

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
01 June 2010 at 18:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference on 01 June 2010 at 18:30 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-pednr-20100601.mp3>

On page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Present:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC – Chair
Jeff Eckhaus RC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Tatyana Khramtsova - RC
Michele Neylon - RC
Berry Cobb – CBUC
James Bladel – RC
Paul Diaz – RC
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Helen Laverty – RySG
Ted Suzuki – IPC
Debra Hughes - NCSG

Staff:

Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: Excuse me (for once). The operator does need to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And ma'am you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 1st of June. We have Alan Greenberg, Michele Neylon, Tatiana Khramtsova, Paul Diaz, James Bladel, Ron Wickersham, Jeff Eckhaus, Ted Suzuki, Mikey O'Connor, Berry Cobb, Siva Muthusamy, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Debra Hughes, Helen Laverty.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam, Glen DeSaintgery and myself, Gisela Gruber-White. If I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and there's quite a large group this evening. Thank you. Over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you very much. What I'd like to do today is to do a moderately quick review of the survey to identify - well, obviously to look at the responses to identify problems that there still are in terms of understanding and interpretation. And generally go over if there aren't any surprises for people in Brussels and we do it in the public meeting.

All right. I think the easiest way - I think everyone has their own ability to scroll. And so we'll do the one by one. The first question was the - should registrants have the ability to renew their name post-expiration?

I must admit I was a little bit surprised by the results because we had had 100% unanimity in the previous go around that at this point all of the registrars and the one registry changed their minds and said essentially it should be a best practice which is not an enforceable one. And registrants would not have the guaranteed ability. But the results are what they are and we'll accept them.

Any particular comments on that? I will assume if someone has some comments they'll call out. I do have a question for James. And James has his hand up. So we'll let him speak first.

James Bladel: Yeah Alan. Essentially I considered myself in both the status quo and the best practice camp. I just really couldn't really make the call on that sense. So it may have just been a contextual thing. But I think that if you for, you know, simplicity if it makes more sense to include me into that column, I'm find with that. Either category.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'm sorry. I really wasn't trying to single you out - to put you in (in an out). From my perspective since we don't have a code of practice where best practices are required or even required to get some level of certification or approval, a best practice is effectively the status quo. So I...

James Bladel: Well, and that's...

Alan Greenberg: I didn't differentiate from it from that - in that (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yeah. And that's what I was struggling with...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...a little bit is I think that, you know, determining what the difference would be between the best practice and the status quo and then over thinking it a little bit about how that might play out for folks that...

Alan Greenberg: And...

James Bladel: ...don't have business models that I'm familiar with. So...

Alan Greenberg: And indeed one of the recommendations I was going to make, and we can discuss it now or discuss it at the end, is for most of these questions I agree with you. There isn't a lot of difference between the two. And for simplicity we may want to in any future versions merge the two together because I in fact don't think it's much difference unless the registrars get together on their own and come up with a unified code of practice or something like that.

And I did have a question for you James though on your comment on - I'm curious what kind of business models there might be where the safety net which registrants have traditionally had and as we have noted virtually all registrars give may not be in the business model. Were you just covering the possibility or did you have something in mind?

James Bladel: Just covering the possibility that I wasn't being too narrow in my understanding of the question.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah. I think - actually Alan I just wanted to address your point where you said you thought we had - you were at 100% and I think the difference is is that I agree that when you say hey, should be registrant, you know, should there be - should they be able to recover it? Yes, they should be able to recovery it.

But then when you have a sentence that says should we change the policy so it incorporates the ability for at least a certain amount of time where that at least a certain amount of time is not stated. We don't know the reason. That changes the equation.

So I think that would be - well, at least me personally, that's the difference. And I just want to say one other thing is that I'm in complete agreement with James about the status quo versus the best practice. I actually didn't see the status quo box. I must have missed that or else I probably would have checked that one as well.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So you're agreeing that in cases like this there really is not a big difference between them. It might be one day when the concept...

Jeff Eckhaus: You know, I...

Alan Greenberg: ...of a best practice is more formally agreed.

Jeff Eckhaus: No. I don't know because I think that there is - I think it would be - I know some people say best practice are meaningless. Some people argue that, you know, there's an argument there.

But I think that personally I thought it would be better to send out a best practice and say we see this as a best practice. And I think that is better than the status quo but I'm - I think that there isn't much of a difference but I wouldn't leave - I wouldn't, what's the word, combine those into one category.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Yes. This is Ron. The wording that I thought that you were trying to include there when I read it for at least a certain amount of time is to be more inclusive rather than less although that seems to have had the opposite effect. So I'm kind of surprised as well on that point.

Alan Greenberg: I believe in our drafting the certain amount of time was - the time was Question Number 2. So it wasn't as if it was going to be completely undefined. It was just let's separate the two questions. If any registrars want to change into the first category right now, we will take changes for a modest fee.

No laughs. No hands.

Man: Yeah. Alan, that's the problem. You say modest - you say modest fee and that's the same as a certain amount of time. I don't need to know the fee or the time to make the changes.

Alan Greenberg: Tell you what. For anyone on this call, I'm like the TV ads, if you answer within 90 minutes, it's free. I'm going to have to flag my jokes so people know when to laugh.

James Bladel: As I mentioned - this is James.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

James Bladel: Fell free to move me into that column for best practices. You know, it was preferable a minor distinction in the way I was reading the question.

Alan Greenberg: We can do that. But I was hoping to move people into the make it a policy.

James Bladel: (That's not).

Alan Greenberg: All right. On the amount of time, the majority of people if you combine the best practice and the option and the policy, we end up with the majority saying 30 to 39 days. And outliers which I'm one of them on the less than 30 or more than 40 days. Don't think there's any real surprise there.

