

**WHOIS WG Meeting**  
**TRANSCRIPTION**  
**Monday 30 July 2012 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 30 July 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-20120730-en.mp3>

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees**

Michael Young - Individual  
Wilson Abigaba - RrSG  
Don Blumenthal - RySG  
Anne Naffziger – IPC  
Susan Prosser - RrSG

**ICANN Staff**

Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apology:**

Cintra Sooknanan – ALAC

Coordinator: I'd just like to let you know the call is being recorded. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much (Cathy).

Michael Young: Hi. It's Michael Young joining. I finally got through.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Hi Michael. We're getting the recording started.

Michael Young: Okay.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois Working Group call on the 30th of July 2012. On the call today we have Wilson Abigaba, Susan Prosser, Anne Naffziger, Don Blumenthal, Michael Young. From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have an apology from Cintra Sooknanan.

I'd 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. Berry, I think we have a simple agenda, which is to continue processing the comments - public comments.

Berry Cobb: That's correct. So for the sake of time shall we just go ahead and move right into it...

Michael Young: Well...

Berry Cobb: ...unless anybody has any other agenda items to add.

Michael Young: Don, Susan, Wilson, is that okay with everybody?

Susan Prosser: Works for me.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And on a side note, I think we'll be losing Wilson and Don probably like the top of the hour.

Michael Young: Okay. So let's just get as much done as we can because once we lose them, I don't think that we have enough people to, you know, make it count, so.

Berry Cobb: All right. Great. So where we left off from two weeks ago we're beginning on Section 3, which is the definition of a standard query structure. Looking at the comments review tool is Number 21. And this comment is in regards to Question 20.

And for those that were on two weeks ago, it's probably easier to review through the draft PDF of the survey as opposed to the live survey itself, which I think it's been taken down anyway.

So the comment is from Chuck Gomes. It's requesting for select the following benefits of query standardization. Pick one or more. He's stating that there should probably be a none of the above and/or an other box. And again, this is in regards to Question 20 for select the following benefits of a query standardization.

Michael Young: Berry, do you have that PDF again (somewhere).

Berry Cobb: Yes. Let me send that out to the list real quick.

Michael Young: Thanks. I don't see why it can't have an other box.

Berry Cobb: Any other comments in that regard? Disagreements?

Susan Prosser: No. Makes sense.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Okay. The PDF is on its way. And let me take a note or two. So there's going to be actually two actions here. The first is within Question 20. There needs to be a space between the benefits and - and then the section action item will be to add an additional option for other.

Okay. Next comment. Row 22. As I mentioned before, these are repeated throughout each section. The commenter is unknown but they've gone through and stated which questions or which sections were suitable for all users versus technical users.

Basically the comment or the working group response here is to refer back to Row 20 and I have a comment here that basically after we've reviewed through all the comments that we'll have a closing action item to potentially enhance each section by noting the level of skill required to complete that section especially for companies where multiple persons may contribute to the overall survey.

And I take silence as golden. Row 23. This is from unknown. It seems like Questions 3 and 4 could be condensed to one, which would rank the four answers provided. And then also ask the last question right after the first one or just use it to replace the first one.

So in terms of deliberation, let's start with Questions 3 and 4. And I take that to translated into Questions 21 and 22 from the PDF file, 21 being please select the single most important of the elements above according to you. And then 22 assuming that you can fully identify IDN registrations and punycode, ASCII is native multiple language support important to you for RDDS queries.

Michael Young: I don't know that we can combine these. I think the intention was to recognize that 21 was - we wanted to separate out I think the concept of recognizing IDN as a unique concern or an issue because it's not supported in existing Whois services. Whereas all the other things mentioned in 21 - well I guess 21 is repetitious in the last point isn't it. We're just being more specific in 22.

Twenty-two might just - maybe we should just expand on the last point in 21 and wipe out 22.

Berry Cobb: Are there any other thoughts? In some ways I almost think that the numbering may have been confused by the commenter. Would it be possible that he's referring Question 20 and 21 instead of 21 and 22?

Susan Prosser: I actually agree with you on that one Berry because I don't know why 22 would be tied to 21.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Susan Prosser: They seem to be two totally separate tasks from what I'm viewing on the PDF.

Michael Young: Yeah. The only thing that I think is that there's redundancy in 21 to 22 in that one of the options of the single most important elements in 21 is query start and multiple languages. And so it's kind of repetitiously asking that to some degree as native multiple language support important to an RDDS queries.

