

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Whois Survey Working Group  
Monday 12 November 2012 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Whois Survey Working Group on the Monday 12 November 2012 at 20:00 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-20121112-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Don Blumenthal – RySG  
Anne Naffziger – IPC  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Wilson Abigaba – .ug ccTLD registrar  
Susan Prosser – RrSG  
Steve Metalitz – IPC  
Michael Young – Individual

ICANN Staff:

Barbara Roseman  
Berry Cobb  
Julia Charvolen

Operator: 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.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois Survey Working Group call on the 12th of November.

On the call today we have Don Blumenthal, and Anne Naffziger, Avri Doria, Wilson Abigaba, Steve Metalitz, Susan Prosser, and hopefully later on Michael Young.

We have no apologies so far. And from the staff we have Barbara Roseman, Berry Cobb and myself Julia Charvolen.

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

Berry Cobb: Great thank you Julia. Welcome everybody from our long hiatus while the survey was up and running which of course closed at the end of October.

I'm going to kind of wing the beginning of our agenda till Michael shows up. And then we'll hopefully roll up our sleeves and get into some details about how we'd like to move forward with analyzing the results, et cetera.

So the first part of our agenda is agenda bashing. Essentially if there's anything that you'd like to have added to the agenda please let me know and we can throw that under new business or make it a part of the reviewing the survey results.

Because of our break we don't really have any action items yet. Hopefully we'll get some at the close of this meeting. And that really kind of takes us into reviewing the survey results.

I guess before we get started and hopefully as a stall tactic I'd like to open up to the floor to have any general thoughts by the working group members about the survey.

I did send out the results as it closed on the 31st or actually the results are from the 1st of November. What - there are two PDF files that were sent out.

One is only those results were there were completed and submitted responses. And then the second PDF file contained all responses.

So in terms of overall stats we had 67 completed and submitted responses. There were 173 incomplete responses for a total of 240.

And I'm going to throw a little caveat on our full responses. I think it was around November 3 that one participant did complete their survey and submit it.

So the PDFs that I sent out now do not include that latest submission. And as we start getting into the details I'll run a fresh report so that we can ensure that's included in there.

With that in mind I'd also like to point out that of the partial responses saved we still had at least - oh we still had 20 saved responses as to which we had also sent out a specific email to those participants to see if they could complete the survey.

By my rough count I think about six or seven of them completed and I think there were five or six new ones that were started but never submitted.

So with that does the working group have any general comments about what you've seen with the survey, any feedback from the community in Toronto and if you've dived into the details of the survey itself, any thoughts about that?

Don Blumenthal: All right I'm going to, as long as nobody else I'll just fill the area little bit for a second here. I'm sorry it's Don.

Yes I've had limited feedback all along including Toronto which was generally positive. And to be honest I think 67 is a good return.

I mean it was a long survey and I do know of two people who said we - they didn't intend to complete it but ultimately did. So they must have seen some motivation in what we were doing there which was a nice bit of gratification.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Don. That's very helpful. Just finally got a text from Michael. He needs a dial out. Let me get that started really quick.

Avri Doria: Okay this is Avri. I have a question too when you (unintelligible).

Don Blumenthal: But I'm going to have to sign off at 3:30 for some medical tests, just thought I'd mention it.

Berry Cobb: Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. And I've only looked through the report and not read in detail.

Did you - is - are the questions that were left unanswered by the - by those that didn't complete just the ones at the end or are they questions scattered throughout that were sort of looked like they were left for later and just never got back to? And you might have that in there and I just in my perusal haven't seen it yet or haven't pulled that out but...

Berry Cobb: Thank you Avri. This is Berry. Yes it's the full spectrum. Some of the responses I should classify, some of the incomplete responses were several members only filling out the profile and maybe one or two questions on the first page.

Some are a scatter of answers throughout the entire survey. And I would probably say less of them -- and I don't have the exact stats on those yet -- but there's a number of them where there were, you know, they were close to completion but they never actually submitted the - or, you know, hit the Submit button to close out the survey which definitely will provide a challenge I think when analyzing the results just because it's at least the way that they

line survey presents the data and maybe (Wilson) may have some more background on this.

But when we look at the results in the aggregate it's hard to compare a particular user with what they submitted it within those rolled up results.

Michael Young: There we go. Thanks Berry for getting me online. I was really struggling there. I didn't have the US number and it looks like that's the only one that works for me here in Canada. So thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. We just we went ahead and kicked off the call. We have (Ann), Susan, Steve, Avri, Don, yourself from the community and the normal ICANN staff.