James, you made a comment that you're assuming that these are minimums and I'm - if we didn't word it that way, it should have been worded that way.

James Bladel: I think it was worded that way. I went back and read it after putting in my response. And it is worded that way.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

James Bladel: And it's just wanted to reinforce that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We always like people who do better. Next question. I'm working from a paper document by the way, so if I miss people's hands up, please call out.

The indication of how many notices and right now by inference we have two notices. The vast majority of people said that we should have - we should change - revise the language. There was some slight variation in the number but in total we have something over 80% saying change the language. So I think we have a very clear statement there.

James, you had a comment on - do we need to change the RAA? That's why we have consensus policy. I think the problem is I was using - I'd be using the term change the RAA as a sort of generic thing. If something is within the picket fence as is this since it's related to the things that were already by consensus policy under the EDDP, I'm assuming that the method to change the RAA would be consensus policy.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank.

Alan Greenberg: And now there are other things. You know, make your contract clear or, you know, who knows what else that clearly are not within the picket fence and the only way that could be changed by the formal negotiated RAA change. So the things we have are in two different categories.

But I think your point is well taken that we should have been clearer and not just used the generic language and had people figure out for themselves. Is it a picket fence consensus issue or is it a wider one? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just on that point, I mean that's one of the reasons why I would have voted the way I voted. The option - the only option you gave us was to change the RAA, which I ran away from screaming.

Alan Greenberg: But consensus policy changes the RAA by definition. The RAA has a provision that says if there are consensus policies passed on such and - on - in the applicable areas, it de facto changes the RAA on the fly.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. I don't disagree with you. But that's - the way it was worded was much narrower.

Alan Greenberg: All right. If - do we want to consider that for things within the picket fence, the recommend to change the RAA is an indication that we're saying we should write consensus policy on it. If people feel that was a difference and their vote would change because of it, then we can certainly handle that at this point.

And if we do it prior to Brussels, so much the better. So if anyone feels so inclined, let us know now or sometime soon. But I, you know, I - in my mind it was clear but I guess we didn't actually say it anywhere. Okay.

Then we have the question on details on - one second. Oh, this is the timing of the messages and that we had a very large majority, 71%, that basically said they should be - the two messages should be reasonably spaced. We had a number of status quos. But I think we had a strong one. And again James, yes I think this would be done by consensus policy since it is related to expiration things, which are within the picket fence.

The next one was the grab bag of technologies and modes in which to notify registrants. As expected, the answers were all over the map. We seem to have a reasonable numbers in some of the - in some of the areas. I was a little confused that in some of the areas people suggested that something both be changed by policy and via best practice at the same time.

And if anyone could offer any insight as to why we would need it to be a best practice or a recommendation, the wording we used in this particular question in addition to being policy, I'm not quite sure.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) being one of the ones that did that. I misinterpreted the question and so I thought I was supposed to answer about the ones that I liked as policy or as best practice. So I...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Well...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: You're effectively saying if it doesn't - if it doesn't make the policy, it should at least be a best practice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's how I did it as well.

Alan Greenberg: All right. And I would have done it if I had been sharp enough to think of that at the time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Trust me. It wasn't because I wanted to do the survey any longer.

Alan Greenberg: Well see, you just could have answered yes to everything then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, bloody changed it say no to everything...

Alan Greenberg: Or no.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...just on principle.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Yeah. In any case, that was all over the map. I think we're going to have to look at that carefully and try to correlate the recommendations and the policy ones to see if there's any real strong (ones) there. None pokes out other than there are a number of them which have at least support from half the group.

Then there was the question on should there be other additional measures. Ones like explicit warnings on the Web site point to a tutorial on the ICANN site. And we had some moderate support for these. Again, if you look at the combination of policy and best practice, then there's a fair amount of support for some of these. And I think we should be able to come to closure on how we implement these.

The next one is on status of on WHOIS message. We had almost unanimous support and I should note, including Michael Young from a registry, that we should change this. Jeff, you're one of the people who said no and I'm wondering do you have a rational or is just again the feeling that...

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah. I think (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...it's good enough as it is.

Jeff Eckhaus: I did my comment was really much better which is that I'm not really against it. You know, that wasn't - it wasn't saying oh, I think it's a bad idea. I just don't think that a change to the WHOIS status is going to affect the registrants that do not renew.

I think people who have the ability and idea thing, oh let me go check the WHOIS record, I don't think those are the people that we should - that we're - not that we shouldn't be concerned with but our primary concern and - as I said, I'm not against it.

I think it's - it might be a lot of work. I'm - I don't think it's going to - this is mostly on the registry side for their work. But I don't - if we had to choose certain things to let's call it prioritize, I would put this at the bottom of the list because I don't think it would have a huge effect. But that being said, I'm not against it at all.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Post-expiration notices. Yes Helen.

Helen Laverty: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify about the WHOIS status message. I mean that's got to be the easiest thing for anybody to do. It's so easy. And we're really actually talking about the registry. So maybe the registries should respond to this if they have a less confusing message. Because people will look and as a registrar I can say people do look at WHOIS and say, "Oh mine's renewed. I don't have to renew it. I don't have to pay to renew it. It say's it's renewed."

And it says expired at some time in the future. And yet not everybody looks at it. Maybe it's a small percentage but it's a gnawing percentage of people that get confused because they look at their domain and they say, "It's been renewed. I don't need to renew it. I'm not paying for it." And when we put it into redemption, they get quite upset. So yeah, but maybe (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I couldn't have said it better myself. When we were talking about this earlier, the difficulty seemed to arise that there may be other transactions from the registrars of the registry held in the registry especially for (thick) WHOIS, what the status is. And mislead, there may be something like that. But I think the case Helen, the case you just made is the strong one.

