

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
012 November 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 02 November 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-20101102-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

Present:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC – Chair
Jeff Eckhaus - RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Mason Cole - RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSG
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Ted Suzuki – IPC
James Bladel – RrSG
Tatyana Khramtsova - RrSG

Staff:

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

Absent apologies:

Ted Suzuki – IPC

Michele Neylon - RrSG
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: Excuse me. This conference is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 2nd of November we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tatyana Khramtsova, Mike O'Connor, James Bladel, Jeffrey Eckhaus, Paul Diaz, Berry Cobb, Siva Muthusamy, Ron Wickersham.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam, Glen de Saint Gery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies today noted from Ted Suzuki and Michele Neylon. And also to let you know that Mason Cole will be joining the call later.

Please can I remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. All right we have - a proposal came out yesterday. And I know there's been a lot of discussion going on among various parties over the last week or so. So I think we're off to an interesting start.

I have some ideas of how to proceed on the longer term but I think for today let's - I'd like to turn it over to James or whoever he delegates, since he sent it, to talk a little a bit about the origins, if you care to, and the philosophy and then perhaps we can go through it a bit by - a bit at a time and get comments from the rest of the group. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Alan. I'm not sure if you get - touch on this when you talked about ways forward but I'm wondering, you know, some of us have put together this proposal, put it out to the list, I'm wondering if there are others on the working group that have their own ideas that they're going to want to publish and what not or are we basically going to use this as the foundation and we start adding, subtracting, etcetera?

Alan Greenberg: Well I'd be working on another one. But in trying to figure out how do we go forward I don't like the idea of treating this as a, you know, proposals from two sides and then, you know, having a negotiation as such over them. I would like to put the ideas on the table.

Cheryl maybe you can speak for a minute? We've had some - a very successful methodology that's been working on the Morality and Public Order, the Rec 6 working group and more recently on the gTLD Applicant Support working group of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...coming to closure where people have started off with some very diverse views. And instead of trying to do things as a single proposal we've tried to break things down into the component pieces and then see where - how close we are to consensus on each given item as we go along.

And I think that may well be more successful than try to have overall competing proposals as such. Cheryl, do you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know what you want me to say about it because you just described the process basically.

Alan Greenberg: Well one of the difficulties we're going to have which didn't quite apply on those groups because there weren't people - in both cases these are groups without large people with vested interests and therefore we really looked at the consensus over the working group as a whole whereas here as we've seen because of the split in some of the positions on the surveys we've done that I'm not sure just counting hands is the right way to do it.

And I'm wondering if you have any insight based on your work on developing these procedures how we can go forward, you know, without pasting stars on

people's foreheads but at the same time not being overwhelmed because any given group has more numbers than others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well, I mean, you've sort of got several things running in that question. One is the matter of balance between supply and demand and the other is mechanisms as to how you can actually reach consensus or need consensus on outcomes regardless of what the balance is.

I don't think I need to address the first one I described because it is what it is. And, you know, we all know that. The second one you raised which was first in your questioning as to - as to potential methodologies I think you'll find that if you apply the type of methodology that has been used in Rec 6 and JAS what it would certainly do as a quick first run is allow us to see where - we're very close to agreement or, you know, a tiny tweak will do it.

And if that can be dealt with and then put to side to fasten on their (posture) then perhaps we can look at a negotiation, in inverted commas, with anything that's left. And it may very well be that some things are intractably different depending on from which side of the approach you come in from and so (unintelligible) that's the way it is in the final report then that's the way it is in the final report from my perspective at least.

But we don't even know at the moment other than the few reactions that have come in on this first thing that's been put to the table - when Australians say tabling or when New Zealanders say tabling something in the meeting we don't mean taking it away we mean putting it down for discussion not removing it from discussion. So I'm very careful how I say those things.

Alan Greenberg: That's what comes from living on the other side of the world, your directions are off a bit.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, you should all try it sometimes; it works well. But, you know, why not have a look at what we've got and see what else does or doesn't shake

out? But I wouldn't want to see it become a here is my offer and counter offer exercise mainly because I don't plan on making PNDR my life's work thank you very much.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I've been very impressed with how well, you know, for anything where there are multiple components and that certainly is the case in our situation...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...how well it's worked to not try to say this is my position - this is my proposal, this is your proposal in the sense of the VI working group but try to break it down and say, you know, as will be one of the first examples today the number of days.

And, you know, fine..

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...one groups says five, someone else says 49 and we try to see how close we are to consensus and if there is no consensus try to characterize the majority/minority report if we can have such a concept but at least the two different positions. But not to tie them all together in a single bundle which I think is what may - to some extent what made the VI ones intractable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay but is there a suggestion that this is a single bundle, this is a negotiation issue or this is a good start, can we now start working on it?

Alan Greenberg: Well I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because I'm not clear that any predetermination has been made on that.

