GNSO
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference

July 17, 2007 at 14:15 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Domain Tasting
Ad hoc teleconference on 5 July 2007. 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/domain-tasting-20070717.mp3

on page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

Attendees

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-ordinator CBUC (Council)

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registry constituency

Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency

Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency

Danny Younger - NCUC

Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)

Alan Greenberg - ALAC representative on GNSO Council

Absent apologies:

Sophia Bekele Nominating Committee appointee to Council

Peter Lambson - Registar

Greg Ruth - ISPCP

ICANN Staff

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Kurt Pritz - Senior Vice President, Services

Tim Cole - Chief Registrar Liaison

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Karen Lentz - gTLD Registry Liaison

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

(Mike): I'm hopeful that we can keep the conference calls to one member from each constituency as we have today. Today, we'll have two from the registrars. No problem.

Obviously, keep the email list open and leave the option open for this group to decide to have broader calls, you know, at anytime.

Does that sound good and reasonable to everybody?

Any objections?

All right.

Statements of interest. Interesting, this is not really working group at this point. On the other hand, it is a public group. Most of us on the small ad hoc group as it's being called are counselors so we have statements of interest on file because obviously, those should be amended if needed for this group in particular and I think that we should also ask for them from the folks that are not counselors.

Any objections to that?

(Jeff): Nope. Glen, this is (Jeff).

I think you probably have lines from some other groups, maybe.

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) and look it up.

(Jeff): If you could, that would be great.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. I'll do that.

(Jeff):   Thanks.

(Mike):   All right. And then we will just need one from (Danny Yonger) and from whoever is chosen from the registrars.

(Danny Yonger): I think you've my number also from the Who Is working group.

Glen Desaintgery: From the Who Is, I'll use that (Danny).

(Jeff):   Yeah.

(Danny Yonger): Great.

(Jeff):   This is (Jeff).

I guess if I'm the rep mine is on Feb. '06 PDP my statement of interest (fund) file so let's see who is going to be the official rep here first. But mine already on file of my statement of interest.

Glen Desaintgery: And you want to keep that as it is, (Jeff)?

(Jeff):   Yes, I want to keep that. Yeah, (unintelligible) to that.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

(Mike):   And, you know, to be clear, this group is certainly not intended to really vote on anything formal so it should not come to that but anyway.

Let's move forward. The one thing I'd like to do rather quickly is schedule next week's call before we get into substance because Glen has raised an issue that we are essentially back to back with another call starting next week.

And Glen, is that a weekly call for the right protection mechanisms?

Glen Desaintgery: Every two weeks. So next week is the second is of course the week at the fourth and it is at 15 UTC…

(Mike): Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: …which is really back to back with this one.

(Mike): Right. Well, we need - I'd like certainly to have more in 45 minutes if we're going to need to schedule every week, you know, should at least schedule an hour or an hour and a half ideally unless anybody have objections to that. And, you know, of course, you don't have to use all of the time every week.

So I guess (Adrian) is now not going to represent from the registrar. Is that pretty clear (Jeff) and (Jonathan)?

Man: Actually, I can't respond one affirmative one way or the other. If you could just hold off on a solid response, and I'll round up the team I guess, I could say later today and have a response to you by tomorrow.

(Mike): Okay. Then why don't we go ahead and schedule the call once we know that and do it via email.

Man: I wouldn't hold off on one of the registrars to schedule the call. I think you can schedule it without it. It would be okay and then we'll accommodate.

(Mike):   Okay. Well, we certainly do want to accommodate you as well.

Okay. So Glen, what times are available for next week and weeks, you know, something that we could get on the calendar for every week at the same time.

Glen Desaintgery: Do you want to keep it on Tuesday or do you want to move to another day?

(Mike):   I would be okay moving to another day.

Glen Desaintgery: Isn't there a (flat) opening up from the Who Is call and the Who Is call is now going to finish. Probably they won't be finished next week but they maybe finished the week after. You know, we could move to (unintelligible) and just to make it in case they would go on for one or two times (unintelligible) making it at day or at 1330. So if we may then at 16 UTC.