Post-expiration notices we have again, if you include the best practice, there's a moderate number of people who think that post-expiration notices should be mandatory. Not quite a majority of people think it should be a formal policy.

On taking down the Web site how to handle Question 9 on Port 80, Helen, the previous question or the last one?

Helen Laverty: Again, I'd like to just (breaking) of the registrar, when we say things like we don't recommend any changes, it doesn't mean that we're not doing it. It just means that we don't want to force people to do it or encourage them very strongly because it does depend on their policy. But keep in mind the majority of registrars do send out lots of renewal notices and the majority also send

out post-expiration reminders. So just because people may say they don't change anything doesn't mean that they...

Alan Greenberg: I think we need to be careful with saying things like the majority of registrars. Certainly the large number of the registrants are served by registrars who do that. But whether it's a majority of registrars is a completely different thing. And even in the group represented on this working group, it's not clear that it's the majority since one of the large registrars doesn't send out post-expiration notices.

Helen Laverty: Yeah. But a fair number do and the ones that don't often do have reasons why they don't do it. I mean if you were a registrar and you actually do want you registrants to renew their domain so if you feel that you've already sent out enough for whatever reason or you've changed the WHOIS to sort of make - I mean the domain DNS so if it shows it's like saying it's got the renewal. You may feel you've done enough.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'll...

Helen Laverty: I think - part of us seem to think that registrars are stupid and they don't realize they should, you know, encourage their registrants to renew. And I...

Alan Greenberg: Well we...

Helen Laverty: ...think that this is kind of missing because most registrars are going to want...

((Crosstalk))

Helen Laverty: ...to force them into sending renewal notices. And it's like when you're in a bar and your beer's going down. Doesn't the server usually come and offer you another better. They don't usually say oh, you don't want another beer. We'll leave him alone.

Alan Greenberg: We talk about different business models and registrars do have (vision) business models. And as has been mentioned in numerable times, we're not - a lot of these things are not aimed at the large registrars but at the small ones and very particularly the resellers who don't necessarily fall what you might consider best practice.

Helen Laverty: Again, they often have reasons and often if they're doing it, the resellers, they know the resellers are sending out renewal notices if they're (unintelligible). It's just something to bear in mind, you know, when you say you don't recommend any changes, let's not rock the boat too much because some people do have very good systems working and may not be in line with this.

Alan Greenberg: And perhaps vice versa. Okay. I'm taking down Web sites. The majority of people say it should be done. Again, there's a difference of should it be done as a best practice or should it be done as a requirement. A small number of people say maintain the status quo.

On email we again had a reasonable number of people I guess it ended up being exactly half saying take down the email and the other people again status quo which means in some cases there are - I just realized - Marika, James seems to have voted in both categories here. Was that actually possible in this question? Or is that a typo?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Which question are you looking at?

Alan Greenberg: We're looking at Question 10.

James Bladel: I'm near Chicago if that helps.

Alan Greenberg: The question is...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...where is the survey company located?

James Bladel: Yeah. The first I didn't really vote on...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I come from Quebec. That's where we start and then go from there.

Marika Konings: It's probably a typo. I just need to figure out...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We'll need to figure out who it is. Probably James didn't vote in to different places. I'm a little bit - I didn't quite understand Ron's comment. And maybe Ron can elaborate just a little bit.

Ron Wickersham: Okay. Yeah. Hi. This is Ron. Yeah, well the - if you weren't clear on the tail end, if a lot of people have very long time to live on their DNS records and so frequent correspondence the name server serving them will continue - it won't even check the root zone to see if there's any changes because it's within the 30, 60 or as I say, in some cases people have very long expiration times on their MX records.

Alan Greenberg: And if they do...

Ron Wickersham: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...they live with the results.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah. Right. But it's also considered good Internet friendliness or, you know, good practice for not making every DNS record very short, you know, five minutes. Otherwise the DNS traffic would zoom up, so, (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: Well I'll...

Ron Wickersham: ...important but you could choose from...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. But that - but the fact of - it's a fact of IP protocols.

Ron Wickersham: Right.

Alan Greenberg: We can't change that.

Ron Wickersham: Right. So even if the zone is deleted, the frequent correspondence mail may continue to work even six months after its deleted if, you know (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: It probably won't work but it may go somewhere.

Ron Wickersham: Well, it would still go to - yeah, right. Well that's the one - no, that's - no, you did bring up a point though, which I hadn't thought - well, no, they would cache the A record at the MX record because the MX record can't be an IP address. It's only a house name.

Alan Greenberg: But in any case...

Ron Wickersham: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...we have no control over...

Ron Wickersham: We have no - yeah, right.

Alan Greenberg: ...what time to live the user puts on it when he still has custody of the domain, so.

Ron Wickersham: Correct. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: He lives - he or she lives with whatever they say. Yeah. I was more curious about the several days that we use several days essentially to give registrars

a reasonable window in which to do the action and not try to demand that things be done within, you know, 12 minutes when that may not always be practical for a whole bunch of reasons, you know, including things that are scheduled on a daily basis and that kind of thing.

So there was - I don't think there was any intent to keep on running a mail server on someone's behalf. No, I'm just wondering did we word the question wrong or - okay; let's take that one offline because I think we want to make sure that we don't have something there that's confusing.

The last question in this section is what do we do with all the other ports? And I'm a little bit confused that people think that we should take down Web sites. Maybe we should take down mail but we shouldn't take down things that happen to work on other IP ports.

And I'm not sure if anyone who said status quo on this one where they didn't say status quo on the previous ones have any insight on this. And the answer is no. Okay. We do have a majority of people who said things should be - everything should stop working. Okay.