Basically we kind of just kicked off the agenda that I sent out and the email. And right now we're deploying a stall tactic until you came online to bring us up to speed.

So we're just kind of chitchatting about the survey trying to get any feedback that people had heard like in Toronto and those kinds of things.

And just one other final comment just so that you're are on par with everyone else there were 67 total completed responses 173 that were partial incompletes that didn't get submitted for a total of 240.

I had sent out two PDFs of the results, one that only contains the completed submitted responses versus all that the entire population of responses.

And basically Avri just asked the question as to what was the nature of the incomplete responses. And that's basically the full spectrum that were responses that were basically only the profile was completed and one or two questions were answered.

Some of the responses or some of the surveys had responses that were filled in or completed and various parts of the survey as though that they answered the question that they understood and we're going to come back at another time.

And then there's a smaller population of responses that were close to completion but the participant never finished the survey and most importantly they never hit the Submit button.

Michael Young: Right.

Berry Cobb: And so I think wrap-up will be the challenge as to how we decide to review those results. And so with that I'll turn it over to you.

Michael Young: Okay. Well thank you everyone. It's great attendance today so I truly appreciate that.

You can see in the agenda - and I sent out an example of a testing frame - or test results examination or a survey results examination framework.

That's just a I think a fairly pragmatic approach but I'm completely open obviously if you want to do something else.

Berry did restart the recording on the call already? Is that taken care of?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. Great. So I - we're in a fantastic place but I guess, you know, Berry one of the first things I want to ask because I really don't have the agenda should we discuss a little - why don't we put a quick discussion point before we dig in too far into the agenda ?

Was at a point after, we're going to have - now have we completed - (Wilson)'s kind of in years overview of the results or do we still need to kind of just go over elements of that? Do you still have more that you want to talk about?

Berry Cobb: No this is Berry, more or less completed. I just gave some quick rolled up stats about the number of completed responses et cetera, but we haven't...

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...gotten into the details.

Michael Young: So...

Berry Cobb: And I also have your strawman framework posted up in Adobe Connect room as well.

Michael Young: Great. So I guess my first question to everybody I'd like to have us jump into that strawman and start discussing it almost right away so we can get some work organized.

I see today as more of a work organization call than us getting too deep into the responses because there's over 200 pages worth of information in that PDF.

And I think it's just we'll never get through it if we go through page by page as a group. So my perspective on this is to divide and conquer.

But my first question to everybody is how do people feel about the in - uncompleted or incompletes on the survey responses?

Because my own feeling out of the gate is that given how complex and how long the survey was and from what I can ascertain from average completion

statistics on other surveys we actually had a really great response rate and a really great completion rate all things considered.

So I'm almost inclined to focus on what we had completed and go from there. How do people feel about that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I think we should look just at the ones that were completed. Because the ones that weren't completed -- I mean there might be a lot of reasons for that -- but, you know, they're basically a draft.

And even the person responding hadn't necessarily approved all those responses. So I just I don't think we really can make much use of the incomplete responses.

Michael Young: Okay great.

Don Blumenthal: This is Don. I agree. You - yes it would take too much parsing of incompleting ones to try to mind read on whether somebody intended to just fill some out and not others or not. So I just say let's just draw the line, Submit button we'll count it, without it we won't.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I had my hand up but obviously that didn't matter.

Don Blumenthal: We're not all on Adobe Connect.

Avri Doria: I tend to disagree. I think the way we wrote the questions was very much question for question. Questions didn't really rely on other questions.

So perhaps we can do a differential analysis if you take just these questions into account or if you take all of them.

But I think completing the whole thing and registering it is sort of beside the point. And I haven't even looked through the results yet in enough detail to



know whether, you know, this helps any particular case or hinders any particular case.

But I tend to see the answers as atomic and taking the answers as put being adequate. So I don't think, you know, that we should waste the work that was done but not complete.

Michael Young: Okay. Well actually that gives me an idea Avri, that I might circle back to. But let's see if anyone else has anything more to say.

And I'm sorry about the hands but some of us aren't on the - I'm not on Adobe Connect either so some of us, we'll just have to depend on Berry to keep us all in order.

Ann Naffziger: This is (Ann). If I - this is Ann Naffziger. I agree with Avri. I think, you know, especially because there may be some that are almost completed, just missing a few elements and some that, you know, are missing more but, you know, if someone happens to have just skipped over a couple or there was a not applicable answer and they just didn't check it I mean I think that makes sense to look through them and take the value we can from them even if they're not complete.

