WHOIS Study Group
Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 5 August 2008 15:00 UTC
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the WHOIS Study Group teleconference on5 August, at 15:00 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-sg-20080805.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Participants present:
Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice chair -gTLD Registry C
David Maher - gTLD Registry C
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Lee Eulgen - IPC
Tony Harris - ISP
Steve DelBianco - CBUC
James Bladel - Registrar
Tim Ruiz - Registrar
Alan Greenberg - ALAC Liaison on the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:
Liz Gasster
Patrick Jones
Glen de Saint Géry

Absent apologies
Ken Stubbs - gTLD Registry C
Olga Cavalli - NomCom appointee
Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Liaison on the ICANN Board
Eric Brunner-Williams -Registrar
Jordi Iparraguirre - Registry C

Coordinator: The recording has now started. If you're not talking, please press star 6 to mute your line. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Do people not already think that?

Man: But you're such a...

Chuck Gomes: What a way to start the recording, huh?

Man: You're a nice dork though.

Woman: Thanks, guys. I'm glad this is retained for posterity. Wow.

Man: Well, we waited for it to start.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, now that we have the - all that recorded, or at least part of it, let's get started.

Thanks, everybody, for joining and for the ongoing work on this.

Glen, you do such a nice job with the roll call, I'll let you do that since you were on the call after the other meeting.

Glen de Saint Géry: Chuck Gomes, the chair, Alan Greenberg from ALAC; David Maher, the Registry Constituency; Tim Ruiz, Registrar Constituency James Bladel, Registrar Constituency; Steve Metalitz, IPC; Steve Del Bianco, BC, Business Constituency.

And for staff, we have Patrick Jones, Liz Gasster; and myself.

Have I missed off anybody?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks...

Glen de Saint Géry: Fine.

Chuck Gomes: ...everyone.

Any comments on the agenda before we start going through it?

All right, follow-up discussion then on what we - the work we did last week. And let's start with the Note Number 2 at the - for the table that Steve Del Bianco just added.

Steve, why don't you walk us through that? Maybe even read it?

Coordinator: Excuse me. Mr. Lee Eulgen had joined.

Steve Del Bianco: I said that - Number 2 says that the hypothesis table below is intended to categorize, consolidate, and add relevant detail to the hypothesis originally submitted.

As council considers which of these studies which should be pursued, it will be up to the original study submissions. And I indicate the link. These original submissions include statements of how study results could lead to an improvement in WHOIS policy.

Many submitters also described the type of the survey or study needed, including data elements, data sources, populations to be surveyed, and template size. These original submissions should be used by council and its consultants in designing further studies and deciding which are worthwhile to pursue.

That's what (I said in the Wiki), and it's a theme that I've mentioned on multiple previous calls when I try to return to the original submissions to show that the submitter, in some cases, it was me (unintelligible) many of us who have shown that the submitter anticipated the kind of data elements that we need, the kind of a survey or study or test that would be required.

And I know that those original submissions are difficult to find, it is difficult to wade through them, but I think it would be a complete waste to throw away the thoughts that went into them when council decides what next steps to take.

Chuck Gomes: And we agreed last week to add a statement like this and I think it makes perfect sense.

Any discussion on what - on Steve's note?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I think the note is fine, but I wonder if we should also say that in some cases we had to provide a hypothesis or put - you know, draw a hypothesis out of the suggestion because it wasn't clearly stated in the - and that's certainly true.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody opposed to that? It sounds like a good idea to me.

Steve Del Bianco: I will add that to the first sentence and I'll say that in some cases the hypothesis had to be inferred from the original submission.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's fine. That's good.

Lee Eulgen: Yeah, this is Lee Eulgen. I just wanted to say I just joined and I would say I agree with that, too.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Lee), and welcome. I - we didn't see if - hear that you had joined. But since Steve Del Bianco started, I didn't want to interrupt, so.

Lee Eulgen: No, me neither.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Lee Eulgen: Thanks.

Steve Del Bianco: I'll go ahead with that sentence (as you move on).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, very good.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah?

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan.

Steve said - mentioned that the original documents are hard to find and hard to work through. We can't fix the latter but we can fix the former and make sure that we - in our final report, that we include either it's an easy way find or in a table, you know, (as a third) column what the original text was...

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Alan Greenberg: ...or a companion document or something...

Chuck Gomes: ...let me ask Liz if that's possible, Alan, in all cases because in some cases, the text gets pretty lengthy.

Alan Greenberg: Well, then let's have a companion document, you know, one by one so you can refer to them easily.

Liz Gasster: I can pool them all into one giant Word document. It's just going to be really big.

Alan Greenberg: Well, but if we're recommending...

Liz Gasster: I mean, I think you have a point.

Alan Greenberg: ...that someone look at them before making a decision, you know, I don't think we really have much option.

Chuck Gomes: Well, that's going to be especially true. Well, I guess the council may need to do that some, but it's going to be especially true of any consultants that we - that may be enlisted to look at, you know, how the studies might be designed. They're the ones we really want to look in detail. And it may, I don't know, it may be different consultants for different studies. So I'm not sure that it's all that useful to have everything all in one huge document as long as there are clear links to the studies.

Steve Del Bianco: Chuck, this is Steve. Can I speak to that?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Steve Del Bianco: The risk of just simply pasting them all in is that we'll - we won't have added judgment about which parts of the original submissions actually are relevant. And that's something we have gone through (with them) for these submissions so far.

So, I do believe we should have a link, a hyperlink, to the original page. And I provided that at the top of the Wiki today, there's a link up there now to WHOIS study suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Steve Del Bianco: It includes the page where they're listed, and it includes the form that we were asked to submit them in. And that's important.

But I believe that as we prepare our final report, it won't be that difficult to jump back over then to the original submissions. Scan it quickly to see where is it clear that the submitter put time and thought into the implications on policy where the submitter said this has to be a test and not a survey, or where the submitter actually indicated data elements.

It won't be but a few extra hours of - I'm sorry - sorry to say this, but probably Liz' time to pool that stuff into our final submission, our final report, because it's too much to expect people to constantly link back to the original and figure out what's important and what's not.

Liz Gasster: Steve, it's no problem for me. Whatever the group thinks makes sense, I'm happy to.

Chuck Gomes: Well, in our final report, I want - now are the - let me ask the question of Liz.

Are the - are there separate - is it easy to separately link each study suggestion? And the reason I'm asking that is I wonder if on our final report, within each study area, we should provide the link to that specific suggestion.

Liz Gasster: I can do that, too.

Chuck Gomes: I mean, is - that would make it really clear as we go through. And if that's, you know, if they do have separate links, that might be - make it very clear what the direct reference in the table to each study.

What - thoughts on that?

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve.

I think that's necessary but not sufficient because it doesn't add the other element, which is, you know, in judgment about which part of those submissions should be looked at. We can't rely on the reader to always click the link. But in fact, if we highlight and pull up parts of it that it clearly demonstrated that some thought went into it and if we think it's relevant to the council's consideration, it should be repeated in our final document, not just linked.

Tim Ruiz: That's not part of our mandate, Steve. We're supposed to be coming up with hypothesis. We're getting a little bit away from that as it is. But, you know, to start saying, well, here's relevant - other relevant portions

of these proposals that you should take into account, I mean, that's not what we were asked to do.