Next we have inter register transfer. A mixed bag. This is essentially the one that says a registrar cannot refuse a transfer if the registrant can figure out how to request it. And I was a little surprised that we had as few people as we did recommending that registrants be allowed to. That registrars should not be able to block the request because of technicalities. Again, I'm not sure if this is a question wording issue or if indeed that's the way everyone feels. Okay.

Contractual conditions. The first one is to make - to put things in such a way that the registrant has a reasonable chance of understanding whether it's in a reworded contract or FAQs or other related materials. We have an overwhelming majority who believe that this should be done either as best practice or as policy.

The fee.

Jeff Eckhaus: Wait. Alan, it's Jeff. I - my hand...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Yeah.

Jeff Eckhaus: ...I had it up.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry.

Jeff Eckhaus: I don't remember if you said you had - you weren't looking at the hand.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No I'm - I try to glance up occasionally but I miss them at times.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. So here was my - this was my comment and why I have a huge problem with Option A. And for the people that voted for it, I'd love to hear some answers to recommend ICANN to put in place rules that mandate some level of clarity and predictability in registration agreement.

My comment was at the bottom. Very unclear who will be the entity that defines clarity and while ICANN has to review all agreements and decide on clarity. I have - this one I, you know, it's love to hear how - who's the decider of what's clear and to whom and how would this ever work. And that's sort of reason why I - for me I said maintain the status quo.

And I can see in a bets practice but I'd love to hear from people who are saying hey, let's change it. Like how would that ever actually work? I'm just curious. You know, if somebody said this is a great practice, here's our definition of clear, who's the arbiter of it is I guess my main question on that.

Alan Greenberg: James is next in the queue. I'll give you a very brief answer, which is not really an answer. The RAA has modified in this year already uses the word

clear and you're right, it's not defined and I'm not sure who would define it and who would judge. And I sometimes think registrars agree to that because of the lack of definition of clear. James.

James Bladel: Yes Alan, this is James. I see my comment and I see that more individuals voted for status quo but I don't see my initial (on any) tag or I am assuming that's where my vote registered. And I just wanted to clarify that.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's interesting. We do have - we do say that they added up to 17 and there's a comma after (Mason)'s name so I'm assuming there's a missing JB there.

James Bladel: Yeah. I'm thinking that's - I just wanted to clarify that that was the case because I've known to, you know, skip through (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: And you took the right parenthesis with you.

James Bladel: Thanks.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm sorry for messing that (unintelligible). I think after all the reports I just missed some here and there.

James Bladel: No it's...

Alan Greenberg: So far we've identified two pages out of the 800 you've produced in the last week that you had one character missing on or one word missing on. That's going to go on your performance report, you know.

Marika Konings: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Were there any - anything else on this question? All right. If we go on to - should the fee be shown on the Web site and this one got me a little bit

because the RAA - the EDDP and the RAA already required that the RGP fee be shown.

And I'm wondering what is the objection against having the more common fee being shown as well. And James you said the RGP should be clearly stated in the registration agreement. I think EDDP says it must be shown on the Web site if there is a Web site.

James Bladel: Well that was my question; in fact was - and I think, you know, again I think Jeff's comment earlier. I think it got hung up a little bit on clearly display because I think without going into position and font sizes and contrast colors and things like that, I just wasn't sure how far we wanted to go with clearly displayed. So that's probably where I got hung up on this (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: I took the easy way out in this one. If you remember correctly, we had some wording in the first version that implied that the price I see when I register my domain name will be the price when it comes up for renewal ten years later. And I - we changed it to actually copy verbatim the words in the RAA right now regarding the RGP price.

So again, I'm not sure what clear place means. But those are the words that have been agreed to already. So I'm - we either need to go back and erase those or something. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. Cheryl here. In just - believe it, it's not because I want to talk. I do have something to contribute by way of minor example. But I don't think it's too minor an example with the discussion that was going on this question and the last one for clearly and clearly displayed.

In the case then James when you asked about font size, et cetera, et cetera, the Australian domain name industry code of practice in (unintelligible) dot AU I admit though, you know, that's my reference to a small example. Doesn't give me the (max) minimum font sizes. It does give a - how many,

you know, clicks down and where the links should be for where this information is on the Web.

So in the case of at least A dot AU, the industry code done by the industry has decided what clear and clearly displayed is. In the case of the Australian communications industry, it's done by the industry council in combination with the consumer councils. So it's not impossible. I guess it depends on your experience set to have things like clearly and clearly displayed. Quite (unintelligible) clearly defined.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And I think the corollary to it is as difficult as it may be, and Cheryl's implying that it's not all that impossible to define clearly, it's pretty easy to define things that are not clear. And I in fact was looking for a registration agreement. You know, the registration (unintelligible) with it on one registrar's Web site and it is in very tiny type in a light shade of gray, which is there but it doesn't stick out at you very much.

So, you know, the corollary I think is there. But regardless, the word is already being used in existing contracts and compliance has been auditing registrars to see if they're compliant with it using that wording. And I haven't - I certainly haven't heard that they've had any complaints that their interpretation of clear is unreasonable. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: I'm sorry. Now I - did you - I've somehow - maybe I'm the only - which - are we back onto I think it's Question 14 or did we move on to another question. I'm sorry if I'm - I just needed a point just to bring us...

Alan Greenberg: I think we're on 15.

Jeff Eckhaus: Fifteen. Okay. Thank you. Sorry. Just got - because I think we were going - we were just jumping back between some questions, so, we're on 15.

Alan Greenberg: We're on the word clearly in 15. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, thanks Alan. Question for the group here. Maybe some of the confusion that's going around, we're not being as careful with our terms as we have been elsewhere in that we cite a provision from the existing RAA that talks about redemption grace period. But we're talking - given how these questions at least have been put together, it seems like just the auto renew grace period that we're talking about here in 15...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: ...should be redemption grace in which case it would appear in the next section of our survey.

