

**WHOIS WG Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 27 August 2012 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 27 August 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-20120827-en.mp3>

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

**Attendees**

Don Blumenthal - RySG  
Anne Naffziger – IPC  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Wilson Abigaba – .ug ccTLD registrar  
Cintra Sooknanan - ALAC  
Steve Metalitz – IPC  
Susan Prosser - RrSG

**ICANN Staff**

Berry Cobb  
Barbara Roseman  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apology:**

Michael Young - Individual

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tonya), good morning, good afternoon, good evening this is the Whois Working Group Call on the 27th of August 2012. On the call today we have Wilson Abigaba, Anne Naffziger, Don Blumenthal, Cintra Sooknanan and Steve Metalitz. We have no apologizes today's call - sorry my apology, we have Michael Young's apology for today's call of course.

And from staff we have Barbara Roseman, Berry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state

their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Nathalie - welcome everyone, as you heard Michael had to send his apologies, he's traveling today so Don has gladly took on the chair role for this afternoon. Basically we have a pretty simple agenda and for the most part I'd almost classify it as we're in the home stretch to finally get the survey launched.

So really there's only a couple - few items to review today, basically we'll run through our key milestone list which has been updated from our previous call, as well as we'll talk about what is listed on the screen here about the skill sets - and welcome (Susan). So with that in mind, I guess the first thing that I'd like to brief the working group on is the current milestone schedule. For those that haven't been in attendance in the last couple of meetings or if you've seen on the list, we ran into a slight problem with where the survey was going to be hosted.

I have confirmed with - conferred with ICANN Legal and they raised some concerns and some potential risk for hosting a survey that is denominated from - by ICANN that was out of ICANN's control or external to the ICANN environment. We had first thought about trying to do a URL redirect from an icann.org address, but we figured that that wouldn't work throughout the entire survey - then we had to basically pursue hosting it internally.

So over on the right-hand side within the Adobe Connect session, you'll see a current key milestone section, we're - just to remind everybody the Open Source Lime Survey is the software solution that

we're using to build and host the survey itself. It is an open source solution and basically I've submitted the request to ICANN IT.

I had listed here that the 27th of August or today that they would have the solution implemented, however I did receive an email late last week that they will have the solution hosted and ready for myself to be able to login from an administrator perspective by Thursday morning - or actually I should get the ID by Wednesday of this week and then we can spend Thursday and Friday basically migrating the current survey that's hosted on the ISOC server into production at ICANN.

So what you'll see here - the first bullet is again just getting the hosting solution implemented on ICANN servers. I haven't seen what the final URL will look like, but I requested something along the lines of [icann.org/whoissurvey](http://icann.org/whoissurvey) being the URL address that we'll be able to advertise out to the community to access. And so the second bullet which is basically migrating our current survey from the ISOC server into ICANN production, I'll - we'll get into the details a little bit and we'll have to ask Wilson a couple of questions in that regard, but we'll save those for just a moment.

The third bullet or the final task is to make sure that we have covered all of the changes to the - or proposed changes to the survey that we will view through the public comment tool and make sure that those are all completed in the final version of the survey as it is hosted within the [icann.org](http://icann.org) realm. And then at that point we'll be able to release it to the working group to do some final integration testing before we turn this live - turn this on live to the community.

So with that said, in general up until we get this hosted up into the icann.org environment, it's pretty much beyond the working group's task of control to get this completed and it's pretty much falling on myself and Wilson. So before I ask Wilson a couple of questions about migrating the survey into production, does anybody have any questions up to the point of Bullet 4? And Don I see you have your hand raised, which was raised when you joined - do you have anything to add?

Don Blumenthal: No that was great, (am I open) to Adobe - very strange.

Berry Cobb: There you go, okay so I guess Wilson the question I have for you as I mentioned I should get administrator access to the Lime Survey software by Thursday morning. I personally don't have any experience with Lime Survey, but I don't envision it being all that difficult to manage. The first question I have for you is - I'm assuming that it's possible that you'll be able to export the survey from your Lime Survey instant into some sort of XML or HTML file that I can upload into our production environment, is that correct?

Wilson Abigaba: No that's not entirely correct, I will need to have full access to server because I need to do an install on that server. I need, well we need someone with the technical knowledge to do that - to work through the installation of that server. So if you can - (well for you, Christine Fuller) right, for the server (good user, so) (Christine) to give me access to the server or I will give you format but it's only a technical person (who would log) onto the server.

Berry Cobb: Okay, well the ICANN IT Department will be installing the Lime Survey software on there, are there system level configurations that you need to perform?