Steve Del Bianco: Is that Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yup, Tim.

Steve Del Bianco: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's an excellent point. I want to try to refresh my memory about our charter. When - were we restricted to only actually summarizing, categorizing hypothesis, or were we asked to provide council with the information to consider for whether to pursue any further studies.

Tim Ruiz: It's pretty narrow to make - so there's a clearly stated rehypothesis or hypotheses for each study.

                  Now, the...

Man: Did they allow for including, you know, information as to why we - (enough with that) hypothesis which we're doing somewhat in different ones. But I think, you know, pointing out other relevant portions of the proposals, you know, has been - like you're suggesting, is getting kind of beyond what we...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Now, it's been my opinion all along that anything we can do without getting too far off of mission to facilitate the council making some decisions will be helpful and appreciated. I guess my question...

Man: And I think the Note Number 2 there on the Wiki is getting there, right? I mean, that's a general note. I think we're all in agreement to include that - you know, it makes it clear that, you know, there's more to consider here than just this hypothesis which I'm sure the council understand anyway, but...

(Crosstalk))

Man: So I already have that note included.

Man: Yeah. Now, Steve Del Bianco, it's not clear how we would accomplish what you're doing without adding quite a significant amount of information to the report. What are you exactly thinking? How would you fit it into a report to accomplish what you're doing?

Steve Del Bianco: It's a fair question. So I'll just use an example.

Area 6 is what I worked on last week. And under Area 6, once we consolidate one of the core hypotheses would be some registrants are not revealing the registered data as required under the RAA. You'll all remember that discussion.

In the submission for that study, Study Number 3, we indicated in the submission that this wouldn't actually be a survey. Well, it would have to be a test where we would actually provide evidence of actionable harm to a certain number of proxy servers and determine the amount of time and accuracy with which the reply came back.

And I could be wrong here, but I have felt that that suggestion will help to inform council about whether to proceed or not. And it defines the scope and difficulty and, to some extent, informs the costs of doing a study, a test in this case that will figure that out. And then also demonstrates to council that this isn't something that would be picked in the routine audit that (Doug Res) is doing on registrar compliance today since nothing I've seen indicates that those audits include tests of the (reveal) obligation.

So I'm at a dilemma, folks. I think Tim is right about scope. And I hate scope (creep). I really do. But we had put a lot of work into this. So when it gets to council, let's design the most expeditious way that the readers with some report will know that there's more than just a summary, and it will be easy for them to click over and find it. I guess that was Chuck's point about putting a hyperlink.

Every place where we indicate a study submission, that ought to be a hyperlink to the original. And that gets halfway there.

And if this group feels that it's too - it goes too far, if we start pasting in what we think is relevant, then I'll go along with the group.

Chuck Gomes: Let me make a suggestion in a way to handle this because what I really like - I really want as soon possible to get to the point where we can send back the hypothesis we've drafted to the submitters who were not involved in the group so that we can, you know, get their - get any comments they have in a short time period.

So what I'd like to suggest, if there's no opposition, is that we defer this particular issue and how we handle it until we get the hypothesis done,

which will probably mean the next meeting and maybe we'll even finish them this meeting, so that we can get that time clock started in getting some responses back if there are any.

Is that - anybody opposed to that approach?

Liz Gasster: I mean, Chuck, I like the approach; it's Liz. But I have an additional suggestion, too. I need to go back and look at the first document that we compiled that actually had more of the description of what the study was and the methodology too because I still think they were abbreviated descriptions but they were more robust in a way that I think Steve is trying to get at.

And I could take another look at that and maybe add the link to that and see if we could use that as an appendix or attachment. That would at least have more color to the details associated with each one. And I'd be happy to work with Steve, if he's willing, to go see that up, you know, check it and make sure, you know, it's a good reflection. But it might be a starting point that's already been done that we could work from.

Chuck Gomes: Steve, are you willing to do that with Liz?

Steve Del Bianco: Of course.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: It's like putting a couple of dorks together. We'll be fine.

Liz Gasster: Nice dorks, nice dorks.

Chuck Gomes: We have two dorks on this group.

Liz Gasster: But Alan said we were nice. So I want to hold that.

Tim Ruiz: Chuck, this is Tim. I just have one other - if we're good to go on that for now, I have one other request as far as minor changes.

Chuck Gomes: Well, anybody else have a comment on...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I have a quick comment. It's Alan.

I may not be on the next meeting so I'll say it now so maybe someone will remember.

I think the real issue that I started off this discussion was to make sure that whoever comes next to this process has access, reasonably ready access. And I would hate all the work we did in preparing these hypotheses is lost. And somehow, you know, if we can make - do something easy, you know, whether it's simply taking the original text and highlighting what the person who wrote the hypothesis thinks are the pertinent parts, just to make sure that they don't - that the next group doesn't have to redo all the work we did all over again, or, worse, miss something important that we got.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Anybody else before Tim have the floor again?

Okay, Tim?

Tim Ruiz: You know, just in the first note on the Wiki, it reads that - the sentence, it talks about throughout this document the term "registrant" or "registrant data," the first two one is sometimes called the actual registrant or customer of the Proxy Privacy Service. I think that that is more - would be more accurate by saying it's sometimes called the beneficial user or customer of the Proxy Privacy Service because not in all cases - I mean, in some cases, the actual registrant, just as the 3.7.7.3 there states, is the Proxy Privacy Service. They are the registered nameholders.

                 So it seemed a little contradictory there, and it's probably more accurate to say that they're sometimes called the beneficial user or customer like a Proxy Privacy Service.

Chuck Gomes: Tim, could you - and so you're changing the first part of the note? Is that right? Why don't you repeat that for Liz' benefit?

Tim Ruiz: I'm changing two words; so the first sentence would read, "Throughout this document, the term 'registrant' or 'registrant data' refers to what is sometimes called the beneficial user or a customer of the Proxy Privacy Service."

Chuck Gomes: Any objections to that?

Liz Gasster: Tim, do you think that should still be in quotes? Beneficial user?

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Okay, I think so too. I wanted to check with you.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Any opposition to that?

Man: No, no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay. Good.

                Next...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All right, if there's nothing else on that for now, and thanks, Steve and Liz, for volunteering to work on the - that other issue.

Liz Gasster: And Steve, I'll get in touch with you offline on that.

Steve Del Bianco: Okay.

James Bladel: Chuck, this is (James).

Chuck Gomes: Yes, (James)?

James Bladel: Just real quickly. We do want to mention in Note 2 any of our work relative to consulting the GAC questions?

Chuck Gomes: In particular, what are you suggesting?

James Bladel: Well, note to refer the council back to the original list of submissions. And I wonder if there is a separate need for a separate Note 3 referring to the list of GAC questions or if that can be some kind of shoehorned into that paragraph that those were also considered and factored and associated with the most parallel hypothesis wherever appropriate.

Chuck Gomes: Now I was assuming that the GAC submissions were inclusive there. But the...

James Bladel: Let's make a separate note.

Liz Gasster: I have a suggestion. It's Liz.

Steve, you may not want to incorporate this within that - your suggestion. But what I - what we could do - we added that sentence anyway so it could it read, "The hypothesis table below is intended to categorize, consolidate, and add relevant details to the hypothesis originally submitted." In some cases, as with the GAC recommendation, the hypothesis needed to be inferred from the information submitted.

