

**WHOIS Survey Working Group  
TRANSCRIPT  
Monday 05 December 2011 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-20111205-en.mp3>

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

**Attendees**

Susan Prosser - RrSG  
Elisa Cooper - BC  
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar  
Michael Young - Individual  
Don Blumenthal – Ry  
Steve Metalitz - IPC  
Wendy Seltzer - ALAC  
Taki Skiadas for Kevin Suh

**ICANN Staff**

Liz Gasster  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apologies:**

Anne Naffziger – IPC  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Rafik Dammak - NCUC  
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC

Coordinator: ...all participants, this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Man: Well, hello everyone, and thank you for joining the call. I'm sorry, I guess, Berry, did you want to do an official ICANN intro or - and do the roll call?

Berry Cobb: Yes, and so for today on today's call we have - sorry, the (unintelligible) survey working group and it's kind of my first time on the meeting view. So starting off we have Michael Young, Don Blumenthal, Susan Prosser, Wendy Seltzer, Steve Metalitz, and from ICANN staff we have Liz Gasster, Berry Cobb, and also Nathalie Peregrine. And if I've missed anybody please announce yourself.

Elisa Cooper: This is Elisa Cooper.

Berry Cobb: Okay, sorry. And Elisa Cooper and then also we have (Taki) from - for Kevin Suh and Wilson Abigaba, pardon my mispronunciation, is on the Adobe Connect but I don't see him called out yet. And so with that, Michael, we've...

Michael Young: All right, thank you. Yes, sorry, I got a little out of sequence there. I should know this by now, I've only been on a few zillion of these calls over time.

Okay, so we adjusted the - I guess we'll start as per usual with our agenda bashing. You guys heard me before we started recording officially, I was just saying one of the action items that we're missing is I was supposed to go through the SSAC - I guess review of taxonomy. I'm never going to be able to say that clearly in terms of WHOIS terminology or, you know, in general consideration of elements we might talk about in the survey.

So we may have to adjust some of our terms after we review that but I also would ask for those of you that can commit a little bit of time to also read through it as well. Particularly I was going to ask for - group to take a look at it. So please refresh me, do we have anyone on in the first group on the call in the group members since Rafik wasn't able to make it?

Okay, I guess we don't. (Unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: This is Don Blumenthal. As the resident SSAC person, (unintelligible) at least pending the Board vote, I don't know if that's accurate or not. You know, I've

gotten somewhat familiar with it so I'm willing to talk briefly or just work with Rafik to the extent possible to cut their workbag. It's really fairly limited in terms of specific recommendations.

Michael Young: Okay, great. Don, if you're willing to do that that would be fantastic. And I see we just - I see Steve Metalitz is now showing on Adobe Connect as well so I assume he's on the call by this point.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I'm here.

Michael Young: Great, okay. So Rafik joined us just recently and was able to commit the time to jump into the Co-Chair role which was - (unintelligible) (Chris Warner) is as you all know the industry is got just a little bit of turmoil going on around the new applications.

So Werner's time was quite limited. He'll still be participating as a member in helping review and give comments and so forth on the actual survey that we draft so that will be very helpful given he's very knowledgeable in this space as well.

So unfortunately Rafik can't make this call but I will try and catch up with him directly in between calls with whatever we come up with for his group today.

Does anyone have anything else they want to add to the agenda before we roll through? Hearing nothing we'll go to the first item which is, Don, I think we might as well start with the review of this response to the GNSO Council with you because you had some comments to the list. Do you want to explain them a little bit?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, let me - if I can remember what I said.

Michael Young: Most of it's very straightforward.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, I looked at the - excuse me, I looked at the - what Berry had said and mainly had some - just an editorial suggestion, a couple of wording changes, changing the link and also questioning one of the words. I kind of raised a question as part of it which is what would - what the timetable would be for submitting this to the GNSO and that's important because the draft refers to what I think is the work of the WHOIS review team and whatever they have to say is - should be submitted, very possibly might be submitted before we send this along.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: The other item (unintelligible) is I'd like to see some clarification - like us to clarify some of the description of how compliant the (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Sorry, Don, can you repeat that last item there?

Don Blumenthal: The other thing I'd like to see us - well, the document refers to a couple of ways in which compliance has stepped its efforts up and I would just like to get some clarification on those.

Michael Young: Okay. Berry, are you able to respond to that?

Berry Cobb: Can you hear me okay?

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay, good. Yes, so we did reach out to compliance and they're still in the process of determining and overall strategy with their WHOIS Port 33 Probe (Tool). What they have acknowledged is that they are running the scan on an interval basis and they plan to step that up and then also continue to publish the results of that.

I think the biggest quandary about the use of this tool is given the current provisions in the RAA there's no specific SLAs or anything associated with the availability or the access for Port 33 or for the HTTP. So they can't really - they haven't been able to set exact targets and what a threshold - an exceeded threshold would look like yet.

But those are in the process or is on their to-do list to complete some of that activity. We didn't get a timeframe in which that would take place yet but we did acknowledge that the effort was going to be moving forward.

If need be we can go get even more detailed as to a timeline but last we had contacted - they haven't been able to commit to any kind of timeline yet.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, this may be just as a conservative (unintelligible) in me, (unintelligible). Maybe my voice is clearer now, I would hate - I would hesitate to site these without a little more concrete detail, concrete commitment in something to the GNSO.

Berry Cobb: Okay, understood. I will take that as an action item to get back with them and hopefully nail down some dates and better details around the scanning that they provide and also I think what would probably be good is to include a link to the - some of the reports that they have published. I'm not clear this has actually been posted on ICANN.org yet but I will take that action item for our next call to provide more details in that area. So thank you for that feedback.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate it.

Michael Young: So let's see, if I understand the concern, Don, is just that we will make sure what we're citing is 100% accurate.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. So, Berry, I guess we'll leave that in your hands to follow up on. Does anyone else have any other comments on this response?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. In addition to the points that Don raised, the last point here about RAA amendments and law enforcement efforts, I'm not sure what that refers to but if it's referring to the negotiations on revision to the RAA you might just include a link to this wiki that the - I just got a notice of it from staff.

