ears at the same time; I don't work that way I guess. Avri is suggesting that maybe we need to split that question up a little bit more too. So - and I can see your point. Avri, do you mind taking a shot at carving that one a little bit so we can see what you're thinking?

Avri Doria: Yes, I can. I guess I just need to understand - this is Avri - what the - in other words we're asking what areas - no what benefits do you expect from query standardization. Or we're asking how does query standardization affect you? And they're similar so you can have a strong negative effect whereas here what the sentence that says what areas of benefit effect for you is just an awkwardness that I don't quite understand.

                   And I don't know exactly what we're trying to ask. Are we trying to ask - rank it in terms of the most beneficial or are we trying to rank it in terms of the most affecting? Because bad effect, good effect is - can be absolute, you know. The thing that affects...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes...

Avri Doria: ...something that hurts me.

Michael Young: Yes. I'm thinking this should say select the following areas of benefit for - select the following areas of query standardization has benefit in for you, something like that. And then we probably need to - so we're assuming that there's some benefit there.

But I think we need to add one more at the bottom that basically is a box that says none of the above so that they can choose to say negatively - basically claim that they don't have any area of benefit if they really want to if that's the way they feel about it. Does that make sense?

Avri Doria: That makes sense. And it goes along with what Cintra said in the list that the question was meant to be a positive one. So please, you know, rank the - since we're doing the ranking or if we're doing the ranking please rank the following in order of most to least benefit or something like that.

Michael Young: Yes, okay that's...

Avri Doria: It's just I always see both positive and negative side of affect.

Berry Cobb: Okay Michael, I'll take that one to change that question. And I just captured the statement that you'd mentioned and then we'll add the none of the above option as well.

Michael Young: Okay. And, Cintra, to your question on the list here that should we have a separate question for negatives? I think we kind of revisit this in another question or two if I remember correctly. I have to go back through. But I think the negative case might be covered elsewhere. I'll tell you what, let's take a look through; if I don't see it I'll look at it again. We don't have any option we definitely shouldn't include it because people may feel that there's no benefit, right? It's a possibility. I personally can't see that but it's a possibility.

Berry Cobb: Okay I think that takes care of R2. We'll move onto R3. And in R3 basically the biggest change in this section was adding the indifferent option to the yes/no questioning format. Michael did split apart Question 1 with the Question 1.5 that you see right here per comments from the last working group session.

And then any of the other changes were just minor edits or highlights of the hover possibilities - or hover definitions.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I - can I make a comment on Number 2?

Michael Young: Sure, go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I think it might be more accurate to say non-English languages or non-Latin scripts.

Michael Young: Okay. There is - having worked in IDNs for, you know, almost 10 years for now I cringe when I think about getting into the argument over language or script again. But I'm indifferent. How about we do this? How about we do script slash languages so no one can get offended?

Steve Metalitz: That sounds great. That's a good outcome.

Berry Cobb: So it should read non-English or non-Latin languages slash scripts?

Michael Young: Perfect.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I'll scroll through to the rest of the questions. I think the rest were pretty cut and dry. Okay I'll move onto R4. And changes in this section - again really the only changes were highlights of hover definitions and the inclusion of the indifferent option on our yes/no format.

Michael Young: Now one question I had on the hover stuff - because I wasn't - I was kind of on the fence on this one. So how at the beginning of R4 I suggested, you know, a hover over error conditions. And then error conditions is mentioned is Question 3.

Should we activate the hover wherever error conditions show up just in case they don't happen to hover over it when they're reading R4 at the top and

then they hit it down in the Question 3? So we should be prepared to hover again?

Okay I see Cintra says yes. Good enough for me; let's do that to be safe. I'll go through and when I write the definitions to indicate that it should be hovered wherever a term or word shows up again.

Berry Cobb: All right great. All right any other comments on R4? Moving onto R5.

Michael Young: I see Cintra has a question whether or not we expect someone to do the survey in one sitting? I think we'd like people to do the survey in one sitting but I think we're going to know more once we have our beta survey takers try it and comment on it.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. Further to that the survey tool has the option to log out and come back at a later time to complete the survey as well.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Can I just make a comment there? You know, ICANN just went through this on this globalization survey and - where they had a lot of people start it but a lot of, you know, 70 - it looked like 80% of them weren't finishing it because it was a very long survey.