Steve Del Bianco: All right, I'll make that change right now.

Liz Gasster: Does that work for you?

Chuck Gomes: (James), is that good?

James Bladel: Yeah, that's perfect.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Gasster: I think that's a good suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Do we also want to put in a link to the GAC suggestion - this is Steve Metalitz. Do we also want to put in a link to the GAC suggestions along with our link to the original study submissions?

Steve Del Bianco: Absolutely, yes.

Chuck Gomes: And so they're not - have that link? So they don't really...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Chuck Gomes: A good (guess). It's a good (guess).

Liz Gasster: I'll add that, too.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Good. Anything else on the note?

Steve Del Bianco: So, Liz, you go ahead and make that change.

Liz Gasster: Yes, I will.

Steve Del Bianco: But make sure you (rephrase) first, Liz, because I had already put in the earlier suggestion.

Liz Gasster: Oh, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, the - so now we're to - last week, we developed hypotheses for Areas 5 and 6. I didn't see any discussion on the list on those. Does anybody have any points they want to bring up on those before we move on to Area 7?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve Metalitz. I just had one question.

On Recommendation 12, Liz says it's summarized - as it was summarized in our earlier documents, it didn't actually say anything about WHOIS accuracy. I assume registrations would become more accurate. I assume that refers to the accuracy of the WHOIS data.

And I'm sorry I missed this part of the discussion last week, but was that - is that - was that part of what was proposed there?

Chuck Gomes: Let's take a look at the...

Steve Metalitz: Because it just says inventory privacy and...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...law enforcement requirements for WHOIS. That's - again, that's just a summary.

Chuck Gomes: So 12 - let's see, I've got that, where's my - oh here we go. I was trying to find the - here it is, okay, Study 12 under Area 6. Let's see, that was submitted by (Wood Denacha) off of Netherlands. And it was inventory privacy and law enforcement requirements for WHOIS; that's where - and, Liz, there was a staff note, "No hypothesis was provided. The following was provided as (ability) for such a study," and that was the better that date in WHOIS is and the proportional access is assured, the less to need for strict rules for access will be.

Now, Steve Metalitz, when he is talking - when they're talking about the better that data is, do you not think that that's referring to accuracy?

Steve Metalitz: Gee, I guess it could be.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know. I'm just raising the question.

Steve Metalitz: Accuracy and completeness.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Just some in Wiki - somewhere in that criminology.

Chuck Gomes: No, I was - I had a work table that Liz and (Voltare) with brief summaries and I was just reading from that.

Steve Metalitz: Got it, got it.

Liz Gasster: I think it was not the most articulate submission. I think it was probably be a language issue.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's a language issue, but...

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: But I guess my - just as when I saw this in the - you know, this
                 hypothesis, was there any discussion last week about how you would
                 test this hypothesis? Registrations would become more accurate if the
                 sensitive information that private persons can be secured while giving
                 law enforcement act? I mean, maybe that's not our job, but it's just...

Steve Metalitz: I don't remember how - we can do that in some case because I don't
                    remember if we did on this one. But let's just look at this. Is there
                    maybe an easy way to fix the hypothesis to deal with your concern? I
                    don't know that anybody was, you know, locked in to the word
                    accurate. Is there suggestion as how we might reword this to better
                    express it?

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve Del Bianco. I had tried to infer this to Study
                      Submission Number 12. And what he really talked about, he had a
                      multi-part topic. He kept talking about accuracy data implying that the
                      submitters will lie about who they simply are, they are afraid, it will be
                      misused. So to the extent that (they are secured), that it's not misused,
                      they would be more willing to put in accurate information.

Chuck Gomes: Cool, okay. So did he use the word accurate? Or is that your...

Steve Del Bianco: He quote - I'll use it; his utility was "the better the data is - in
                      WHOIS." He talked about the better data. He talked about how can
                      registrations become fault proof so the word fault proof. This is a tough

one. If you look at the suggestion and it's not as a - it doesn't really adhere to the kind of rigor vocabulary we've been trying to use.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And is he really talking about registration would become more accurate or registration information?

Man: For WHOIS data I mean.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, WHOIS data is probably even better, yeah.

Man: I think he's talking about WHOIS data.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Steve Del Bianco: I believe it's WHOIS data.

Liz Gasster: Okay, I'll make that change.

Chuck Gomes: Now what about the word accurate so that Steve raised, Steve Metalitz?

Man: That's subject to intentional falsification.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Man: Yeah, yeah makes sense. Again, I'm still not quite sure how you're going to test this hypothesis.

Chuck Gomes: Most would just spend it with - a little bit of time thinking about that. So we're talking about WHOIS data would be - right now if we just reword

it, WHOIS data would become more accurate if the sensitive information of private persons can be secured of giving law enforcement access.

Steve Del Bianco: The only way to test that is to survey people that state that they gave false information in WHOIS and say to them, "If you were assured that the data were secured and only law enforcement had access, would you be inclined to put accurate information in?"

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this is the kind of thing I think that could be tested in a longitudinal study where you get a good sampling before anything has done to protect privacy and giving law enforcement access. And then, doing it again, over a few years afterward might be tested that way. I'm not sure it's the kind of study that would be practical for us to do. But I suppose it could be if you did on a long-term study like that.

Liz Gasster: You know, the other thing is that that plan I guess is for the council would select some studies for to be scoped further and that would be part of scoping, how realistic it would be to actually...

Chuck Gomes: I understand that.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, yeah. Because I think that's really tough.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I would think that what Steve Del Bianco just said might be helpful, if those things would become more accurate, let's say would become less subject to intentional falsification.

Man: And to Steve, to put that a little further, we could say that registrant would be less likely to falsify their WHOIS data, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have a problem with that? That sounds good to me.

Man: No, it sounds good.

Liz Gasster: Got it.

Chuck Gomes: You got it?

Liz Gasster: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else on Areas 5 or 6? Thanks Steve Metalitz for that -
                 bringing that one up. And I think that is much better.

                 Okay, let's go to Area 7. And (James) submitted some starting points
                 for us on Study 8 first of all. And note in his study he has a couple
                 parenthetical inserts in the first one there. His suggestion was some
                 registrars knowingly tolerate inaccurate or falsify WHOIS data to
                 financially gain from spammers and other bad actors and because
                 there are no consequences for doing so. And then, the provided
                 hypothesis or hypotheses were provided there as well.

                 Discussion on that.

James Bladel: Hi, Chuck. This is (James).

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to point out that there were four
                 elements I thought within this study that I wanted to get captured in a

hypothesis whether we want a long turn out sentence like that one or whether we want it to break them up in two separate A, B, C. I would leave that to the group.

But the four elements were there was that awareness element that registrars were aware that there was inaccurate data in their WHOIS, that there's a correlation or link between the submission of false data and spammers and I added other bad actors. There was an implication of a financial benefit to registrars for tolerating this and then the final element from the study was that there's absolutely no enforcement or negative consequences for doing this, but try to kind of (glam) those all into a single sentence so to (unintelligible) we can work on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (James).

Thoughts on that?