Wilson Abigaba: No not system level, it is just the application level.

Berry Cobb: Okay, at this point - and I'm still trying to confirm with the IT group, I believe I won't require VPN access and to be able to configure the Lime Survey software, do you have any thoughts about that based on your experience with what you have here? Like is there basically an administration panel that we can log into and do the Lime Survey to make the configurations that we need to?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, once we've installed Lime Survey they will be - we should be able to load the (information) into the panel and the (unintelligible) on the 72. But first of all they just need to install Lime Survey on the server - I can or they can do it, either one.

Berry Cobb: All right, they will be performing that install, I don't believe they're going to give us the rights to actually install at the, you know, the software itself. But as soon as I get an ID I'll send that over to you so that we can start to configure the Lime Survey software and get our survey migrated over into this instance.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay so I'll be waiting.

Berry Cobb: All right great, so barring any big speed bumps I hope to have our setup concluded by the end of this week or the 31st of August, certainly if we need the weekend to work through any issue. But in general I want to have it available to the working group by Monday of

next week so that we can all start to review the final version of the survey and make any last minute changes that we need to.

One other task that I'll be performing is just to reconfirm that through the public comment tool that we've made all of the changes that the working group agreed to. A majority of them are typo errors, there's a small subset where we added additional options to our survey questions and I think there were also some suggestions about some further definitions that we need to define. But like I said, we'll make that final confirmation as we get this rolled over into the ICANN production. Any questions up to this point?

Don Blumenthal: Yes it's Don - not a question but given this next week, we'll give you until Tuesday - Monday's not necessary.

Berry Cobb: Exactly yes and for the working group for the non-Americans, Monday is a designated holiday, hence why we won't be meeting next week. But I do plan for us to have a final meeting on the 10th of September as to which hopefully we'll have everything up and running. The working group will have access to survey one way or another so that we can perform the integration testing by the 10th of September which is basically the tail-end of next week.

So all of the communication about the integration testing out to the working group will occur next week and then we'll basically meet on the 10th of September and during that session we'll try to address any final issues along those lines. If the working group signs off that the survey is ready for the community, that's when we'll kick off the next bullet in our milestone schedule, which is the communication strategy.

Several meetings ago we had talked about this as a group and there's basically going to be a three or four prong approach to how we communicate the survey availability. First and foremost is just the ICANN Web communication channel and we'll have a posting on announcements within the gnso.icann.org Web site - I intend to put an announcement on the icann.org Web site to make that available as well.

I'll also be connecting with the ICANN communication teams so that there is - that it follows their communication channels such as a couple of Twitter feeds noting the availability of the survey and - as well as I think they also do one or two other things besides Twitter in terms of how they'll communicate certain announcements, I'm trying to follow-up those details.

The other communication method is that we'll ensure that the announcement is sent out to all of the (SO) and (AC) distribution lists so that the community is properly informed. And then there's two other elements that we'll try to pursue - there will be a September ICANN policy update that will be deployed, so I hope to have that in there and then the last route which was brought up on the call several weeks ago was being able to communicate out to the RIRs and ISOC and the IETF.

I - Don, the question for you is can you take the lead in terms of communicating out to the IETF, because I believe you're a heavy participant on the (weird) group - that's correct, yes?

Don Blumenthal: Certainly yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay and...

Don Blumenthal: I'll send that directly and then see if ISOC has some formal communications channel that we can use.

Berry Cobb: All right great.

Don Blumenthal: And also we can (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Okay, and then the last part is - which I'm still trying to follow-up is how we can communicate this to the RIRs as well. I had here in my note that they have a few Twitter handles that I'll try to track down so that we can try to communicate out that way. So that's a pretty decent laundry list in terms of trying to communicate the availability, does anybody have any other suggestions for other routes on how to communicate this out to the community? Okay so it seems like we've got...

Man: (Unintelligible) I was just waiting (with that respect), no I would just make a few suggestions and obviously just send it to anybody that you know is not formally in the - may not formally be in the ICANN communications system that you think might have some good thoughts. And I can't speak to how other constituency groups work but, you know, the registry stakeholder group, David Maher is very good at forwarding to the group.

But sometimes if it comes from David in just a forward, it tends to get lost so at least in my case I'm also going to forward it directly so folks see it different names, so I'm just throwing that out as a possible idea for other folks who might get them regularly through constituency

groups or whichever. But I want to take a special effort to flag them - flag the survey.

Berry Cobb: Yes and I probably wasn't clear enough in my laundry list, what I meant the SOACs that will also include the GNSO Council list and the Chair's list as well so that we ensure that all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies get the notification as well.