(Mike):   (Unintelligible) from you saying the Who Is calls are currently at 1615 UTC, is that right?

Glen Desaintgery: No, 1330.

(Mike):   Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: That's 1330 UTC.

(Mike):   Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry.

(Mike):   About 8 - at 8:30 LA time.

Glen Desaintgery: Uh-huh.

(Mike):   Okay.

Man: All right.

(Mike):   That's 6:30 LA time. Sorry. (Unintelligible). Well, that'd be, you know, okay for me…

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: …is just a schedule asking you whether that would - giving you one or two times and asking you separately who would (unintelligible).

(Mike):   Yeah, let's do that. Let's take it offline and do that so we can start talking about the substance here a little bit.

                  All right. Thanks, Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

(Mike):   Okay. So, I sent around the resolution and that's pretty clear that we're, you know, not a working group. We're just to direct some additional research and ideally, frame some terms of reference for the council to consider a potential PDP in a couple of months.

I'd like to kind of get everybody's initial thoughts on what specific sorts of research we should look to get in response to the staff's questions at Page 3 of the (issue's) report.

Unless anybody have any objection to that, I kind of just like to look at those questions, (unless anybody) has a document.

(Danny):   (Mike), before we jump into that, can I just raise a question? This is (Danny)

(Mike):   Is that (Tim)? Oh, (Danny). Sure.

(Danny):   Page 25 of the report indicates that staff has been involved in a focused discussion with VeriSign's possible options including potential contract amendments and that VeriSign stated they'll come back to the staff on the issue following internal analysis. I just like to find out if VeriSign has in fact come back to staff yet if there's anything to be reported.

(Kurt):   No, they haven't. We - this is (Kurt). We, you know, prior to the call for the issues report, not writing the issues report we've had discussions with VeriSign and other registries about domain tasting and its effects and whether it should be eliminated and if it should be eliminated in house.

So in the case of VeriSign, they said they were studying it and they come back to us but they haven't and the really short answer is no, they haven't yet.

(Danny): Okay. Thank you, (Kurt).

(Kurt): Yup.

(Mike): All right. Good question.

(Christina): Actually, can I ask a follow-up on that (Kurt)?

Did they give you kind of a general time frame as to when you could start to receive that feedback from them? This is (Christina).

(Kurt): Yeah, I know. Hi, (Christina).

They didn't give us specific time frame but they said shortly which I took to mean, you know, two months or about that and we're about there. We're about, you know, two months since we've had our last specific discussion about it.

(Christina): Okay. Great. Thank you.

(Mike): All right.

So we do have the VeriSign registry data that just came out that some folks were waiting for. I can forward that around to the list later.

So okay. If everybody has those questions, I just kind of like to take everybody's initial thoughts on what we should do, who we should go to, to bear answers to these questions.

(Jeff Lehman): Hey, Mike, this is (Jeff Lehman). I also have an additional question if it's okay.

Something that kind of came up, you know, because everyone talks about, well, what if we just eliminate the add grace period and that's what a lot of us focuses on. And the thought, you know, discussed this before of, you know, even if we eliminated the AGP of registry and theory could lower their pricing for the first five days, not have a great period but just say for the first five days of a registration, I'll give it to you for free and then you have to pay. It's not a grace period but it's essentially the same type of thing.

So just - I don't know how we figure that in so we kind of have equated domain testing with the add grace period and that's not the only thing as it could be.

(Mike): Okay. I think that's totally good point. So I've got your question as, you know, what if registries or registrars offer free domain registration.

(Jeff Lehman): Right.

(Mike): We can consider that as well. I'll put it at the end of this list of questions, (Jeff).

(Jeff Lehman): Okay.

(Mike):   Start from sort of some of the basics, who benefits from domain testing and who is harmed.

I guess, I just like to on each of these open up the floor and let anybody have comments on this and take it from there.

Man: Are you asking for comments on who we could go to, to get answers to these. You're not asking for answers from us.