I'm comfortable that they're differentiated enough that they could stand in separate questions but I think you're right, it's 20 and 21, they're referring to, which is just a - it almost looks like a complete repeat doesn't it. And first glance one's talking about query standardization and yet...

Susan Prosser: Well one is actually - 20 is actually - you can choose multiple and 21 is tell me one.

Ann Naffziger: Right.

Michael Young: Right.

Susan Prosser: And so it's a totally different answer for the question. And I don't know...

Michael Young: So...

Susan Prosser: ...which one's more important to us; identify the single most important thing or tell us everything that's important to you.

Anne Naffziger: Or just...

Michael Young: Can I make a suggestion? I think what we should do is more 21 below 22 so that the two of them aren't as confusing.

Susan Prosser: I'm not sure.

Anne Naffziger: Yeah. This is Anne. I don't know that I would do that. If we're - if 20 is saying all those that are of interest and 21 is saying okay, of those which is the most important to you and that's the answer we're trying to get, I think it makes sense to keep them together.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. Don. I agree because they do flow.

Anne Naffziger: And that's how I would read that.

Berry Cobb: So should we just leave them?

Anne Naffziger: I would suggest we just leave it.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Unless we've got (unintelligible) just do a number ranking within a question but I don't remember us doing that in any other item.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I would say that if we did that then we would need to change Question 20 to say, you know, rank all four of these. But the way it's

structured now the survey taker may only choose to pick two out of the four and then you would not be ranking the two that you didn't select.

Susan Prosser: Right.

Berry Cobb: Or you'd be trying to rank the two that you didn't select.

Don Blumenthal: Good point. Then I say let's leave it except for the typo there.

Anne Naffziger: Well we could - this is Anne. We could revise 21 a bit to maybe say something along the lines of of the - of those - of the items listed and selected above in 20, select the single most important. So we're, you know, clarify that we're saying if you picked more than one in 20, let us know what the most important one is in 21.

And the way it's written I mean I could figure it out but maybe it's a little bit confusing through the language barrier or something like that.

Susan Prosser: Right.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah.

Anne Naffziger: So of those selected in 20, please select the single most important of your selections above or something like that.

Michael Young: Yeah. That's a nice clarification.

Anne Naffziger: And then I think it's clear what we're getting at.

Michael Young: That's a great idea.

Anne Naffziger: Okay.

Michael Young: You get that Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Just taking notes real quick. Okay. Great. And then the second part if it is to state ask the last question right after the first one or just use it to replace the first one, which is I think regarding Question 23; where does standardization of searchable RDDS queries being the ability to search on attributes or link to date elements such as street name or postal code. Rank on a scale of one to five, one being most important, five being least important.

Michael Young: Comments on that?

Berry Cobb: I think. I almost kind of think that they're still two different questions all together. I mean A, we're talking about a standardized query structure versus searching that query structure.

Michael Young: They're separate questions.

Berry Cobb: I think I would agree with that.

Michael Young: I don't think we make any changes to this one. Does anyone want to make a change? Okay. Not hearing anyone Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great. All right. Moving on to Comment 24. Whois is not a directory service and should not be used for search. What possible valid reason could there be for being able to find all the names and the registrants with a specific town other than data mining to send them junk or to know where to do most of the damage by dropping a bomb?

Michael Young: Who - what grownup writes something like this? Seriously.

Berry Cobb: Unknown. Anonymous.

Susan Prosser: The anonymous.

Michael Young: That's great. Okay. Well thanks for their crank case opinion. Okay. That's just easing - dropping a bomb. That's so upsetting.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Row 25. Searchable RDDS is a large burden for a big registry. We only support it as an extra credit requirement for the new gTLD process. Given a choice, we'd like to scrap it completely.

Don Blumenthal: (Okay).

Michael Young: Yeah. Well, it's a nice - I would agree that it's a burden. I don't know that I would call it a large burden being a technologist. But my opinion really doesn't matter much. I mean this is an interesting opinion they've given us but it's not our task to respond to that.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Berry Cobb: Great. I just noted it as an opinion and not related to the survey. No action taken.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: Great. Moving right along. I think now we're moving into Section 4, definition of the standard data structure for Whois responses. And that will take us into Question 25 on Page 9 of the PDF.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: The first comment is please support Jason in addition to XML. I believe working group noted as an opinion but not related to this survey.

Michael Young: I think we could have some questions around XML somewhere in here if I recall. Don't we? If we're agnostic to the query structure, then we don't really

need to respond to that. But if we actually are citing questions around XML, we should probably say XML or alternative structure or (other) or something.

Don Blumenthal: Question - I'm sorry. Question 32 asks if the data structure should be XML based.