Liz Gasster: Steve, I think it's really hard to hear you. Are others having trouble?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry, I'll try to speak up. I was just saying on the last point about RAA amendments and law enforcement efforts. I'm assuming that refers to renegotiation of the RAA and there's a - I mean, you know, the Council already knows this so I'm not sure if it's a big deal but there is a wiki that has now been established to lay out the topics that are being discussed in those negotiations and provide some insight into where things stand.

So we might just want to include that link rather than trying to summary - I mean there's a bunch of issues here that are relevant to WHOIS accuracy and availability questions. But so it might just be worthwhile to include that link.

Liz Gasster: Well, it's Liz, can I comment?

Michael Young: Go ahead.

Liz Gasster: You know, I think the reason that we noted these things, and Berry correct me if I'm wrong, is really to - not because they may lead to a standard but because they are more policy - they are in play of sort of policy and compliance related improvements if you will to WHOIS I think to convey that we didn't see a technical component to this.

That, you know, going back to our charge as trying to execute this survey of the technical requirements that would be needed to, you know, create a new protocol that the thought was that this availability element involved further activities by compliance, further activities in the policy realm, further activities perhaps operationally but not a technical element to them.

And therefore weren't appropriate for this group to undertake. How they get addressed by other groups in other context I think is a very fair concern but I think the point of this was just to say that the issue of availability should be addressed in those other context or rather than in this context where we are focused on identifying the technical elements to - that are sought for a new protocol, that this would not be needed. Is that fair, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Liz.

Liz Gasster: Yes, I just wanted to clarify why I think this is listed in this way. Not to provide you with either assurance or non assurance that it will be addressed in these other context, only that we think these would be more appropriate avenues to pursue the concern than including it in this survey. And that's the purpose of, I think, what we're proposing to communicate back to the Council.

Michael Young: Liz, listening to what you're saying I think we probably should then add a little bit more clarification in the opening paragraph here. I'm just kind of scribing, Berry, some stuff in here and then I'll email it to the list rather than try and read it across.

But it's not just technical requirements (unintelligible) talking about functional requirements and I think what I worried about is we can equally get - you know, there's two parties here that we're kind of sitting in between or sitting between, you know, the actual technical implementators of these systems which is really kind of, you know, getting into protocols and IETF space and consideration.

And then, you know, policymakers may be on the other side who are trying to decide, you know, what's a good idea and what's a bad idea to do ultimately for many different reasons, you know, sometimes legal, sometimes jurisdiction, even, you know, cultural in some cases or respective language flaws or norms or considerations.

We're trying to just gather - sit in the middle and name all the functionality of WHOIS system could do and ask questions about that functionality, you know, versus, you know, leave any (unintelligible). We're not here to put an opinion on whether or not functionality is good or bad. We're just trying to get people to respond to their opinion on that functionality and the need for it. So I'm just trying to adjust this a little bit to capture that.

Do people think that's the right way to describe it?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, yes, I agree and I welcome your input. So if you want to just send it over to me or send it out to the list I'll update this master copy and then recirculate the next version.

Michael, are you still there?

Michael Young: Sorry, I was speaking on mute. I was actually trying to think, talk, and edit all at the same time. It's not going to work. So I will have to send this later on in the conversation or after the call. But, you know, just have a little bit more adjustment, Berry.

I think this is really close, Berry. The comments are - you're along the right lines anyway and it's just, you know, between Don, Steve, and I there's not too much there. Did anyone have anything else they want to add?

Berry Cobb: Yes, this is Berry. I'd just like to, you know, kind of circle the wagon back to this. When we - when I first started the draft I had just stopped at the first



paragraph and it just didn't seem like it was enough information to get back to the Council that, you know, this is just out of scope and hence the reason for including the three master bullets of information for the Council to consider.

And I forgot who had said this but, you know, most likely may be outside of what compliance is doing with the Port 33 Probe Tool, the Council's pretty aware of the other two bullets and the activities going on with that but certainly - and then, you know, the third one more specifically kind of nailing down on the policy side, which is kind of the essence from the RAP recommendations.

So at any rate, I definitely welcome other feedback. Like Michael said, he'll send over some language to improve the first paragraph and update those areas that are highlighted in yellow, specifically getting back with the compliance team and then also adjust this link to the draft. I believe I included that one instead. So thank you for all of that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: This is Liz, before we get off this particular subject if I could just clarify then, does everyone agree in concept that this element should not be part of the survey and that we should respond this way? I understand we need to wordsmith the explanation better but does anyone disagree?

That's what I think was key for today because we hadn't really had a chance, especially with this big a group on the phone, to be sure everyone was okay with that. Great, thanks. Sorry to interrupt, I just wanted to be sure we finished with that item.

Don Blumenthal: Good point.

Michael Young: Okay, so just trying to get the - pop the agenda back up again for a sec. So I talked a little bit about - most of you on the call probably know Rafik has been

around the community a great deal. I worked with him in a couple of groups before and he's a good contributor. And apparently always shows up for all the calls so it's kind of ironic that the first one we've got him scheduled for he wasn't able to make. So it's unfortunate.

So I understand - one of the problems that I think we were faced a little bit with or concerns rather is that volunteers of the Co-Chair for this particular group, we like them to have a little bit of - we're hoping, and Liz and I were talking back and forth and Berry, that we'd get somebody in there who has enough of a technical background to help with crafting the survey questions.

And I think Rafik's there but certainly - more technical backgrounds in the group so I think we should be prepared to help reinforce and review and if we think any of the - the phrasing in the questions is a little bit off or he's missed the point at all we shouldn't hesitate when the subgroup starts passing around their first drafts of the survey questions to assist with that.

It's going to be one of the more challenging groups because the language has to be very carefully chosen, it's got to be meaningful both to the technical and the non-technical. So I'm encouraging everyone to please be prepared to actively comment and help initiate those - to hit the lists and start to come out.

And we will do formal walk through of them anyway once we have a full draft, end-to-end of the survey questions but we don't have to wait until that point in time to start giving comments.