Steve Metalitz: Well, the one thing I would mention here is that the - this is Steve Metalitz, I'm sorry. The original proposal said this would be based on non-response to WHOIS data problem reports. And first, that doesn't - I mean that's how - I mean that's how registrars would know about this. So I think (James) is captured by saying registrars knowingly tolerate.

But I just would point out that again this kind of overlaps pretty significantly with something that contract compliance unit is already doing. Again maybe this is not our role to point that out. But I just wanted to - so I suggest we want to mention.

Chuck Gomes: Now when we combine four elements like as done here, does it make it a little more complicated in terms of a testable hypothesis and I

guess what is the question I'm asking is, is it better to separate it into multiple hypotheses instead of one all encompassing one?

Thoughts on that.

I don't have strong feeling one way or another. I just want to throw that as a question for discussion.

Are people - anybody not comfortable with what (James) has proposed here or any suggested changes?

So in other words, we could remove the parenthesis and if the hypotheses for Study 8 would be some registrars knowingly tolerate either inaccurate or falsified WHOIS data to financial gain from spammers and other bad actors and because there are no consequences of doing.

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve Del Bianco. I have a question.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Steve Del Bianco: (James), two questions really. The first is do we imply something like financial gain? Are we implying the financial interest or is it just inferring that they simply keep the fees and people who shouldn't otherwise be allowed to register the domain.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...an interest being implied just keeping fees.

James Bladel: I think that it - I think the implication is that these - because it says that the actually text from the original study is, "These registrars benefit financial by harboring spammers." So I can't believe there's any skin in the game beyond the fee.

Steve Del Bianco: So given - and I agree with that interpretation having read the original. And I don't want to see overly (unintelligible) here, as if they're getting a cut or a take from the money that's made by spammers and (fraudsters). All we're really implying by these hypotheses is that they earn and retain fees for registration and is there a way to change the way the language read to remove the implication that they're participating financially in the spam.

Chuck Gomes: And as I correct (James) that the study proposed is that there was no indication that they met some sort of collaborative effort in regard to financially gaining from spam or something like that.

Liz Gasster: Or you could say to retain fees from spammers instead of financially gain.

Man: Or from registrations by...

Man: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Right, to retain fees from registrations by spammers.

Steve Del Bianco: Yes, I think that would be helpful.

     (James), does it make sense to that?

James Bladel: That's excellent.

Steve Del Bianco: And the second...

Liz Gasster: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: ...question is when council receives this, immediately somebody, a staff, is going to say, "Wait a minute, we're already doing audit and data access. Do we really have a program underway for that?" And so it only helps council if we describe ways in which this (unintelligible) is not covered by WHOIS data accuracy that's going on today and in existing program.

Steve Metalitz: Well, this - and this is Steve Metalitz. This is really my point which was not so much from WHOIS data accuracy, but this whole separate audit on WHOIS data problem response, you know, how our registrars responding to data problem reports that they receive.

I'm just saying we might want to flag this, but that whoever takes this the next step on this if they do, probably ought to talk to the contract compliance to try to minimize overlap.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I think that's going to have to be done in several of these studies. And that accounts is going to need to take that into consideration here. And I think that will pretty naturally be a focus by the council when it makes decisions on which of these to take to the next step.

Now, the question I guess is do we need to comment on that here? And, you know, defer to the group on that in terms of what you want to do.

Man: Could we get there by just modifying the hypotheses slightly by saying that after that - after the comma there, because the consequences for doing so do not serve as sufficient deterrent.

Chuck Gomes: Reaction for that?

Steve Metalitz: Well, I think - this is Steve. I think we've got two separate questions here. One is maybe we should think about putting a separate note since we've already got two notes maybe we can have a third note that says, in evaluating these, the council may want to talk with the contract compliance staff to minimize overlap or something like that. I mean that applies to several of these, it's not that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, it does. It really does.

Steve Metalitz: ...so maybe we just have a general statement like that.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I think that's not a bad idea. With that actually - that's a good idea I think.

Steve Metalitz: The second point is that, you know, looking at this we've been trying to minimize statements of causation here if we're - just we're trying do factual studies. And maybe we should just say I'd like the idea that sanctions are not sufficient to deter them. Maybe we need to change

this into registrars who - registrars that knowingly tolerate inaccurate or falsified WHOIS data; one financially gain from the registration fees - not bad actors; and two, are not deterred by any enforcement consequences or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Now, one concern I have with that, Steve, is that it's the very first part. I think one part of the hypothesis is that there are some registrars who knowingly tolerate and the way you worded it, it kind of - that wasn't so much something that we kept it as it was an assumption I think.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, maybe we would say any registrars who knowingly tolerate. But you're right, maybe that is part of our hypotheses too.

Chuck Gomes: Is that right, (James), part of our hypotheses is that there are some knowingly tolerate inaccurate?

James Bladel: I agree, Chuck, that there are four questions here and that we can combine them in a tortured sentence or we can break them up, but if we start to put them into a hierarchy of sorts, I think that that's kind of the interpretation that someone would take away.

Chuck Gomes: You know, I'm back to the question I asked before, does it make sense to break these up into several different hypotheses rather than one big one?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I kind of like (James)'s tortured sentence here actually because I think it really does kind of cover between and maybe we should just I mean leaving the first part of the sentence as it is and then with that change about financial gain, I just want to take the word because out of there...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...because that just implies or actually states causation. And we just say and do not face or and suffer no deterrent consequences for doing so.

Chuck Gomes: Or do not face sufficient consequences.

Steve Metalitz: Well, deterrent I think was a good...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's - I'm comfortable with that. So whether we have...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: We do not face deterrent consequences for doing so instead of and because there are.

Chuck Gomes: Any problems with that?

Man: Makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: So what do you have, Liz?

Liz Gasster: Hang on. Some registrars knowingly tolerate inaccurate or falsified WHOIS data to retain fees from registrations by spammers and do not face consequences for doing so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and other bad actors; did you have other bad actors?

Liz Gasster: Oh, and other bad actors, right. And do not face sufficient consequences for doing so.

Chuck Gomes: Deterrent consequences.

Liz Gasster: Deterrent. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You got all that?

Liz Gasster: Yup.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, any further discussion on that?

Okay. All right, then let's go to Hypothesis 11 and, (James), I'll let you to talk about this one.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks.

For Hypothesis 11, I would like to really throw this out to the group and see if there's any consensus for determining whether this is within scope of our task or whether we should really market it as out of bound. But the way I the restated the hypothesis was the inclusion of non-ASCII character sets in - and there's a parenthetical there are certain field of either Web based or (Port 43) WHOIS records will detract from data accuracy and readability.

And my note there was that the study appears to touch on the equal challenges of implementing non-ASCII character sets and WHOIS and some of the confusion that can arise and also the potential for homographic attach.

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve Del Bianco. I was the submitter for Number 11.

James Bladel: Oh, okay.

Steve Del Bianco: And let me try to clarify a little bit. I think you've captured it as well and it maybe out of scope, but I'll make the best clarification I can and then we can all decide.

Whatever the new (visual) hypothesis was the use IDN characters, I didn't write non-ASCII, I said IDN. I think we all know what that means now. The use of IDN characters and TLD specifically, will impair the access and readability of WHOIS records displaying the domain name, email addresses and name server addresses.