Man: Oh no that - Berry I kind of assumed that when I see SOACs I just figure it's the laundry list.

Berry Cobb: Cool.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne, I'm following up on what Don just said, you know, I will plan to send it to, you know, my (INTA) Whois (domain) subcommittee who can even get it to the broader Internet committee because I agree with Don, if we can get it sent reminders and information sent from say my emails or Don's to some of these groups that we work with, that might help participation as well.

Berry Cobb: Agreed, thank you Anne. Okay so if everything that we've discussed to this point happens on the 10th of September basically September 11 is when we'll turn this on and make it available to the community. I started pondering a little bit earlier today and per the charter we were only given 30 days for the survey to be made available.

I believe everyone on this call is familiar with the breadth and quantity of work that is out there in the community, not to mention that if we stuck with a 30-day window that would take us to basically the 12th of October which is when everybody will start to travel to the Toronto

meeting. This is only a suggestion and I'll send this as a note out to Michael and the working group, but I might recommend that we try moving to 45 days.

We've already missed several of our original milestones schedules, but I'm concerned if we end the survey right before the Toronto meeting that may increase - or decrease possible participation in the survey itself. So if nobody objects or sees any issue with that then perhaps we would target a week or two post-Toronto to conclude the survey - Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay yes thanks, this is Avri Doria speaking - the only thing - I think it's a great idea. The only thing I'd recommend is that you do not include the days of the ICANN meeting itself in your extended count. So whatever you're deciding to extend it to, don't think of the days of the Toronto meeting as days when people are coming, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Understood, thank you - Don?

Don Blumenthal: Yes I was going to say just what Avri suggested, that beyond that this idea of pushing past the ICANN meeting I think is good because it may give us a chance to do some hustling face-to-face, depending how good our participation is before then.

Berry Cobb: Very good so, you know, just looking at the calendar I'm kind of inclined to make it available to the 31st of October and then we can close the data a clean month and that gives us - two, three, four, five, six weeks, not including the week of Toronto for the community to complete the survey - does that sound fair?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: Yes that's good.

Berry Cobb: Great.

Man: How do you do that Avri?

Berry Cobb: Okay then that would allow us to basically review the survey results November - the month of November minus the US holidays for Thanksgiving. But once we close it out then we'll be able to easily extract the results fairly quickly and start to distribute then review amongst the working group - Anne?

Avri Doria: Just one comment, to the extent we can highlight that change because I think there's at least some understanding with some of my constituencies that it is a 30-day window, so we probably should highlight or make clear when we launch that the dates - the end dates or the longer time period.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely and yes and instead of communicating the duration, we'll just communicate the open and close dates.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Berry Cobb: So basically use the month of November to review the results and start to build the final report basically per the charter we were asked to release the results of the survey to the community before publishing the final report.

Now having looked at the output from the survey tool it is - it's a daunting PDF given the quantity of questions that we have basically that export one page as the question itself, then the second page is a summary draft of the results to that question as well as it appends any freeform text to those answers. We can certainly make that PDF available out to the community, I guess my only concern is that it may be somewhat confusing but I'm not going to say that we shouldn't release it either.

But that's something that we may want to think about over the weeks exactly what releasing the results will mean. I guess my big fear is that such a daunting PDF may be overly confusing for the community to consume without having some reference to what our final report maybe look like that could somehow summarize some of the results that would allow community members to dive into the details, any thoughts in that regard?

Okay I will - I'll take note of that and certainly when we're doing our integration testing the week of 10 September, before we reset it, when we go live I'll have Wilson kind of do us a quick extract - or I should hopefully be able to do it and send it out to the working group so that we can put more thought about how we want to release the results, (Scott)?

(Scott): Yes I was - I dropped for a second there so my hand didn't show when I put it up, I'm not quite following your concern about issuing a PDF could be confusing - (publishing) PDF.

Berry Cobb: I don't know if you - I'm sure you've seen the PDFs that Wilson had sent out from when we did our public comment period. I wouldn't say

that it's confusing, but it's easily a 200-page PDF of every question that shows every detail, every answer and every graph.

And I'm just basically drawing to the working group's attention is that it is a very large document and if the working group agrees that that is the deliverable that we should communicate out to the community and that satisfies the model stone requirement of releasing the survey results I'm perfectly fine by that.

I just know from my personal experience in looking at that survey and especially extracting out the data that we use for the public comment tool, it takes a considerable amount of time to understand where you're at in the survey. So I don't know if the working group would like to do a summary of that PDF and that we release those results or do we just release the raw data as it's extracted out of Lime Survey and that's really up to the working group - Anne.

