

TRANSCRIPT

Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Meeting Buenos Aires

17 November 2013

Attendees:

Cristian Hesselman, .nl

Isak Jacobsen, .fo

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Kristina Nordstrom

Gabriella Schitteck

Apologies:

Luis Diego Espinoza, expert

Antoinette Johnson, .vi

Hitoshi Saito, .jp

Bart Boswinkel:

For the recording, my name is Bart. Welcome. It's -- I think we have one agenda point only, in my view. That's talking about the survey that we announced in the interim reports and how to move that forward.

And I think the Working Group has such agreed on, say, the proposed steps from Cristian to first send out a - take stock of what are the use cases, and if it's valuable to continue the work of this Working Group or maybe do it in other format. And then a survey is the means through which, and as we announced and defined in the interim report, or the progress report, however you want to call it.

Cristian, do you have any additional remarks on that one?

Cristian Hesselman:

This is Cristian. No, I don't have any additional remarks. I think what we need to do is -- Gabriella already asked me just a few minutes ago how do we want to word those questions. So we have three questions in the questions for the questionnaire.

So we have three questions in the documents that we might want to reshape a little bit, because now they're closed questions so people can only answer yes or no. So maybe we need to go to more open-end questions, at least for one or two

of them. But other than that, I don't think there's any other work we can do at this point.

Bart Boswinkel: We could do it two ways, say, addressing the survey as well. Maybe another thing is the timeframe in which we want to have the survey out and collect responses, et cetera, and based on that, come up with a discussion of the Working Group itself.

So maybe, Gabi, you can have -- you've done some surveys. So what is a reasonable timeframe, in your mind, for sending out this survey based on -- I hope you've seen the interim or the progress report and the questions you just discussed.

Gabriella Schittek: Sorry. No, I haven't seen the questions. But it seems to be very short. I might want to have a look at it. Perhaps you want to say if yes, blah blah blah, why. So that makes it a little bit more complicated, but that's doable. But I can -- sounds like a really easy survey, so I can probably send it after this meeting, even. And then, I guess, it's up to you; about two or three weeks. Shouldn't be any longer than that, to be honest, because people get sick and tired.

Cristian Hesselman: So if we put out the survey in about two or three weeks, then what would be a typical timeframe to, for people to respond? Like a month, or how would you do that?

Gabriella Schittek: It depends on the survey. But no; I would recommend not to have it out for a month. I would just say maximum three weeks. Because -- maximum three weeks, that's it.

Cristian Hesselman: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Excuse me. So this is Bart again. So if you would add this up, that means five weeks as of the end of this meeting, we will have the results more as from the survey.

Cristian Hesselman: I think -- this is Cristian -- this would be good, because if the answer of the community is yes, please continue, then we need to do some -- prepare some work for the next ICANN meeting. So if we have let's say the go/no-go by the end of this year, for example, then we have an additional two and a half to three months to actually do some work, I'll say from our desks, so to speak, and then meet again in Singapore.

Bart Boswinkel: And just one point -- say five weeks from at the end of this meeting, that's around, that's just before Christmas, isn't it?

Cristian Hesselman: Yeah, I think so, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: So that would work. You don't want to have the Christmas break or the seasonal break in between because that breaks up. And it's a nice seizure, because then in the New Year, we could start looking at the results and analyzing them based on that we -- so somewhere early January. That's the timeframe we're thinking about of, say, that the Working Group can really have a look at the answers.

Cristian Hesselman: Yes, because if we are allowed to proceed, or the community thinks we should proceed, then there's work to do because we need to look into these use cases and find some realistic scenarios.

So I just had a brief discussion about that with Isak. So one way to proceed there would be to have a chat with Google, because they give a presentation at the Bervern (ph) Meeting about registry hacks. And so maybe they also have,

let's say, specific scenarios as to what happened, that means we can distill patterns from that, but that might form the basis of the use cases.