Alan Greenberg: No. We are talking about the price to get the domain back four days after expiration.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: As an example.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And that's the way I did read it. I would just say for ourselves as a group when we're looking to Brussels to really underscore that the contractual requirement that exists is for redemption grace. Then, you know, and that period doesn't begin until X number of days after the expiration, et cetera.

I just think it's going to be very easy for people in the audience that are - have not been involved in this to get very confused about what point in time we're talking about. And of course the redemption grace incurs a fee, an extra fee, at the registry level that is passed through as well, so.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No, none of these questions were referring to the fee for redemption grace period. That was addressed very well in EDDP.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: The problem in EDDP is it did not address the regular fee, the far more common one.

Paul Diaz: Right. But again...

Alan Greenberg: And this is trying to make up, fill that gap.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And again, just for the group then when we talk about what ICANN compliance may or may not be doing to look into this, their review if I remember correctly was to make sure that registrars are in fact posting the redemption grace period fees.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct. The only - the reason I brought up redemption is there is a provision in the RAA now which talks about posting it clearly and that compliance is auditing that particular requirement.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: That was just in response to the comments that clear is undefined and it's untenable to have such an undefined word in the agreement.

Paul Diaz: Yeah. Very good Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'm just saying it already exists in another context and it's being used.

Paul Diaz: No problem. I'm following you. I'm just thinking that if we're not part of this group and have not been enmeshed in this for awhile, somebody's hearing it, seeing these results during our session in Brussels it's going to be very easy to get confused and we'll just need to remain very careful that we defined whatever period of time we're talking properly.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. And I think the question - I don't want to read it out loud right now but I think we're talking about the recovery after expiration, which the implication is immediately after expiration, prior to a delete. But your point is well taken in that maybe we need to make sure that we're not confusing it with the RGP.

Okay. Question 16 now is on the RGP. We had a majority, a significant majority, saying that the - that registries should implement - matter of fact we had 100% majority saying that registries should implement the RGP for registries because of Safe Harbor provisions. RG - no I'm sorry. I was reading that - I misread it. We had 65% saying have a consensus policy, 35 status quo. I was reading that as the - as a best practice.

So we have a majority but not 100% saying the registries should do it. Now that would have very significant impact on new registries because the track record at this point is that new registries as they form do not implement the RGP.

Seventeen is should registrars be required to offer redemption under the RGP if the registry offers it. And again, we had a majority suggesting that indeed we should.

And lastly, the transfer during RGP, a grab bag of answers all over the place with most saying don't do anything. And if indeed we end up doing what the previous majority says, that is require it, then there's much less change - much less rationale for a transfer during RGP because you don't have - you aren't in the position of a registrant not having any alternatives.

Okay. Hold up. My screen has just gone blank. Any more comments specifically on the survey? Okay. Do we have general belief that or agreement that we offer a form of the survey? And I say a form only in that the problems that we've identified in this call and from the comments in the

existing survey saying some rewording must - needs to be done. That we offer this on a wider scale.

There was a concern raised in a previous meeting that this is not something that normally gets done during the policy development process. And I think we have an interesting counter example going on right now although not a formal PDP.

We have the Board public participation committee doing a survey, even more flexible one where the - where participants can add options to the survey on the fly. And as a way of trying to get input from the people who are involved in the process. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Considering how awkward it is to use that survey, I wouldn't consider it to be an example.

Alan Greenberg: I wouldn't - I don't plan on following that model.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The precedent is what I'm talking about.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Now does that bloody thing - I tried to fill it out and practically gave up. I eventually managed to do but I think it took like three tries.

Alan Greenberg: I think we've come to the conclusion there are no good survey tools. Marika I think lost a fair amount of her hair in trying to craft this particular survey into the rules that the survey tool allowed. And as a result we saw some very wordy questions just because they didn't allow more flexible formats. So yeah, noted I think is the right answer to that. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Some other people suggested as well, you know, if it would be possible to look into options where you can be either, you know,

(create) your own survey results or save it and complete it later. I'm going to look into another survey tool that's for example being used now I think for the public comment form on the meetings which I think uses BigPulse, so.

Alan Greenberg: That's the one Michele said he hates.

Marika Konings: Oh. Oh. Well, okay. Well if anyone has any good suggestions on a survey tool that they use because for example, one of the challenge for this one as well that, you know, in order to identify who wrote what, I have to go through all the individual survey results and, you know, add them. And that's why there's some missing because, you know, obviously I missed a few.

So I really would like as well a tool that, you know, one pushes the button and the results will allow, you know, with that option to identify who's doing what. So I see Michele's already making suggestion there. So I'm happy to look at some other options to see if there's a survey tool that works better because, you know, I think we'll probably have more surveys in the future because it seems to be a tool that working groups do like to use in order to set opinions and views.

Alan Greenberg: With that name I would have thought James would be suggesting it. That was a play on words. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah. It was actually - I was going to say that (joke) that I now agree that most of the survey tools, the standalone ones, are not that good. Unfortunately the really good survey tools are usually much - are part of a larger CRM package and not something that would probably work for this group. So I think that they're all going to have their pluses and minuses.

But I think my - but my main point, my main question here is so many of these questions in the survey are so nuanced and detailed that we've gone over them and I wanted - I have a fear of sending this out to the general public - you know, well let's say - I won't say general public. But to a broader

group because a lot of the meaning and the discussions would not be conveyed through this.

And - so that's one part. And two, I guess my general question is what is the goal of sending it out to a group who - a larger group of people who have not been involved in this working group? What are we hoping to get from those - let's say an extra 50 people fill it out? What would be - what would we expect from those results is my main question on this.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Let's go through the list first. James.

James Bladel: Thanks. And really almost to the letter of what Jeff was going to say is that when we need to tighten up some of the language in places because I've been working with this group since the beginning and I made some mistakes in interpreting the questions.