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Prosser: And this is Susan. If we're able to tell somebody hit the Submit button but not answered every question that was - if I was to hit a Submit button in my opinion that means that they have committed to the ones that they answered.

So it may not be completed survey 100% all questions answered. But they said they completed the ones that they thought relevant to them. So in the case they are questions that we should consider.

That's really interesting distinction Susan. Berry is there any way that we can...

Steve Metalitz: This is...

Michael Young: ...ascertain that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I do have a follow-up on that. I assume when you said incomplete survey it was one where they hadn't hit the Submit button or they'd saved it and to come back to it. But is that wrong or when you say an incomplete is that to say...

Berry Cobb: Yes this is Berry. It's really a combination of both. For those participant that actually hit the Submit button -- and I haven't looked into this great of detail yet -- but there is a probably a strong possibility that not all questions were answered.

We only had, the very first question in the profile was the only one that was required. So there will be a small percentage or a certain percentage of submit - of submitted responses that had incomplete questions whereas...

Steve Metalitz: When you said there's 67 what are you talking about? Are you saying 67 people hit the Submit button or 67 people answered every question?

Berry Cobb: Sixty-seven people hit the Submit button.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well that's...

Berry Cobb: And that's...

Steve Metalitz: That's what I assumed then. And I disagree that we should take into account at all something where they - people didn't hit the Submit button.

You know, I voted last week in the United States and I had a bunch - it was an electronic voting system and I was given a bunch of races to vote in.

And at the end I was asked to review my results and hit Submit. And even if I had answered every question if I hadn't hit Submit my vote would not have counted.

So I think that's a bright line that we should follow. If they hit Submit then we should take it into account no matter how many questions they answered or didn't answer.

But if they didn't hit it I just think it's a draft. We don't even know - we can't, you know, even assume that any of those were actually answered.

Michael Young: So Steve can I make a suggestion to the group? Because I do - I in principle I agree with you that you have to make some kind of definition of what was an official response and what wasn't.

But I think Avri's saying - I think it was Susan saying that there might still be some good information in the incompletes that inform us of something interesting and it's a shame to waste that if we have it.

So maybe what we can do is officially we won't in our official - in the body - in the official report in the sense of the analysis we do in the main body and so forth let's focus on the ones that hit Submit.

But Avri and Susan are willing to take this on as a - as an allocated task between the two of them maybe they could go through and work with (Wilson) to look at the incompletes and do a commentary and maybe a little bit of statistical analysis summary of statistical analysis of what's in those incompletes and provide an unofficial commentary that we'll include with the report that just says, you know, on the incompletes unofficially here's a bit of

analysis we did and here's interesting information that we think we might have ascertained from that but these are unofficial results.

Berry Cobb: Avri has her hand raised.

Avri Doria: Yes I guess I just don't buy it. This isn't voting. This is a survey. I don't remember looking up front a big announcement saying if you don't go back and press the Submit button at the end none of your work will count and we're going to throw it away.

So I tend to think if the question was answered it was answered. And hitting the Submit button at the end is just a formality of this particular method.

We're not talking about voting here. You know...

Michael Young: No, no...

Avri Doria: ...we're talking about a survey and...

Michael Young: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...we're trying to gather information. If they answered a question they answered the question.

Michael Young: So Avri it's Michael. I hear what you're saying. I don't disagree with it. And so I think we should have some commentary in with it.

I do think we have to differentiate between the official analysis and the incompletes. And it's maybe even we can make it a little stronger but if we do it in a balanced section I think we should separate out the incompletes and do an analysis based on the incompletes for the following reason.

It's not that it's necessarily as rigid as voting system and, you know, there are presidencies on the line here. But it is about people self-certifying what they put in.

And if we didn't tell them they should hit the Submit button than that was actually a failing on our part because we aren't sure about the incompletes.

We just aren't sure if it's the same person who started the survey a couple of times from, you know, one from their personal email address, one from their work email address, who knows. And so there's not even without the Submit button there's not even a self-certification of that submission.

And so it doesn't mean it isn't good information. It just means that we have to - we aren't assure of the information (incomplete) is fair.

Avri Doria: I have absolutely no problem with us submitting the answers to the same analysis but differentiating this is the analysis we get if we just include the submits and this is the analysis we get if we include the incompletes and basically certainly drawing that line there for anybody that's reading a report to be able to determine.

