ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 20 May 2014 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 20 May 2014 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-dmpm-20140520-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#may

Attendees:
Marinel Rosca - Individual
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Nenad Orlic – ISPC
Pam Little – RySG
Andrew Merriam – RySG
Olevie Kouame – NPOC
Tony Onorato – Individual
Jeremy Beale – Independent
Mouhamet Diop - RrSG

Apologies:
Graeme Bunton – RrSG

ICANN staff:
Amy Bivins
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Steve Chan
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the conference coordinator. At this time the conference is being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the 20th of May, 2014. On the call today we have Nenad Orlic, Andrew Merriam, Steve Chan, Jonathan Zuck, Pam Little and Tony Onorato.

Looks like Cheryl Langdon-Orr was just able to join us on the Adobe Connect but I believe she's travelling so it just may be typing only today.

We have apologies from Graeme Bunton. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, Steve Chan, Amy Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd also like to remind all parties to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Great. Thanks a lot for the roll call. Berry, why don't we just dive into the document? I think we all know what we're doing so let's just start discussing the (unintelligible) effort.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. I think just real quick, although it's probably not necessary but if anybody has any statement of interest changes please announce them. But we have a pretty small crowd today so I suspect none has changed.

So per Jonathan's statement we definitely have a pretty simple agenda going forward today. We're going to run through the review of the PEDNR Working Group which was from 2008-2011.

We'll talk about the outcomes of that effort and then we'll basically just tee up our next homework assignment which will be the Add Grace Period Working Group. And then we also have a listing of the review of the work plan and determine next steps and the next meeting although I really don't think we're at a stage where those are critical to review.

So with that in mind let's go ahead and start with the PEDNR exercise. You'll see the compiled document within the Adobe Connect room. I also just sent both the clean version and the redline version out to the mailing list. What we'll be reviewing through the clean version today.

And before we dive into any of the details first let me state that my Internet connection is not stellar at this point so hopefully I won't drop. But at any case you should have control of the document yourself if you choose to review within the Adobe Connect room or, again, just review on your own local machine from the mail I just sent out.

So for review today is the short title is called PEDNR which is the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery which was a policy development process. It was initiated in December of 2008 and concluded around - within the GNSO - around October of 2011.

Subsequently from there, of course, the ICANN Board reviewed the recommendations, approved the recommendations and sent - has been implemented by ICANN staff and is now a consensus policy I believe starting at the end of October of last year. So really this policy has been in effect for approximately 7 or 8 months now. And we'll talk more about that in - towards the end of this review.

So I think one more point to note about our current analysis template, in reviewing this effort I think I recognized that our current structure is somewhat out of order.

We're predominantly reviewing three main work products of these previous working groups, the first being the issue report that the Council will review to initiate a PDP and then the second is the working group charter and then lastly the final report which contains recommendations whether they be for consensus policy or not depending on the type of effort that's being reviewed.

The way we have our template structured is somewhat out of order and if there are no objections from the working group I'm hoping that - I'm going to restructure this, not necessarily changing the content of the questions but I would like to segment it better so that it does align to these three particular work products and essentially kind of ask the same style of question but specifically for each work product.

When I was completing this form this time around, versus the previous one, Fast Flux, I felt like it was getting repetitive in areas and I had to kind of refer the reader back to the previous answer in some cases. So after conclusion of this call I'll blink out this version and send out to a list kind of a restructured style, like I said, that probably aligns better to the work product review.

And again, it shouldn't really change the substance of the questions or what we're trying to get to but just hopefully make it a little bit easier flow in terms of recognizing what's occurring at each stage.

Okay...

Jonathan Zuck: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Jonathan, please.

Jonathan Zuck: Hey, yeah thank you. It's Jonathan Zuck for the transcript. I wonder - I look forward to that new structure. I wonder if we should be doing anything that has to do with - anything post recommendation, i.e. what the Board did with it, questions or statements that came out of the Board that reflect, you know, the

disadvantage of recommendations without a data foundation and then any kind of, you know, anecdotally maybe but any attempt at review after the fact did another PDP end up happening to address a similar issue because it didn't quite get - is there some way?