Anyone have any questions about Rafik joining the group and stepping in as this Co-Chair? Okay, anyone have any concerns or issues with that because we didn't actually do a formal, you know, vote or anything on this. We were kind of scrambling for resources in here so if anyone does have a concern or objection we will backtrack and do it in a more formal way with a vote.

Berry Cobb: Michael, this is Berry. In terms of getting Rafik started with this sub team is there anything that I can do from an ICANN staff perspective to help that sub team get started? Not sure if you've had a first call or not yet.

Michael Young: Yes, Berry, I think from my perspective what would be very helpful is if you reached out to Rafik directly and helped him - initial call. I'll be talking to Rafik directly just to spin him up a bit, much like Don and I met a couple - few weeks ago and got spun up on things and we'll go from there and see if he has any further requests.

Berry Cobb: Okay, thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Michael, this is Steve Metalitz. Could you remind us who is the other Co-Chair of that group?

Michael Young: That was (Warner).

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you.

Michael Young: Yes. Steve, I don't think you were on the last call. (Warner) came on and explained that he's overwhelmed with the new gTLD application process and, you know, at that point we asked him, well, if that's the case would you prefer to hand off the Co-Chair to someone else and he had opted for that.

Steve Metalitz: So there's only one Co-Chair?

Michael Young: For that group, correct.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Michael Young: We have three Co-Chairs in total.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Liz Gasster: I think we're getting our terminology mixed up. It's Liz. We have the Chair and then we have, like, three Vice Chairs.

Steve Metalitz: I got it.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Michael Young: Is it Co-Chair or Vice Chair? I'm not...

Liz Gasster: It doesn't matter really but I think that's what you're referring to, right? We have the three sub groups and each Vice Chair or Co-Chair is the Chair of one of those groups in addition to Michael.

Steve Metalitz: Great, thank you.

Michael Young: Yes, Steve, is that all right with you? Do you have any concerns?

Steve Metalitz: No, I don't. I just was - I was just confused by the title Co-Chair but now I understand.

Michael Young: Okay, while I'm on the subject of people joining the group and volunteers we've been a little bit - you know, we had a lot of interest from (unintelligible) and then things got very busy in our industry in general. And people's time is of - been a little bit wanting in some cases to get people - a lot of time from people on these things.

Now I have a couple of potential volunteers that I'm talking to tomorrow so, Liz, Berry, hopefully they'll - it's looking very positive for them probably donating some time to the group, which will help as well. Plus, they've got an interesting perspective on future - who is functionality that might be helpful as well for the group.

So just kind of priming everyone that we might get a couple more volunteers in and to think about which teams we should probably - we can split them up, we can throw them - they work together typically but we can split them up and put them in different teams, wherever we feel we're resource short, okay.

Berry Cobb: Michael, this is Berry. I'd just to remind the working group that on our wiki page, Item 4 lists working group members and then right below that list we have a breakout of the sub teams and how belongs to who if you ever need a reminder.

Michael Young: Right, I think what we - it's not just that, I think what we need is a little feedback from the Vice Chairs on, you know, how far they're progressing, if they're just seeing resource pull and whether or not they need more help.

It's not always just a - we've got an even number of people assigned to each group and maybe that certain groups are feeling that that's insufficient or, you know, the draw or the list that they have to do with their group requires so much time from individual members that they need more people for that reason.

So I'm a little concerned about that I just want the Vice Chairs to think about that and think about whether or not they (unintelligible) on board.

And I've - I don't know about you but my Adobe Connect page kind of went blank, there we go. So one of the things we're missing here, Berry, that I would want to do I think before we - and for some reason I thought it was there and it isn't, before we go through the work goals can we just get our Chairs that are on the call to give us an update before we go on to setting work goals? We can add that in after 3?

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: Yes, so either Wilson or Don, whoever wants to start?

Don Blumenthal: Okay, I'll jump in. Well, the first thing I need to do and I'll do it right after the call is reach out to a couple of listed members and in a final attempt to see if they're still interested or not. Avri and I, Avri Doria who joined after that list was put together, and I have gone back and forth a bit but, you know, the work's going to require more than just the two of us.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: As far as status, it really is us going back and forth and trying to identify any ICANN effort that is even remotely WHOIS related and also the IETF effort would be involved in that. The plan is to reach out to - to just try to clarify exactly what everybody is working on so that we can stay out of each other's way where necessary but also be aware of what each other is doing where needed to keep things more efficient.

Michael Young: Don, is it realistic by the next call that maybe you guys could at least - and it will help us with our resource estimate, draft your objectives and goals in scope?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well, okay, maybe we shouldn't even wait for the next call. Maybe we can just publish this to the list for everyone to review. Would two weeks be enough?

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. And Don, sorry, I kind of jumped in there. Were you done?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, pretty much.

Michael Young: Okay, any questions for Don? Okay, just a refresher for everyone, Don's group is tasked with the outreach - ask people to look at the original staff report on WHOIS requirements, make sure that they're aware of it, that they've read it, make sure they understand what our group is doing, and to make sure that they - if they want to provide any comments or thoughts and that on that report, any additions that that report seems, you know - is either kind of stale dated on because it was written a year ago or into considerations, new ideas or thoughts that they've come up with altogether.

So it's a go around, this is to make sure that all the stakeholders that were talked to originally on the group are touched base with plus, you know, a sweep around to see if we have any new stakeholders that we should inform of what's going on.

And then their group is really to - Group 1 is drafting the survey questions to make sure that we extend the survey questions to consider all those - any feedback that we get.

Don Blumenthal: Just one quick add-in that occurred to me while you were talking, Michael. If anybody is aware of any possible efforts, things that are being talked about that might not be formalized that would be helpful too.

I am just saying that because I am aware of, for example, a possible SSAC right now to the working party stage. I don't know if something will come out of it but it's useful to know that it's happening. So if anybody knows of similar things, similar maybes please let me know.

Liz Gasster: Well, it's Liz. There's also a report on (unintelligible) WHOIS, an issue report that's in draft form that the staff prepared at the request or direction of the GNSO Council following that public comment period that's posted on the ICANN's website.

Now they will finalize that issue report, our staff, and then following the finalization of that issue report the GNSO Council at some point short thereafter would vote on whether to pursue a PDP on (Thick) WHOIS so that might be worth mentioning in the same context.