(Mike):   I think that's right, you know, I mean, if you think it answers pretty clear, I'm glad to hear that right now. But yeah, generally, we want to know how to kind of frame the work of this group going forward, what issues specifically should we try to find out and from whom.

Man: I mean, I think the question - our first question, you know, for the benefit I guess you would probably - we want to talk to some of the leading tasters.

(Mike):   Yup.

Man: Does that mean that pretty well-known these days, is it something in profile in magazines and there is tasting conferences, you know, whoever goes through the (traffic) conferences I believe knows those people.

(Mike):   Okay. And I think that logically, we would want the registrars to assist with that and say we have the relationships with these folks.

Man: And I think - indirectly, I think (unintelligible) we don't have much of it at all really or, you know, or any or outside US but I would think that

VeriSign might benefit and they might offer some statistics so the percentage of those that names that are tasted become registration.

(Mike):   Okay. Domain tasters on the registrars VeriSign. Anybody else that benefits from this as far as anybody's concerns at the outset, Google search. Yes, Google.

Okay. And then harm. I think we've got the (ARX) request on that and have some discussion about harm and assume that has made it into the staff report.

Man: There's probably a number of other things that could be added that have been discussed in various lists since then. I could certainly pull those together, you know, over some reasonable period of time.

(Mike):   Okay. Also…

Man: The harm is certainly going to be a much harder one to document it and…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …lot of money.

(Mike):   Right. Obviously, it's a much broader group. It's not to say that the harm outweighs the benefits necessarily but at least, there's a much broader group of folks who are experiencing a smaller degree of harm than on the benefit side or smaller group of companies not taking big chunks of the benefit.

(Christina):   (Mike)?

(Mike):   Yes, (Christina).

(Christina):   I have a point of clarification, I certainly know the answer but I just want to make sure that I'm on the right track here that in terms of, you know, to the extent we're going to go back to our constituency and then say, you know, these are the questions that we've been asked the right information and put it out. Am I correct in thinking that kind of the ideal answer would be a combination of narrative and numerical data?

(Mike):   Yes.

(Christina):   Okay.

(Mike):   I think so.

(Christina):   All right.

Man: It sounds like we're trying to write the report and not have staffs to it at this point.

(Mike):   No, I'm not - the different - I'm not trying to do that. I'm just trying to get initial thoughts on what this group can direct going forward. I'm not really worried about writing the report. I'm worrying about the - just taking notes of the call so all of the other volunteers can have access to those notes. Of course, they can review the transcripts or the MP3 recordings as well. I'm trying to be helpful here.

And definitely not getting into writing the report. We've got six votes from the staff on the right…

Man: I didn't mean - excuse me, I didn't mean the writing. I meant it looks like we're trying to create the body of content just using (Christine's) comment and even what I volunteered and I thought we're really supposed to be identifying what it is that we want from staff as oppose to trying to create the information ourselves.

(Mike):   Fair enough.

So I take it - you're asking about the form. So the suggestion obviously is we want to talk to the domain tasters and their registrars, we want to talk to VeriSign, we want to talk to Google, how do we do that, how do we make that happen.

(Kurt):   This is (Kurt). I have a suggestion.

(Mike):   All right.

(Kurt):   It seems that when we go to these entities, we should have a fairly high list of questions and ensure that there's commonality across the questions so when we walk away with the meetings - from the meetings, we have the information necessary to write the report.

So I think the first and an important step is to, you know, write the listing of questions and for that, I think we ought to enlist some experts, you know, because we want to gauge economics impacts, we want to understand the statistics of what's going on and we want to understand the business side of domain tasting.

So I think we should get those three types of expertise and we've done some of that. Staff has - I think we need to - we should get those three types of expertise so we can write the question, you know, write the questions we want to ask. We only have to do that once and come away with it with the material necessary to write the report.

I think it would go to Google and say, you know, well, I don't want to be (glyph) but the opposite of that is going to Google and say well, tell us, you know, your model about domain tasting and ask open-ended question so I won't get to the hard information that we really need to make the conclusions we want to make.

