

**WHOIS WG Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 16 April 2012 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 16th 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-20120416-en.mp3>

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

Attendees

Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC

Susan Prosser - RrSG

Michael Young - Individual

Rafik Dammak - NCSG

Anne Naffziger - IPC

Steve Metalitz - IPC

ICANN Staff

Berry Cobb

Liz Gasster

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Don Blumenthal - RySG

Avri Doria - NCSG

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois call on the 16th of April, 2012. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Anne Naffziger, Steve Metalitz, Cintra Sooknanan, Michael Young and Sue Prosser.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Liz Gasster and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Avri Doria and Don Blumenthal. 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 very much. And thanks, everybody, for coming to the call. So we have made some progress since we last - and so we'll review that in the course of the agenda. But let's start by opening up the agenda for - see if anyone wants to add or modify it.

So looking at the agenda on the Adobe Connect screen does anyone have any changes or alterations they would like to add to it?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Could I just ask a question? Are we - so we're going to only review - are we going to review the entire survey questionnaire or are we just going to focus on these three questions first?

Michael Young: I think the goal was to focus on the three in the call, Steve. And although this is open for discussion. But the idea was to focus on these three, if you will, more difficult areas that are a little outstanding. And then do a final review on the list for - because Cintra has done an editing pass recently that I'd like everybody to go through.

Steve Metalitz: Okay that's fine; maybe if we have time we can get into some other questions. But I'm happy to start with these.

Michael Young: Absolutely. If we have enough time on the call then we'll just keep adding discussion basically under new business.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. And so, Berry, do you want to do a - walk us through a review of the last set of action items we had and where we've progressed on some of those things?

Berry Cobb: Yes. This is Berry. Starting with the first action item was assigned to me and basically to schedule the SO/AC road show Webinars. Over - I think it was about two weeks ago we met with Don to discuss what the Webinar would look like.

There was a little bit of disconnect in terms of what the Webinar was going to be for. I think originally the Webinar was supposed to be to reach out and collaborate with the SO/ACs for input into the survey questions which we basically already constructed.

And we still need to figure out if, you know, how the working group wants to approach this (unintelligible) we have pretty much a good working draft now. And whether we want to move forward with the road show per se once we release the draft out to the GNSO or anyway figure out how that works. So I have that set at pending right now.

Michael Young: Okay. Berry, my understanding of the purpose of the road show - and, you know, everybody jump in if you had a different understanding. But my understanding of it was that we were basically prepping people and making them aware of the posting we were about to do for public comments so that they understand the context around it, what we're trying to survey in general terms.

And hopefully, you know, that'll help avoid any, you know, misunderstanding or confusion about what we're attempting to learn from the survey and result in more constructive comments on it versus, you know, maybe reactive ones because people think we're inadvertently delving into areas where we're not trying to.

Berry Cobb: And, Michael, this is Berry. That was my understanding as well. But that had - there was kind of a slightly different discussion when we met with Don so I wanted to bring it back to the working group and figure out how we wanted to approach it overall.

Michael Young: Okay. You know, I'll throw out a thought and see how other people feel. But my thought is I think our original intention was a clean one. And, you know, I can volunteer to do a follow up talk with Don - I'm overdue with that anyways - about his understanding of what we're trying to with the presentation.

Does anyone disagree with that? Or would anyone feel strongly about repurposing or redirecting the intent of this road show to familiarize people with what we're doing?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I guess - I had a question about this. Is the goal to encourage people to participate in responding to the survey or is the goal to give people input to the survey before it's posted? I'm not clear on that.

Michael Young: Kind of a bit of both, Steve. I guess in the short term it's to get the various stakeholder groups that we do the road show for to look at this draft version of the survey and tell us if there's something else that they really feel strongly belongs in the survey. And then we can assess that and see if it fits our scope and our mandate to give us an opportunity to fine tune the survey.

And then obviously, you know, once those memberships are aware of what's going on we hope that that will encourage response rates when we actually put the survey out.

Steve Metalitz: I guess my sense is that it's hard to do both those things at once. If you have a call before the - Webinar before the survey is posted and get feedback there could be some additional changes and it could be a while before the survey is posted.

And I just don't know how much follow-through effect there would be if we have the Webinar in, you know, May and the survey is not posted until July. Those might not be the right dates but I think you see what I'm saying.

Michael Young: I do...

Steve Metalitz: So I think we do either one - we should either focus in on one or the other. And I would certainly support the idea of getting some input from the community before the survey is posted I suppose.

Michael Young: Okay, I'm with you. I think probably the priority should be on having them look at a draft of the survey and making them - making sure that they feel that we capture everything that they feel is appropriate and that also fits in the scope of our charter as a priority.

Well, I guess what we could do is when we get closer to actually releasing the survey for people to actually take we could look at other - I guess the term would be promotional activities we can do to make people say, hey, make people fully aware that the survey is now out and ready. And, Berry, maybe ICANN staff has some ideas and some thoughts about how to help us, you know, raise the flag once the survey is out.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Absolutely. And we'll take this one offline, Michael, and we'll get with Don and circle back and make sure that we get the right approach and move it forward from there.

Michael Young: Okay, anyone else other than Steve and myself have thoughts or comments or is everyone else happy with that?

Anne Naffziger: This is Ann Naffziger. I agree that the focus that we're discussing should be the focus. But I do think it's possible to achieve both from my old political days. And it's (sends) an advance team going out and I'm getting people

ready for an idea and I think it at least gets it on folks' radars that this is coming down the pike.