I know that it's not - it becomes less and less sort of official looking at that point but it might be worth in our structure, especially when we're trying to interview the people that were involved to gain an understanding of kind of what the life of this was after the consensus recommendation was made.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Jonathan, that is a very excellent point. And maybe it is worthy of creating a Section 8, so to speak, to this analysis. And that's what I tried to accomplish in Number 7 which is really kind of more tailored to the outcome from the working group. But you are correct, there's definitely a series of events that occur after the GNSO has adopted the recommendations.

And what you'll see with this particular effort is I did extract out each of the resolution statements from the GNSO Council and then I tried to highlight with comments to the right as to kind of inventory the recommendations versus what the existing policy states today. And so with...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...each one of those sections you'll see a corresponding consensus policy language section just to make sure that everything was highlighted. And in fact there was one particular recommendation that the working group had made, and again we'll get into this in a little bit.

But in essence it wasn't a part of the policy itself but it was some actions that needed to be taken which we'll get into in a moment. But duly noted and I'll make sure that we do create kind of a separate section that once it leaves the Council then kind of conducting analysis of what the Board did and then

certainly what staff is doing whether it be compliance or whatever and any things that we find in that regard.

Jonathan Zuck: Terrific. And why don't we, for the purpose of this analysis, get rid of the notes pane so that we have a wider portal into the Word document?

Berry Cobb: Okay great. All right so with that we'll start back up at the top. And so essentially, like I said earlier, this effort started around December of 2008 which was when the actual issue report was created by staff. And prior to December 2008 this initiative was actually kicked off based on a request from the ALAC.

For members that aren't familiar with this advisory - or advisory constituency - why am I getting that wrong? For those that aren't familiar with the ALAC they're an advisory committee within the structure of ICANN.

And during that particular timeframe they have basically taken note that there were certain issues regarding the expiration of names and that the existing policy within 2008, which is the EDDP, which is Expired Domain Deletion Policy, was vague in certain areas and allowed certain shortcomings that disadvantaged registrants with their names.

And more specifically in the fact that a name would expire, the registrant wasn't necessarily informed either because of a bad email address or they had a bad credit card; there's a series of reasons that a particular name wouldn't be recovered.

And in that process that registrant would actually lose the name in some cases and wasn't able to necessarily recover it. And in reading the original issue report the ALAC had attempted to try to have these issues addressed in other avenues. It didn't get into details as to what steps were taken but eventually I believe the ALAC had wrote a letter to the GNSO Council basically outlining and highlighting the issues around this.

And in that deliberation the Council did finally request that staff write the issue report which eventually did evolve into a PDP. So the issue report itself, again, was in December of 2008.

Within the analysis of that issue report staff reviewed through the current - I shouldn't say current - the existing consensus policies for that time which was the EDDP and also they did a review of the domain lifecycle as it existed at that day.

There was some information in a visual graphic that basically highlighted what the beginning and end of a domain name registration looked like and the various phases that would occur through that particular - through that particular cycle. Noting that - sorry, the screen kept moving on me. Noting that there were potential shortcomings within that lifecycle that didn't allow for the renewal of a particular name in certain cases.

So the issue report itself, again, was passed to the GNSO Council. I believe it was unanimously voted on that the PDP be kicked off which started in - shortly after - probably January of 2009 is when the working group actually kicked off.

So from there I think in the review of this particular working group effort, unlike our previous Fast Flux effort that was shallow of data, in fact this particular group did have several activities in trying to obtain additional data to understand - or better understand the problem at hand.

At a very high level what did occur is that there were a couple of surveys that were deployed either within the working group or in terms of a public comment and where individuals from the community were asked to fill out a particular survey that asked what their opinion was about certain aspects of the expiration of a particular name.