Michael Young: Right. Yeah. Don, I think we should probably up - that is kind of a prejudice question.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. I agree.

Michael Young: Yeah. So either we strike the question - I think we should just strike the question.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I don't pretend to be an expert with the weirds stuff. But should - how about restructuring the question XML, Jason or are there a couple of other options?

Michael Young: There are a couple other options.

Berry Cobb: I mean like they're a straight yes, no.

Michael Young: Yeah. Including - yeah, including a predefined text template could be built. Like there's almost countless structures when you - say a consistent data structure, you can create almost anything you want Berry. So maybe - I don't know.

It's a - you have to see the arguments that go on on IETF mailing list over which is the best approach to take on things. And know that - we want to be careful not to step into that quagmire. It's up to them to decide or the participants on those lists.

So maybe it's - maybe this should just be an open-ended question where we only allow a text answer. You know. We do have some others in comment boxes. So maybe this one should be would you like to suggest a data structure, which the data structure should be based on. And leave it for open comments.

Don Blumenthal: And then just to clarify list Jason and XML as examples.

Michael Young: Yeah. Yeah. Such as i.e., XML, Jason, so forth.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Michael Young: Berry, could we do that?

Berry Cobb: We can do whatever the group would like to do. So basically modify Question 22. What should the structure...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...should the data structure be, question mark.

Michael Young: Thirty-two, not 22.

Berry Cobb: How would we like to modify the question? What is your preferred data structure?

Michael Young: Yeah. Please list your preferred data - please list if you have a preferred data structure bracket i.e., XML based, comma, Jason, comma, et cetera. And then what I suggest we do with the answer for 32 is if we can parse that out into a separate report, we give that to the weirds folks. Just be constructive.

Berry Cobb: All right. Are there any other comments on this one? Okay. Moving right along to Number 27. These questions are mostly for technical users. The

second one could also be asked for general users. As I mentioned, the same comment we'll just refer back up to Comment 20 for action.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Number 28. This is by unknown. It is arguably more important that the data is human readable than the (assumed parsable). We admire some of the work around making the data available in XML but using XSLT to format for humans.

Michael Young: So it's an interesting opinion. As a technologist I find that interesting but I don't know that it fits into our scope to use it to change the questions really. Unless Don - maybe I'll throw this out to Don because of your technical background.

Don, should we - I don't know. Maybe we should - the only other thing I think we could do with this is actually turn it into an additional question to supplement 32 that says should the data structure format be human readable. But then I don't know. It's kind of overkill.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. I'm trying to - rereading the comment there. You know, the data needs to be human readable at some point or for some purposes.

Michael Young: Right. But will people actually - how many people will actually read the payload versus look at it through a tool?

Don Blumenthal: That's just it. That's where I was hesitant. So no. I mean - you're right. It would have to be readable through a tool. And that's going to be provided. So no, I'd stay with what we have and not worry about specifying XSLT or anything else for readability. Let people build the interfaces.

Michael Young: Yeah. Okay.

Berry Cobb: And so I'll - noting that as the recommended action as none.

Michael Young: Great.

Berry Cobb: Moving on to 29. From unknown person. Localizing based on the IP address of the client is a terrible idea. Use the client provided flag if you're going to do it at all. My neighbor speaks Spanish and Chinese and may not like having their IP identify them as English speakers.

My company is worldwide and users queries might come through a firewall in the U.S., Europe, Japan or Singapore and showing up on the Belgian firewall does not mean a response in Flemish is useful.

Michael Young: Hey Berry, can I stop for a second there. I was just reading down further on the PDF and I realized 33 - the Question 32 probably necessitates - removes the necessity to change 32.

Berry Cobb: That is true.

Michael Young: Okay. So I'd suggested on that basis of 33, we don't need to change 32. Don, if you - have you seen 33 there?

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. And you're right. I hadn't scrolled down any further. You know...

Michael Young: I started scrolling down as Berry was reading there looking for the ones whether or not we had a question referenced to IP addresses for locality, thank you. I don't think we do have a question that refers it to IP addresses.

Don Blumenthal: That one (doesn't).

Michael Young: All right. So Berry, we're not going to change 32 I think.

Berry Cobb: Yeah.

Don Blumenthal: Well let me just ask. Are we - do we want to build in the, for lack of a better term, bias in favor of XML? Should we leave it more generic?

Michael Young: Well, I mean the reason we had it that way originally Don is because XML is specifically in the working report - in the staff report.

Don Blumenthal: That's right. I had forgotten that. You're right. Okay.

Michael Young: So I - yeah. We're trying to stay true to the report within reason.