(Scott): Let me just follow-up on that, yes it seems to me yes I would not- I would hesitate to issue that as a - as the report, but assuming you do something about a narrative, I don't see any reason not to release that also.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Anne? Anne is your hand still up from last time - and if you're talking you're on you mute.

Avri Doria: Oh sorry, sorry, sorry, what I was - what I'm hearing you say Berry is some - perhaps somewhat of a bit of an executive summary over the top of it, I don't know that we want to do one or the other, but they could go together. My concern about that is that if we're looking at the close of October 31 and we're looking at a release of the survey results

on the 30th, taking into consideration the Thanksgiving holiday week in the states that could be a pretty monumental task to pull that together in that amount of time - but (I don't know).

Berry Cobb: Perhaps I agree, I mean I'm hopeful - well there's two points to that, when we went through the draft survey and the public comments, you know, I think we received some 40 odd responses or so and that was somewhat manageable in terms of trying to dissect, you know, what was going on with the draft survey. I am hopeful that with the production version of the survey that we at least get 500 responses.

I think Steve when your group performed that Whois survey several years ago I believe you received somewhere over 2000 responses, so certainly anything beyond 500 will definitely take some time for us to extract meaning out of that. The other option here is that we can go back to the GNSO Council and say, you know, perhaps maybe it's better that we not just release the survey results in a quick executive summary.

But we release it all together - here's the raw data and here's the working group's final report that contains the executive summary and the details of the results of the survey as well as has (unintelligible) define them. And I don't think we need to address this today but it's something that we certainly should think about at least while the survey is moving forward.

So I will - I'll draft up a note and send out to the working group that kind of outlines what we just discussed and maybe we can draw up some more ideas over the list and certainly we can talk about it again on the 10th when we meet - before we go live. Any other thoughts or

comments about the milestone schedule that we have - at least up to this point?

Okay the only other item that I'd like to discuss with the working group what we have listed - or I'm sorry, what we have physically here in Adobe Connect room is an email that I sent out last Monday based - and it's really only action that we have left out of our public comment review and the - there were several instances and Steve I believe you'd responded to the working group about this table.

But there were several instances of feedback that was stating that first there are parts or sections of the survey where a more technically capable person could answer all the questions whereas other sections of the survey a more general type skill set could answer the questions. And the context of this is there may be certain organizations out there where multiple persons may respond to their one instance of the survey and so it was suggested that within each section of the survey we listed out a statement of the most likely skill set that it would be required to complete that section of the survey.

And as a result when we reviewed through all the public comments one person that was unidentified consistently went through the - each section of the survey and stated that this section is strictly for technical users, this section will really anytime user can fill it out, etc. etc. The table displayed before you today is a summary of that section that I only pulled from the comment in and of itself.

And so that the task before us is first, do we agree that this is something that we should include in the introduction of each section and if so is this the right skill set that we have identified hearing column

two? And if that is correct then we basically need to whip out like some short general statements that would state that for each introduction - Avri?.

Avri Doria: Hi, thank you this is Avri Doria, I just have two questions more than an opinion at this point - one I'd be interested to know how technical and general is different from all. And two, I want to sort of understand and I guess make sure that this isn't telling people that if they're not technical, don't do this part. And so I don't know whether we should have such a table or not, but I think we need to be careful in terms of informing people somehow what they should and shouldn't do, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Avri I agree 100% with your second statement - as I was putting this chart together that immediately popped in the forefront of my mind that if we listed a skill set restriction then that may be more of a hindrance to us than speaking higher a completion percentage of the survey then not, so I agree. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes thanks this is Steve Metalitz, thanks for explaining this. So as I understand it this is one person - one of our respondents came up - this, you know, with saying that Section 2 would be technical people in Section 3 would be for all and so forth, is that right?

Berry Cobb: That is correct and in working group review of this comments we had discussed that there were certainly the possibility for multiple persons that may fill out or complete one survey as a possible example and this is not a real one, if (Bear Sign) chose to fill out only one survey there may be two or three persons in that organization that would fill it out for (Bear Sign).

Steve Metalitz: Okay, I think I would share Avri's concern that if we do something like this it would be done in a way that doesn't discourage people from answering as many of the sections as they want to. It might be preferable rather than kind of putting these in different pigeonholes to just have a statement at the beginning that some of the questions here are quite technical and you shouldn't feel that you have to answer every question.

If you encounter a section that you don't have the technical background to answer then just go onto the next section - that it seems to me, you know, that kind of leaves it up to the user but also gives them permission to skip one and it doesn't - and it encourages them not just give up on the whole thing when they - if they reach one section that is incomprehensible to them.