And one thing they did was to make available an attachment containing the survey so if you wanted to you could look at it offline and think about how you would answer certain questions and then when you came to do the survey you would be prepared and could go through it a lot faster.

So it's - I think that was a positive for that survey which was quite long. And since this survey is going to be pretty long it might be worth considering for this survey as well.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. So perhaps on the homepage of the tool we could have the attachment of the survey questions there for people to download and take offline and then come back?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, give people that option and then they could complete the survey faster online.

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...you can add that (unintelligible) but I can't confirm where it's supposed to go or where it's not; I (unintelligible) two three times and see.

Michael Young: Okay. I mean, we could also - we could also just have a downloadable PDF copy of the survey. I mean, I assume we're going to start out with a landing page that people can get to - that we can refer to when we're doing the Webinars or something. I guess we haven't talked through that, Berry. How are we going to do that? How is ICANN dealing with that sort of thing these days?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, but there's a problem I see with the offline survey is that we have to import it back into the online one and importing it back may prove to be a problem because you have many chances of losing the format while offline.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, let me just clarify, Wilson. I wasn't saying that you could complete it offline and then just upload it. It was just that you could take it offline and read through it and prepare your answers and then you would still have to go back to the tool - back to the survey and enter your answers but this would give you a little bit of a preparation.

Wilson Abigaba: Oh to me that's absolutely fine. We can actually have a PDF downloadable - that's fine, we can do that. And - yes, we can have the downloadable PDF at the beginning of the survey so that people can - who want to - who are (unintelligible) can do that, that's fine; it's possible.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Berry Cobb: And to Don's question - this is Berry. Yes the survey tool does have the ability that I can start the survey, quit and log out and then log back in at a later point in time to complete the survey.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes that's true.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. R5 let's see what's changed here. This is highlights of the hover definitions, incorporation of the indifferent notion for yes/no options and that's about it. No real significant content changes. However Michael did add the comment we need the ranking to be enforced so that no one can enter in two 6s, for example.

Michael Young: Yes, it's got be an absolute ranking order. So, Wilson, does the tool enforce that?

Wilson Abigaba: Repeat the question please?

Michael Young: So if I have six items and asked in a question and ask people to do a ranking and they start to punch in 1-6 and what if they take two items and try and punch in, you know, 1-4 and then two 6s. Will the system stop them from making that mistake?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes actually for ranking of items we shall have likely a moveable bar - we just move it, not punching in figures directly. So we shall have very, very low chances of (unintelligible) for ranking items to just be moving automatically. They can move the bar back; move it with the mouse.

Michael Young: Okay so it's a drag and drop ordering, okay, got it.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, sure, yes, drag and drop. But you can also - yes, you can (unintelligible) just to confirm it.

Michael Young: Okay thanks.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. Just two comments on this question 1a. One, just purely editorial that we should just specify whether - when you rank in order of importance is 1 the most important or is 6 the most important?

                   And secondly I wonder whether we should also have an Other Category 7 here since I don't think we can assume that this necessarily covers all of the data elements that would be...

Michael Young: Yes, I think that's a good point, Steve, we should have an Other in there. Particularly with some of the new use cases with registries like what if you're a community TLD or something and there's a community identifier associated?

Steve Metalitz: Right, good point.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. So if we include the Other option then do we allow free form text for them to enter in?

Steve Metalitz: I think you'd have to.

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I have a comment. Jumping in - I agree on the ranking. Whatever we use, 1 to whatever we should set the direction the same for all questions. I've noticed that people get confused when you switch from 1 being most to 1 being least. So whatever we do for the scale I think everything has to be in

that same direction even though the numerical range may be different or something. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: And Michael...

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...I'll take that action to review though and make sure we're consistent in that regard.