And two, looking ahead, you know, if we have an area where the working group splits let's say, you know, eight people in one direction and five people in another direction and we get 50 people responding chocolate ice cream, you know, what do we do with that? And does that then set the expectation that we're going to put something completely new that no one on the working group has considered.

So I'm just trying to think a couple of steps ahead and maybe I'm getting a little too far ahead, but I just wanted to start that conversation. And it sounds like Jeff has already opened that door.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Two things. It was only one when I put my hand up and now there's two. Handy to be at the end of the line sometimes. I was going to mention on the issue of better survey tools, first that Michele had in frustrations with the BigPulse tool.

I suspect as I've recently had the opportunity to work with BigPulse on designing something for some other purpose, it's - the difficulties of Michele in not being able to (cast insight) et cetera, et cetera, was a matter of choice. The actual tool itself does have all of those options. But either the people who put the survey together for ICANN didn't know about it or didn't want to use it for whatever reason.

So Marika's doing an analysis of what survey tools will meet needs for the future. She should actually talk to Ralph McKay. Just drop an email and he will ring her back because it has far more capabilities and does all of the backend statistics and identifications as one option right through to very, very public ones that people can come in and out of forever more.

So there's a full gamut, so. But actually talk to the tool designers and not just look at how it's probably being badly set up by someone else in ICANN before.

But then my other concern was - so that's actually a bit I wasn't going to say. My concern is because of the complexity and nuances of some of these questions, I was going to suggest could we look at a subset of questions and some carefully worded and defined explanations where we've come across on what is the definition of clearly and et cetera, et cetera?

I think for an average punter most people would give up and run away screaming from the survey as it is at the moment. I definitely did...

Alan Greenberg: So you're...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I definitely did and I'm motivated to be in it.

Alan Greenberg: So you're saying find the really important questions we need to ask...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...to a wider audience and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...ask those not necessarily the whole gamut of them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Start talking port something and they're going to after - I'm not going to say it because I'm, you know - fill in the dotted lines sake. You know. It could be a very worthwhile exercise. I'd like to do the exercise but not with this particular bunch of questions as they are now. A small, notice that, small essential subset, absolutely.

Alan Greenberg: I think that's an interesting comment. And you of course are willing to work with various people on trying to develop what those are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That should probably come out of Brussels.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. We wanted to include it as part of the public comment. That is reference the survey as part of the public comment. So we don't have a lot of time coming out of Brussels. We're going to have to do at least a draft of it going in I would think and then if necessary change it because of what happens during the public consultation there. But that's probably doable. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah. I'm still trying to figure out what the average punter is but that's all - but back to - so say we do do this and here's the point I just wanted to clarify. Again, I'm not against that to doing like a smaller subset of the survey for the questions that we deem are more important. And, you know, we clarify these

questions and we put it out to this other group of, you know, whatever number of people.

I'm just trying to figure out what is - is that the best usage of our time? Let's call it Marika's time. What are we going to get out of that if we get the results say from another 50 people or so? Is - you know, it's - how will that improve the process and move us along? And will it - if it is, let me know because I'd love to, you know, somehow wrap this up. But I don't see it at the moment with this additional survey.

Alan Greenberg: Any other comments before I chime in? Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, thanks Alan. Just to follow up with what Jeff's saying. I mean my view within ICANN working group is that, you know, ICANN's not a pure democracy. It's a representative one. People self-selected to get involved in the working group. A bunch of us have been here for many, many months. ICANN then has public comment periods for everybody to weigh in.

And, you know, we take all that on board in the second round and refine the things to come out with a final report. I just see opening up this survey or even a subset of it to anybody who happens to walk into the room in Brussels is just an opportunity for all sorts of mischief and...

Alan Greenberg: There was no intent of doing it in Brussels.

Paul Diaz: Okay. But even after, you know, I mean as we've all said, we all had confusion about questions and what not. I mean I just see it as really, really difficult to try and boil this down and then ultimately, you know, come up with something that is so black and white that once you have the results you can consider it hard data and then try and build policy around that.

You know, these things are very nuanced, very complex. That's why we have this working group and why we all commit to what is typically over a year's

worth of our time, you know, kind of grinding though it. I just feel that, you know, if we try and open this up again, except for this one other thing, it's essentially precedent setting and, you know, it's probably going to just create many, many more headaches for us as a group.

I think the exiting mechanisms that we have, the pulse we've done within the group, the comment periods that we're soliciting, feedback from constituencies, et cetera, you know, those are more than adequate to guide us in crafting whatever we may come up with in the final end.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Anyone else before I chime in? No. Okay. I guess I'm a little bit confused about all this negative reaction because I just see this as a vehicle with which to collect the public comments other than send us your pure text. That instead of identifying in the report, you know, these are the six things that we would particularly appreciate public comment on, we suggested that we do it in some form of a survey.

Now we can change that at this point and, you know, instead of having an automated machine based survey, we can identify the five questions that we want people to answer in their public comments. I just think we're likely to get better responses if we craft the questions so we, you know, so we get yes/no answers instead of, you know, things that again to use whoever mentioned that they say chocolate ice cream that we don't know what category it fits in.

I just view a survey as a simplistic way of soliciting the public - the input during the public comment period. Because these are all - we're only going to be asking them about issues that are discussed in depth in the report. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. It is in fact certainly from my mind just a mechanism, a tool that is integrated into the equivalence of a formal public comment. In the traditional way public comments have been explored and indeed exploited by those who practice in ICANN.

We've had significant input in other forum within ICANN including looking at the accountability and transparency of ICANN where the use of more simple, more metric based, less open to interpretation on whoever is doing the interpretation of what was meant by Subsection 5 of Paragraph 53 or someone's text in a public comment.