Woman: Well, you know, kind of making an observation here, I mean, I think many of us are already aware of the litigation, the class action that's been filed against Google and frankly, I think the likelihood that any of the parties named in the Wall Street are going to participate is between (unintelligible).

So, you know, I don't know whether we want to continue to pursue that or not.

(Kurt): Well, I think that's a good point but I think that points the same across the marketplace.

Woman: Sure. Yup.

(Mike): The other thing about litigation, you know, is that those documents are public so they're going to make arguments and we can just take them from the brief.

Man: True although it's not going to happen in the time frame of this small group anyway.

Woman: Well, I already have a docu text for that litigation. So if there's anything that - anything subsequently filed, always just make sure to circulate it.

(Mike):   All right.

                And then (Kurt), to your comments, I think it's obviously great suggestion. We want to come up with the list of the questions we need to ask on these folks.

                I do think that the list can be different depending on who we're asking. I think it just by necessity would need to be actually because we really want to get at specifics.

(Kurt):   Right. That's correct.

(Mike):   Okay.

Man: I would seem (Kurt) was saying the same question to any people in the same market in, you know, if we ask to registrars, we should ask both the same thing. That's what I interpreted (Kurt) is saying.

Man: Okay.

(Mike):   Thanks for that and that certainly make sense to me.

Okay. With the still the question remains, are we anticipating that staff would take these questions and go out and do the outreach on behalf of this group?

Man: Who's on the call from policy?

Man: Hello, (unintelligible).

Man: Hello.

Man: And I would say that I think there's a two-step process. First of all, we'll develop a question and we get them verified by this group but yes, these are the questions we want to ask and then we will have results depend to make the necessary investigation.

(Kurt): All right. So, and (unintelligible), you know, to this thing you need support, you know, we'll find other steps to help right and support this group. So…

Man: Right. So if I may express a preference, I think I would very much like to see our first suggestion of the relevant question. I mean, we've got a list of questions already on Page 30 but that and probably be doomed down and expanded and more refined depending on the target audience we foresee.

And also, groups that or which market factors like has been mentioned already and we should address the questions too.

(Mike): Okay. Good. All right.

I think I'm at least on the same page to see there (unintelligible) and (Kurt) so thanks. I think this (Phase 2), what we want to do is breakdown these broader questions from the existing stock report into narrower questions for each constituency for lack of a better word. And then we'll decide how to do the outreach in the answers.

So I'm still - I just want to finish up on the first two questions which are essentially who benefits and who is harmed.

I think we've got the benefit side. The harm side, we've got essentially (alac), the potential domain name registrants of the world. We've got brand owners. Anybody else on the harm side that should be consulted with specific questions?

Woman: What about law enforcement? I don't have a very good sense as to, you know, I'm reading that tasting is pending is being used more frequently blood pressures but I don't know if it's true or not and if no, to what effect - to what extent law enforcements can affected.

Man: Okay. Certainly, a good thing to put (unintelligible) law enforcement/APWG, Anti Phishing Working Group and we could definitely reach out for those folks.

(Mike): And then should we go ahead right now while we're talking about that and decide on some specific questions in this category of who would benefit and who would be harmed? In other words, how do we want them to document that for us? Keep asking people about the harm is definitely going to be easier than asking people about the benefits that they get from the practice.

Man: I think it's easier to ask all of the questions. This is all up here, also about the benefits (unintelligible) full longitude.

(Mike):   Right.

(Kurt):   So without making this too long. This is (Kurt).

So I think there is a set of perceived benefits and perceived harms. Some of which are probably, you know, real and - some of which are probably not real and so there's a couple of ways to go.

One is to compile the list of benefits and harms as sort of hypothesis and then use some sort of analysis either economic or statistical analysis to try to prove the hypothesis.

So for example, if domain tasting was ended, would that end harm to registrants as far as the availability of names or would domain are to develop a different scheme of testing and then registering names.

You know, I don't know the answer to that. I think there are several questions about the marketplace in how it works that people, you know, that subject to a lot of conjecture but no hard analysis is done on it.