Michael Young: Great, thank you, Berry. I'm just watching the time; we're - we've got 35 minutes left so we should probably try and pick up the pace a little bit if we can.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Any other questions with regards to R5? Okay we'll move on to R6(a). And I think we're pretty good with this. I think the only changes here again, which we've already discussed, about the question as relevant. And the only o there highlights were just the hover definitions.

Michael Young: Right. Hey, Berry, can we jump ahead to R9 really quickly because Steve's got to go in a couple of minutes and I just wanted to cover what we did in R9 while he's on the phone.

So, Steve, let me take a second to explain what I did. I took your list of questions and some of the discussions we had about where things are at with thick Whois in general development around the ICANN community, that it's intrinsically part of the new TLD agreements and expectations and it really has been for some time with the newer TLDs.

Also in respect of the fact that even Com Net is up for question and that there is, you know, I guess a scheduled PDP to start when things are a little less busy on finalizing, you know, the question of thick Whois for even Com and Net and the conversion of that.

So, you know, making some assumption that that's the way the world's going I created a couple of questions that were more about clarifications of, you know, things that might help dealing with that.

So one question I came up with was, you know, should we develop - should standardized tools for registrars be developed to help them move from a thick to thin registry?

And then another kind of informational question because a lot of different stakeholders might have a different impression of, you know, what's involved or how long it should take for them to be able to migrate from thin to thick so I thought it'd be an interesting question to ask what people think is a reasonable timeframe.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I think that's a good idea.

Michael Young: Okay. And I really couldn't think of, you know, in terms of migration sort of questions - I really didn't come up with anything else particularly novel. But if anyone else has any ideas it'd be great to have them added. Okay, sorry to hijack, Berry. If we're done with this we can go back to going in order. I just wanted to...

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, I appreciate...

Michael Young: ...point that out to Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you and I will have to drop off now. Thank you.

Michael Young: Thanks, Steve.

Berry Cobb: Okay so back to R6(a). Again the only changes to this section, which one is will occur and that's adding the Option 6 to replace the question that's

relevant so you'll see that in the next version. The only other change was the highlights of the hover definitions. And I think content-wise everything is intact from the previous version.

If nobody has any questions I'll move onto 6b. And the same - the same thing; no content changes here just highlights with the hover definitions. There was one comment that I think does need clarification on Question Number 5. Is it - it is appropriate to include other forms of contact information such as social media - I think is what that's supposed to say - as one method of Whois contact.

Michael Young: Okay. I actually thought that might be going toward like social - I don't know - I don't know what I thought it said. I was having a bit of a brain gap; I should have seen that one.

Berry Cobb: All right, I corrected the typo there.

Michael Young: Yes. Clearly I'm not a crossword puzzle kind of guy.

Berry Cobb: Okay any other questions on 6b? Okay let's move on to Requirement 7. And the only changes from the last version for R7 is this was the nexus for the yes/no/indifferent section and so the other changes were just highlights of the hover definitions.

Michael Young: Yes, this is a relatively technical set of questions I think.

Berry Cobb: Okay move onto R8.1 I should say. And just like the rest the inclusion of the indifferent option and then highlight of hover text definitions. And there were a few edits just to the language here but it didn't change the content of the questions.

Michael Young: Yes, I just did some edits in some cases to make things more clear. I was not trying to change the questions at all.

Berry Cobb: And I actually had the comments that - over here to the right that does it make sense to include the indifferent option for these because they were a little bit more expanded from just a simple yes/no options that we've had for other questions. I'm inclined to say yes but I wanted to make sure that the working group agreed.

Michael Young: Yes, I don't see a problem with having the indifferent in there.

Berry Cobb: Okay. All right let's move on to 8.2 I believe. And outside of just the highlights of the hover definitions a couple of small language changes but no content changes.

Michael Young: Okay I don't see anything else personally.

Berry Cobb: And we just - oh there's an 8.3. Eight dot three is a couple of language text changes for better meaning and then just highlights of the hover definitions.

Michael Young: This is a fairly technical set of questions again so I think the hover definitions are really vital to this one.

Berry Cobb: Okay. And we just reviewed through R9, move onto over to R10 which R10 was included in our last version which was basically kind of a replication of I believe R3 but in a Whowas view versus a Whois view. And so the only changes here were just a couple of word-smiths and highlight of hover definitions.