Don Blumenthal: Definitely would, yes.

Liz Gasster: Plus we have this group, plus we have the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group that is a joint group between the GNSO and the SSAC as you all well know.

Michael Young: Sure, Don, are you in touch with liaisons from there?

Don Blumenthal: Not yet, no.

Michael Young: Okay, can we make that relationship happen?

Don Blumenthal: Definitely will, I was more getting a list together and hoping to portion things out.

Michael Young: Fantastic, well, and we can see why you need more people, that's a lot of groups to talk to. So we haven't even gotten outside the ICANN community yet.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I'm a member of that IRDWG so...

Liz Gasster: Excellent.

Steve Metalitz: To fill you in, if the work product is not crystal clear.

Don Blumenthal: Fair enough.

Michael Young: It probably won't be but - clear as mud, yes.



Steve Metalitz: That was just my personal (unintelligible), anyway.

Michael Young: Okay, Don, anything else?

Don Blumenthal: No, that will do it.

Michael Young: Okay, Wilson, can you give us an update? I see Wilson dropped off Adobe Connect. No, he's back on again. Wilson, are you there? Liz, can you see whether or not he's logged into the call as well as Adobe Connect?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, I don't see him in the...

Michael Young: Or Berry, I meant to say.

Berry Cobb: No, problem. I don't see him in the meeting view.

Liz Gasster: We're interchangeable, that's okay.

Michael Young: (Unintelligible), okay, well, so let me raise a question then for Berry and Liz. I saw an email, I think it might have - I'm trying to remember who sent it. It might have been between (Susan) and Wilson if I remember correctly, about an assumption of (unintelligible) has to be free or not. Is there any chance of us getting funding for the actual survey distribution tool? Or do we have to seek a free solution?

Liz Gasster: There is possibility of funding if funding is needed. We would just need to have something prepared with, you know, the costs and the rationale, the estimated costs and rationale from the group.

And then I think the GNSO Council would be - you know, this group would want to take that request to the GNSO Council because in essence it involves the decision-making - would involve both the Council's concurrence as well

as, you know, the staff concurrence. You know, and depending on the dollar amount, you know, it would require senior staff.

Michael Young: So we need some estimates basically.

Liz Gasster: But there's nothing to discourage us from asking when expertise or special capabilities are needed. So I would just ask that subgroup to try to size the need and, you know, I think we have some free survey tools out there so it's just understanding, you know, perfectly reasonably why those might be insufficient or why some special capability is needed.

Michael Young: Yes, and I don't know if...

Liz Gasster: If you recall everyone too, the charter for this group also includes a step once the draft survey questions are prepared to have an independent assessment of, you know, the draft survey, I think, to make sure that it's - from a number of perspectives properly designed and built. And that's likely to require some funding as well.

So in terms of funding request I think we should just keep in mind that there may be more than one coming from this group. It might actually be driven by two different subgroups and in our correspondence to the Council and in our estimating we just want to keep that in mind.

But I would not discourage it at all. You know, one of the things we're trying to do even in our new PEP process is explore these kinds of issues early and with the proper resources so nothing unreasonable about asking. It just needs to be sized and, you know, determined whether there's budget to cover it either this year or next.

Michael Young: Okay, so Liz let me ask you pragmatic questions. One, is it better for us to get all our estimates together for all our potential costs and go to the well once with a request?

And two, once we put a - you know, that we start to cycle that request out to the Council and so forth, what would you estimate to be the average time period, you know, to get it approved and potentially get the funding released so that we can, you know...

Liz Gasster: On the first question, I think it's always optimal to bundle them together but I'm not sure it's always realistic. And so if it can be bundled together into one request I think that would be optimal again. If not, I think what you - what we would want to do is just in the first request note that we will also have a second request that involves the following functions during the independent review of the survey.

And noting that it's unclear at this point what we think that would cost or entail and, you know, just so that it doesn't seem like - if we know there are two requests, you know, we want to make that clear up front. But I do think it would be better to make them together if possible.

And then with regards to the Council, you know, it probably depends how much money we're talking about and the Council's overall view of this but they are supportive of this work and understand that we've written some of those costs even into the charter, right, since they're aware too of this independent review and probably should be anticipating some requests for funding.

So I would expect - you know, they typically have a habit of taking motions once, you know, seven days before a Council meeting and then usually holding them over for one meeting, not always but usually at least one meeting for stakeholder groups and consistencies to consider. So worse case, I would imagine maybe a two-month interval for Council review.

And candidly, depending on the dollar amount it may be more of an issue than with ICANN, you know, in terms of confirming the funding since funding

decisions involve both the Council's desires and, you know, the officers and often the Board's concurrence following that.

That's another reason why I think it would be better to include the two together because if it ends up being anything considerable then it would be the opportunity to insert this into the budget for the fiscal year, the next fiscal year which is being developed now.

I hate to think of it in terms because it seems so far away in the future but realistically something to keep in mind.

And since I've been working quite a bit with other studies and, you know, the studies are all being done by independent experts and I have a consultant helping me in a sense monitor the work of those other independent experts and we have various benchmarks and I've become quite familiar with these surveys and studies and the review of them.

And realized, you know, candidly that they're - to get experts to review them might not be a trivial cost.

Michael Young: Well, I - okay, let me ask maybe a really dumb question given something you just said. If most of the other surveys are being done by experts or paid for by experts and why aren't we just - as a working group, why aren't we just reviewing the survey questions and not having a budget to have somebody actually draft the questions?

And we play more of a reviewing function and value added function versus actually trying to draft the questions ourselves.

Liz Gasster: You know, that could be a recommendation that comes out of this group to be honest. I realize it may come as a surprise to people on the group, and I don't mean to open that up, but it was just the specific request to the Council that the community develop the survey, that's what was the thinking.

So kind of the task we were given by the Council and, you know, ICANN is a bottom-up organization where I think the preference is to have the community lead in those processes. And I think it was, you know, the Council members - you know, consider those issues. But there's no real reason why it couldn't be done a different way.