The use of a set of tools can be a very good way of assuring that it's not - the nuances and situations that we're dealing with in this workgroup don't simply happen in the analysis phase of any public comment period as it does in going to - or perhaps not into policy development later on.

So if we do a survey, it would simply be part toolbox, part of the toolkit and offer some metric based stuff. Just as many public comments say please answer or please focus on the following five issues. Those same five issues can be turned into far more simplistic and metric driven answers in a survey tool.

It also encourages those people who are not verbally dexterous and particularly practiced. Insert here lobbyists and most of those who know how to influence policy development in the GNSO and ICANN. Please enclose that insert.

From having too greater influence and finding the follow on frustrations where satisfaction isn't held by those who are not practiced in the use of the current public comment tool. And I use that in inverted comments because I think it's an (abortionate) thing rather than a tool for getting their way.

And so that it can be transparent and it can be accountable experience. And I'll now get off my soapbox.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll just point out Jeff's next but I'll just point out that there have been other public comment periods in past that used other tools. Some...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...of them I think abominable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: The one used for the President's policy - sorry, I've lost the name, the President's something committee, you know, last year where they were looking at, you know, what has to be changed in ICANN. And they used a tool instead of text public comments which I thought was quite inappropriate because it was the sole tool, as opposed to one of the options. But, you know, this is not really new ground we're on. Okay. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah. Just last comment. If - thank you for answer that question of what it would be used for and that is your - I guess the goal would be to get more public comments on this. Then my next point being that I would - if we decided to do that, I think we would need these - the questions themselves to be I don't know if the word is sanitized but just reviewed to make sure that they're not leading one way or the other.

I think all of us have been so, you know, so deep in this we know, you know, the issues and as, you know, the word nuance keeps coming up. So I want to make sure it's clear that they don't feel that it's a leading one way or the other because we wouldn't want something to go through the public comment that - does not seem impartial.

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm assuming that although anyone else can participate that we'll start off with what was the drafting team for this survey which was me, Paul, James and I think Mikey and Cheryl, who's volunteered to add herself into that. And, you know, I don't want to restrict it but I think a smaller group is likely to come up with something, you know, other than the - well, is likely to come up with something quicker. But if anyone else wants to be involved or the whole group, we can certainly do that.

We're starting - going to get close to running out of time and I want to do one or two other things. But can we say we have marching orders to go ahead with this and try to craft something which is as clear and un-leading as possible. I think we do have some obligation to put it forward soon after Brussels although we haven't specified an exact date. James.

James Bladel: Yeah, just really quickly. I wanted to point out that, you know, if there's some way to de-emphasize the numbers, you know, if 75 individuals have a very, very bad idea and one individual has a very good idea, I don't think that we should necessarily treat them unequally. And I'm - and that's my problem with the survey. I think that really good ideas could, you know, run the danger of being lost in favor of really popular ideas. And so I just wanted to (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: We may want to change the word from survey so it's not implied that we're obliged to accept the majority rule.

James Bladel: Yeah. Thank you. Because that also could come back to haunt us when we publish a final report and someone says why did you go against the will of, you know, 95 individuals, that sort of thing.

Alan Greenberg: Look...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, we've all had recent experiences of that. The manner of weighting - Cheryl here. The manner of weighting responses and indeed weighting who the responses come from is something that a good survey tool will affect a portion of a good polling tool will do.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think so and I mean, look, to be blunt we have that same situation within this working group where registrars are represented far more numerously than the various other groups. If we had gone back to the now out of - out not - no longer allowed or appreciated task force. You know, we

would have defined numbers and then you can take votes and look at percentages.

But we're not - we're on a different model right now and I think we have to factor that in. And the chocolate ice cream answer is applicable. If you look at any of the public comment periods right now, there will always be a few that say don't approve dot XXX.

No matter what the question is they're asking, some people will say don't approve dot XXX. Those answers typically are just discarded. But I think we have to factor in the concept that we will be getting people in who are not necessarily going to have studied the matter with any amount.

And we're going to have to weight those answers. And I think we're going to have to use some modest amount of intelligence and discretion in doing that. So I just think we have to make sure not to set expectations. Helen.

Helen Laverty: We keep coming up with the chocolate ice cream scenario.

Alan Greenberg: Someone mentioned that. I like chocolate ice cream.

Helen Laverty: Yeah. But I think that in the early stages that's a very useful tool because if you're getting a lot of responses that don't quite follow what the survey is doing, then you know that the survey isn't complete and a lot of people do have more questions.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Helen Laverty: So in the early stages you really want to encumber as much flexibility as possible but as we narrow down the questions, then gradually we'll get to a yes/no. But I think you should always have a undecided or third comment, a third one as well. But eventually you may want to start removing the ability to add chocolate ice cream once we've really, really narrowed it down.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure how many more versions of this we want to go through.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...survey is starting to wear thin with some of us.

Helen Laverty: Yeah. But if we're still getting chocolate ice cream, then something implies that the survey is not doing everything it should do.

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Helen Laverty: Especially if you get a lot of chocolate ice cream comments or maybe people like me that say beer. It means that some things are not being included. Yeah, there you are (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: On the other hand, if the question we are asked is what color - you know, I hold that chocolate ice cream is a good answer for that. Never mind. If the question - if the answer of chocolate ice cream applies, yes you're right. If it's completely out in left field, which means they didn't understand the question, that's a different issue.

Helen Laverty: But if you get a lot of people saying chocolate ice cream or beer, then it's probably not just the one person that didn't understand the question. Either the survey is really, really bad or the survey has not included important options like to you like chocolate ice cream and/or beer.

Alan Greenberg: This will be the third version. Let's hope we'll do better. Pray we'll do better. Anyone else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may...