And - oh I lied. I also had changed the description or definition for R10. And I hope that that is acceptable by the working group as well. I think that was literally a cut and paste out of the requirements document.

Michael Young: Yes, it's fine by me. It's easy to read. Does anyone else have - is everyone okay with it?

Berry Cobb: Okay. There's one other highlight here which is down on Question 6. And there were a couple of dialogue exchanges on the list. And so I had just literally cut and pasted in here for just reference. And I believe it has to do with the timeframe for retention changes.

Cintra had brought up that, you know, there are different requirements and laws with respect to data retention requirements.

Michael Young: Hey, Cintra, what about adding another option, a 7a, that is an option - you've got six months when your two years, five years. And you have another option that says varies by jurisdiction?

Cintra Sooknanan: I don't know - this is Cintra. I don't know if varies by jurisdiction would be appropriate but maybe we could have another option that says varies based on legal requirements or something like that or...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes, yes okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Something to that affect. I don't know if we actually wish to speak to the Whois - the thing that actually came up with these requirements to see if they had anything like that in mind - to the retaining details because (unintelligible) where - whenever we are retaining details it's for - it's with that purpose in mind for litigation. So I don't know if maybe we are over thinking this aspect of it or if it's, you know, a valid concern.

Michael Young: Well I think we're - okay. What about in 7a let's go up a level, Cintra, let's make another option to say six months, one year, two years, five years, retention range should be user configurable is another option. And basically what we're saying - because we're worried about functionality here and not policy enforcement, right?

So we're just asking the question should that functionality be variable so that people can set up their Whois for whatever reasons; maybe that's because of local law, whatever, right? We're not judging why you want to set us up we're just saying do you need flexibility?

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I'm the wrong person to ask because I do think, you know, the legal requirement is very important. So I'm guided by the group here.

Michael Young: Personally I do too; I just think that we have to remember our job is to talk about functionality and ask whether or not people feel strongly about different forms of functionality not, you know, we're not trying to inform policy decisions or even legal decisions, right? Even though I know some of you happen to be very astute lawyers so.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay thank you. So I guess you can include that bit and I'll review it then.

Berry Cobb: So, Michael, I made two changes here. I put as a fifth option duration is use configurable.

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And...

Michael Young: It should say - let's just say duration is configurable because it could be - we don't even want to dictate whether it's end user or server or what have you it's just the system allows it to be configurable. And we'll leave that as a bit of an open question.

Berry Cobb: Okay. And I also included indifferent here. Do you think that that's worthy of inclusion?

Michael Young: Yes, we were - it's consistent.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: We put indifferent everyplace else; we should put it there. I think, you know, it's probably not likely that they're - if they mark 7 indifferent then probably then you can assume that 7a is indifferent. But, you know, maybe - so they're likely to mark both indifferent in that case. But still we might as well just write the questions consistently.

Berry Cobb: Right, okay. All right moving onto R11. and basically the changes here were with respect to using our standard format of - I changed it from - it was ranked from a 3, 2, 1 scale to just the general option of very important, somewhat important, not important and then inclusion of indifferent.

And then the original version, which I'll show you here for basically Section C. This was originally a table that would be filled out that would have the general use of abuse point of contact over in the left hand column and then selecting the three or four options as columns of that table.

I don't think - it was different from our other formats so I went ahead and exported it out of the table to this format. So I'm not sure that we had the table format option available to us. But none of the content was actually changed here.

Michael Young: The only comment I'd have to say, Berry, is that these should have sub point identifiers like C, I, C - sorry, C1, C2, C3 so that when we're correlating data and responses we can differentiate them.

Berry Cobb: Right, very good, yes, I'll add those in. And I believe that takes us to the end of the survey.

Michael Young: Berry, did you see Cintra's comment? I think that to - going back to 7a for a second we could just add another option that says, you know, I guess

custom, you know, other and then give them a text field and allow them to - or give them a time - maybe if we can force them into entering in like a days or months or something. Let's just see if Wilson can do that with the tool.

Berry Cobb: Which one was that again?