And I'm taking note - Cheryl chatting in the chat window that this was the first time a mechanism was used, which I believe, yes, so just to provide clarity around Cheryl's statement. It was the first time that the ALAC did collaborate or initiate a PDP with the GNSO Council. And I believe there was a little bit of back and forth as to whether that could technically happen or not which it did.

I'm sorry, I can't - whoever is playing around with the document please stop.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, I'm sorry, it's Teri doing it. I was trying to actually get to the - be able to see the entire document that's all.

Berry Cobb: All right.

Jonathan Zuck: That was at my request so I don't mean to disrupt your presentation but Teri's trying to work on us being able to see the comments on the right margin that were hidden.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Well, I would recommend if people choose to...

Jonathan Zuck: Maybe people would need to just open it themselves.

Berry Cobb: Yes, that'd probably be the best. So with that, as Cheryl stated, it was the first time and it did successfully launch a PDP within the working group. So as I was stating, there were several attempts at trying to acquire more data to analyze the issue.

And believe it or not I think that - and now whoever is typing can you please put your phone on mute?

There were several attempts to collect additional data that wasn't provided in the issues report which I do believe was helpful in trying to better understand what was happening from a registrant perspective.

I think there were a lot of generalities at the time or maybe even some personal experiences that did provide a cursory overview of some of the issues that existed and certainly some members of the community actually had believed that there were already shortcomings within the existing policy so that's one of the most important aspects about this.

So while the issue report did lack in qualitative - or I'm sorry, quantified data to understand the issue there were definitely several efforts to extract qualitative data about what the issue was at hand.

Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Hopefully you can hear me. I'm trying to be relatively quiet in an airport lounge. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. One of the points I just wanted to make particularly on what you were then referring to, Berry, and that's the quantitative attempts that were made throughout this process. It was a best effort but it was an effort that was far from good enough.

And it's something I think is working where it needs to be I think (very aware of) and that was because the connection of the - an inverted commas - metrics with the surveys we've only conducted from within those that were participants of the working group. It was extremely an effort.

And an additional limitation to that, even though, you know, it was good to have any metrics at all, an additional limitation to that was the fact that we did keep banging up against, you know, commercial incompetence and (unintelligible) the material. And this is where I think we all have to come at some point in our work to a decision on what value there may be in having a more (build-reaching) attempt out of some PDP processes and (unintelligible) non-PDP processes to get metrics that are more quantifiable and perhaps anonymized from industry (unintelligible) because, you know, metrics are just as important here as anything else.

But we constantly came up with the fact that we were only surveying ourselves, which was a somewhat skewed if not perhaps faulted data set to work on as the only set of (unintelligible). And also those commercial incompetence issues continually came up. And I'll go back on mute now because it's (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Cheryl. And, yes, that is in fact true. So there were two surveys that were conducted. The first was internal to the working group. And in reviewing the membership from the working group, you know, this was - there were a large amount of members, not all of them active from week to week, but specifically because this addressed around consensus policies from the RAA there were a considerable amount of registrars.

And I think that that was the intent of that particular survey is to try to extract some of the more technical components of what happens during the expiration phase of a domain name and obtain some of that registrar feedback.

The reason - and I still need to actually go back through some of the transcripts from those meetings but I believe the primary catalyst for having that internal survey is because there was deliberations on the working group in an attempt to acquire more metrics of that - of expiration issues because of two factors.

First, there was limited data from ICANN Compliance, which we'll talk a little bit more in detail in a little bit. And then secondarily there was also an ask to try to acquire data and metrics from contracted parties as to what they're truly seeing within their ticketing systems in respect to issues raised with the expiration of domain names.

And if I recall correctly the access to that data wasn't something that was possible and is more or less one of an example in which a working group was trying to work with contracted parties to capture some of that data which,

again, wasn't successful here thus kicking off the survey so the survey within the working group.

And it was a pretty detailed survey. The final report I think it's Annex 3, was series of 25 questions that were pretty detailed out about certain aspects of that expiration cycle.