Michael Young: Okay, no I understand that and I guess I wasn't suggesting that, you know, you hand the whole thing over to a paid consultant per say. I was suggesting that the first draft of survey questions directly taken from the WHOIS requirements report could easily be drafted by a consultant if you will or paid consultant.

Liz Gasster: To be drafted by staff.

Michael Young: Or staff.

Liz Gasster: And to be honest, if I were given the assignment, let's just say, you know, I would make a judgment about whether we'd be in a position to just sit down and draft them or try to have a consultant do them. That's a little different than the independent review that I think those who were in favor of that and added it to the charter were envisioning because there was a specific, I think - and again, this is just my perception of conversations.

You all can go back and hear them, the transcript, you know - a desire to have that kind of independent assessment to (unintelligible) perhaps should be done by a third party.

Michael Young: Well, yes, and let me take a step back again, I'm not suggesting that it's one or the other. I don't see why it would be one or the other.

In talking about the mechanics of actually taking an existing report, translating it physically into survey questions with what's in the report, we as a working

group would still have to do an initial review as a - add anything we feel that's missing, go through the process of the outreach that we've been talking about, incorporate new feedback and effectively potentially new survey questions that aren't even in the existing WHOIS requirements report as part of that go around.

We'd still have to develop the survey tool decisions and then when we were done with that then we would still be turning over that survey for review by an independent expert.

Liz Gasster: So you know me, that's a - perfectly reasonable way to go about it. I think it may be that, you know - it's definitely a shift from how the Council and community initially viewed these steps but it might be more efficient and that could be the thought of the group.

The only thing that - well, two things that I think I'd want to address or, one, just capacity how we would do this and over what period of time. Like, if we were to just take it on - and this, let's just be - what I'm thinking of just hearing you talk, just to feed it back to you would be a skeleton set of questions that could be included in the survey for all of you to review and assess and edit and make whatever changes to - you thought were appropriate, maybe it would be that Subgroup 1 would do that.

And then, you know, we would decide at that point - you all would describe at that point if you think an independent review is still needed, you know, that would still be the understanding I think that the Council would have now in the charter. So if you didn't think that was needed or thought that should be done a different way I think that would require some communication with the Council.

And then, you know, we could proceed accordingly. What I don't know is - just at this point, shifting to staff putting the first draft together, which again

conceptually I don't object to at all, is when could we get that done? Would I have some flexibility in using a consultant to help with that?

And assessing - we have some expertise, obviously, in my group as well, maybe they'd want to take the first crack at it. (Steve)'s not on the phone because I didn't think I'd need him today, now I could really use him. But, you know, we can discuss that offline and I'd be glad to get back to the group with, you know, our assessment of sort of timeframe and how that might work if you'd like us to pursue that route.

Michael Young: Well, I guess there's...

Liz Gasster: (Unintelligible) isn't on the call and I don't know if others from that group, that subgroup, have - about this particularly from, you know, your vantage point of how you thought you wanted to contribute or, you know, (unintelligible) your preferred approach.

So I'm willing to basically go with what the group wants with the understanding that I might have to, you know, arrange some things as far as the resources and timeframe.

Michael Young: Okay, so Liz, I mean bluntly it sounds to me like if we're - we don't want to change the nature of what we've all agreed to do in the sense that, you know, we don't want to turn this - the original report was a staff exercise.

It was supposed to be a community exercise so I think your idea - I don't think we would change anything that we've told the Council that we intend to do because that would be going back and, like you said, changing the whole structure of things and I don't think that's the intention.

But a draft set of questions for Group 1 to work from, for Subgroup 1 to start with, sounds like me like a helper tool, not a change in what they're doing. And they would be free to edit, change, modify those as they see fit.

Does the rest of the team agree that that's an assist versus change in our methodology?

Liz Gasster: Helper tool, you should be in sales.

Michael Young: Well, we don't want it to be anything more than a helper tool to be honest.

Liz Gasster: I think Wendy Seltzer has her hand raised.

Michael Young: Yes, Wendy, what do you think?

Wendy Seltzer: I'm sorry, I raised my hand much earlier simply to say that I think the Council would come back immediately with a - to a request for funding for one project with a - and what else are you going to be asking for funding for. So I'll just agree with Liz that it would be helpful at least to be able to preview all the funding requests at the same time.

Michael Young: Okay, great. So while you're talking what do you think about getting staff resources to help with the first draft of questions? Give us a starting point for our...

Wendy Seltzer: What do I think as in would I support that? I see it - at Council we're constantly being told how many ways that staff is being stretched and how they don't have time to take on even all of the projects that we've already tried to start. So I'm not sure that they would look kindly on trying to task more staff to more things. But I don't really have more to add on that.

Michael Young: Okay, so let me para - let me change my question a little bit then in consideration - if beyond the resource issue of staff, is there any other issues that you see?



Wendy Seltzer: I'm really wondering whether we've taken this and blown it way out of proportion in that it sounded as though we're constructing a giant behemoth in order to ask people a few questions. And I'm wondering if whether there are - and I haven't been involved in all of the subgroups so I may be missing something. I may be missing quite a lot but I'm just wondering whether or not we're not overdoing this.

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I'd like to be in the queue but others may also want to comment first.

Michael Young: Anyone else with their hand up? I don't see any other hands up. Liz, why don't you go ahead?

Liz Gasster: So I think Wendy brings up something really important about the sizing of, you know, how big a project is it to design a study this kind of - sorry, a survey. And I guess, you know - I've just spent the last year completely immersed in developing surveys. You know, we've got several different surveys we've just conducted on WHOIS.

And I think I'm exactly in the middle. On the one hand I think she's - Wendy, you're right that, you know, we're blowing this way out of proportion and then on the other hand I think there's some things about it that have to get done really right that are more complicated than they might seem on the surface.

So one sort of easier list thing is that I think we have a universe of technical or functional requirements that have been identified, whether it's 100% universe or not, I don't know, but I think it's a long enough list that you could kind of set up some questions about them working from the report that - and with an opportunity to, like, open fields to add some things that would, you know - where we could keep that piece of it somewhat simple.