But to relegate it to something where well there's the official analysis and then there's the extra comments the two people managed to add in their spare time seems a little bit too much denigration.

Certainly splitting the analysis so that it says, you know, we get this picture from those that, you know, officially pushed the Submit button and we get this analysis if we include all data.

And, you know, and then see if there's any difference between them. And if there is a difference between then then that's something that needs to be understood and followed-up on somehow.

But, you know, I guess I'm not volunteering for an extra homework assignment to come up with a another interpretation based on or extra comments based on the data that was submitted but we've decided not to count. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible) has their hand raised.

Michael Young: Go ahead.

Woman: I just wanted to - yes I wanted comment that I think the fact that we allowed people to save this, you know, I think may have - you know, and we should err on the side of looking at that data because people may actually believe that by saving it that, you know, their - the information they've saved will be reviewed and considered.

So their...

Michael Young: Right.

Woman: ...could be a little bit of confusion on the part of survey takers because we gave them that capability.

Michael Young: Okay. So, you know, I think we have a bit of a mixed responses. And I'm trying to find a way through here where we can find, you know, a consensus-based approach to this.

The other thing I'm concerned with and Berry I think we do need a little bit of help from ICANN's legal on this is it'll be good to get advice from them on to what degree of if any do we have to acknowledge how we treat data from incompletes versus completes, do they see any issues with that in our analysis and how we recognize the results?

Berry Cobb: I will ask them. My guess is that they may not have much input for us especially since we didn't track who was the survey taker. But I will take that action item.

Michael Young: Well if all the answer back is they don't see any additional liability to ICANN by doing this then, you know, or by not differentiating the results then we're back to the question of how much do we need to differentiate the results?

Avri I think maybe trying to do a conjoined result set but I don't want to be too much work for all of us either.

And I don't want to have so many versions of the results of people reading the final report get bored and wander off as well while they're in mid-read.

So, you know, I think maybe the happy medium is to, you know, do the results on the completed, do some results in a similar format on the incompletes.

The question is whether or not we do a third track where we show what would happen if you consider them all together.

I think you could probably get that effect by, you know, doing the completed responses. Then after the completed response section showing what we saw in the incompletes and noting if we think that there were significant differences in the answers we got in the incompletes versus the completes at the same time.

I think as people are, for each kind of section of questions people are kind of reading two serialized analysis, you know, a preliminary - a primary analysis and then an additional analysis based on incompletes.

In that analysis we could comment on whether or not we think we observed it. You know, if you consider the completes it makes much of a difference.

I just don't think it would be wise for us to try and do three versions if that makes sense?

Berry Cobb: And Michael this is...

Avri Doria: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Just to add onto that. I think one aspect of it is we need to consider how the analysis will look. For example is it going to be qualitative statements or is it a combination of qualitative and quantitative?

And if we choose to include the quantitative aspects into the results then for sure we should only focus in terms of utilizing the numerical aspects of this that 67% of all respondents said X should be done to Whois then we should only probably confine ourselves to the submitted responses.

And then as a footnote to that that we did perform an analysis on the incomplete responses and hear some of our findings noting that that doesn't necessarily effect the quantitative aspect to the recommendation or the results of that analysis.

Otherwise then our numbers would get all over the place. You know the, certainly the submitted responses are valid based on for lack of a better word...

Michael Young: Right.



Don Blumenthal: This is Don. I've got to jump off. But real quickly is in addition to legal is there anybody within ICANN who has applied survey experience that we can go to and say okay what's the practice in the industry in terms of that formal submissions or not?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I've - I'll ask that question internally as my gut says no but I don't know for sure so I'll ask.

Don Blumenthal: Okay appreciate it.

Berry Cobb: Don I'll volunteer for an action item to do some general industry survey industry research. And I've got a couple of associates that work in that industry as well so I can certainly ask them what the standard industry practice is as well.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. I used to do this kind of work but it was when I was in college and I'm not going to discuss how long ago that was so I just flat don't remember. So I'll catch you all next call.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Don.

Don Blumenthal: All right.

Berry Cobb: Avri has her hand raise?

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay obviously I'm going to be in a minority in this one and I'll give up. But first of all I doubt that 67 responses are statistically significant anyway.

So I mean arguing about the statistical significance of what we're doing is probably minimalist. I think we probably had way too small a sample.