What I was getting at there is that WHOIS data to the extent it includes domain will include TLDs and to the extent IDNs will introduce the TLD space, there will be IDN character showing up in WHOIS record being read by law enforcement to the extent that public (reason) and also Consumer Protection Bill.

And what I'm concerned about is that certain in some case homographic and what do we hear, that the (Cyrillic) paypal.com looks just like the ASCII, but they're not the same, that there probably are opportunities for inaccuracy. It will be introduced by having allowing TLDs to be displayed in WHOIS.

I'm not suggesting in anyway that that would lead to disallowing it. But it might change the way the WHOIS is displayed and change the

standards of display to ensure that they're continued to be read accurately by those who do have original reasons to read it.

Chuck Gomes: Now, this particular issue is one that raises all kinds of questions on my mind.

First of all, my understanding and correct me if I'm wrong is that we really don't have an adequate WHOIS protocol to deal with IDN whether it's the second level or top level or anything. Am I correct on that?

James Bladel: Chuck, I think that's correct although we have the varying degree of support for IDN through the Web-based WHOIS that are offered by registries and registrars, but the underlying protocol, you're correct, is that there is not currently IDN support or is not defined outside of the ASCII space.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

In the case of Web-based WHOIS (Port 80), there's no standard, right? Registrars do - each do their own thing in that regard. Am I correct on that? And as far as displaying IDN characters.

James Bladel: I think that there are browser dependencies and there are data storage dependencies on whether the registrar is storing only the localized IDN contact information or whether they are storing that, plus some sort of encoding like similar to pin codes but you're correct and that there's a variety of different ways that can be implemented.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Tim Ruiz: We - even in - this is Tim. Even (Port 43), I mean, there seems to be
                 some 0 not necessarily an adherence to the strict standard of ASCII
                 only in (Port 43) so we think we've seen that too.

                 And then, I just like to comment on the scope issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. You know, I just wonder if that's really a question we need to
                 answer. You know, whether the proposed is or isn't within scope of
                 what. I mean, our scope is to try to define the testable hypothesis, I
                 mean, the scores that we can get for the proposed study. And I think
                 (James) made a fairly good stab at that.

                 And then the discussion about the scope would be reserved more for
                 accounts of deliberation and not necessary something we have to try
                 to figure.

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve Del Bianco.

                 Tim is right and when the council tries to figure out about scope, that's
                 one of these great examples where I would refer council straight back
                 to the original submission. Because in the original submission I said
                 there wasn't a study needed instead, this requires the technical
                 analysis because, remember the WHOIS submissions, there were two
                 things you could submit -- a study/survey or a technical analysis.

                 And I said, that this requires a technical analysis of how the entry of
                 IDN, TLDs and WHOIS information could increase risks of inaccurate

data particularly through use of client site software that fails to properly check the syntax of a field that might contain both IDN and ASCII strength and that will often be the case with email addresses and name server record.

I said that this analysis should examine and recommend methods to display IDN-based WHOIS information such as those who access WHOIS can effectively read, recognize and reliably use the information to reach the registrar and contact the name server resources.

I said there was no data needed, since it's just a technical analysis, the kind of analysis that staff might do or consultants might do, but it would certainly lead to useful policy changes, like a standardization on how registrars enter information with syntax checking and standards on how it's displayed and standard on how it's registered to (Port 43).

Chuck Gomes: So, Steve, this is an excellent example of the point you're making earlier in terms of going back to the original study. And based on what you just said and this is one of the reasons why I was struggling with this one is that it's really not so - a study it's a technical analysis and so, maybe a hypothesis isn't even appropriate here.

Steve Del Bianco: I think the hypothesis could still be there because frankly, if that accuracy is not a problem because of IDN, if IDN doesn't increase the accuracy problem then, you probably don't need to do the technical analysis but I think the hypothesis probably still work.

Man: Maybe this is a case where, you know, we would add from, you know, we would add a note to the specific hypothesis to explain and make it clear that the, you know, hypothesis should be looked at in light of the

fact that this is a suggestive technical analysis and not a proposed study. In that way...

Steve Del Bianco: I think you're right.

Man: Yeah. Certainly make some kind of prejudgment that this is out of scope or whatever based on hypothesis.

Steve Del Bianco: Right. The last thing I want to suggest is to go out and survey the records that are being used today with IDNs in them.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah.

Steve Del Bianco: It's not at all we're talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. This is a case I think where that note is really needed. Anybody disagree with that?

Steve Del Bianco: If all we do is provoke ICANN to study it and come up with a policy on how the data's gathered and displayed, we look on a service to the community so, we don't want to miss that chance.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And this is a real wide issue. I mean, regardless of we have say on this one, this - the whole WHOIS issue with regard to IDNs have lots of potential issues that need to be resolved and haven't been. So totally aside from all the other issues with WHOIS, putting those in the background, there are some real issues here.

So what do we have in terms of the suggested note with this hypothesis is what again?

James Bladel: Chuck, this is (James).

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

James Bladel: Just a further question and maybe it's just something I'm not getting clear on, but when using words like IDN and non-ASCII character sets somewhat interchangeably and, Steve, you know, help me with the submission. You were specifically addressing contact information fields, correct?

Steve Del Bianco: I said three things, the Contact Information Field, the Domain Names and the Name Server Addresses as because they were all elements of WHOIS...

James Bladel: Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: ...they all contain TLD.

James Bladel: Okay. So the domain name and the name servers would have an encoding standard, but the contact information would not, it would have to be stored either in a look-alike character set, a non-ASCII character set or there will have to be some to be determined the encoding standard for that. Is that...

Steve Del Bianco: (James), I would say that - I would stored - I would say, it's completely up to the registrar. I was getting at how it is entered by the user and it have to be syntax checking.

And number two, how it is displayed to those who are allowed to have access. So, how it's stored is up to folks like Tim, right? But I would say that how it's entered and how it's displayed is what matters to the community.

Man: Yeah. And even if the technical analysis doesn't touch on it, I mean, I think it even extends into things like the name fields, the address field I think could all potentially be affected and some of this registry in IDN, this will high likelihood that, you know, we're going to be doing - entering the other contact fields in another language as well potentially.

Steve Del Bianco: You know, that's something I am afraid I had missed and that's a very wise statement. I was focusing on IDN and the TLD portions of the information what you're bringing up is the first (unintelligible) phone number which contain no TLDs, it might also contain non-ASCII characters. Is that your point?

Man: Yeah. Right. Exactly. Yeah. And then, those are issues we struggle with as we looked at IDN implementation and what really makes sense for, you know, the registrants are going to be highly interested in that and things to move forward. So, you know, I don't mean to just get us all of track here but I just think it's - first I think it's a big enough issue that it's worth considering and I wouldn't want to call this out of scope, it still affects WHOIS policy, you know, and I think it's, you know, something that should be seriously considered. So whatever we have to do to add a note here to make sure that that's clear, I think we should do it.

Chuck Gomes: So what again is the note that we're adding?

Tim Ruiz: Well, I will suggest the - this is Tim again. I was suggesting that it'd be something like that the hypothesis should be considered in light of the fact that this is a proposed technical analysis and not a proposed study.

Chuck Gomes: Get that, Liz?

Liz Gasster: I am typing. Hold it.

Steve Del Bianco: Would - Tim, the two sentences that I included in the submission which expanded that, I would have proposed that those sentences also make a way into our report and some folks feel that might be going too far.