But what I think are the harder parts to me in the survey design are first of all describing these functions in a way that are universally or relatively universally understandable because if you recall one of the things that Chuck

and Avri in their proposal emphasized so much was what a broad number of people should really be commenting.

And the terminology is somewhat technical terminology. So I think we do have a taxonomy issue with the survey in how we make it both really understandable to the breadth of people I think they were envisioning participating but be true to the technical concepts that were intended, I think, is not trivial.

And then the second piece of that is that I still struggle with what's policy and what's technical functional and I am concerned that in - that somehow the preface and the conclusions or the packaging of the survey needs to express that in a way that is universally understood.

And Wendy, you know - I like to say, you know, could someone write that paragraph and take a stab at expressing the scope in a way that you think would make sense to a broad audience that I think we're being asked to consult. And that I think is challenging given just some of my recent work.

So I guess I'm ambivalent and both seeing - wanting to keep it simple and worrying about some of the - and by the way, we also have some demographic questions and other questions beside the technical that I think at least initially we all thought were appropriate for inclusion. So you have some of those additional, you know, expertise and wording and requirements to consider as well.

Michael Young: Liz, this is Michael - sorry, go ahead, Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I'll get in the queue, sorry.

Michael Young: No, no, go right ahead.

Wendy Seltzer: All right, thanks, Liz. And I appreciate all of the work that you've been doing in survey design. And I wonder - just to go back to your sort of policy versus technical question, since making decisions based on WHOIS gets deep into the muck of policy and I think no survey no matter how carefully crafted is going to be accepted as a community consensus because that's the work of policy development.

I just wonder if whether a lightweight survey couldn't do most of what we're trying here. You know, a - the most heavyweight survey that we could possibly do is still not going to be accepted as now the community has spoken because that's not the way the community speaks.

And yet a lightweight survey that turns up interesting things that we haven't thought about or turns up the fact that none of the usual suspects and unusual suspects could find anything that we hadn't thought about gives information to the process without needing quite the level of statistical rigor, methodological rigor, cost, time and expense.

Michael Young: I'll put myself in the queue now. Is there anyone that hand their hand up? I don't see anyone, just Wendy's hand is still up virtually. You know, Wendy, I agree 100% with you that what we want to do with these survey questions is actually make them very easy to comprehend and make them lightweight and we don't want to (unintelligible) on the survey.

When we were talking about in earlier meetings is as if the survey's too long people lose interest and we won't get it completed, the completion rate or the finish rate will be terrible.

I think one of the things we're faced with is taking a fairly complex set of potential functionality that's been suggested and not just what's in the WHOIS requirements report but some other stuff that's been discussed since then in various groups and boiling it down to simple.

I mean I think it can (unintelligible) simple but to be honest to create a lightweight survey in some ways that's coherent and graceful in its application is one of the most difficult things to do because you've got to take all this heavyweight information and simplify it, right.

So it's challenging on our side. It's going to be a lot of work for us. It should not be if we've done our jobs well then, you know, it should be a pretty easy survey for someone to take. It should be a pretty easy survey to understand the results or the responses from. But that's - that doesn't alleviate our workload I don't think. Does that make sense?

Wendy Seltzer: I guess - since I don't see other hands I'll just say that I'm not a heavyweight social scientist but I do know that they sometimes refer to things like snowball studies where you start with a core and move out from there. And I wonder if there's room for that.

Rather than trying to design the instrument in advance and think in advance of all of the questions that we might need what about doing it (unintelligible) testing it with people, volunteers and finding out from there that it's missing pieces because at the - maybe I need to go back and review some things.

Michael Young: Yes, that is the plan actually. So I know you're a little more recent to the team. Perhaps what we should do then is I don't - you know, some people on the call have already been through this stuff, Wendy. If you...

Wendy Seltzer: Okay, I'll go back and...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...and I can continue up on, yes, yes. Because your points are all very valid, we discussed all of them though so far, those ones you've raised. I think we - yes, okay.

So Liz, I think basically why don't you - if no one objects, why don't you - we're not saying we're going to do anything but it wouldn't hurt for you to kind of investigate and see whether or not - whether it would be possible to have somebody help with that part.

And we can absolutely, you know, see what you find out in talking amongst staff resources before we make any decisions anyways. If it's going to be very difficult to get resources to do it then we'll just push ahead with ourselves anyways but if it's a possibility then we can take the time to discuss it as a group.

Liz Gasster: Yes, yes. I mean it's Liz. I think the issue is really just the time that it's going to take. (Unintelligible) is finishing with the original report. He's a PhD research scientist and has done many surveys and I have others on the team that can support that and a consultant who is helping me on the other WHOIS studies.

I think as long as this group is conformable with, you know, that approach. I think we should inform the Council that from the moment, you know - that's just the approach we're looking at just to kick start this with the understanding that the group is going to, you know, shape that appropriately.

And, you know, we can give you kind of a basic structure for it. I think it would follow closely the report itself as it's been proposed. And we may find that that looks relatively easy to convert into a straightforward survey or we may decide at that point to take a different approach.

So I'm happy to start with that and, you know, at least turn around to the group an estimated timeframe for when we might be able to give you a - you know, a skeleton of that.

Michael Young: Okay, does anyone object to Liz looking into this and investigating what's entailed anyways?

Liz Gasster: I think you'll want to talk to Rafik just so he doesn't feel brought in (unintelligible) yet again.

Michael Young: Absolutely, and I'll take that as an action item.

Liz Gasster: And I do think there will be plenty for all of you, the working group from all over, you know, we're just going to put a basic structure together that I think, you know, we've all read this report. Steve knows it intimately.

We're also looking to have a strong suggestion on the format we use. We might play around with that particular format but we've done some recent surveys ourselves so, you know, happy to explore that too.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: The key is not getting too far, you know, without you all looking at it and making sure it meets the kind of approach and rigor that you're envisioning because...

Michael Young: So Liz, I didn't hear any objections so why don't you go ahead and consider it further and then tell us what you would suggest.

Liz Gasster: Okay, very good.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: We're going to meet again on the 20 something, 20th or 22nd?

Michael Young: The next Monday, yes, okay.

Liz Gasster: Two Mondays from now.