But it would take a statistician to look at the whole community that we reached out to and the amount of response we've gotten with the diversity

mix that we'll have in the answers to tell whether any of this made statistical sense or not. I doubt it but (that's) - in terms of the quantitative I was really seeing that there would be two numbers that, you know, a number that said on this question taking into account those that, you know, press Submit 67% said blah.

If we take into account all people who answer this question we see that it comes out to 68%, you know, and not much more complicated than that and basically just doing a run of the subset and a run of the total and differentiating the two answers.

But if that's too much work and it'll make the report too unreadable for people recognize I'm in a severe minority and I'll just, you know, make my minority comments later about the significance of the report. It's no problem.

Berry Cobb: Yes. Avri I don't think that there's anything wrong with that approach. I think what I was trying to guide before was that we just need to differentiate and we need to do so in a format that's not overwhelming to people.

I think what you're suggesting is exactly kind of what I had in mind. And I think that that's workable as a reasonable point of compromise.

And I think it sounded also like Steve was willing to include those results as long as they're pointed out in such a way.

So, you know, I'll ask the entire group that does that looking down that path, does that make general sense to everybody?

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve. I mean I think the first way you formulated it was a little better than the second way. But I'm not - let's not - I don't want to make a federal case out of this.

The - you know, and I'm fine with some reference to the incomplete answers. But let's just make sure it's clear that those were the incomplete answers and we don't know whether they actually represent the views of the respondents.

But it's grist for the mill. I agree with Avri, it's not going to be statistically significant anyway so there's not any sense in splitting hairs over that.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: But I think as long as we present the submitted responses and then whatever color or whatever other perspective is added from the incomplete I'm okay with that.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. I'm just going to read (Wilson)'s response in the chat as well because I think it is pertinent that maybe we can try to filter out some of the meaningless entries. The statement is regarding the incomplete surveys.

It's possible to eliminate tests or meaningless entry, example those who filled in only a few questions on the first page.

I think we can eliminate such entries and remain with those - and remain with those that are actually filling in the survey and possibly made comments but did not hit the Submit button.

Steve Metalitz: I - in principle I think that that would be fantastic. The cautionary side of me says that we don't have the right to judge where the threshold is.

Do we cut them off if they answered six questions or 15 or two? So I guess the only cut off I'd be comfortable with is the - if they got past the questions where they - that were about personal profile and answered even one of the main survey questions then we have to include them in the incompletes. Because I don't know no other, you know, bright clear line to draw otherwise.

Does anyone disagree with that?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I - actually I do agree with that, the bright line is not so bright at all. But for curiosity's sake (Wilson) can you maybe take on the action of trying to filter out some - play with the tool a little bit to filter out some of those incomplete responses? And maybe we can get a better picture just to see what we're dealing with? And...

Wilson Abigaba: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...Then we can make that decision? Because I agree if they stopped at the profile and they didn't answer anything else then for sure that comment, that can be set aside. But then any other real relevant question in the survey then, you know, that would remain in the population.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. So, yes this is (Wilson).

Berry Cobb: Yes. Go ahead (Wilson).

Wilson Abigaba: Yes I will next - I will try and make on - make statistics by also eliminating those entries which we think are (test) and the also after (submitting) them and this (also) including them.

And then we can see that just like Avri said this (unintelligible) are difference between the statistics and (unintelligible) on the table that include them in the results or not. But it was but to analyze with them included and we didn't (really need) it.

So it's (do both) and the - and take our decision from them. And so also (sale) on how they - on how I will have remitted the entry that I think - that we think are these entries like those that we just click and then close the (service).

And so yes, I was (unintelligible) say how we be eliminating them. So and then we say what's different (unintelligible) and you tell me what to take, either everything that was included or not be included? Am I clear?

Michael Young: Okay sorry I was on mute. I don't have a good connection so I'm trying not to give you guys too much background noise.

All right so I guess I go back to the question is everyone okay if we make the cut off point then? (Wilson) we make the cut off point, if they get through the profile they answer either one of the main questions then they're in for now.

And if they only did the profile questions or didn't finish the profile questions then we won't bother looking at their results because the profile alone doesn't add any value. Is everyone okay with that?

Susan Prosser: This is Susan and I think that's a great way of approaching it.

Michael Young: Okay great. I don't hear anybody else raising objections so we'll take that as ascent and move on.

If we're okay on that subject I'd like to move on to kind of walking everyone through kind of a strawman framework I set up.

And obviously it's up for discussion and adjustment. I just thought I'd start by walking everyone through a division of work to get it done.