And even if they don't want to participate in any kind of comments on them - the survey itself I think it does have the benefit of just getting us in folks' minds that this is going to be something to be looking for in the not too distant future and give them a sense of the timing.

Michael Young: Sure. I think that would be part of our, you know, slides in the presentation anyways to give people an overview timeline target and an intention. So they'll get that. You know, it'll be interesting to see how much of it sticks in their minds and how effective the - I guess the pre-socialization...

Anne Naffziger: Yeah.

Michael Young: ...of the survey would be.

Anne Naffziger: Time will tell I guess.

Michael Young: Yeah. Yeah, I mean, they're going to get this just through the focus of us asking for their feedback on the first draft we accomplish making them aware alone. So we'll see what benefits have.

The interesting thing is we're never going to have a clean baseline to say, you know, how much of an impact that had on response rates. So - or, you know, maybe we can - it's probably not really worth it but I guess we could try and develop one of our baseline questions a way to capture that, you know, whether or not they came into the survey - at what point did they become aware of the survey.

So if someone's taking it maybe that's one of the baseline questions that we stick in at the front. Berry, you want to take a note of that and...

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'm writing that down now.

Michael Young: And I'll volunteer to maybe - when we review the baseline questions we can bring that up again to see if we want to throw that in. I'll draft a version of that.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Go ahead, Michael.

Michael Young: I guess we should just make that a generic expanded question like how did you find out about the survey and list off some options.

Berry Cobb: Okay very good. And Steve's comment sparked a memory of mine as well. I think one of the things that Don was hoping to accomplish with the road show is when we go to communicate out that the availability of the Webinar was to definitely spread the word that everybody is welcome to attend but he was wanting to mostly focus on the techie community out there to really provide legitimate feedback that we needed on these technical types of questions.

So I just wanted to bring that up real quick.

Michael Young: (Slide) that? Okay. I don't entirely disagree with them. This survey is by its nature somewhat more orientated towards the functional focus I guess on these systems. But, you know, this really is a type of requirements document which I just think we have to be careful not to preclude, you know, one community in favor of another.

So, you know, I don't want to make this - I personally don't think we should be making this all about the - just the techies. And, you know, this is somebody who is a techie so, you know, maybe that rings a little more strongly. I think it's important to try and bridge the gap between the - really focus on

functionality versus, you know, turning into hardcore tech that other stakeholders and end users won't understand.

And I think we did our best to try and - I mean, there's some technical questions in the survey but we did our best to try and tone them down I guess so they're understandable.

Berry Cobb: Very good. As I mentioned we'll take this one offline and get it squared away. Action Item Number 2 was up to you, Michael, basically to review the link of the survey and language. As you pointed out earlier Cintra made a pass at cleaning up some of the language and Wilson has mentioned several times about the length of the survey which we're well over 60 questions now.

Michael Young: Yeah and...

Berry Cobb: Go ahead.

Michael Young: Yeah, that draft came out last week. And I'll be honest, last week was a bad week for me given everything going on at ICANN right now so I did not get a chance to go through it in detail. So I will be doing that this week.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. The third action item was to Wilson which was to provide examples of survey question types, which he did. And that one is closed out.

Four's action item was to Wilson as well and to review the survey (co)capability to enable a user to return to the survey. I'm not sure how many people on the working group were able to play around with this prototype but it seems to work very well in terms of not only the layout of the questions and answers themselves but as well as closing out the survey and returning back in to continue it. So that seems to be functioning as designed.

Michael Young: Berry, just for the record for the minutes can we, you know, officially mark a strong kudos or thank you to Wilson. It was excellent, the demonstration. I think he did a really great job.

Berry Cobb: I concur, definitely. Okay Action Item 5 was basically out to the entire team and to mold the survey questions into the available question types. I won't claim that this is the case for all of the questions but looking through this latest version 8.3 we're very close. So - when we do go to import our draft into the survey tool I don't suspect there will be hardly any rework for Wilson.

Michael Young: Right and likewise let's thank Cintra for - I don't know if she's hearing us with being on two calls but let's thank her for that; that was a great amount of work as well, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Very good. Okay the sixth action item was to the whole team and the use of question as relevant as it's used in Question 6a and 6b. Avri had submitted this suggestion and her question types. And we were basically going to evaluate whether that should be relevant to the other questions as well. And I, myself, haven't gone that far deep into that yet. But that's something that the team probably still ought to consider.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Can I ask a question about that?

Michael Young: Absolutely, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: So is your - is the question whether - this doubles the size of the survey for those questions, words, appearing. And is the point - the question on the table whether we should apply it not just in 6a and 6b but throughout and thus...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I think that's what Avri was suggesting.

Steve Metalitz: Well I recognize I wasn't here for a couple of calls but I don't - I don't even see the point of this question where it appears now. I mean, perhaps one way to deal with this - and maybe you already discussed this is simply to add another option in response to each question instead of 1-5, for example, and R 6b you just have 6.

The question is not relevant. If someone thinks the question is not relevant they can click that box. I'm just not sure what else we were trying to achieve with doubling the size of the survey in this way.

Well it's - I agree it's kind of clunky. And let me explain what I think we were trying to capture with it and maybe you have an idea of how to capture it a little bit better.

What we were trying to capture in the process of this type of gradated scale, Steve, was, you know, given how strongly people rank a particular question gives us an indicator of how important that piece of functionality is on a scale of, you know, assuming that most of these questions have (around) - different pieces of functionality it gives us a sense from the respondents of, you know, across 70% of the respondents felt that, you know, I don't know, Questions 15-20 ranked the highest in terms of relevance.