Secondarily there was another survey that was deployed. And this was around in terms of the process when the working group develops an initial report that contains a set of recommendation we're supposed to conduct a public comment. So I think at that time it was 45 days was the standard policy.

And within that public comment period the working group had also developed a survey that was available out to the community. And it actually was quite successful because it reached a broader aspect from other registrars, from registrants, registries, pretty much a good slice across the community.

I believe there were some near 460 total responses with I think it was approximately around 15% or so were not valid inputs into the survey but it did - it did provide good context in respect to the recommendations - the initial recommendations that the working group had developed.

So while some may question the quality of that particular survey and maybe even some of the reach I think that it did actually produce some validation against some of the recommendations themselves and it did help structure the future dialogue as the working group refined into their final recommendations.

So moving on with that I'd also state that in the initial stages of the working group, you know, what I would term as the due diligence phase, the working group did reach out to ICANN Compliance and ask for additional data as to

what ICANN would see from a ticket perspective regarding issues with expiration.

So as - I think as we discussed in our previous call when we reviewed Fast Flux, back in 2008, early 2009, the systems that were intaking problem tickets or issues that were submitted to ICANN were less than optimal. Certainly a particular request would be fielded by staff.

However there were limitations to the ticketing system itself where categorization was certainly less than optimal. In fact I believe the end user would assign a category based on a selection themselves. And when that particular ticket was resolved there was no clean up in terms of correctly categorizing that ticket.

So for example, if a ticket came in and it was a transfer issue but it turned out to be an expiration issue once it was resolved it was still classified as a transfer issue.

So what ICANN Compliance staff wound up doing was scanning the text of the particular ticket for keywords such as "expiration" or "redemption of a domain name" etcetera.

Within our analysis document I extracted some of the numbers that I can't see in front of me at the moment. I think at the time there were about 2500 or so tickets that were identified.

Oh, my bad, I'm sorry, 1642 tickets was the largest categorized ticket component. And when staff did a text search within that, 644 of those complaints contained one of those key words. But then even still it was difficult to extract exactly what the root cause was from those particular - those particular incidents.

So while it kind of shaped the working group's discussion about the issues overall it didn't provide any concrete data as to what the working group was truly trying to accomplish in regards to the expiration of domain names.

As a result of this initial effort by Contractual Compliance they also determined that this was a portion of the policy that hadn't been audited in the past. So in parallel to the working group's effort - and I believe this was approximately the timeframe that Maguy Serad came on to take leadership role of Contractual Compliance program - they deployed an audit based on the EDDP policy, again, which is there Expired Domain Deletion Policy.

And there were particular provisions in there that stated that a registrar was required to post somewhere on its Website the pricing of restoring names, some of the higher level components of what happens when a domain expires.

As a result of those audits it did in fact show that a good majority of the registrants were in - I'm sorry, a good majority of the registrars were in compliance. And those that weren't they worked with those registrars to ensure that that particular - that those particular provisions were being met in regards to the RAA.

Okay - oh thank you, Pam. It was so long ago I kind of forget when that happened. So Pam corrected me in the chat. Maguy didn't join until 2011 so it was prior leadership that did conduct that particular audit. But nonetheless that action of conducting that audit didn't necessarily feed into the overall deliberations of the working group but it was pointed out within the final report that that activity did occur.

So I think in terms of overall - of what we're trying to accomplish here in our working group is, you know, how did data and metrics affect the start deliberations and outcomes of the working group effort?

And in summary, again, we've had a couple of surveys. There was an attempt to acquire metrics from ICANN staff. There was an attempt to acquire metrics from contracted parties that didn't succeed. And there were extensive deliberations as to what should be a better experience.

And I'd say more specifically what would be a better registrant experience of how - essentially if you wore the shoes of a registrant and you take into consideration certain issues of either having the wrong email address or being on vacation and different ideas - or different aspects that would cause - that would - when a name expired that would cause a registrant to not be able to renew it and would have to go through even additional steps to try to recover that particular name. So there were definitely extensive deliberations as to what should have happened.