Berry Cobb: Understood and agree with that as well - and I see that Anne and Avri and Don agree, so to carry that just a little bit further Steve, if I understood correctly it wouldn't be the very beginning of the survey that we would mention it but it would be kind of a repetitive statement across each section that stated more or less what you had just mentioned, correct?

Steve Metalitz: Yes I guess it could be either way actually, but it wouldn't hurt I guess to say at the beginning of each section if you think that this is too technical you don't need to answer it, but please go onto the next section.

Berry Cobb: Right, cool, understood - Don?

Don Blumenthal: Following up on that, since we do have the general or technical view, I think we might want to just make a statement, if this section is an appropriate for your skills (unintelligible). I would be more general so that, you know, on the other hand somebody that's technical may look at one of our general questions and say I know that.

Berry Cobb: Should we try listing something that would state that if you feel that this is too technical for your current skill set try to get somebody else to help you fill it out or just skip it and move onto the next section or a combination of both?

Don Blumenthal: Yes I think what I would suggest is if you - it's not even if you - if you think or whatever, it's if this set of questions is not appropriate for your skill set or for your interests, feel free to have somebody else in your organization complete it - that's not to say something kind of a drift of what I (unintelligible).

Barbara Roseman: This is Barbara, what if we were to say something more along the lines of, you know, if there are questions you feel you were not qualified to answer, please feel free to have somebody else in your organization fill out the survey as well instead of completing. So it sounds like, you know, you want two people to use the same survey results - I think you should just give them the option of having somebody independently fill it out that they might not automatically think that.

Don Blumenthal: Well I think all along we and I don't see a problem with two different submissions, but I think all along we (reason) - have everything set up so that an organization could submit one survey with different - with people with different skill sets contributing.

Barbara Roseman: Oh okay.

Berry Cobb: All right thank you Barbara and before you get to you Avri, just real quick since there's some more participants this week Barbara Roseman is now assigned over to the ICANN policy team. She's responsible for the four Whois studies that the GNSO Council is working on and she's also acting as backup for this Whois technical survey as well, so welcome to the team Barbara again - Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, Avri Doria and yes great to have Barbara on the team. I think we're talking about two different things here and getting ourselves more complex than we need to. I think it needs to say somewhere that, you know, filling out this form can be an individual or a group activity and I think a simple statement elsewhere and perhaps repeated in many elsewheres (sic) is, you know, it's not mandatory to answer all the questions.

You know, answer those you feel comfortable with without getting into are you technical, are you general, are you all, are you whatever and just sort of, you know, leave it at that and really there's two separate dimensions in this that we're talking about. You know, because a group could feel itself not confident of all questions even so, you know, I think if we convey those simple thoughts it should be okay, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great thank you Avri - Anne?

Anne Naffziger: Yes I agree with Avri. The other thing I think we want to convey and we probably are in - at some point is that, you know, we want people to fill the survey out to the best of their ability, but I also want to be sure

people understand if it's above them and there's no one else in their organization that can address certain issues that we do when you hear from them on the parts of the survey that they do fill out comfortable completing. And it's not a do or die, you know, all or nothing proposition.

Man: Are you sure - is the working group sure we don't want to make them to go study before they fill it out - joking.

Anne Naffziger: I think we'll be lucky if people make it through this thing, so I want to try to encourage (unintelligible) as possible.

Man: We could sell prep classes.

Man: Yes or the Whois for Dummies publication and then...

Berry Cobb: All right, okay I think I've captured the essence - I'll fill out a couple of sentences that we can populate through the survey and I'll send that out to the list and then we can edit it to the right message that we want to convey and populate from that more generalist standpoint then as opposed to breaking out as we have in the table here.

Okay, well to be honest that was really all that I had down on the agenda for today, as I mentioned at the beginning of the call most of the burden is on staff to get this up and get it migrated into production and made available back to the working group. But before we depart does anybody else have any parting thoughts or suggestions before we meet again on the 10th outside of the communications that will occur on the list?

Don Blumenthal: This is Don, I just really appreciate everybody's participation - this was the largest group and therefore I think the best conversation we've had for quite a while.

Woman: Great.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Don. All right well I appreciate everybody attending today, if you come up with any other ideas please send them to the list and hopefully you'll see some big announcements for Monday of next week and we'll see you on 10th of September.

Woman: Thanks Berry.

Man: Excellent.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you everyone.

Woman: Thank you, bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you very much, (Tonya) you may now stop the recording, thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

END