- Gabriella Schitteck: May I just ask the survey, who is it going to? Does it go just to ccNSO members or the ccTLD community? And do you want just one per registry to reply, or should it be open for everyone, and so on?
- Cristian Hesselman: I haven't really thought about that, to be honest with. Intuitively, I would say one vote per registry.
- Bart Boswinkel: And your ccTLD community as such, because there's --
- Cristian Hesselman: Yes, yes.
- Bart Boswinkel: Because if you really look at it, say, if there is a go ahead, and that's one of the points in the interim report, it don't even make sense to do it. The vast majority of the ccTLD community signs up to the --
- Cristian Hesselman: Commit --.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, to the survey, to the services. And one of the tricky ones is, again here is I think that's something we need to discuss in more detail, but maybe that we can do that offline. So not during this meeting. But whether -- it makes a difference whether they have to pay and how it's paid and who is going to pay for it. Because if you just have the services out there for free, that's a complete different picture than you have a reasonable subscription fee.
- Cristian Hesselman: But it's a bit of a chicken and an egg for one because without the use cases, it's very difficult to assess what we stated in the document to assess the added value of the service. And so what's happening now is that we are also asking people to give their go or no-go based on very vague added values.
- Bart Boswinkel: Maybe that's a way of structuring the survey is so if you see value in additional use cases, and you list them and maybe we can include already some suggestions, and then based on that, does this add value for you to continue? And then the next question is, would you still subscribe if there was a fee indication?
- Cristian Hesselman: So if we add an open section, for example, in which we ask people, what would you need from the service in order to have to show that it has added value for you, that is something that we could ask as an open-ended question.
- Gabriella Schitteck: I have a more -- I have some more practical questions. So if you want one per registry, should we target this as such the CEO, sort of tech person, or shall we register, ask them to say which registry they're from in the beginning so that we know? Or shall we just send it out then ask people please just -- trust that they behave?
- Cristian Hesselman: I would send it out, and I would let's say recommend people for their security officer or somebody similar to fill it out. And if they don't have it, then maybe somebody else. But ask them it's a -- I'd say preferably it should be the security officer.
- Gabriella Schitteck: And do you want us to track the cc, ccTLD, or we just trust that they will follow all instructions when we not (ph) send it in more than one instance per registry?
- Cristian Hesselman: That's something you cannot enforce. That's something you cannot enforce in the system, that each registry only fills out one.

Gabriella Schittek: No. No, what I can do is I can block that to whoever replied to it so they can only do it once. But of course, if you send it out to an e-mail list, then often several people from the same registry.

Cristian Hesselman: We should trust people.

Gabriella Schittek: Yes, that was my hope.

Bart Boswinkel: And at the end of the day, it probably, I don't know if this is doable, but you can say if people send it in more than once, assuming that it comes from the same address, if you can block it, you use the final version.

Gabriella Schittek: No, they will not be allowed to fill it once again. So it's just --.

Cristian Hesselman: Okay, so maybe we should spend some time. I'm not sure if we should do it during this session, but maybe we should sit together and then try to work out the questions in a bit more detail.

Bart Boswinkel: May I make a suggestion that as with this group, we're more or less in the same time zone, that we do it offline. So not during the formal session, but over the upcoming days, use as much free time (ph) we have here in BA. But at least by the end of, in one and a half weeks, we can send it to the whole group to have a final say on the proposed survey. And then be ready to send it out in two weeks, because that is really the cut-off date. If we go beyond it, you will hit the end, the end date.

Cristian Hesselman: Yes, sounds like a plan. All right. So if there is nothing else -- Isak, no? Should we talk about something else? I don't think there's anything else on the agenda, right?

Bart Boswinkel: No, this is the only thing that we send out the week before.

Cristian Hesselman: I thought you looked confused like maybe I'm missing something.

Bart Boswinkel: No, no. So let's call it a day.

Cristian Hesselman: All right. Thank you, everybody.

Gabriella Schittek: -- questions now, or --?

Cristian Hesselman: Yes, but we don't need to use the mikes. We can do it now.

Bart Boswinkel: We don't have to use the mikes to discuss it, so this is the formal end of this meeting.

Cristian Hesselman: Yes. Thank you.