The two sentences were that this requires a technical analysis of how the entry of IDN and TLDs and WHOIS information could increase the risks of an accurate data, particularly through client side software, that they also check the syntax of field.

And the second sentence is if this analysis should examine and recommend methods to display IDN-based WHOIS information such as those accessing WHOIS can effectively read, recognize and reliably use the information to reach the registrant contact the name server resources.

Tim, do you feel like that's relevant enough to pull it up into our table, into our report or whether our readers have to go and find that in the underlying submission?

Tim Ruiz: Well, you know, I'm not sure how others would feel about it but I guess I would be okay with that in there as, you know, as a quote from the report so, you know, we can include the note, you know, for example, you know, the technical analysis requests and then quote or something to that effect.

Steve Del Bianco: I'd be very happy with that.

Chuck Gomes: I really do see this one as a special case where I think that's justifiable in contrast the way we've handled all the others, what - anybody disagree with that?

Liz Gasster: So it's Liz. We would have a (unintelligible) sentence that says, "Note, the hypothesis should be considered in light of the fact that this is a proposed technical analysis and not a study." And then, we would insert Steve's language.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's correct.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: Great. And I would go further to Tim and (James) have gone one better than me because here I was only focusing on the IDNs and the TLDs, but more broadly it's non-ASCII characters in any okay the WHOIS information, like the address, phone number and name.

Liz Gasster: So how would that change from the hypothesis that's there - that (James) wrote?

Steve Del Bianco: (James) is probably better than what I have.

Liz Gasster: Okay. So I can delete the brackets?

James Bladel: We could - Liz this is (James) we could - for example, say something
                 to be effective the inclusion of IDNs in - and I...

Steve Del Bianco: In TLDS...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...using the term fully qualified Domain Names and non-ASCII
                 characters in contact information it becomes a little bit of a complicated
                 sentence. But if we associate IDNs with the TLDs and the Domain
                 Names and then non-ASCII characters with the contact information,
                 name, address and phone number then maybe that - those two would
                 go together more clearly.

Steve Del Bianco: I'd agree with that, (James), that's a good point.

Liz Gasster: So we would have the inclusion of IDNs and TLDs and non-ASCII
                 characters that in contact - in the contact information of you want to
                 use Web-based to (Port 43)?

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve Del Bianco. I would recommend not putting Web site-
                 based in (Port 43) because...

Liz Gasster: WHOIS reference.

Steve Del Bianco: ...they are just access methods to the underlying data and we want
                 to look at all access methods whether it's Web-based or (Port 43) to be

sure that they are providing a consistent and readable and usable information to the reader.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I agree with you, Steve, it doesn't belong there anymore and we should just go right to WHOIS records, we'll detract from data accuracy and readability. I would point out that, you're - I guess you're right, there are methods that are retrieval but they will handle it very differently and I think there's a - treating them as equals would probably hamstring the technical analysis.

Steve Del Bianco: We need to identify those two different methods in the technical analysis sentences that we're going to throw in the bottom.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's a good place for it.

Liz Gasster: Steve, you want shoot me over that couple of sentences once you've got it?

Steve Del Bianco: Yeah. I'll just cut and paste it from the original submission analysis report; okay.

Chuck Gomes: And did you want to add the broader definition in terms of contact information, Steve?

Steve Del Bianco: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

Steve Del Bianco: Good point.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So without having Steve's exact language again, then what do we have now, Liz?

Liz Gasster: We have the inclusion of IDNs and TLDs and non-ASCII character set in contact - in the contact information of WHOIS records will detract from data accuracy and readability. Note, the hypothesis should be considered in light of the fact that this is a proposed technical analysis and not a study and then, we would insert Steve's texts.

Chuck Gomes: You know, one thing I don't understand is why do we have in TLDs in there, because does it really matter whether it's at the top level or the second level, the problems are the same is it not?

Man: We can say TLDs or Domain Names but I think the email address, the Domain Names and the email address, the Domain Name and the Name Servers maybe foreign to that particular TLD.

Steve Del Bianco: Here's how it might read, "This requires technical analysis of how use of IDNs and Domain Names and use of non-ASCII characters and WHOIS contact information." But is IDN redundant with non-ASCII characters?

Man: Not really, I wouldn't think so, but throw that out to the smarter folks on the team.

Chuck Gomes: It seems redundant to me, but do you think in that, (James)?

James Bladel: When I think about IDN I think of - there is an encoding or a mapping between IDN represented in ASCII that's not true of non-ASCII character sets.

Chuck Gomes: But non-ASCII character sets...

James Bladel: Are non-standards.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...is it not?

James Bladel: I'm sorry?

Chuck Gomes: Isn't non-ASCII character sets more precise than saying IDN characters? Because you're right, the whole IDN protocol and so forth involves an elaborate mapping scheme and lots of other things too. But basically, what we're talking about is non-ASCII character sets, are we not?

Man: For the contact field those - that is correct, that is precise and probably also, for the Name Server Name and the email addresses of the contact fields too. But those could also be IDN that the use of the phrase non-ASCII characters include IDN.

Man: And I think non-ASCII character is better because then there's no confusion over when some will sees IDN if they're thinking - when I say - when I see IDN I'm thinking the non-ASCII characters, someone else might see IDN and they might be thinking of the, you know, (PUNI code), ASCII mapping of those characters.

So - and I think that the point is, if the non-ASCII character sets that we're concerned about, not the, you know, mapped to ASCII (PUNI

code) which is not a problem probably better in itself can also affect readability, you know, (XN dash) (unintelligible).

Man: Right, right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...both the (PUNI code) representation and the localized character set?

James Bladel: I'm sorry I didn't hear it first...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: What I'm asking, (James), is, are you concerned about both the (PUNI code) representation, the (XN dash dash) and a bunch of ASCII characters being a problem as well as the localized representation in non-ASCII characters?

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Well, this is Tim. I can give you my opinion and it may not be the overwriting one, but that the (XN dash dash) whatever is the issue because that's not what consumers want to see in the record, it's not what they're going to really connect with or understand. What they're going to connect with and understand is the representation of that in their local language.

And so ultimately, that's where we feel, you know, we need to get to it, how can we give a fair representation of that in their local language which to - what they expect to see and then have that work and comply and meet all the needs that everyone sees or have in regards to the WHOIS context information.

So there's a lot of issues there, they're not - certainly not, you know, it's not cut and dry; there's no simple way to describe it, there's a lot of different issues associated with that. But that's ultimately the issue. You know, you've got the consumer who wants to see things in the local language that they've entered in and you've got users of that data who want to be able to be - understand it. And then maybe getting that in (XN dash dash) or in the local language; either one which could potentially cause problems given the certain - the current WHOIS standards.

Chuck Gomes: So in that case...

Tim Ruiz: I don't know if that helps or not I don't know, but...

Chuck Gomes: So in the case of Domain Names and anything else in the WHOIS record that uses the Domain Name, whatever level is that, it's both the localized display - display in the localized script and the (PUNI code) representation of the name that are issues in this case. In the case of contact information, it's really the localized script that were concerned with.

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve. This would be a surprising statement from me, but that is almost what I would say is beyond the scope of analysis suggestion by taking them just a little too far. It might be saying - it

might be safer to say that the technical analysis of how the use of non-ASCII characters and WHOIS data element might increase risk of inaccuracy particularly through use of client side software, et cetera.