So I talk too much but two days to go, then our to state this - state the harms and benefits as hypothesis and then try to prove them or the other way to do that is I can - it has a economist on staff, you know, as a consultant to use that person or somebody who is, you know, might be more applicable to do a study at the marketplace and then use that

information to inform, you know, inform the harms and benefits or, you know, as they're developed.

(Mike):   Okay.

(Kurt):   Is that clear at all?

(Mike):   I certainly understood the first part about, you know, basically, lining up each of the harms and benefits, I think we've got some of that in the report already.

(Kurt):   Yup.

(Mike):   And essentially, trying to prove each one in the event that domain tasting ended. In other words, that the add grace period were closed or there's
other - of course, other mechanisms that had been proposed to potentially end the domain tasting as well, we need to at each of those I think.

(Kurt):   Yes. So that would be one example. You know, there's a lot of examples across the marketplace.

(Mike):   So you're essentially proposing going out with a questionnaire to all of the participants in the marketplace? In other words, asking the registrars to send out the notes to all of their accredited registrars with these questions?

(Kurt):   Well, we could if we think that's the best way to get the information. I
               mean, we certainly want to do a survey. You know, we want to get
               100% participation.

(Mike):   Right.

               I'm just a little worried about time on that as well but it can be done
               assuming we can draft up the questionnaire in the next couple of
               weeks and put it out for a couple of weeks.

(Kurt):   Yeah.

(Mike):   And then we have a couple of few weeks to analyze the results.

(Kurt):   It's more about I think creating a hypothesis and testing them. So, you
               know, and there are largely in there. I mean, we don't have to have a
               big survey to try to understand what the benefits or harms are of
               domain tasting but we want to write - try to cover that field and then
               test each of them.

               Or the other option is to do an economic study of the marketplace and
               then use that information to answer the question.

(Mike):   (Unintelligible) studies of the marketplace my take, well, just as long or
               even longer than the questionnaire, what do other folks think about
               those two options?

(Danny):   This is (Danny).

I participated on the 2001 Who Is survey, (Paul Cane's) group and frankly, the process took forever. I'm not chin on these open ended processes.

Man: Me either.

Woman: And I would say frankly seeking from the pro working group, I would prefer that we avoid something like that only because I think it's inevitable that even once we get this point where there's an initial draft of questions, that, you know, we'll probably spend enough time discussing about how they can be raised so that we really won't give ourselves enough time to have people participate.

So I actually be inclined to suggest that we might - it might be more efficient to kind of put together some pieces that can be distributed to each constituency and make it incumbent on the constituencies to distribute them as they see fit.

And if for example, the domains aren't interested in participating, well then, fine. There isn't going to be any, you know, their - to the extent that they are perceived to be one of the group's most in favor of keeping it and then aren't willing to support their argument, well, still be it, you know. And that would apply frankly across all of the constituencies.

Man: Okay, then. Can we just do (unintelligible) just do an RFI is just do, you know, we request certain information. It's an open call from ICANN to whomever and of course, we'll make sure that our constituencies get it and we could send it to others and really, it's just the request for information and we can frame the issues how we see fit not that we

can work on and, you know, rather than trying to come up with any detailed questions.

As (Christina) said, you know, (unintelligible) is kind of tough because none of us have our experts in the surveys and the surveys or statistical, you know, statistical study of the surveys. I think we just do a general RFI to the community that, you know, we'll probably get some responses.

Man: Yeah. And maybe just ask the broad questions that have already been asked by staff and see what we get back, as well as any additional questions we can all agree on, you know, very quickly…

Woman: Right. And encourage people to the extent that they have got numerical data that they decide it.

Man: And I would put in the RFI, you know, I wouldn't say it's a warning but just something that says, look, you know, we're going to take this information and we are going to develop policy and failure to respond I guess not the best working but basically, you know, that we're going to continue the input we have and if you don't get your input in, then, you know, there can be policy created that could impact you.

(Jeff): Yeah, this is (Jeff) and I have a question.