So it helps give us a sense of - of de factor prioritization on some of this functionality at least from their sense of relevance.

Steve Metalitz: Well - but I think that's what the existing question is trying to do. You know, so you have a question like, you know, it should be possible to include other forms of contact information for Whois; strongly disagree, mostly disagree and through strongly agree. So you get a sense there of whether people - how strongly people feel about that.

And then to go on and say the question is relevant first of all anybody who thinks the question is irrelevant probably shouldn't have answered it should they? And...

Michael Young: Yeah, yeah so maybe - I think part of the issue here is - what she was suggesting is that second section would get tagged onto almost, you know, all the questions or if it physically, you know, works with that question. So a lot of them the first section would not be 1-5 like she's done it; she's done these ones like that and then done a relevance scale the same way. Some of the other questions the options wouldn't by default create a relevant scale. Do you see what I mean?

Steve Metalitz: I'm not sure that I do but, you know...

Michael Young: Well okay well - I mean, let's try and understand this; this is probably important for all of us too. Berry, can you pull up another question type? Avri didn't - go beyond the stuff that she put in this.

We had a couple of different ways of phrasing the question so I'm just looking for one of the other mechanisms. There we go. So this is obviously a more technical question. But this is the answer/no answer. There's no - there's no opportunity for someone to say whether or not they feel this is a - there's no indicative way by reading the answer, Steve, to pull a relevance scale out of this without adding one.

Steve Metalitz: Okay but isn't - I don't see anything inherent in this question. I mean, you could ask people if they agree or strongly disagree about the ability to search by wildcard. It's - I guess I'm just not getting why if you have a five-point scale or a yes or no why you also need - especially if you have a five-point scale why you also need the relevance question.

And I just think that if you add that to every question you're going to reduce your response rate by I would estimate 90%. Most people will not put up with that on 60 questions to say okay...

Michael Young: I...

Steve Metalitz: ...now you want to know whether I think your question is the right one.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: I just think it's going to...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I agree. I agree. All right so, Berry, maybe you and I can take that as an action item off site to try and think about ways of - short and sweet ways of leading a relevance indicator into each question - it's somewhat the, you know, five-point scale like that but go for the short, simple and sweet approach like Steve's reaching for here. Because I think I may...

Berry Cobb: Yeah, very good. Yeah, we can also send a note out to the list and maybe have Avri provide some examples or the more reasoning behind including it as well that may help...

Michael Young: Oh no I think we all understand why she included it. I think Steve, that's clear, right? I mean, you're suggesting that we just need to come up with something that doesn't turn people off doing the survey, right?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I - no I don't really see the need for this question. But if it is going to be in there it should be in a way that is less intrusive.

Michael Young: Okay. All right so that - that should probably be our focus around that.

Berry Cobb: Okay I will carry...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...this one over and we'll take it offline.

Michael Young: Okay. And we can grab Avri offline as well to talk this through as well. I do think we want to - one of the goals that we had, Steve - maybe I'll restate the overall goal and maybe you can think of a completely different novel approach to solve for that goal that's even away from what we're talking about here.

One of our goals of our charter was basically out of all the functionality is to try and get an indication from the survey which people - which of the functionality people feel is most pressing. Not necessarily most important though, you know, time-based which ones should be focused on first.

Steve Metalitz: Okay that's - that might be a good dimension to try to capture.

Michael Young: Okay. So think about that, Steve, if you can think of a way to capture that that's more graceful that would be fantastic.

Berry Cobb: Okay Action Item Number 7 was out to the team and that was to review the Requirement 7, internationalized registration data for use in the survey. We didn't get any responses back in our downtime. I went ahead and brought in the interim IRD team's recommendations and basically mold those recommendations into the questions that are loaded into the 8.3 which we'll review here in a little bit.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Berry Cobb: And see whether they're worthy or whether we should include them or not.

Action Item Number 8 was out to you, Michael, which was to identify editors of the survey. I'm not sure how much more relevant this task may be given where we're at. And then lastly...

Michael Young: Yeah, well...

Berry Cobb: ...since - go ahead.

Michael Young: Sorry, no, why don't you hit me on both of them and I'll answer to both of them. Go ahead.

Berry Cobb: And then lastly identify test survey takers and so far Don has said that he would be willing to be a test taker.

Michael Young: Okay. So around March 5 it was around then that we, you know, I was getting very, very poor response rate to - almost no responses from people that, you know, historically have actually been quite responsive to any emails or queries or outreaches I've gone to them.

And that's when we decided to do the suspension of work because it was - everything going on around ICANN right now was eating up an, you know, abnormal amount of everyone's time and energy. So this week I'm going to re-reach out to people that I had tried to before and to finish these off, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you. That takes care of the action items for now. The only other thing that I'll point out just below the action items list is a revised proposed milestone schedule and that's something that we probably ought to review to see if these dates are achievable from our downtime.

Michael Young: Well why don't you just - why don't we hit that now since it's on the screen in order - Berry, and tell us what you shifted and as compared to what it was before.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Our previous milestone schedule and then with the delay actually caused about approximate - note quite a two month delay from our original schedule. So essentially what I did is kept the same milestones in place but added dates that I thought were hopefully achievable so that we can still try to make our 1-October deadline.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: So with that in mind if we're close enough with the survey draft try to load the questions into the tool by the 23rd. We may have to extend that a little bit more depending on some more work with the questions. And then basically by the 25th we have our internal survey control group. Somewhere around this timeframe is to conduct our Webinars.

And then still hopefully submit the draft survey to the GNSO Council by the 7th of May and open up the public comment period by the 8th of May.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: We need to have 42 days minimum for that. Okay.