Michael Young: That was - the one that we were looking at with the time retention - the time retention for Whowas.

Berry Cobb: And I just lost network connectivity.

Michael Young: Yes, I see that.

Berry Cobb: Oh there I'm back.

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So, I'm sorry, again which question is that so I can make sure I capture it?

Michael Young: It was in the Whowas section.

Berry Cobb: Oh the Whowas.

Michael Young: Seven A in the Whowas section. I can't remember which R that is.

Berry Cobb: That's 10.

Michael Young: Right so six months, one year, two years, five years, other, please specify.

Berry Cobb: Right, got it.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, this is Cintra. Maybe we could say please specify with reason.

Berry Cobb: All right, I got that one.

Michael Young: Okay, Cintra, I just want to say that I'm volunteering you to sort through those
                 written answers on that one.

Berry Cobb: Okay so we're at the end of the survey. I think that that's pretty much it.

Michael Young: Okay so I guess next steps, Berry, we have an editing review to do. Then do
                 we post I guess version 10 to the list to see if anyone has any final
                 considerations or comments, give a reasonable period of time of a few days
                 for that. And then I guess we turn it over to Wilson to get it out into the tool.
                 Would that be a plan?

Berry Cobb: Sounds like it to me. I'll have the changes from my perspective out to you
                 tonight. And then you can take over tomorrow or the next day and then we
                 can send it out to the list and ship it.

Michael Young: Okay. I should be able to do my changes tomorrow at the latest. I'll get them
                 done Wednesday morning. So, yes, and then we can put it out to the list
                 afterwards so that's definitely to the list within two days so that's good. Okay.

                 So I think we're done with that. I guess we'll just jump and I'll ask if there's
                 any new business. Now that we've been through all this work has it inspired
                 anyone to any new business? Okay...

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, this is Cintra. I just want to know have we set up a meeting for Prague
                 or do we have any plans for Prague?

Michael Young: That's a good question, Berry, I don't think we have one, right?

Berry Cobb: At this point in time no we haven't set anything up. At best that I had just
                 suspected that we would maybe do a base to any of the councils or the SOs
                 or ACs that that was necessary because I figured we'd be in - still in public

comment. If the working group does wish to put a session together I need to know like right now.

Michael Young: Well I think, you know, I'll definitely reserve and make some time to go around and sit in on people's stakeholder group's meetings if they'd like to hear from us directly along - to reinforce the Webinars that we do. But given that we are in public comment at that time I don't know that we need a - also a public meeting. So, Cintra, what do you think?

Cintra Sooknanan: We can try. I'm (unintelligible) I don't necessarily think we need a meeting per se but I do think we should actually meet with the different (unintelligible) that we do plan on attending the (unintelligible). I agree with you, Michael.

Michael Young: Okay great. So any other new business, questions? Berry, can we do a quick review of the assigned items?

Berry Cobb: Okay. There all to you and I. The first one is myself to start getting the paperwork together for the public comment period and to start scheduling the Webinars to be hosted approximately at the same time.

Then there's a series of edits between myself and you. Michael will provide hover definitions. I will change Question 6a, 6b removing the question - the question is relevant. I think there is one to modify Question 10 of the profile.

There's just a series of small edits. I don't want to bore everybody with these. So just those two main areas, provide edits, get the next version out to Wilson and then start scheduling the paperwork for the public comment period and Webinars.

Michael Young: Okay so, Berry, you can see me trying to talk and type again at the same time which is not going to work. But what Cintra was asking what about the beta testers? And I think that, you know, I guess what was going through my head there but not specifically announced, which I guess I should share

what's going on in my head, is that we should focus on getting the Webinar done and the draft up for comment.

And thereafter we should focus on scheduling a time to let the beta testers in as soon - but we want to get it up for - we want to get it up for public comment and get the Webinars going, make sure that we've gotten that nailed down first and then we can get the beta testers in because the public comment period is open for quite a - how long is it? It's quite a long time, right?

Berry Cobb: It's - this is Berry. It's 21 days minimum for the comment period and then 21 days for the reply period. We can have a longer comment period which I would suggest that we do given the amount of content that's available for review. So probably - my recommendation would be a 45-day comment period with a 21-day reply period.