So the use of non-ASCII characters and WHOIS data element becomes a catch phrase that I think covers entry and retrieval and storage of non-ASCII characters that are used as part of Domain Names or (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So Steve, then translate that into what you think the hypothesis should say now.

Steve Del Bianco: The inclusion - the use of non-ASCII characters and WHOIS data element will detract from data accuracy and readability.

Chuck Gomes: Comments on that? Anybody opposed, have any changes to that or any opposition to that?

Okay. And then we'll going to add on that, the general note and then the text, the modified text from these actual submissions. Is that right?

Steve Del Bianco: I slightly modified from the original submission to incorporate the comment that came up on this call.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's what I meant by the modified version. Got it.

So, Liz, are you with us?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I think so. The use of non-ASCII character sets in WHOIS record will detract from data accuracy and readability.

Chuck Gomes: I think that Steve struck the word sets and just use...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...characters.

Liz Gasster: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct, Steve?

Steve Del Bianco: That's right.

Use non-ASCII characters and IS - and word records so I could say data element which is more descriptive.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Steve Del Bianco: Is records okay?

Chuck Gomes: It's okay with me. Anybody oppose to that?

Now, do we want to include the parenthetical Web-based (Port 43) or is that unnecessary?

Man: I think that where we're including that in your language for the note, Steve?

Steve Del Bianco: Yes.

Man: So it can probably be removed from there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Got it.

Man: And we can remove the certain field of as well because that is captured in either record or data element.

Liz Gasster: Right. Got it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

              Anything else on Study 11?

Man: Just - this is out of - what I'm going to say is definitely out of scope for this, okay? But this discussion and this would mean more than ever that one of the things that GNS really needs to work on is this whole issue of WHOIS display involving (IDNA) and - but that's a totally separate issue not related to this one.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...Steve, really quickly. One of the things I think I pinged you early on working on this I would like to reach out to the original submitters. So it's great to have him on the call.

Man: You bet.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Area 8 then is other GAC recommendations and what I did on this one
is - (Erik Williams) who has a conflict every time we have this call had
made some suggestions for the GAC studies that are listed here -- 1,
5, 6 and 3.

Now, didn't we deal with one or two of those previously? GAC 1, let's
see, I thought I saw GAC 1, maybe not. Yeah. GAC 1 was in Area 5,
right? So we want to get back to that. And GAC 2 was in the area of 5
and we actually - so that's not one of these.

Okay. So the 1 is a that duplicate - what about 5, 6 and 3? Did we do
anything with those elsewhere? I'm just doing a quick scan here. I don't
think so. If anybody finds any one of those other three, I don't think so.

So I don't know - let's look at one realizing that we have already done
something with 1. So may want to just revert back to what we've
already done. But what we had done if we go back up to Area 5 for
GAC 1 was we set the legitimate use of gTLD WHOIS data is curtailed
or presented by the use of proxy and privacy registration services.

And then what (Eric) did there, the amount and source of WHOIS
request is non-uniform and that the non-uniformity is interpretable and
a likely interpretation is that data point clusters will correlate with intent
and a reference data set and then he has an alternative or some
subset of registrar raw data minimally containing just the data and
source of WHOIS request data is to flow to a third party for data
analysis and that use cases for WHOIS data maybe discerned from

clusters and a reference WHOIS access data set. And that the use cases and statistical (unintelligible) disclosed to the GAC role call.

Anyway, the - well, with all due respect to (Eric), he certainly has a way of wording things in a complicated way.

Steve Metalitz: Chuck, this is Steve Metalitz. This seems to describe a totally different study than what's read...

Chuck Gomes: It sure does.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: I wonder whether I'm just looking at our original list of summary of public suggestions, you know, it says GAC Bullet Number 1. The other one way GAC Recommendation Number 5, 6 or 3. This is GAC Bullet Number 1. Is that something different? I don't have the GAC...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. The GAC recommendations had like two study suggestions. I don't have it in front of me either but they had two study suggestions and a whole bunch of, you know, 15 or so different things that could be then learned or studied by virtue of that research.

So they're worthy sort of (precatory) to research areas and then the hypothesis - not the hypothesis but the information you would then glean or study from those like 15 different options.

Steve Metalitz: I can read you the first bullet if it would help.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I think so.

Steve Metalitz: So I have the GAC in front of me. Liz is accurately describing. The GAC report had two bullets and then they followed it up with the list of 15 different questions to ask about the data.

First bullet was they want data on the amount and source of traffic. Accessing WHOIS servers, the type numbers of the different groups of users and what all those users are using WHOIS for.

Chuck Gomes: So this is not - this is note GAC Study ; it's GAC Bullet 1? Is that different?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. But I think (unintelligible) that Liz described accurately, the GAC believes the studies of WHOIS data should be undertaken to create a factual record. And that the goal should be initially compile data that provides documented evidence-based regarding the two bullets and I just read you the first bullet. The second bullet has to do with the types and extent of WHOIS misused which I think we covered earlier.

So there would be two bullets, one about who's accessing WHOIS servers and what are they doing with it and the second bullet was the type and extent of misuse.

And then the GAC said that given that, once this basic data is collected, the GAC wants further analysis to be directed towards answering the following questions. And there are 15 questions that are asked. We call those analyses in this format, analysis of the data that was gathered and the two bullets.

And I tried. I called US government, I tried to get them to reformat to sit the submission but he's taking about herding (GAC). There was no way GAC would come to that.

Chuck Gomes: So what's the thinking - I guess the first basic question I have is - should - do I have it captured incorrectly when I say GAC 1? Does it really duplicate with the GAC 1 we have up above in Area 5?

Steve Metalitz: It conflicts with it because they're not the same thing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I should - it should be labeled something different than GAC 1, right? It should be labeled GAC Bullet 1 like was in Liz'...

Steve Metalitz: GAC data set 1 and then GAC data set 2 as opposed to calling them bullet because those are the data set.

Man: It strikes to me that really those bullets are not something from which you could draw hypothesis. They are the data you would use to test hypothesis.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Exactly right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Not getting into how you collect this data on these others. In fact, we - in some cases we're not sure how you would collect the data. But we're not even getting into that topic. So I'm not sure that we need to deal with those bullets that describe the data that would be collected.

Don't we need to deal with the questions of the GAC, ask and try to turn those into hypothesis? I think that's how we've approached it.

Steve Metalitz: So far you're right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Should we just delete this particular row in the table?

Steve Metalitz: You know, in difference to a GAC, it's anxious to see whether we're paying attention to what they wrote. Let's find a way in a note somewhere to indicate that the GAC had suggested two data sets to be collected and then we'll past in their little two bullets so that it shows we gave recognition to the data sets they requested. But this table focused on the hypothesis implied by the 16 questions, 15 questions that was asked from the GAC list.

Chuck Gomes: So what if...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: ...the way the council - this is Tim again. What I see the council looking at this perhaps is that we look at the questions as perhaps individual studies. It might all be based on the same data but whether that data is collected or not would be dependent of whether any one or more of those questions to that data set would actually be something to pursue.

Steve Metalitz: Agreed.