Berry Cobb: That's correct. It's 21 days comments and 21 days to reply to comments if there are comments. And all it takes is one to get that extra 21 days.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Then after the public comment period we would create a summary of all the comments and take that back to the working group and rework our draft where needed. And then probably one of our most important milestones definitely per our charter is the independent review which is also listed as on our agenda today for us to discuss and - what our approach is going to be to satisfy that requirement.

And then lastly basically the end of June submit the final survey to the GNSO and open up the survey for 30 days. And from there then review the survey results and publish the final report by 1-October.

Michael Young: Okay. I'm nervous about releasing the survey June 30 in terms of getting responses. How does everyone feel about that? But that says to me, you know, that is like vacation time for a large part of the world; it's the start of school breaks in Europe and North America in particular.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Another option is maybe that we extend the duration in addition to just releasing it.

Michael Young: I suppose so but - so we've allowed ourselves review survey results July. Release survey results August 6. Publish final report October 1. Can we slide releasing the survey results closer to the - without changing the final report publishment date? Can we move that August 6 date downstream a little to maybe the end of August? Is that - would that be acceptable, Berry, or typical?

Because if we're going to leave it open for another, you know, couple of weeks or something then...

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. This is just dates that I had proposed so it definitely wasn't shared amongst the working group or anything. But I do agree that there is slack from the beginning of August until the beginning of October.

Michael Young: Okay. I worry a little bit that we're tight on writing up a final report. But okay. Is there - I guess what we could do is we could actually start doing preliminary reviews of the survey results before we actually close the survey. Is there any reason we can't do that?

Berry Cobb: The - this is Berry. The only caution I would give there is based on what Wilson had stated that the output of the survey would be in some sort of

spreadsheet type format where we would need to analyze the results and those kinds of things. I imagine that's probably going to be a fair amount of effort to, you know, either not only...

Michael Young: To build the spreadsheet. Yeah, yeah...

Berry Cobb: To build the spreadsheets, the graphs behind it and those kinds of things. We can certainly start to play around with it but in terms of doing the first 30% or something and then waiting a little bit and then bringing in the other 30% may be pretty tedious.

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

Michael Young: Absolutely, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I mean, I hear what you're saying that July is not the greatest time and neither is July and August I don't think so I'm not sure...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: What is the 1-October? Does that tie into something else or does that tie into presentation of the material in Toronto or I'm just wondering why that's in there - why that's kind of locked in.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It was part of - it was defined in the charter that way.

Steve Metalitz: Oh okay. All right.

Michael Young: Yeah, the GNSO, Steve, asked us to try and target for the completion by then.

Berry Cobb: And just to add to this, I'm looking at it right now, is - it says publish final report by October 2012. Perhaps that is being a little ambitious throwing the first date on there. But we would have another 30 days of slack by getting it in by the end of October.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...make use of that.

Michael Young: Yeah, I'm with Steve. Can we change that - why don't we - well we'll try and keep the survey open for say a month, a month and a half and push the final report publication to the end of October.

Berry Cobb: Sounds good.

Michael Young: And, yeah, Steve. I don't know, I mean, like it's just - July and August it'll be tough to get - well, I mean, it could go either way to be honest. I mean, people sometimes are slower in July and August and might take the time to amble through a survey if we could get their attention.

If we hit them during a busy time of the year where they're active they may just actively decide not to do the survey because it just falls down their priority lists too much so it's hard to say. Certainly most people stay on top of their email even when they're, you know, off in the summer these days.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: Yeah, I don't have any other brainwaves on the schedule. If anyone else doesn't have anything we should move on.

Berry Cobb: Michael - since we're here why don't we go ahead and take out the independent review portion of our agenda because it is listed as a, you know,

pretty big milestone here. Basically we just need to have the working group discuss and determine what this independent review may look like.

Was the independent review by other peers within the community okay or does it need to be a more formalized independent review by survey experts? And depending on how the working group wants to approach that may affect, you know, a budgetary aspect. And so we just need to try to get that nailed down. And if there are budget implications then we need to start maybe working on that channel.

Michael Young: Well here's my thought, Berry, and I'll throw it out for the group to consider. We were talking about this independent review prior to having made the decision as a group to put out a draft version of the survey for public comment.

And I almost think the public comment being 42 days and us doing the road show to make sure people are aware of the public comment period gives us adequate review and feedback which kind of makes the independent review intention redundant.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. Is this also a requirement of our charter or something? I mean, I'm - I'm wondering - I mean, I hear your...

Michael Young: I...

Steve Metalitz: ...Mike, I hear your suggestion, we could maybe just drop this. Is that...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: That's what I'm thinking, Steve.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It's...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Yeah, this is Berry. This part - I'll read it from the charter. Before administration the working group should have the final survey candidate reviewed by a qualified independent third party and tested for comprehensiveness, clarity and general applicability to the subject matter.

Part of the review should include guidance by independent party in developing a mechanism to determine if questions were comprehended by recipients as intended when reviewing the survey results. If the results for a particular question fail that test the working group should discount the results from that question.

Michael Young: Wow, I think we over-engineered that a little bit but okay. Yeah...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Michael Young: Okay well in all practicality - because we need to get this done. Berry, I mean, I think we assumed some help from ICANN staff in lining up an appropriate consultant for that. Can you guys - I mean, you have a whole stable of consultants around ICANN that you've used to assist with different things. Is it possible for staff to make some recommendations and get some quotes for us then to see if we can get the budget for?