Michael Young: That's clearly the - let's talk work goals for 2011. Can we jump into that? Any - okay. So 2011 we've got - we've already got an action list here (unintelligible) list that Berry's been creating dynamically, thank you, Berry. Liz can - is it possible by the next meeting that you can get that feedback to us or size that up by the next meeting?

Liz Gasster: Yes, that'd be my goal if not before.

Michael Young: Okay, and then I asked this to the group, does any - I'll ask anyone to object if they think it's not - everyone thinks it's okay but, you know, if Liz can come back to us by the next meeting with a proposal then I'd like us to debate it at the next meeting and, you know, approve it or disapprove it or make a decision on what we want to do with it.

Steve Metalitz: Michael, this is Steve Metalitz. When is the next meeting?

Michael Young: Two weeks from now, Steve, on the Monday again.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It will be December 19 at the same time.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, and Liz, when do you think you'll have the proposal for us?

Liz Gasster: Definitely by the next call but hopefully before then.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, if we're going to discuss it we should have it a little bit in advance.

Liz Gasster: Yes. Yes, I'm going to try.

Steve Metalitz: Great.

Michael Young: Okay, and I'm just looking through - in terms of stuff we can get in the remainder of the year, I think pretty much all of the action items we had listed here excepting the estimating costs which is going to probably take a little bit

longer, I think everything else on this list is stuff that should be doable before the next call.

Some of it's just - you know, Berry, I'll ask you to go through the action items before we leave the call and who they're assigned to. But I would suggest that that's enough of a scope for the remainder of the year. And unless there's (unintelligible) that are talking about Q1, okay.

So again...

Steve Metalitz: Michael, what list are you referring to? Is it the one that's on the thing?

Michael Young: It's on the - if you look at the...

Steve Metalitz: Okay, well, I see one of those - if I'm reading it right is survey tools sub team, size survey tool requirements for estimating costs and funding requests to GNSO Council.

Michael Young: Yes, that's the one I said would go into next year.

Steve Metalitz: That will go into next year, okay, thank you.

Michael Young: Yes, everything else I think we can do this year. Steve, what do you think?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I was just going to - raising that - I'm on that sub team and it has never met as far as I know so I would hesitate...

Michael Young: Okay, so that's another issue that I'm going to have to give a call out to Wilson and talk about why that's not the case. Well, between now and then I would like to suggest that really given the two-month timeline Liz has raised to circle around funding requests.



Do we need to meet a target of mid-January realistically for that item if we're going to, you know, succeed the team and gets funds allocated? Because we're - right now we've got a commitment in our charter to get a draft out to the GNSO, an initial draft in March.

And so, you know, following that initial draft I think we'd definitely like to get the expert in to do the review and we'd also talked about - and Wendy, this is some stuff I can spin you up on later but we talked about actually maybe using some GNSO Council members as part of our test group for the first draft of the survey questions there to see whether or not we're on track with the questions and that the question mean that - people are reading them the way that we thought that they would be read as well, comprehended the way we thought they would be understood.

So I think we need to get that funding request or sized up, at least an approximation by mid January.

Steve, do you think that timing is about right?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I think it may be realistic. We can give it a try.

Michael Young: Okay, and I'm not - I don't think we have to get 100% firm but, you know, reasonable estimates would probably - at least give us some headway.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Michael Young: So the other thing is that Don's got a - his work plan, he's going to get done - I think if we're going to get - in the first quarter of 2012 really our - we've got to hunker down and we've got to get a first draft of questions out.

It doesn't have to be all the questions, it'd be nice if it was, but Don, I think, your work plan in terms of reaching out to other stakeholders and seeing if

there are any questions that we can't go beyond the scope of the current WHOIS requirement report.

We're going to need that feedback in time to - we're going to need that feedback by probably mid-February in order to make sure that we have those questions included.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Michael Young: In that draft. And, you know, Steve, for your group, I guess I - is Wilson on the phone now, Liz, Berry? Do you see him? Because I see him on Adobe Connect but I don't know if he's - Berry, if you're talking you're muted.

Berry Cobb: Sorry, yes, he is. Wilson, are you there? Wilson, if you can hear us you're talking on mute maybe.

Michael Young: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: The last few calls with Wilson we've really struggled to get him into the communications and actively into the call, and particularly being one of the Chairs we really need him to be. So is it possible for ICANN staff to take as an action item to contact him and see if there's anything we can do to improve the communications?

Liz Gasster: We can but I think he had said before - and we will, but I think Wilson had said before that he had a lot of problems with his connectivity where he is and that it's somewhat of a fact of life. We might be able to get him in the chat to just type out if he's on the - if you see him in Adobe Connect because he had - that was helpful before where he was able to communicate via chat when his voice line went out.

Michael Young: Okay, what I'm looking from him is just a confirmation right now that, you know, I'm almost having a two-way conversation with Steve in front of him about the realities of the group that he is administrating.

So I just want to make sure that he feels that he can come back with some initial estimates if he feels that, you know, a paid version of survey moniker, whatever, would be that much better for whatever reason.

Liz Gasster: Yes, let's see if he responds in Adobe or else we can follow up for sure after the call.

Michael Young: Okay, so going back to, you know, the work goals around the first quarter all about getting that first draft done. We've talked about Don's team. We're waiting to see what we hear back from Wilson.

And, you know, Liz, if we can't get some - you know, realistically get some uplift from staff related resources to get the initial draft framework we're going to have to push and all of us are going to have to reinforce Group 1 to get an initial set of draft questions done during that time. I think it's also really important that we're starting now into regular two-week calls.

You know, we're going to need - as we start to produce materials we're going to have to review as we go in order to make that timeframe. So these calls can't just be, you know, about organization of our work alone, we actually have to start going through survey questions, debating them, talking about them, and seeing how they relate to the documents.

So really need to encourage everyone to make the calls every two weeks and expect them to be at that point a commitment of an hour and a half to two hours to make that timeline.

That's what I would suggest is realistic for Q1. I don't know if anyone else wants to offer any other work items that they think we should be fitting in

there. I think that's a pretty fully plate and if anything we'll be challenged to fulfill against that.