Okay Berry I don't hear anyone wanting to throw anything else in so we'll go on to that.

So what I throw out here was the thought that when I looked through the 200 pages of information which is a fabulous amount of meaningful information but also heavy for people to digest, the first, you know, thing that cross in my mind is the classic term executive summary.

And then, you know, I also struggle with as a group what's our reasonable mandate to provide comments and recommendations based on our interpretation or our reading of the results and the comments, especially the written comments that people made in the results which is probably the area where I'm worried just as much as anything.

So what I suggest we do here is like we had the survey split up into sections is that we do section assignments again, you know, one or two volunteers.

If people want to work in teams that's fine but we get at least one volunteer on a section and ask them to - and (Wilson) this is assuming you can also help us produce some summarization of the question results per section.

We start out with a, what we need each volunteer to do I think is to create a first of all work with a quantitative summary which I assume that (Wilson) can generate automatically once we define what that should look like for each section, write some commentary of observation based on that quantitative profile or display assuming that's some type of chart.

And then also provide some commentary, read through all the written comments that are in their section and provide some hopefully fact-based commentary.

And fact-based I mean the rather than interpret what people have said and what they might mean by it try and derive a commentary or summarize commentary based on what people actually wrote as objectively as possible.

And so what that gives us is each section has its own little quantitative summary, qualitative summary and the commentary that our reviewer, our primary reviewer offers.

And then once we've got those written I would suggest then we do a walk-through of what each person and what each volunteer has prepared to ensure that we feel that all of us feel that those preparations are consistent and represent the groups well.

And then at that point we would draft an executive summary of those sections as well as discuss any final conclusions that we'd like to offer out as a group.

So how do people feel about arranging the work and in that type of frame?  
Am I still on the call?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think basically that I think the strawman you prepared is a good way to go...

Michael Young: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...to try to split this up and have everybody write up something if the extent they can draw any commentary or conclusions from it and...

Michael Young: Great okay. Yes I was just trying to be very pragmatic Steve. And I thought, you know, it's a lot of info. We have to divide and conquer in creating a section summary.

And so also help people that want to read the report. Maybe they're not interested in all of the sections. Maybe they only want to read the results on one or two sections that are pertinent toward their interest set. So I think that would be useful for them as well as the executive summary.

So what I was going to suggest was rather than us go through and take everybody's time on the call to try and come up with the volunteer assignments is I was going to suggest that Berry I could put together a preliminary schedule and suggest volunteers, send the preliminary schedule around.

And then if someone would rather have section, you know, four versus Section 4 or all right, want to make some adjustments here and there, then we can just go back and forth on the list to get that settled out until everybody's assigned out and the work's accounted for.

And then Berry and I could probably because this is all administrative, really Berry and I could then turn around and suggest a delivery schedule that leads us towards doing the reviews.

What I'd like to do is try to parallelize the review effort and the actual writing effort. So some of you who schedules would accommodate getting your sections done earlier would be the first up for the group to review.

And those that have, you know, maybe an opening to do your work a little bit later would be toward the back end of the schedule for us going through as a group. So does that make sense to everybody?

Berry Cobb: And Avri and Susan had their hand raised.

Avri Doria: I have a question...

Michael Young: Sure.

Avri Doria: ...which is is there any value -- and I don't know whether I agree with what I'm about to say or totally disagree with what I'm about to say in assigning...

Michael Young: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...the same people that wrote the questions the second part, the first half at the evaluation?



And I'm just curious about that, you know, giving this some thought and making it easier as opposed to totally doing new assignments to topics that may or may not be as well understood by the person you're signing it to. But it's just a thought.

Having written a question you might be absolutely the wrong person to be doing the analysis. And that's why I wasn't sure whether I agreed with what I was saying or not. But I just wanted to throw it on the table to be considered.

Michael Young: You know, Avri I think my first response to that is I've got to tell you Berry and I sat - would sit down and do the schedule I think that would probably be the knee-jerk reaction for us to try to assign people out that way as a first go. So I think - yes go ahead.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I was just going to say I'll take action to put a chart together of each section and who the original assignee was for that section.

Obviously we've had a few members depart. And then like you said Michael then we can either look to assign it or leave it blank and look for volunteers to help fill the gap.

Michael Young: Yes as far as them being the right or wrong person to look at their own work it's not like we came up with the - I - Avri I'd be more concerned with it being the same person in terms of objectivity if A, we had so many resources that were all experts in the different areas we could afford to be that careful.