Don Blumenthal: (Good show).

Michael Young: Okay. So going back to 29 Berry, I - unless I'm missing - I don't think we have a question that specifies locality having to be based on the IP address of the client.

Susan Prosser: There is - if you go to the question on the PDF, Number 28.

Michael Young: Twenty-eight.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: Yeah.

Michael Young: Let's just scroll the other way. Okay. Well we actually say by IP address or flag submitted within Whois query.

Susan Prosser: Yeah.

Michael Young: So this is just an opinion piece then. They're not adding anything with this comment. Unless they're thinking we...

Wilson Abigaba: This is Wilson speaking.

Michael Young: Sorry.

Wilson Abigaba: This is Wilson. (But) - this is Wilson. (But) the flag submitted in the Whois query you can specify (unintelligible). That could be the browser language.

Michael Young: Sorry Wilson. What about the flag?

Wilson Abigaba: You can specify and tell the flag submitted within the Whois query can be the...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Wilson Abigaba: ...browser language. It is - the browser language is (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Wilson, you're sounding very muddy so I can't - I'm catching like just a few words there. Did anyone else hear what Wilson was saying?

Susan Prosser: I think he's referring to your browser to determine your location I think is how I understood it. Can you type it Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: I'm saying that the browser language can determine languages (unintelligible).

Susan Prosser: Yeah.

Michael Young: Right.

Wilson Abigaba: So we can specify an example with flags submitted with the Whois query is a browser language.

Michael Young: Right. If they're doing it from - I heard you clearly that time. If they're doing it from a browser to a Web based Whois service, great. If they're doing it on a, you know, from a terminal window - from a command line application, then maybe not unless that application is sending a flag because the browser will. I don't think we need to change the question, do we?

Wilson Abigaba: No. We can leave that as an example.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. Because 29 gives you the option to put in what this guy - what this commenter put in.

Michael Young: Okay. So we go back to the - hang on a second. Twenty-eight. So maybe we just add Berry a bit more of an example of what we mean by flag. So - or a flag...

Berry Cobb: Yeah.

Michael Young: ...submitted with the Whois query such as locality settings on the Web browser.

Wilson Abigaba: So or the language of the browser itself.

Michael Young: Right. Or the language of the browser itself.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Got that captured. Okay. Great. That concludes Section 4. Moving on to Section 5, which is definition of a set of standardized error messages and standard handling of error conditions, which if I'm correct refers to starting Question 35 on our PDF, Page 11.

The first comment is referencing to I think our question of please suggest example of such standardized error messages. The comment is all those look

fine plus you're going to get responses saying to go ask some other server and it's good to structure those so the client can handle them automatically.

Michael Young: So the question is should you have standardized redirects. I don't know if those are error messages. Those are redirects. And that's in reference to 35.

Berry Cobb: And 36.

Michael Young: Well, if we're going to make that more generic, we'd have to make it much more generic. So I would say rather than just saying standardize error messages and/or operational messages. Because a redirect is not an error message. It's an operational message.

Don Blumenthal: That's right.

Michael Young: So we could expand both languages to say standardize error message and/or operational messages.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Again, not being all that familiar but between error messages and operational messages, since we do have the free form text in Question 36, would it make sense to add a new set of questions from operational messages so that we - if there's two options within the same question and we go to parse out Question 36 when analyzing the results, it may be difficult to tease out which are error versus operational.

I think 35 - if someone wants standardized error messages, its guaranteed they'll want standardized operational messages. You wouldn't say give me standardized error messages but, you know, do whatever you want with the operational messages.

So I think you could leave that as a combined question. And then maybe you split 36 into 36a and 36b, which are two comment fields, one saying give us

examples of standardized error messages and one is give us examples of standardized operational messages. Does everyone think that makes sense?

Don Blumenthal: I'm only hesitating here because I keep getting DNS messages as opposed to Whois messages confused in my mind while I try to come up with an answer. So give me a second.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: We're not talking about (server fail) here. Okay. What would an error message be from the Whois query?

Susan Prosser: Could be like domain not available or domain not found? And what kind of error message - does server response be an error like the server is down or domain response?

Michael Young: Sorry, could you repeat that?

Susan Prosser: Well I'm curious about - if the error message would be from the Whois - the technical server side like...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Susan Prosser: ...server not responding, port not available?

Michael Young: Yeah. Yeah.

Susan Prosser: The error message would be like, you know, Port 43 not listening, something to that effect I guess.