Constituency, is it the (domainors) would represent themselves this year.

Man: You know, well, we have several (domainors) in the business constituency.

Man: And I would put some registrar in the (domainor) category as well that
               they certainly have (constituency on domainors).

Man: I don't think the RFI should be targeted towards constituencies, by the
               way. I think the RFIs should be general open call and in fact, specify
               the groups that we'd like input from and that doesn't have to be by
               constituencies. That could, you know, it's more of the model of just
               trying to get experts on it.

Woman: I like that idea.

Man: Yeah. It's down here. I support that idea.

               I think the question should not be the exact ones in the report
               specifically at the last half of the question where they start talking
               about intensive solutions, I think we should draft a number of ones that
               have been discussed in various groups and put those specifically on
               the table as what would be impacted doing this kind of thing. That's the
               thought (it need be).

Man: And ask for ultimate solution.

Man: Well, yes. But, you know, right now, there are certain - at least a
               number of them completely eliminating. The AGP is one of them
               having ICANN make the 20-cent fee nonrefundable. You know, there's
               a number that had been discussed a lot and I think we should
               specifically ask for comments on each of those.

Man: I support that.

Man: So that's essentially - I'd ask another additional group of questions
            about the impact or other proposed solutions in the staff report…

Man: Probably replacing the last three or four or something like that. A lot do
            actually.

Man: So two would be what would be the impact of limitation, guidance or
            restrictions on AGP and what are the impacts on eliminating the AGP.

Man: And the previous one and so what enforceable rules to be applied
            towards domain tasting activity.

(Jeff):   This is (Jeff) here.

            I just have quick questions. The third question, what enforceable rules
            to be applied, could we also make this, I think this has kind of been a
            major reaction in like saying, let's get rid of the AGP or charge more
            money.

            We also leave it as an open ended question for other open
            suggestions that could work because I don't know if people in the
            community have had an opportunity to express. Maybe there are some
            ideas or other thoughts on how we could get rid of domain tasting
            without eliminating the AGP certainly.

Man: Absolutely. We should definitely have a call for alternate solutions. But
            I do think we should leave these questions alone and simply
            supplement them with additional questions that say what would be the
            impacts of - in changing the responsibility of the ICANN fee and just

inserting in other alternate solutions that the staff has come up with so far. Does that make sense to everybody?

Man: I think when we define the wording, we're going to find that these are probably redundant once we have the more specific and a general what other ideas do you have but I'm - we can let that fall out of the words here.

Man: Okay. All right.

        Any other comments on the approach or specifics to ask any of these questions?

Man: Really talking with staff putting out a call for information and then consolidating the input.

Man: Uh-huh.

        So we want to give staff guidance from the questions that we want asked.

Man: Yes.

Man: I've had taken pretty good notes from the conversation so far and (unintelligible) probably has it as well.

        Any of the other specific - of the other questions from the staff report that we feel we should dive down deeper on and propose some sort of sub-questions or further questions.

Man: Are we using this call for information as an alternative to having staff try to talk to some of the large players that's out or is this an addition to?

Man: Firstly, I think both should happen. I think staff has an ongoing dialog began with there so I think (unintelligible) we look to get that restarted.

(Jeff):   I think, you know, this is (Jeff), I would think that staff could then focus on getting these parties to respond to the RFI rather than having the dialog about the substantive issues. I'd rather have formal responses if we could by these parties rather than relying on an interview let's say.

Man: I'm just wondering to what extent some of these parties maybe more candid in a non-published report is then something that's going to be posted on the Web.

Woman: Can we do it and that's the same way that we did with the prosing where you have to provide identifying information just as basically, you know, kind of a validation mechanism but that in turn that information was not necessarily disclosed in the sense that in that questionnaire, you had to say, were you a trademark owner, are you registered, what are you, you know, and who are you.

But the "who are you" is not actually identified. In that way, we could have the information and we would need to be able to go back with follow-up if we had it but we would then also have a general enough category so that we could say, you know, 37 ICANN accredited registrars provided information of those, you know, these are the categories of, you know, potential benefits and harms that they identified.