And then secondary to that my understanding in terms of the test control group is as soon as we got it - got the survey loaded into the tool that we go ahead and email out that control group and have them start taking it before we even started public comment.

Michael Young: Okay so sure why not. I mean, there's no reason they all have to go at once either, right? People can trickle in and we can have them do it. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry. From a milestone perspective I was hoping that we could have the survey loaded into the tool by the 7th of May so the 8th or 9th of May we'll communicate out to our test control group that it's available, that they can start taking it. They can send in feedback as they execute against the survey. And then approximately by mid-May is when we can submit the draft to the Council and open up the public comment period.

Michael Young: Okay. So, you know, I'm just looking at the milestones to the bottom right of the screen. And I don't know extending the public comment - we had planned our milestones we were assuming I think the shortest period required in the public comment period was 21 and 21 so 42 days. So we would be resetting our milestones if we did 45 and 21, Berry?

Berry Cobb: That's correct.

Michael Young: So I don't know if we have time to do that. The other thing that goes through my mind is - so now that we've gone through these milestones and we'll have the draft going and we'll be waiting for feedback I think our next meeting in two weeks we need to focus the agenda on working through how we're going to process the feedback from the beta testers and then how we plan to process and review public comments information coming back as a group.

                   So we should line that up for our agenda and post that and see if anyone has anything they want to add.

Berry Cobb: Okay great.

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...feedback. This is Wilson. We're getting the (unintelligible) feedback. We should be able to provide statistics as they are responding to fill in the survey. So in that case if there are any changes to make that really that if I'm making or if there's anything to do (unintelligible) so I think (unintelligible) plan to do like to review the (sub) feedback when the survey are taking place and see if there's anything that due or (unintelligible) provide the statistics in real time.

Michael Young: Well sorry, Wilson, I'm not sure I understand; we need to - so the beta test - the beta takers are going to take the survey and then we need an out of band mechanism for them to communicate back to us what they thought of the survey, right? So I guess we could temporarily add text boxes for that

purpose to every one of the questions so just the beta version if you wanted; that would be one way to do it.

So they're taking the survey question and we add them an extra - could we do that for the beta version, could we add an extra text box in every question that says - with a little note above of it saying, you know, notes on questions go here.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes you can do that.

Michael Young: Okay that allows us to collect the information while they're doing the thing. Susan, you wanted to say something?

Susan Prosser: Yes, I had a question on - I'm going back to the consistency of the format of the survey in general. So...

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Prosser: ...some of the questions - especially when they do the - when it does the yes and no and indifferent...

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Prosser: ...there is inconsistency as to whether it's no and then yes then indifferent and case sensitive, things like that. Is that going to be finalized before it goes - uploaded into the survey for Wilson or does Wilson have to fix that all?

Michael Young: That's a good question. I guess Berry and I will clean up as much of that as we see while we're doing our edits and then we would ask Wilson if we miss something to try and clean that up as well.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. So that - yes so that's how we'll - Wilson, that's great. If you can add that for the beta survey takers that would get us information back while they're actually looking at the question and capture their first impressions so that'd be the best way.

And anyways let's discuss in detail how we want to review and walk through that information, who's going to look at what and how we're going to use that information to affect changes on the next call because we're running out of time on this one and I want to be sensitive to people's schedules.

Susan looks like she's typing another item. Right, the formatting should be all cleaned up when it goes into the tool. Right now we're working in Word and it's a little bit all over the place.

Okay, Berry, you and I should probably try and do an initial cleanup as we go through.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I just added it to my list.

Michael Young: Okay great. So I think we're at our hour and a half pretty much now. And I'll open it one more time, any last issues, comments? Cintra is typing. Okay, thanks everyone for the hard work. This was a great call; we got a lot done today. I'm getting excited because we're about to start interacting with the community on the work that we've done and that's the fun part.

So once again we couldn't do this without your volunteer work and your expertise. A bunch of great resources and personally I really enjoy working with all of you. Thank you very much for the call today.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye, bye.

END