Michael Young: Right. And that's exactly - it'd be consistent structure and formatting in this - and, you know, the error message would mean the same thing no matter what Whois service you're on.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. I think I would go with the question as they're - as they are. Because to be honest, I'm struggling here with what those - what the range of possible error messages could even be. Nothing else, my own education. I like the way it's laid out here.

If we're talking about Whois, the server being down, that error's not going to be generated by the Whois (system).

Michael Young: I don't know. So what do you want to do Don?

Don Blumenthal: I would leave it as is.

Michael Young: I don't feel passionate enough about it to argue otherwise, so I'm happy to leave it as is.

Don Blumenthal: Well I'm the same way. So I'm open to other thoughts. Like I said, I'm just kind of (unintelligible) (concept here). But I'll let everybody else hash that out because I got to get out of the hotel room here and get to my next session on (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay. Well Berry, you know, I think we may get down to few to - I think we needed at least a handful of us on this to keep processing the comments. So with Don exiting out, I think we'll have to wind up.

Berry Cobb: Okay. This is Berry. Let me go ahead and close out Row 31 at least, which again is our referencing the general user versus technical user types for the section of the domain and again referencing back to Comment Number 20. And...

Michael Young: Sorry, go ahead Berry.

Berry Cobb: No, please.

Michael Young: Once - let's finish the housekeeping on this part and then I want to talk about group participation for a second.

Berry Cobb: So I pointed this one back to Comment 20 and no action taken on this specific line item. And that basically wraps this for the day halfway through Section 5. We've got - say we have about 40 - about, well, 50 more - 60 more comments to go through to get to the end. Starting Section 10 and the remaining sections where a lot more of the heartier comments come into play.

Michael Young: Okay. So Berry, on the participation side, I think it'd be good if administratively you send out a notification to folks from (IM) and they're - that if they want to be considered a member of the working group, they do have to participate. Because we've had some people that haven't shown up on meetings for some time now.

And I'd rather have them just decide that they're not going to participate in the working group then they should rescind themselves so that we have - we can form a quorum on things.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I can start it for you and make any changes you see appropriate. I think that's a Chair message to be delivered.

Michael Young: Yeah, I can - I'll send it out if you think that's appropriate. I mean Susan, Wilson, I mean I - Don, I think that's reasonable to ask people to either participate or, you know, retire from the group. Right?

Susan Prosser: I support you in that.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. It's - yeah, you can only miss so many in a row before just saying...

Michael Young: Yeah.

Don Blumenthal: ...may a choice.

Susan Prosser: Yeah.

Anne Naffziger: Well, and this is Anne. I think...

Michael Young: Okay.

Anne Naffziger: ...this is Anne. I think it's also frustrating when people don't even send in their regrets. I mean if people are not going to even let us know they're not attending, then they're obviously not paying attention to it.

Michael Young: Exactly. And now it's causing a roadblock. If I knew if it was just the group of us that were still actively participating in the working group then, you know, Don could drop off and we have enough of us here to continue. Right.

But if I look at absolute numbers in the working group right now, you know, we can't process public comments without, you know, a reasonable defined quorum. So we have to, you know, ask people to - whether or not they're in or out.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Right. Yeah. I'll get a first draft started and I'll send that over to you and you can modify and send out to the working group.

Michael Young: Thanks Berry.

Berry Cobb: And I'll also include the overall members list.

Michael Young: Perfect.

Berry Cobb: Okay. In terms of - again, we just really have our recurring action item just to distribute the next version of the public comment review tool. Lastly,

milestones. I think we'll probably be shifting a little bit. We had targeted today to try to have the final survey released. I'm guessing that that's probably going to be mid August before we can get to their...

Michael Young: I'd say so. And that's only if you keep scheduling weekly meetings Berry.

Berry Cobb: Correct. Which we will continue to do.

Michael Young: Yeah. Okay.

Berry Cobb: All right. That's all that I have.

Michael Young: Thanks everyone. For those of you that have been coming to the meetings, I truly appreciate your efforts. Look, I understand how much of a pull it is on everyone's time. It is on mine as well. And, you know, the - so the survey is really starting to shape up fantastically. And our preliminary feedback generally was very, very good for these type of things.

So I'm excited about the results that we're - of the work so far. And I'm looking forward to that survey getting gout there. So I think everyone should be proud of the work we've done so far. We've just got to see what we can do about being freed up to keep the pace up from our non-participative members.

Woman: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Woman: Thanks.

Michael Young: All right. Thanks everyone.

Berry Cobb: Take care. Everyone take care.

Susan Prosser: See you.

Woman: Thank you. Bye.

Man: Thanks. Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: And (Cathy), you may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

END