Berry Cobb: I will definitely take that action item. But I will also mention as well that if the working group does feel that the vetting amongst the community is sufficient we can easily just go back to the Council and seek their approval for that, you know, with the appropriate justification.

Michael Young: I'm game to try that. What do you need from us to present to that to them?

Berry Cobb: Probably a paragraph or two on exactly what our process will be by vetting this. And then once we - once the working group agrees on what that

statement should be then we'll carry that over to Wendy to brief the Council and get their approval.

Michael Young: Okay. I'll volunteer to draft that and then send it out to the list for everyone else to hack away at it. Unless someone feels super strong - feels strongly about still having - getting an independent contractor in to look at this in - as well as doing the public comment period?

Steve Metalitz: Well let me ask another way we might achieve this same goal - we have this internal survey test control group. I'm not - I heard Don's name mentioned as someone who would take the survey, you know, as a guinea pig. But beyond that, you know, and this question of whether people understand the questions...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...which I think is a major concern that has not fully been addressed in the survey. I'll just say that as a general matter.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Maybe if we just - we could recruit some other people to take the test and see - and then have us, you know, and then brief us on what they thought; did they understand this question or did they find the whole thing, you know, which questions did they find difficult to understand or to answer. I don't know if that - if we could do something like that informally without hiring a consultant just, you know, recruit our own guinea pigs.

I know that's not, you know, a sociologist would look down his nose at that. But, you know, it might be - it would at least give us a rough idea of whether people outside our group understand what the heck we're asking about.

Michael Young: Well, Steve, I think that's a great idea. We're already doing it in a limited fashion so why don't I build on your idea here and say can we ask all the members of the group to go out and recruit - each of us recruit a - one or two guinea pig test-takers outside of our working group.

Steve Metalitz: I'm happy to do that. I think we should aim for maybe two or three...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...or three or four. But, yeah, I'd be happy to do that.

Michael Young: Yeah, well, there's no upper limit. If you can get three or four great. If you get even one at least we're starting to get some sampling, right?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And just to remind the group, you know, this isn't a milestone that's really required until we're ready to submit, you know, closer to our final version of the survey. So we certainly have plenty of time and is not necessarily a requirement for us to try to meet our milestone for the draft survey.

Michael Young: Okay so we should fit this in after the public comment period and after we've reworked our draft but before we release it at the end of June. So it should be kind of a -we should be looking to get these folks to do the test survey somewhere in early June?

Berry Cobb: Sounds good.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne again - Anne Naffziger. I've already talked with some of my constituencies around this and there's a real willingness to do something like

that. So once we have a date firmed up and how we want to process that I can get some people as well.

Michael Young: Awesome. Berry, can you put a formal - up for those people that aren't on the call - can you put a formal email out asking for people to rally volunteers for that time period? Please.

Berry Cobb: Okay. And I - just so that we are covered I still recommend that, Michael, you do draft one or two small paragraphs about the approach and that we still take that to the Council just so that it is slightly (unintelligible) from our charter.

Michael Young: Yeah, absolutely.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. All right so that wraps up action items and milestones. I think we're ready for the agenda now.

Michael Young: Okay. So we want to hit three and review this list that you have up here on the right. Do you want to take us through it, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Okay. So as I mentioned in the downtime from the working group staff worked on a few questions and also Cintra helped with the language and the voice of the survey.

Both of those versions are now combined into this one. And the only reason that I had listed these R7, R9 and R10 requirements for us to talk about is that we haven't talked about them as a team yet.

The first one being R7 which is the IRD requirements and as I mentioned earlier basically I took the recommendations from the initial report of the IRD working group and shaped them as yes, no and different formats. So we definitely as a working group should review whether these are acceptable and applicable to the survey.

And I'll stop there before going into R9.

Michael Young: Okay. So I'm looking at this and the first thing that hits me in the face, Berry, didn't - I'm just trying to remember I think Wilson confirmed that we could do hover buttons basically over certain words and phrases to give definitions?

Berry Cobb: That is...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: That capability is there.

Michael Young: Great. So I think that would be important for things like U-label or A-label because I don't think a lot of people taking the survey would know what that is off the top of their head. But they probably have heard it before and if it was - there was a definition there they would probably understand it then.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I very much agree with that.

Michael Young: Okay. This is the - like I said, I didn't get a chance to go through this before the call. I'm - these look pretty clean to me, Berry.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. The - I would say the same thing about EPP 27 status code down in 6...

Michael Young: Oh yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...in 6a. Actually I was on this - the IRD working group and I don't remember what that is so explain that and how...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...it ties into the main question of 6.

Berry Cobb: Well - this is Berry. It almost sounds like this is a, you know, a - some sort of a task that we should assign once we're comfortable with all of our definitions that not only the - when we import this into the tool but our survey test takers as well before we even release our draft that we ought to go through and highlight which, you know, which terms are worthy of hover definitions.

Michael Young: Yeah, I think when we put it out for public comment we should have some notion in here that has highlighted these terms like you said, Berry, and indicates even to people in public comment that we're going to be providing - in the survey tool be providing definitions for all the highlighted terms. So that people...

Steve Metalitz: I mean, is it feasible to provide those by the time we put this out? Because otherwise it'd be harder for people to evaluate this if they just say I don't even understand what this question is about it's kind of...

Michael Young: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...the right question.

Michael Young: Steve, I could write the definitions for these terms once, you know, if we have a nice clean draft I could work my way through and probably write definitions within a day or so. So, Berry, put me down for that. I'll do that.

Berry Cobb: Okay very good. And I think probably the best approach to that will be - will give you the master version of the survey in Word and just creating the comment out to the right highlighting, you know, which word you're providing that definition for then that'll stand out good for Wilson when he loads it into the tool.