I'm kind of moving on down through the document on my own; I'm not necessarily pointing anyone out - or pointing you out to any particular area.

In general the charter, again, didn't really have quantitative data; it did have qualitative data such as recognizing that there were potential shortcomings with the existing policy. The charter itself, when they moved into that stage, did in general request that the working group acquire more data but it wasn't specific as to exactly what kind of data may be useful to help in their deliberations. So that was something that the working group took on their own.

And then lastly the final report did document the data that was gathered by the working group again most of which was more qualitative in nature and not necessarily quantitative.

So the thing that I'll close out with is really kind of moving toward the last section of our analysis document. And what I tried to accomplish here is to see where, you know, the recommendations that were approved eventually

by the ICANN Board that were deployed and implemented by ICANN staff and where we sit today.

So most of this particular section contains the actual resolution statements from the GNSO Council which essentially are a revised version of the original recommendations out of the working group's final report and there were at least 13 total recommendations that were specifically consensus policy recommendations. I think there were another two or three that weren't necessarily consensus policy but were actions that needed to be taken by either ICANN staff or the GNSO.

And you can't really see it on the AC screen but I do recommend that working group members look at the comments that I placed out to the right. And as I mentioned at the beginning of the call what I tried to accomplish is to inventory the recommendations from the working group with what we see today that is now known as the - the short name is called the ERRP, which is the ERRP, and that's the Expired Restored - oh my goodness, I forgot the third - it's the ERRP. I'll get you the name in a moment.

The P being the Policy; E being Expiration, Restored - somebody can type it in the chat for me. Thank you, Steve. Oh I can't believe I can't remember it. At any rate the ERRP policy.

So in - Expired Registration Recovery Policy. Thank you very much. The Recovery part was the elusive word for me.

Last week I was collaborating with ICANN Contractual Compliance as to what they were seeing with the policy being implemented now. And we're still working on some of the details of this. But in our initial discussions with those members of the team that are specifically focused on transfers and expiration of names it seems that it's actually a positive result of these policies.

And more specifically I am - we're trying to build a before stats picture and an after the policy was implemented statistical picture as to what they saw before and after. So our discussion was much more qualitative in nature but right out of the - right on the onset of our dialogue with them they were very pleased with the new ERRP policy because it did provide a lot more clarity and a lot more predictability for registrants as to when their name - what happens when it expires.

The biggest proponent - or the biggest component to the recommendation was that there were two required notifications when an expiration occurred. And the policy itself defines that there were a certain amount of days that would transpire when those particular notifications had to be sent as well as providing more guidance around the redemption grace period and more notification as to the fees and activities that occurred when a name expired.

And I think even more importantly as Contractual Compliance had noted to us, that when an issue did arrive at ICANN that related to the expiration of a name and it requires - typically in these kind of incidents contractual compliance will reach out to the registrar of record and collaborate with them to understand that issue in great detail.

And it's also basically been described that in this case that the registrar will provide a perfect - I shouldn't say a perfect but will provide an audit trail as to what they did when. So domain name X expired on this date and five days later we sent an expiration notice; a number of days later a second notice was sent. The name was no longer resolving and that they showed that at such and such date that they changed the name server of that name, etcetera, etcetera.

So I won't get into the specific details. When we acquire this before and after picture I will make sure to highlight some of those details. But I'll just conclude to say that the results of the policy being implemented sound very promising in terms of the - not only the lower quantity of issues that they're

seeing but especially in terms of when they work with registrars to try to resolve these issues that there is a considerable effort being shown that registrars are adhering to the new policy.

So my general impression was that it was a very positive outcome and we hope to be able to share that not only with the team but as well as the GNSO and the community at large.

So with that I think that's kind of a synopsis of what occurred during this particular effort. To Jonathan's point earlier, I think this is probably even worthy of an additional discussion at our next meeting because I would like to try to find more details about how the Board deliberated on the policy recommendations and I would like to try to uncover some more of the details about how the policy was implemented.