And secondly if we had derived all the source materials for the survey I think it would be more of a concern.

But we started with a document that drove our questions. And really what our questions were was an interpretation of existing materials. So I don't feel like we're in any kind of meaningful conflict.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I - this is Avri again. I tend to agree and that's why I originally had the suggestion. But in uttering the suggestion it just occurred to me that the perhaps the adverse was true and so I said that. But obviously my first reaction was that it would be okay.

Michael Young: Okay. So if I - you know, that's where you and I stand. Does is everyone else okay with that approach?

Susan Prosser: This is Susan.

Michael Young: Or should I...

Susan Prosser: I agree with it.

Michael Young: Great, okay. Are - I have to start asking these things in the negative I think so that everyone has to (run open) to the phone. Does anyone object to it I guess I should ask?

So okay, I don't hear any objections and Susan thank you for that. I think Berry you and I will do it that way initially.

Berry Cobb: That sounds good. And this is Berry. I'll also take the action item to - or I'll be the first to volunteer I am going to take the profile sections. And but...

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...my reason for doing that is that I'll create a template for each of the assigned groups to work from so that we have a standard template that then we can fold all into the final report.

Michael Young: Okay. So where are we on the agenda then Berry after that? We've got some action items there but I just want to do a check of where we are in...

Berry Cobb: Essentially - this is Berry. Essentially that's it except for moving into new business and just review the action items. But I think we reviewed through your straw man from top to bottom.

Michael Young: Okay. So Berry do you just want to - I think the action items then I'll throw out the ones I have in my head. And if I've missed any just throw them against a - well while before I do that does anyone have anything else they wanted to raise or bring up or that falls (unintelligible) new business?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. I really just have one point to raise and we should keep in mind as we do this. And I don't know the answer to the question but who do we think is the main audience for this report that we're preparing? Is this...

Michael Young: Well it was requested by the GNSO counsel so I'm assuming that is our initial audience. And then of course when you see the GNSO council you really are talking about everybody and everything that's involved with the stakeholder model in ICANN could potentially be reading it.

Plus all we tried to get participation from outside of ICANN so there'll be a number of stakeholders from outside of ICANN that'll probably read this.

But in particular like I'm thinking of the IETF folks that are working on (weirds) and so forth right now that just kind of next generation (unintelligible) call.

So but I think initially the requested it which (unintelligible) council.

Steve Metalitz: Okay it's just something we should keep in mind as we prepare it, you know, who is going to be reading it.

And I'm glad you mentioned the IETF because this was discussed in Toronto. They did not seem to be aware that this survey had been launched or at least their chair did not. So I think it's useful to keep them in mind, potential audience.

Michael Young: Yes, you know, Steve I'm a little exasperated by that one because Don raised it in the (weirds) list a few times. I raise it a couple of times not wanting to, you know, supplant Don's effort because that one is what he was tasked with.

But I just didn't feel like enough people were listening to it. And it sounds like from what you experienced not enough people are listening to it.

I'm not exactly sure how we short of standing on a table at the IETF meeting and lighting my hair on fire how we get people's attention.

So okay, you know, I struggle with that one. I think it's just, you know, the reality is with a group like the IETF it's almost all volunteers and people have day jobs.

And trying to get them to pay attention to things is challenging because they're overtaxed as a resource to start with generally speaking.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I don't have any solution to it but I guess...

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Steve Metalitz: ...this is something we should bear in mind as we prepare this report?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Anything we want...

Michael Young: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: ...can I...

Michael Young: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes on the IETF anything we really want to say, if we have results we put them in an Internet draft and we submit it as an Internet draft.

And we can say in the Internet draft that it's the results that come from this group. You know, yes we can do liaison type things too.

But an Internet draft sent to that group asks that group to pay attention to it. It's about as close as you can get to standing on the table and shouting.

Michael Young: You know what Avri that's a great idea. It's a lot of work formatting into an ID...

Avri Doria: It's not that hard.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...(conveniently)?

Avri Doria: It's not that hard.

Michael Young: So would you be willing to help with that?

Avri Doria: I'd certainly ask someone who's done far too many Internet drafts I'd be willing to help do that yes. I mean basically once you start using the XML formats it's really not hard at all.

Michael Young: Well that's fantastic. Okay. So yes that would be great. And hopefully yes that would definitely draw higher degree of attention. That's a great idea.

Okay it almost makes me wonder if you want to get their attention just to announce something in the future you could do it, an announcement as a idea as well but...