I think I'm - you know, I would love it someone disagreed with me right now and said, no, Michael, it's no problem, we'll get that done by the end of January. But I just - you know, that sinking feeling in my stomach that we have a lot of work ahead of us is accurate, okay.

Liz Gasster: (Unintelligible) Wilson's responding in chat so looks like he is having some quality issues.

Michael Young: Liz, is there any chance we can get - is he coming in through, you know, Skype or an IP phone or something like that? Do you know how he connects to us?

Liz Gasster: No, I don't.

Wilson: (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: I think I - is that Wilson?

Wilson: Yes, this is Wilson.

Michael Young: Hi, Wilson, good to hear you, okay. Wilson, I don't know how much of the past conversation you've - you heard but right now we're trying to consider whether or not the survey tools - two things here. We're considering our workflow for Q1 of next year, of first quarter, January to March.

And the other thing that hits your group in particular is the discussion of whether or not the survey tool needs to be a free survey tool or whether or not we could be allocated funds to pay for one. We've - it's possible if we saw value in having a paid tool. We could get a budget allocation for it but it takes

about two months to go through that process. So we would need to make that decision and estimate what our funds should be by mid-January.

Do you think that's attainable with your team?

Liz Gasster: I think I'm going to be looking at trying to do this realistically using some of the existing staff resources. And I'm not sure that that can get done in the timeframe allotted because I don't think I can get - I don't think I can work the fundings for the timeframes that we're talking about being desirable.

I still might try to quantify some of the, you know, increased fees here but I just - I'm thinking about trying to be a little more creative at this point and that's the issue with not wanting to commit to a timeframe.

The other option is...

Michael Young: Liz, sorry, Liz, if you've got some tools that are available to us maybe you should talk about that then offline with Wilson.

Liz Gasster: Yes, I mean I'm just thinking - I'm not thinking so much about the survey tool because that I don't know much about - what the cost of that and - because I think, you know, we've had a lot of success with different survey tools and they haven't been - cost...

Michael Young: Well, let's see...

Liz Gasster: I'm not so clear on that. I was thinking more about the incremental cost in time for the - preparing the survey questions.

Michael Young: Right, so I was actually just asking Wilson if he thought mid-January - the same question I was asking Steve because we didn't have Wilson, I didn't think Wilson was on the call at that point.

Liz Gasster: I see, okay. I thought you were asking about our (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay, Wilson, what do you think? Is mid-January...

Wilson: For my (unintelligible) I don't think (unintelligible) needs to (unintelligible) tool. If you (unintelligible) ICANN can also come up with another version (unintelligible). I'll send you (unintelligible) can come up with.

Michael Young: Okay.

Wilson: Which you can (unintelligible). And, yes, (unintelligible) I'll send to you - I'll send example (unintelligible) of (unintelligible) come up with. You will see (unintelligible) soon but I don't think (unintelligible) needs to pay for that.

Michael Young: Wilson, I got about every third word you were saying there, sorry. Maybe you can type into the chat window and just let us know whether or not...

Wilson: Okay, let me (unintelligible) in chat.

Michael Young: Okay, thank you.

Wilson: Okay.

Michael Young: All right, while Wilson's doing that let me just open the floor so we can get two things going at once and hopefully wind the call up so people can start working on some of these action items.

I'm going to ask again, does anyone think that there should be any additional scope of work targeted for Q1 than what we've discussed so far? No? Okay. And two, is there any new business? Okay. As soon as Wilson's - okay, there we go.

I think we show budget for this - okay, so Wilson's going to send us some samples before the next meeting and doesn't think we'll actually need funds for the actual tool.

So good, we'll - okay, so Wilson, then we'll wait to see your examples and make the decision whether or not we think we need to consider funded tools after we see those examples at the next meeting, that sounds great.

Okay, so Berry, can we move on and just review the action items for the next call?

Berry Cobb: Yes, this is Berry. So basically starting at the top of the list, the entire team should review the SAC 051 document specifically looking at the nomenclature taxonomy for incorporation into our survey tool. Berry and Michael - and that's by the next meeting 12/19.

Second action item, Berry and Michael will take a second draft stab at the WHOIS access response back to the GNSO Council. We're going to look at revising intro paragraph. I need to go back to compliance and get a little bit more details around the Port 33 tool. And then we'll revise that draft and send it back out to the list.

Next action item is for Michael and Berry, that's to get with Rafik about the survey question sub team to get that kicked off. And secondly from ICANN staff if they need any assistance to get that started and that's due by the 13th as well.

The next action item is for all the sub team Vice Chairs, and that's to review your current resource pool versus your planned work demand and provide status to the next working group call on the 19th. And this is just a gauge so we can allocate resources where possible across the teams to assist with that workload.

Next action item is on the - due on the 19th by Liz and this is in parallel to invest ICANN staff resource availability to help structure the first run or first draft of the survey questions. And we have a 12/19 due date, hopefully we'll get something a little bit sooner than that so we can socialize it with the working group prior to the call on the 19th.

Next action item is for the survey tool sub team, which is due around the 15 of January of next year, and this is just a side survey tool requirements for funding request of the GNSO Council. And of course, this is pending any outcomes from the next meeting with Wilson providing a sample survey using Google docs and alternatives as well. But we'll keep those on the table until - and review on the 19th.

Last two action items are mine, let's try to investigate connectivity for Wilson and hopefully we'll have something on the table before the 19th although I'm not 100% confident that we'll get far. The next is I also want to produce a meeting schedule through our 30 May 2012 deliverables to basically conduct the survey for 30 days or basically at the conclusion of the 30-day survey access.

And that will include all of the proposed dates for the meetings of - meeting every two weeks so that we can start to map that out and try to look for any potential conflicts with that.

And I think that concludes the action item list. I will send this to - all out to the list once I clean it up a little bit and it will be also - be posted on to the wiki as well.

Michael Young: Great, thank you. All right, so I'll just open up the floor one more time to see if anyone has any last comments, issues, concerns? Hearing none I am glad to say we have some good work items on the table here that we need to get - move forward with and I look forward to seeing you all in two weeks. Thanks everyone.



Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

END