It's likely that those won't really uncover too many things in reference to what we're trying to accomplish here about how data and metrics were used. But most importantly, as I mentioned, we will be putting together some kind of presentation, and I'm not exactly sure what the channel will be, that will provide a true quantitative component to show - or to measure the effectiveness of this policy. And like I said I think it's probably going to be a favorable presentation.

So with that I'll open up for questions or comments and any additional suggestions. And certainly for those that did review the documentation certainly welcome any other input you may have.

Jonathan Zuck: So, Berry, it's Jonathan. I'll start I guess. My impression, having read this, and I just read through it quickly in the past hour, was that the data that was collected was only data insomuch as it was mostly an attempt to get a better handle on the qualitative nature of the problem and that it was understanding those qualitative issues and anecdotal issues that led to the

recommendations as they were made in terms of well what would make this process better.

And so it's an interesting example in that respect in that it was the qualitative analysis that probably was most necessary from the standpoint of determining a solution to the problem.

And certainly anecdotally it looks as though a further anecdotal qualitative analysis suggests that people like the new system better than the old system so I guess part of this I guess, of our exercise, is understanding how we might be using data to define the scope of a problem or the stakes involved in a problem but not necessarily the nature of the problem.

Which will still probably require a qualitative assessment and the quantitative assessment is more about trying to gain a baseline both for the scale of the problem and then also some measure of the effectiveness of the solution down the line but may in fact itself - in and of itself have nothing to do in some instances with the solution of the proposed recommendations.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. And I definitely agree. You know, it had been - and so the interest of disclosure at the particular time I wasn't with ICANN staff and I was a member of this working group and trying to remember back everything that, you know, the working group tried to accomplish and it's easy to forget the past, so to speak, as to what happened other than the higher level activities that occurred.

You know, I knew that we came up with consensus policy recommendations. I knew that they eventually got implemented. But I hadn't heard what - if in fact the implementation of that did actually correct the problem. And now having gone through this exercise, pardon me, I was reminded that there was, you know, quite an extensive effort to go collect data. I wouldn't say it was easy; it was definitely challenging.

And certainly if we had access, or if the working group had access, to other data it may have been even more enlightening to the nature of the problem and certainly more the details.

But now even better after going through this exercise and now getting that qualitative feedback as to the implementation of it I'm much more - I'll be simple, I'm very happy about the results in many ways and so I'm looking forward to kind of completing that picture and deploying or being able to convey that message out to the community because I think it'll be important for people to understand and that hopefully a conclusion of this will in fact maybe change some of the perceptions that exist out there today.

Jonathan Zuck: Sure. And maybe encourage that round trip to happen in the future. I mean, we don't need all bad examples in order to make that case that it's worth doubling back to see what the outcome was and that the fact that this is good doesn't make our efforts any less important.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. And, you know, I think this kind of dovetails into our next homework assignment which is to add a grace period. My instinct tells me that that's probably even going to be another example of - I think this - the add grace period is maybe a more quantitative example of something that came out positive whereas we've just mentioned that this one was more qualitative.

So I think as we conclude this exercise with reviewing, you know, four or five, maybe six additional exercises we're going to get a nice handful of some successes and a nice handful of not so much successes or at least deep challenges that that will provide a good spectrum from which we can look to improve the process and the work products that we use in our policy process.

Jonathan Zuck: Excellent.

Berry Cobb: So...

Jonathan Zuck: Anyone else have any questions or comments to bring up?

Berry Cobb: Okay, well this is Berry for the record. Again I would encourage working group members please review through the notes and most specifically I think that reviewing the final report is enlightening as to what did occur.

As I had mentioned I do - I have a couple of follow ups that I do want to share with the working group. I hope to have some of that by our next call in relation to this particular effort. But if anybody does - if anybody else does have any other input please send that to me and I'll be sure to incorporate it into the master document.

Jonathan Zuck: All right that's great. This is an incredible effort, Berry, going through this so thank you very much for you and the others that had inputs into this to do this analysis.