Michael Young: Yeah. Okay great.

Berry Cobb: Any other questions or comments on R7? Okay let's move onto R9. And R9 and R10 belong to Don. I met with Don shortly after our discussion about the Webinars. And this one was - R9 was specifically the only one that didn't fall within the format of our other questions.

And Don took the action item to start to create the questions. But we asked a higher level question as to is there relevance of thick Whois technical questions for this survey given the current state of the environment with the new Gs coming online and their thick requirement and those kinds of things.

Especially in the context of the quantity of questions that we have now will we - will there be any value by any technical questions with respect to thick Whois. And if the working group thinks there is then we probably ought to review through Don's notes and find out which are the key technical questions that we should ask and get those shaped.

Michael Young: I guess my perspective on it, Berry, would be that there are peripheral things that are of interest around thick Whois obviously like, you know, access levels and privacy information and that sort of thing but that's covered in our other questions.

So I guess I'd want to take another quick look at Don's questions here before I make a definitive, you know, support removing it to make sure that we've covered all those thick Whois considerations in the other questions. But if all those elements are covered then this does seem redundant.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think there may still be some relevance here because, again, I think we're - the goal - the end goal here is a new protocol that is going to apply to the legacy TLDs as well as the new ones obviously.

And if you, you know, while it's true that almost every registry now - and certainly once the new ones come online even a higher proportion of them will operate thick Whois it's still the case that right now the vast majority of gTLD registrations are in the thin Whois registries.

So moving from one to the other may be an issue. You know, I would like to hope that by the time this new protocol becomes operative the three outliers will have been brought into the mainstream. But I don't know that that - that we can necessarily assume that. So at least...

Michael Young: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...here about, you know, really whether there's anything in the design that we're talking about or in the requirements or should there be anything in the requirements that would facilitate transitioning from a thin to a thick registry possibly that's still relevant.

Michael Young: Yeah, Steve, I agree I just don't know if that's being covered in other work. Berry, maybe - or somebody else on the call even I know that there was a delayed vote in the GNSO on a PDP regarding thick Whois for Com/Net. I think there - the vote happened and part of it - the outcome was to open a PDP but delay its start to a certain date if I recall? Does anyone know what ended up happening?

Berry Cobb: That's correct.

Susan Prosser: This is Susan. If I recall it's being delayed until like November.

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: The reason is that the - the dot Com agreement has to be renegotiated before then.

Michael Young: Right. And they wanted to - I mean, the statement I was - Steve, I was seeing in the RySG meetings when they were discussing this and how their position on it - the registries. And VeriSign was very forthright in that they - in saying that their concern was that they didn't want it to actually be a result of their contract negotiation. They wanted it to be something that the community indicates what they would like. And that they would be happy to comply with what the - with what the community decision was.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...guarantees that we will need this question because that means...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...we won't see thick Whois in dot Com in this decade. And that's why they took that position which is very unfortunate. And I'm hoping in the next few months we can mobilize the community to overcome that type of recalcitrance but...

Michael Young: Well as far as I understand the intent of that PDP that was passed is to figure out how to move Com/Net over to thick Whois.

Steve Metalitz: And it looks - and if it works on the usual time scale we'll have it by 2016.

Michael Young: Yeah, okay. I can't argue with you there. Okay so, yeah, probably Number 3 probably should stay. Why don't we not - why don't we agree to open this, Berry, for some follow up comments on the list? And then, you know what,

Steve, I'll make a - I'll go through this with Don and see if we can't trim it back a bit, how's that?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I mean, I think these are maybe not in the format that is needed. But...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...I think the concept of ensuring that the requirements are compatible with migrating from thin to thick is important.

Michael Young: Yeah. Also, Berry, I mean, like I'm reluctant because this was a key element in the report and we're supposed to be building a survey off the report so I don't want to just throw it away entirely.

Berry Cobb: Okay, very good. Any more comments on R9? All righty, now we get to step back in time to WhoWas. And this is my stab at basically the data model that was used in Question R1 or R2 and just shaped it for WhoWas.

Michael Young: So...

Berry Cobb: This hasn't been vetted by anybody and this was me creating in isolation so I could be way off target here. But I wanted to have something to review by the team to see whether it was worthy or not.

Michael Young: I don't think it's bad at all. I think we have the same issue with making sure that we do definitions on certain things through these. But also in the intro, Berry, one note for you is I think the intro should explain what WhoWas is - what it does.

Steve Metalitz: And this is Steve. I wasn't clear how this differed from R6b Romanette 6 and 7 about the history or pedigree of the domain name such as previous owners. Is that different than WhoWas?

Michael Young: Which number was that again, Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Six and seven, Romanette six and seven down at the bottom of this page.

Michael Young: I think it's a little different, Steve. I think - I think in this case they're talking about a current view to Whois and within the current view it includes some past ownership information or past - ownership is not the right term - past responsible party or registrant of record or however you want to define it.

Whereas I think WhoWas is literally displaying what the Whois information would have looked like a year and a half ago...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Michael Young: ...verbatim.

Steve Metalitz: I - okay I see the difference. That could be explained in the definition of WhoWas - just a snapshot, what did the record look like on April 4, 2010 or whatever.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay so we need to - in the introductory sentences we need to explain that a bit better, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Okay any other comments for R10?

Steve Metalitz: Well again I think there's several - I think Michael already mentioned this - there's several other terms that probably need to be defined here.

Michael Young: Okay so...

Berry Cobb: All right, that's it for...

((Crosstalk))

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi this is - sorry.