So I think we can do it both ways. We just need to be careful that what we're going to disclose and what we're not.

Man: Yes, I mean, I definitely support that - those questions as well. We can pretty much take some from that other's questionnaire so that will be easy.

Man: I'm still not convinced it sound but we're going to get the clear answers that we would like to get by doing that - any thoughts from staff?

Man: Open ended question to - or not necessarily open ended but I think we would - we could certainly get the tenors and sopranos advocating for and against next them at least to respond.

Rather, this is the perfect way of getting the information we consider we need well, (unintelligible) and I'm not entirely sure whether this or analysis of what can be perceived as existing data with the - whether the one or the other would lead us. So those (unintelligible) desired end result and information gathering but well, others may have clear thought on that than I do.

(Danny):   This is (Danny).

I know that you've referenced association such as the Internet (unintelligible) association and the report. Perhaps, what we're leading up to is the opportunity for staff to directly engage some of these parties I have a meeting with (so calling) for example.

(Mike): It's (Mike) again. I'm thinking that we want to do various things in parallel and certainly, the questionnaires are part of it, staff continuing outreach is another part of it.

And then we may - well, after we get those initial inputs, we'll be able to refine further specific questions that need to be done as part of the PDP or we do have that answered satisfactorily in order to draft in terms of reference.

I'm also thinking that maybe it make sense to do the economic surveys that (Kurt) suggests at the same time.

I don't see any harm and more inputs into the system anyway at this point. We're going to just to get as many factor on the table as we can.

(Olops): This is (Olops) again.

And thinking the second time, I think we're bound to be in the bit of (intuitive) process that - or actually, we're now framed to rather wide questions about who are benefiting and who is harmed and then comes the big question on how to assess the - make some kind of cost benefit analysis of the benefit and the harm and well, making overall assessments of it and I think that's - it is a step-wise process.

And of course, the sooner you and the more parallel you can do it to the best here using the existing data and what the data may exist already, that's - well, one of our literal problems is really that for the time being, we do not know exactly what the time of - timely information we actually would need in order to make a decision.

Man: I think that's fair although I think we certainly have a good, you know, start from the staff report, you know, the sort of broad questions.

I think that, you know, we've all - our several people have proposed narrower questions and additional questions. I think we're going to end up with the list of a dozen or 15 questions just after this call that we could cheat as a draft questionnaire, get everyone's approval, get it out to the community and see what comes back and go from there while also doing more, you know, formal staff work behind the scenes that you can on the survey and, you know, either to use the VeriSign and that sort of thing.

Does that seem to make sense to everybody?

(Jeff):   Well, I thought I'm a little confused because I thought we were getting away from the questionnaires to a general RFI.

Man: Yeah, I'm sorry, (Jeff). Absolutely.

(Jeff):   I don't want…

Man: …the same.

(Jeff):   I think, well, I'm not sure it's the same in that. You know, we're going to raise the broad issues and ask. I think the RFI should have very general questions rather than detail at this stage.

Man: Uh-huh. Do you think the level of detail in the staff report question is a good one?

(Jeff):   Yeah, I don't think those are too detailed. I mean, I think we can add to those or we can provide further explanation or context for those.

Man: We can also address some of the details by some parenthetical remarks or examples or something like that.

(Jeff):   Right.

Man: Okay.

              And then (Kurt), I'm not hearing any objections from anybody else to undertaking the economic survey that you're mentioning while we're doing this other broader work. Does that make sense to you?

Man: Is (Kurt) still here?

(Kurt):   Yeah, I'm here. I'm sorry. I was on mute.

              So, I think the one answer two sets of questions. One is that there is a set of perceived harms so the first thing we want to do is confirm that those perceived harms are real.

              And then second, we want - there's a hypothesis that eliminating domain tasting would cure some part of - some of the harms or, you know, have a benefit and so we want to confirm that and so I think our set of questions should go to answering both those questions my concern.