Berry Cobb: So - and I think with that I'll just close on our third agenda item. I kind of miswrote the third agenda item as though we might review that during today's call. In fact it's really just to tee up the next effort which is the add grace period which was - a short term name was domain tasting.

And a brief overview of this was a mechanism several years ago that allowed registrants to register a name for a very short period of time. And I'm probably not recalling this correctly but I want to say they could register a name and within five days they could unregister or basically return the name back to the registrar or registry and they could do a particular form of analysis on that particular name such as monitor the traffic or a particular other aspects with that name.

And I'm probably doing a horrible job describing it. But in essence it did cause an issue that the community recognized that there was a PDP launched against it. Just like this one there were consensus policy recommendations

made. And in short what I think will be intriguing about reviewing that effort is that there were a series of reports that were generated by staff and delivered out to the community and it was, based on a cursory review, a very large needle mover in correcting the problem.

So it'll be a good one for the working group to review through and I believe that it'll probably - it for sure will most likely reveal that it was a success from a consensus policy perspective. It will result in data that was acquired by the group and analyzed. And I think further will help reinforce some of our potential recommendations as we move through the working group review.

Jonathan Zuck: That sounds good.

Berry Cobb: Okay not to steal your thunder, Jonathan, but I think that's pretty much - we only have 8 minutes left - 8 hours, that'll scare people.

Jonathan Zuck: Freudian slip. No, my thunder is all well and good. I think that that was a great case study and folks should try to make a real effort to go through and look at some of the comments. And I look forward to the back and forth on the ListServe about a new structure for the document - love to, again, you shoehorned it in here but emphasize what the implementation details were and any follow up data that we can find out these different projects.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. And so with the agenda note that I'd sent out I did include an attachment of our work plan. Really the only thing that's changing within that plan thus far is as we complete one working group meeting from week to week I don't suspect it'll change much more until we've completed this part of our review but it's there for your reading pleasure. And I'll continue to send those out as we have meetings.

And then the last thing I'd just like to mention we will schedule our next call for June 3. And I think we'll be shooting for our alternative time so it'll likely be

probably 13 or 14 UTC to schedule that particular call. And we'll make sure to get a meeting notice sent out to the working group right away.

Jonathan Zuck: Great.

Berry Cobb: And there is just one more point I'd like to bring up and that is the London meeting. And I apologize for not including this on the agenda. So I did designate a request for us to meet face to face. The working group hasn't - we haven't really discussed or decided whether a face to face meeting is necessary or not.

Typically we would normally meet on a Thursday morning and it looks like, based on some schedule change announcements for the London meeting, that that might have to occur at a different date and be a different time if we do choose to meet.

I think that I would encourage the working group to still move forward with meeting in person. It's always a good opportunity to continue to get to know each other as well as to try to continue to address some of the issues that we're trying to resolve with our charter.

But another option for members to consider is that this doesn't necessarily need to be an open meeting which would basically mean that we can schedule a time so that it doesn't try to conflict with some of the other major events that are going on.

So, for example, we could do it at 8:30 on Monday morning and choose to meet for 30 minutes if we thought it was necessary. And by being closed is that it just wouldn't show up on the agenda but if members that are in attendance there at the meeting if they show up in the room they're welcome to listen in and watch the working group deliberate but it just wouldn't be advertised on the schedule.

Or, again, we can choose to have this be an open meeting so that it does show up on the schedule and we can determine what our agenda will look like. So I will send a note out to the list with some of those options and it's probably something we'd like to try to determine whether the working group wants to meet or not by no later than the middle of next week so that we can get it scheduled appropriately.

Jonathan Zuck: All right that sounds good.

Berry Cobb: All right well thank you, Jonathan, that's all I have.

Jonathan Zuck: All right thanks, everyone. If no one else has anything else I'll call the meeting to a close.

Man: Thanks very much, guys.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Thanks, guys.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Berry Cobb: Take care.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Once again that does conclude today's meeting. Please disconnect all remaining lines at this time. (Tiffany), if you could please stop the recordings.

END