Michael Young: Go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Who would you like to go ahead, me?

Michael Young: Yeah, is that Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes. This is Cintra. If you could just scroll up to the top of the page there's a reference to Section 4.6 but it need to say 4.6 of what.

Michael Young: That's a very good point.

Berry Cobb: Okay thank you, Cintra. All righty well that takes care of the three that we had listed for agenda. We've talked about the Webinar and we've talked about the independent review so back to you, Michael.

Michael Young: Okay so let me open it up for new business and afterwards we'll go to a review of the action items. So, Steve, you had suggested that maybe you want to talk through...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah...

Michael Young: ...some other things?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, my - I mean, I did go through some other things but I think my - and it might be easier just to simply send those to the list. But my general

impression was that there's still - I think this really needs to be scrubbed to become more intelligible to the non-technical community.

Michael Young: Right.

Steve Metalitz: And part of that could be through these definitions but part of it could simply be unpacking some of the terms here that occur. I'll just give an example. On R3...

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...Question 1; do you support a standard, formal, extensible data structure and schema for Whois response? I think that needs to be explained. I think people understand what standard might mean. I guess they might understand formal. But extensible is not a term that everybody is familiar with.

The difference between a structure and a schema is not something everyone is familiar with. So I think this really needs to be looked at in terms of - if you're seeking a broad range of responses I think this - there needs to be a little more explanation about a lot of these terms.

Michael Young: Okay. Steve, I...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Hovering is maybe a very good way to do it because then it doesn't clutter up the thing for people that already understand it. But something like that...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...could be done.

Michael Young: I think we can do twofold. So I already have an action item to go through and write out definitions for the hover elements I guess. Steve, while I'm doing that I'll look at the intro language on every question and see if I can't simplify it for the non-technical user.

You know, given the job I do everyday it's a huge everyday responsibility for me to try and translate the technical into implications for people in business and functionality and ramifications. So let me take a - let me take an editing shot at that while I'm doing the definitions anyways.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I think that would be very helpful. And another question I had was about R8.1. Again there's a number of terms that need to be defined here. But it wasn't clear to me whether we were talking here about a projected situation in the future or the current situation.

You know, for example, Question 2, if your access rights are circumscribed, e.g. only to particular TLDs, that sounds like we're talking about what happens today. We're asking the respondents are there some TLDs you don't have access - Whois data you don't have access to. Is that what we meant or are we saying that in a future - under a future protocol there should be some of these restrictions?

Michael Young: Well there are TLDs that have - have tiered access Whois now so I suspect that's what they're referring to, Steve. But who drafted this question, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I have to pull up a old version. Give me a second.

Michael Young: I - Steve, you're right, I think it's confusing to kind of switch between the future and asking kind of a current status question.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, because the first one says do you have a use case and that sounds like all right in the future. Two is - it sounds like it's asking about right now.

Three is is this elevated access right to be granted. And again that sounds like the future. So anyway I just think...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...can be clarified.

Michael Young: I think - I think we should make the first ones all future ones and then...

Steve Metalitz: I think that's what's meant there.

Michael Young: Yeah. And then if we go to subsequent - like the lower questions could build on the previous questions if you wanted to right? So, okay.

Berry Cobb: Stephan van Egmond...

Michael Young: Did that one?

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay. When I'm doing the editing pass I'll - Berry, if we could just mark that one so I don't miss it I'll adjust that one too.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, Michael, this is Cintra. Is it possible for us to go back to R3 Question 1 that Steve was talking about?

Michael Young: Absolutely. Let's go up there.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Yeah, should - this Question 1, should it be broken up into three questions then? So should it be, do you support a standard data structure and schema for Whois responses? Do you support a formal data structure and schema for Whois responses? Do you support an extensible data structure and schema for Whois response?

Michael Young: I think from - as a technical person's point of view I would standard, formal data structure is kind of one element in of itself, not two. But extensible is definitely a choice - another choice. So we should split it at least into two.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Michael Young: Because you could always say, yeah, I mean, standard implies that it needs to be a formal data structure because otherwise how do you standardize? Whereas extensible is whether or not you choose to make your data - defined data structure something that people can build on.

It may seem at first glance that - to be sensible to always allow someone to extend on an existing standard. But sometimes actually it's a good idea not to allow people to add extensions to a standard without going through a whole process of upgrading the entire standard.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Michael Young: IPv6 would be a great example of that. That's a good catch, Cintra, thank you.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Cintra, will you take that task of reshaping Question 1 into a few and send me those changes?

Cintra Sooknanan: I don't mind doing that but I don't want to - I would like to build on Michael's work so I think Michael, how do you prefer to do this? Do you want to put in the definitions first?

Michael Young: Yeah, when I'm doing my editing pass...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yeah, Cintra, when I'm doing my editing pass if - Berry, if you just put a note in the current version I'll split it up. And then, Cintra, can you review what I've done and see if I've done it in the - to your vision?

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, sure no problem.

Michael Young: I guess what I'm volunteering for the group is to really build the next pass - full editing pass and then let the group have at it. Do we have any other areas?

Susan Prosser: Well this is Susan, I have a question.

Michael Young: Go ahead, Susan.

Susan Prosser: Is it - I'm just noticing there's still some consistency amongst the type of answers a yes, no - yes, no, indifferent and then Avri's extensive one. Is there going to be any effort...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Prosser: ...to - make these more similar?

Michael Young: Well we (unintelligible) three different types that Wilson had come up with. And earlier in the conversation - well about 40 minutes ago we were talking about trying to simplify Avri's attempt to capture relevance or I guess what she was trying to do was capture prioritization from the respondent's point of view on these different features and functions.