Alan Greenberg: Please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...part of - when Marika is exploring some alternate tools, one of those I'd be jumping at is the one that says give me your current selection of questions and I'll give you back the same questions and then you tell me if they- if I've made the take and if they are in fact meeting your needs.

So in fact rather than those who are in a forest and trees situation and that's the problem with these deep and complex questions. It's because they fit by workgroup participants for workgroup participants, it allows us to go down these, you know, blindingly dark pathways and stumble over how to define clearly.

You know, get it down on the case its simple, stupid process. You know, that's how you're going to do exactly what Helen says. Tease out are we talking crap? Is it understandable? And can we get anything meaningful out of the other end of it?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think anyone's going to disagree. Doing it right is a different matter but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's where professional as opposed to in house DIY might be needed to be looked at. There is an art to survey and polling. There is a huge industry out there doing it. And what we've been doing is tinkering around the edges and doing some DIY stuff. And by here I mean ICANN has not just workgroup. Don't get me wrong.

We need to do it a lot smarter. And maybe that's something public participation need to look at. But let's try and do the best we can if we do it at all.

Alan Greenberg: But the other thing which they do and we never do is exactly what was being referred to a little earlier of, you know, what we call weighting. But essentially is the - are the people answering the questions...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...then as a community we're trying to look at.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, a professional tool will do all of that.

Alan Greenberg: No, I agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The main thing is Alan - the other thing is we can't have Marika busy sliding her life away doing the analysis. The analysis should be practically auto generated. There should be no interpretation time, energy and (bumpis) brought into anything because it should be so damn plain if it's properly designed.

Alan Greenberg: In a proper...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In a perfect world, which I'm clearly not living in. Anyway I'm shutting up now.

Alan Greenberg: Michele. Michele.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible). You know, if you're going to use a tool that's automated, then you don't need to have Marika wasting her time doing things that are too...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

Michele Neylon: ...and apart from everything else, I'm backing up poor Cheryl because it sounds like her throat's probably going to implode.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or I am.

Alan Greenberg: I think the only question is the balancing the tools that we should be using with budget and skills and access and a number of other things and the timeframe we're working on. But conceptually I agree and let's see how close we can come.

Okay. Is there anything else we need to do today? We are - the session in Brussels we have outlined already. I think Marika and I have a fair amount of work to do on that. I haven't heard - or I haven't asked but I'll ask now if there's anyone else who wants to play an active role in the session in Brussels. And we'll include you in that other - if not then Marika and I will take the lead role.

And Ron are you answering - addressing this or something else?

Ron Wickersham: No, something else.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah. This is Ron.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Go ahead. We seem to have no one else speaking on that. Go ahead.

Ron Wickersham: Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to bring up the possibility of adding - after we come up with our recommendations adding in our report, another public comment period because the main purpose of a public comment period on the - that reviews the report is to comment on the actions that we've taken. And since we haven't put actions in yet, I wanted to get a public comment period for those when we do come up with the actions.

Alan Greenberg: I would...

Ron Wickersham: Recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: ...tend to be inclined to say we should do that. But I think we also need to look at the overall process and see is there going to be a public comment period immediately following what we do or not. So - but I tend to agree that we haven't actually made firm recommendations therefore we should open up at that point. Any other comments on that before we go to Siva?

Silence I take is acceptance. Go ahead.

Man: Yeah. I'm not traveling to Brussels. Will the meeting be - the (unintelligible) enabled?

Alan Greenberg: I'm assuming most of them will be. Marika, do you know anything about this particular one?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think you told me to provide a requirement or will be asked to provide a requirement for remote participation. So I definitely foresee Adobe Connect (unintelligible) as we've been using for past ones and I presume there will also be an audio stream...

Alan Greenberg: Hold on. Go ahead Marika. We'll try again.

Marika Konings: Yes, I was saying we still need to discuss the requirements with the meeting staff for remote participation. But I'm presuming that it will be similar to what was provided in - at the previous meetings, so audio streaming and Adobe Connect facilities.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I was assuming that a session talking about a PDP would have those implicitly. But if you could check and let us know.

Marika Konings: I will.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Anything else? Then let's talk about future meetings. I am probably busy next week and my inclination is to say unless we have something pressing that requires action of the whole committee, of the whole working group, that we do not hold a meeting until after Brussels. The week - next week is the 8th. And the week of the 15th people are just starting travel.

So typically there's not a lot of time to participate in teleconferences unless they're really urgent. And my inclination is that we have pretty well come to closure on this part of our work and that a meeting next week is not likely to be a very productive one for the whole group although the small group trying to figure out what to do with this quasi survey I think will have to meet.

And perhaps same time is something that we can - or somewhere sometime near it is something we can look at but we'll talk about that privately. I see an infinite number of checkmarks. I'll take that as support. Are people going to be back from Brussels in time to have a meeting on the 29th in general? Marika, are you back then? Cheryl says no. James says no. Paul says no.

Marika Konings: I'll still be here, so.

Alan Greenberg: Oh that's right. Your travel times come back from the meeting is not very long.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...this time round.

Alan Greenberg: You don't even have to take a train. Some people do. All right. I see a number of Xes. Therefore I would suggest that we meet again actually a little bit over a month from now although most of us will be meeting in Brussels. And by then everything should have been cast in concrete.

I will ask for some - again, if we come out of Brussels not knowing exactly what we're doing in the public comment period, then we may need an ad hoc meeting the week after Brussels for some of us. But let's schedule the formal - next formal committee meeting for the 6th of July.

And unless there are any other issues, I thank you for your help and let's get on with this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...don't talk. How many more...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: How many more conference calls do you have today?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, you don't want to know. Bye.

Alan Greenberg: Bye bye.

Man: Thanks Alan. See you.

END