I have a lot of concerns. My one concern is that, you know, we implement a policy and then the markets courts out in another direction and the harms that exist just remain.

Man: Uh-huh.

(Kurt):   So I think the economics really answer your question. So I think, you know, a broad economic analysis I think everybody is right, takes a long period of time and might not get as close to the end but I think some points of analysis on those questions support.

Man: I think and (Kurt) that's why I brought up the whole notion of, you know, even if you got rid of the AGP, you know, there could be registries or registrars giving away free domain name registration especially if a registry gives it away for free or close to free that can result in the exact same problem.

So the question is need to be - mainly to be drafted broader than, you know, focusing on the AGP.

Man: I think everyone is in agreement on that, (Jeff) as far I can tell.

(Jeff):   Right.

Man: So we'd be taking the staff questions and kind of asking them in the more broad context.

Man: I would say supplementing the staff questions with additional questions that also ask about the other proposed remedies.

(Jonathan):   This is (Jonathan).

Wasn't there another question which was sort of like the pro survey which was to have a person identify from what sector they're coming from?

Man: Yes, I think that's - (Christina) proposed that. We have that set of question in this RFI as well. I support that. I haven't heard anybody objecting to that.

So, you know, I think that, you know, I love to have somebody volunteer to help me out with an initial cut of the questionnaire but I think that I, you know, I have enough from this call, enough guidance to come up with, you know, an additional list on top of the staff list.

((Crosstalk))

Man: …everyone.

Man: We're going to supplement this report you on that from the (self) side but…

Man: Great.

Any other volunteers? Otherwise, I can take that upon myself with all (unintelligible) to circulate, you know, a more complete list as I see it within the next couple of few days.

(Kurt):   Yes, well, I'm speaking for (unintelligible) if this is acceptable to (IMS).

If you take a first cut, then staff will add what they can add and then we circulate it to this group. So I think, you know, all of that, you know, are - the staff or can happen within a few days of receiving many input you have, (Mike).

(Mike): Okay. Great. Thanks, (Kurt).

The other one question I still have in my mind is if you want to start to try and to kickoff a more professional effort, you know, the economic surveys that you mentioned at this time or are you saying that you prefer to wait until we get responses back from the community or are you saying that you think we should come up with the different set of questions to kickoff sort of expert research.

(Kurt): I can as an economist on staff, not as a staff member, as a consultant and we should review the existing questions with him and get and, you know, at least his opinion on the most effective way to move forward so it can move forward on parallel even if it's not the most efficient, if it's the fastest, then we should get him involved now so he can either (coin) up some additional questions or, you know, decide when (input) would be the most effective.

(Mike): Okay. I think that's a good idea. So maybe we can try to (lose him) now with this next set of questions and possibly get him on our next call next week so others can - so he can tell us what he thinks and we can ask him questions.

(Kurt): Yeah, I think so. He has been exactly report to me in our organization but I'll often I work to arrange for that.

(Mike):   Okay. If not next week, then hopefully, the following week. Next week's call time is not set at the moment so we'll work on that first in the next couple of days and I'll work on the questions - list of questions and reconvene next week unless anybody else would like to discuss any of this any further today.

(Jeff):   (Jeff) got one quick question for (Kurt).

            Last October, we did have a board resolution calling for payment of the services of a reputable economic consulting firm to deliver findings on particular economic questions to see economists that's on staff fit that particular bill or we still out there finding another economic firm?

(Kurt):   Yeah, one is you don't think reputable accounting - economist for (Emerson) (unintelligible). We put all of that and retain that expertise.

(Jeff):   Okay. Thanks.

Man: Great.

(Mike):   Okay.

            I think I'm to the point of closing this call then unless anybody else have any questions or comments.

            Then, Glen, we'll you around some proposed times for next week's call and I'll send around a revised expanded list of questions based on today's call within the next couple of days.

(Kurt):   All right. Well, thanks very much, (Mike).

(Mike):   Yeah. I thank everybody as well for participating.

(Kurt):   Yeah.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Bye-bye.

                           END