Susan Prosser: Yeah, I agree with that.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Prosser: But even...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: ...yes/no ones - even on the yes/no answers there's still difference amongst those. And I think it would be more consistent and it would look more together if we had - particularly across all those - even if it was yes, no and indifferent across all the yes/no answers or all the yes/no questions.

Michael Young: Yeah, yeah, so what we end up doing is a single extra element instead of the whole scale thing. That's what Steve was saying, if there's a whole scale thing after every one people will get uninspired and not finish the survey.

Susan Prosser: I completely agree with you. I would bail on it. But I'd like - even if you go to R2 and you go to R3, R2 is a yes/no and indifferent and then R3 is yes/no. And I'm just saying across...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Prosser: ...the whole survey whenever there's a yes/no we should have a standard so that it's always - they're going to expect a certain standard across the questions.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve. I'd agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay so when I'm going through on my editing pass I'll put indifferent - we'll do all the yes/nos as yes, no, indifferent.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, this is Cintra. Well that's a question for the group as well. Do we want to make indifferent an option?

Michael Young: I think so. I mean, I'm in favor of - because what that implies to us is that it's not a particularly important issue for the respondent.

Susan Prosser: I agree. That could also assist with possibly getting what Avri wanted out of her point - not the same five-point scale but at least it would indicate whether or not it's a question that matters to these respondents.

Michael Young: Yeah. We could quickly end up with a whole bunch of tricky answers - I - if people could dwell on this a little bit more and we're looking for a graceful way to capture people's - how strongly they feel about each of these issues.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne. I - one thing that's - one thing that concerns me is because of the technical nature of this I wonder if we're going to have a skewed indifferent result if people just don't get it - don't understand it.

Michael Young: We were supposed to have an option on the technical questions. We talked about this but we didn't want to alienate anyone about having a - we ended up with the indifferent actually or a don't care answer because we were going to say, you know, provide a radio button that says too technical or I'm not technical.

And the way that we talked about resolving that was to create the baseline questions at the beginning to allow us to understand whether or not a respondent is not technical.

Anne Naffziger: Okay.

Michael Young: Because we didn't want to make people feel like (that's) diminished in each question.

Anne Naffziger: Right. Okay. Yeah, I think that's probably the graceful way to do it but I do think that there will be some people that will select that option because they

just don't understand and I guess just to acknowledge that it's probably the case.

Michael Young: Yeah, some people don't, you know, some people are quite comfortable with saying I don't understand that, right?

Anne Naffziger: Yeah.

Michael Young: Other people can - we're worried could get offended, right?

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. One slice of how we can analyze those for those that don't understand is to compare it against their profile on where they come from which we may be able to do when we get spreadsheet access to the raw data.

Anne Naffziger: Yeah.

Michael Young: Yeah. That was the goal, right was to basically try to adjust for that. That puts the onus on us in putting some type of adjustment factor on our results to deal with that. We're going to have to be very transparent with any kind of adjustments we make in our analysis on the final report though.

Okay, does anyone have any other areas they want to comment on? Okay it sounds like we're done with new business. Berry, do you want to go through the action items?

Berry Cobb: I'll give it a shot. This is Berry. Let's see, from our previous list we still have the Webinar test which is pending and both you and I will get with Don to determine our next course of action for that and hopefully some sort of schedule about how we want - or when we want to accomplish that.

The next carryover was the - is the question relevant which we just talked about. And both Michael and Berry will get together to get with Avri and also determine the use of the yes/no/indifferent option.

Next carryover is basically to identify short term editors of the survey before we submit the draft. And I'm sorry - editor/test survey takers before we submit the draft.

That carried over into an action item for myself which is send out an email to the list to rally volunteers for our more formal test taking and to accomplish our independent review.

Next I have the action item to add the question to the profile about how did the survey test taker become aware of the survey with a list of options.

And I'm sorry, these are kind of all over the place. I've taken some pretty dirty notes today.

Next action item is for - I just reviewed that one - for Michael and Berry to review the question of relevance and the indifferent with the yes/no.

The next action is with Michael and Berry and - I'm sorry that's the - those are - crap. The next one basically, Michael, you had the master to do which is to create the next version. And before I get into this to-do I think what we'll - what I'll do is I'll run through the various small changes that I needed to accomplish which, for example, was adding a definition to WhoWas.

Sending out a note about R9 and ask for the prioritization (unintelligible) migrating thin to thick for R9 and some other changes to this version. I'll send you this next version and then you can take it from there to review through the definitions or find those key words that would require a hover definition. That you'll also take a shot at editing to simplify the technical language.

And I've identified a few specific questions that need attention that we discussed through in the call today which is R3, splitting up Question 1, R8.1, the past versus future context and as well as the yes/no/indifferent which I'll take care of in the version that I send to you.

And then lastly, as I think I've maybe already mentioned, I'll improve the definition for WhoWas in R10.

Michael Young: Beautiful. Okay everyone okay with those action items? Anyone feel that we missed anything? Okay hearing nothing we are finishing 10 minutes early so we have - we kept the schedule really well today.

Thank you, everyone. It's good to get back in the saddle and get some forward work going. Once again I thank everybody for their volunteer efforts.

You know, I've sat in a lot of working groups and a lot of times the chairs don't bother to thank you for their efforts and I think it's fantastic that you guys are all making a huge difference here and making this effective.

And we couldn't do it without resources like yourselves so thank you again for your time.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Michael.

Michael Young: Great. Thank you everyone.

END