Avri Doria: No I...

Michael Young: ...you know...

Avri Doria: ...I think an ID if you want it to be taken seriously has to be content full.

Michael Young: Right, right. So we can do with the results. We just yes, we have to do the hand waving when we want to get them to do the survey. But the ID will work for the results. Okay, great. That's a great idea.

So Berry can you capture that just so we don't forget to come back to that when were done with the report?

Berry Cobb: You got it.

Michael Young: Okay. So action items I Anyone have anything else sorry?

Okay so action items. Berry and I are going to go away and draw up an assignment, a preliminary assignment with a preliminary schedule, suggested schedule that won't be finalized until we hear back from everybody.

And so I would ask that you try to respond quickly so we can at least finalize the schedule.

And based on when people deliver their sections Berry and I will do an additional schedule that will take us through suggested meeting times to do the walk-throughs and suggested time allocation to produce an executive summary and final conclusions again which will first be produced in the draft form for us to go through and agreed to in finalized with the group.

But I think really we still have a lot of work ahead of us. But I think I like, you know, personally I'd really like to see if we can't square this away and have it

all zipped up well before the next ICANN meeting so people can be actually discussing the results that we put out by the next ICANN meeting.

Avri Doria: If we want to do that I recommend doing some backwards scheduling and setting us a bunch of dates with that being the end date so that we have targets to meet.

Michael Young: Avri you flushed out my - our evil plans. You ask me...

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Michael Young: ...absolutely.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. I concur with the backward dating scheduling.

I'd just like to remind the working group that I think from the charter we're originally supposed to have this done in October. Then I tried to adjust the schedule so that we had this complete by the end of the year before holidays but that really only leaves us five meetings left.

So if we do choose to target beginning of April or before that we probably ought to have some communication with the council once we get the schedule together so that we can update the council with where we're at.

Yes Berry I suggest we get the schedule together, we come in as a group and we can make that schedule and then we talk to the council because I, you know, I don't want to have to do a reset with them again.

Berry Cobb: I think we'll...

Avri Doria: Who is our liaison?

Michael Young: What's that Avri?

Avri Doria: Who is this group's liaison to the council?

Berry Cobb: I believe it's (Wendy).

Michael Young: It was (Wendy).

Berry Cobb: And she's still on the council so I'll send a note to her just to confirm. And but yes I agree we shouldn't communicate to the council until we write our schedule and so...

Michael Young: Right. I'm only quasi-apologetic for the - for being late on this Berry because I don't think very many working groups first of all have as much real physical work we've all had to do, you know, some of them do but not that many have as much hands on work that this group's had to do.

And then none of them have had to live through the new gTLD program going on while they're trying to get their work done. So it is what it is when we're talking about people's time in volunteering.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, understood so now that we are on the topic of schedule right now we have a meeting scheduled for next Monday the 19th which is an American - well the Thanksgiving starts on a Thursday. Do we still want to try to have this session on Monday as well as the 26th being the week after Thanksgiving?

And I'd like to remind the working group that there is a policy retreat that'll be going on that week. So the Working Group's welcome to have a meeting but there probably won't be staff support for that.

Michael Young: Berry why don't we take that - well I don't think that it makes any sense to border the US Thanksgiving holiday with meetings given that how it is



probably the most major holiday in the US and people travel around it extensively.

Certainly the Monday after is going to have very poor attendance. And I think that the next leg of work and getting all the scheduling and stuff in place between you and I is stuff we can do in the list and individual phone calls to members of the group to get that ratified.

And then so I think we're talking the next meeting being probably two or three weeks out from now. And at that point we're probably going to go into a heavy duty schedule to get this done. But I rather I'd rather plan it out before we start throwing out meeting dates.

Berry Cobb: Okay sounds good. So just in terms of getting the next call scheduled I'll look to do that for the 3rd December. So that gives us two weeks after Thanksgiving basically.

Michael Young: Okay and so really just so everyone's expectation that first call back we'll be going through one or more of the sections that people have done their work on by that point. That would be the expectation that starts off a series of working calls where we're reviewing these section summaries or ratifying them.

Okay, all right Berry last call anyone else have anything to say?

Okay hearing nothing thank you everyone for your time. This is as always a lot of work and we're making progress slowly and painfully but we are making progress.

So and we're in the home stretch now so I'm looking forward to getting the results out. Thank you everyone for your time and effort.

Man: Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you all. Take care.

Woman: Thank you all.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thanks bye.

Michael Young: Bye.

END