Chuck Gomes: So how are we going to portray this one? It seems simplest if we can just leave it where it's at but call it something different and then under the recommendations column just, you know, add information that you were just describing, Steve. Does that work and what would we call it?

Steve Metalitz: It would be GAC data set 1. It's just the GAC data set 1. It's just the GAC data set 2. That's more descriptive than calling them bullet. But putting them in here doesn't infer that the hypothesis associated with the data set. They're sort of a suggestions from the GAC that if they had adhered to the format, they would have put it in there type of analysis required and date of survey required.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So are they thinking two separate rows, GAC data set 1 and a separate row for GAC data set 2 or should they be combined into one row in our table?

Steve Metalitz: I think you could put them as two.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody oppose to that?

Liz Gasster: We didn't have the second data set. Did we anywhere else up in the...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. You know, we did. If the - if I can just summarize briefly, the second bullet in the GAC letter what I've been calling data set 2 is the types and extents of misuses of WHOIS data what harm it cause by each type of misuse, including economic, spam and abuse, loss of reputation, identity set, security cost and loss of data.

Liz Gasster: So that's the one that right now we have in Area 1, right?

Steve Metalitz: Let's go check that.

Liz Gasster: Because I'm having trouble - yeah. And then the...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yeah. We call the GAC 2 on the last line.

Liz Gasster: ...three. Yeah. So it should be - if we were to leave it in Area 1, we would rename that GAC data set 2.

Steve Metalitz: Exactly.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I got it.

Chuck Gomes: So we don't need GAC data set 2 down below.

Steve Metalitz: You know, we don't; it's the way it's referred to up above in Area 1. We did not actually bring in all of the data elements of the GAC requested.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz :   So again, if you throw a bone to the GAC, it would be to include their two data sets explicitly somewhere whether by link or by inclusion. And it could be even be at a note.

Chuck Gomes: So you're suggesting leaving GAC data set 2 down below as well as having it up above and we just cover - we've obviously just covered a subset of it in Area 1.

Steve Metalitz: We did.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm okay with that. Anybody oppose to that?

Liz Gasster: So we would add a new row for GAC data set 2?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Is that right? Okay.

Steve Metalitz: I think so.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: And to make it easier for all of us, you actually circulate the GAC recommendation months and months ago? Do we - we don't have it linked at all on this Wiki. Is the document available? We can click to throw a link in so everybody can see that. Is it online anywhere?

Chuck Gomes: We definitely should add a link on a Wiki.

Steve Metalitz: I mean, I have a PDF that (unintelligible). I don't have a link to it.

Chuck Gomes: Can we link to it, Liz?

Liz Gasster: Sure. Yeah. I'll add that to the Wiki.

Chuck Gomes: Add that to the Wiki.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: So let's at least try and wrap up or get a good idea of where we're at on these two data sets.

So under recommendations and for data set 1, what are we going to put? What's you're thinking in that regards, Steve? Steve Del Bianco?

Steve Del Bianco: This is back to Area 8.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: If we actually have two roads in there because this is the area we're just saying other GAC recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: We could have - we ought to have two roads that recapture and perhaps just repeat two of the other GAC recommendations where recommendations for data set compilation. And without inferring which hypothesis would hinge on this data to simply recount that the GAC had suggested two data sets be collected, data 1 and data set 2 and then we go on to look at to see whether any other GAC questions or 1 through 15 and just the hypothesis that we're trying to flush out in this cable. And that's what (Erik) does by putting in GAC 5, 6 and 3, right?

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: And try to capture the other GAC questions and tournament hypothesis.

Chuck Gomes: Now, would it make sense to facilitate this and we're just about out of time to have a couple of people work on Area 8 in preparation for our meeting next week? I guess maybe the better way to ask a question is do I have a - is there a volunteer to that that would do that taking into consideration what the discussion we've just had?

Steve Del Bianco: I can work with Liz on that. This is Steve the dork. I could do that.

Liz Gasster: Liz the dork will do so too.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Gasster: You know, one thing...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: You're implying that the other Steve is not a dork. I don't know if I should resent that.

Liz Gasster: Everyone wants to be a part of a team, you know.

The one thing I would like to raise is whether either of these data sets belong in hypothesis. I kind of want to go back to the idea of adding it as a note rather than trying to shoehorn them in here. And my reason for that is that you wouldn't actually select one of these as a study to be done, right?

Steve Del Bianco: You're right. I know this (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah. I would agree.

Steve Del Bianco: It's easier to put them in these two GAC study suggestions. Easy to put them in a footnote or top note than it is to note them every time we bring up a GAC hypothesis because there's 15 of them gathered through here. We wouldn't have to have that note 15 times.

Chuck Gomes: So Liz and Steve will work on this area and that will mean creating a note or two notes whichever way you want to do it that would be added at the top of the table and then taking a look at 5, 6 and 3 from the GAC. Is that correct? Is there a need to look at any of the other questions that may have been overlooked in the GAC?

Steve Del Bianco: That's a great question. Do we think we've covered all 15 elsewhere?

Liz Gasster: I think we did. I think we made sure to do that but we can double check it.

Chuck Gomes:1 Okay. So you guys can take a look at that and come back.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Ruiz: I was just going to ask if these 15 - okay, you're really quick but the 15 were very clearly one - relied on one data set or the other were in some cases they might rely on both? I'm just wondering if it made

sense to try to indicate, you know, which data sets, the particular recommendation or question might apply to or might require.

Steve Del Bianco: You know, Tim, looks like most of them go off their second data set which is the extent and type of misuse.

Tim Ruiz: So whether we can do it here or not I think the council will have to figure that out because...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tim Ruiz: ...you know, we're going to need to understand which data set needs to be collected to get...

Steve Del Bianco: But it's possible that the way we structured it - I mean, remember, we had an area called - I guess it was misused. It's Area 1. If Area 1 - and it includes at least a couple of the GAC item, if further study was needed, it would gather data about abuses of WHOIS data that would feed that multiple GAC question.

I mean in other words, it may well be that council would - proceeds with a study pursuant to Area 1 and they say, "Look, this covers the GAC bullet Number 1, so we're not going to worry about a separate consultant study to figure out how to answer GAC first data request."

Chuck Gomes: All right. Well, our time is done for today. So I appreciate Steve and Liz volunteering to work on the last area.

And so, next week, what we will do then is we will confirm the work we did on Area 7 and certainly, any comments are welcome on that during

the week. And then we'll try and wrap up Area 8 and we'll also then follow up on the issue with regard to Steve Del Bianco's suggestion regarding the reference back to really pertinent details in the actual study recommendation.

Any comments on that?

Steve Del Bianco: This is Steve. I think the charter was - we knew as Tim said, we will link - put a hyperlink every time we have a submission. Hyperlink to the original.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: That's a technical thing. And the second thing was (unintelligible) to make one pass to see if there were items in particular note like we came up with on this IDN string...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Steve Del Bianco: ...that deserved to be suggested to you guys as worthy of inclusion in the hypothesis table. And a few of them I anticipate maybe worthwhile; that would just be my first task.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That would be very helpful.

Anything else?

Okay. Thanks everybody. Have a good rest of the week.

Man: Thanks.

Liz Gasster: Thanks, Chuck. Thanks, everybody.

Man: Thank you.

Liz Gasster: Bye.

                        END