Alan Greenberg: No there isn't. And I'm proposing that we not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Alan Greenberg: ...treat it as a single bundle or we treat it as a discrete set of components and obviously as we have the discussions there'll be other issues that are added in and some taken off the table because we agree with them point blank.

So I'd like to use that as the method going forward. Today I'd like to start just discussing what is - what was in this particular message and see where we go on that.

I should look at the screen and see if anyone has a hand up. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay thanks. One other thing I wanted to add to that is if we could go through this and also, you know, with the different - one of the most important things I think sometimes we neglect to do is to look at this, you know, this proposal - and, Alan, when you put yours forward and all the others and also just to make sure that they do address the charter and the reason that we put this PDP together in the first place is because I think a lot of times that gets lost in the details.

And I think we should all look to that and say does this address the concerns that started this PDP and to make sure of that. And negotiating over days might not, you know, if both solve it then, you know, that's other issues. But let's also look and see do these proposals resolve what the issues were, why this working group started in the first place? And I think we need to do that before we move forward.

Alan Greenberg: I believe...

Jeff Eckhaus: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I believe the intent - and Marika and I have looked at this a little bit - is to try to formulate any recommendations we have as applicable to the charter

questions. So I would hope that anything that's coming out of this does pretty directly relate to the charter questions and not something off in left field.

But I'm sure someone will try to keep us honest if we stray.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, just if we can just - I always like to make sure that we are addressing the concerns there in some of the proposals and some of the items we discuss because, you know, that sometimes - sometimes we forget about the charter. Sometimes I actually bring it up and put it up on the screen so I remember what actually - what were the issues that needed to be addressed and make sure that when we're looking at these that they do address those issues.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: ...that started this PDP.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Can't disagree on that. Anything else before we start looking at the details of this proposal? And Jeff, just to be clear I don't think I'm going to come out with a single proposal and say this is Greenberg's proposal. I think we're going to start trying to develop recommendations, find things that we do have consensus on and then identify other things that perhaps we don't.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. Oh okay I thought that you had said - maybe I...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I said I do have one but I don't think it's going to serve us well to come out with dueling proposals at this point.

Jeff Eckhaus: Oh okay that's fine. Oh sorry, yeah, no, I thought that you had said that you were going to - in the email you said that you were going to send it out but that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: No I said in the email I'm going to have more stuff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Oh okay, okay. I guess I combined it from what you said into the email. Sorry, my mistake.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Who's taking the lead from the registrars on this?

James Bladel: It's James. I can go ahead and speak up on this, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: And, you know, again this is - I think maybe was born in discussions amongst registrars but, you know, has definitely branched out from there. And I think the conversation started with this idea that, you know, was not clear that, you know, another six months or even 12 months of continuing to discuss some of these issues was going to bring some of these topics any closer together on the working group.

And so it was more of an attempt to identify those things that could be driven towards a consensus and, you know, identify where the middle ground exists and to try and flush that out and drive towards that. And...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Let me interrupt. Yeah, I think quite independently a number of us have been going in that direction the last week or so so yes.

James Bladel: Sure, sure, I mean, nobody wants to see a PDP have its second birthday right? I mean, this goes for...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: God no please.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...everything to help. So, you know, I think that we're all kind of keeping one eye on the calendar and one eye on all of the other developments in the community that are likely to land on our to-do list here in the next, you know, year to 18 months. And we all want to kind of bring some things in for a gentle landing and have something meaningful to bring back to the community to show for our work.

And in that regard, you know, I mean, something that I've always held to be true is that, you know, in a consensus-driven organization not being able to achieve consensus is a legitimate outcome and it essentially favors the status quo. So what are the things that we can find consensus on? And that's where we tried to boil down some of the key elements here with these three objectives in mind.

And hopefully everyone's had a chance to read - I know I posted it kind of late yesterday afternoon which was probably in the middle of the night Cheryl's time. But we wanted to provide some additional safeguards to protect against inadvertent - and I think that the key here is inadvertent loss of registration.

And we wanted those to be backed up by consensus policy so that if a registrar, you know, or other contracted party that we haven't invented yet in the future didn't provide these safeguards then compliance would have something to push off on. We wanted to inject some uniformity into the registrant experience with how - what they can expect when it comes time to renew or expire a domain name.

And I think importantly we wanted to achieve a first and second - or - I had a typo there - we wanted to achieve the first and second objective in a way that was as minimally disruptive to all of the activities, aftermarket, ecosystems, practices, tools and systems that have developed in the last 10 years we

don't want to necessarily with the stroke of a pen have someone throw out something that's very popular or very useful.

And I think that we need to be mindful of that. So that was kind of the - that with an overriding desire to - yes Ron, that's correct, that is a typo. So, you know, with all those in mind we wanted to sort of drive those elements that can achieve consensus and start to coalesce some group discussions and possibly draft recommendations around those.

I will tell you that, you know, we've already received some feedback on the list on this but, you know, just even getting a lot of the contracted parties to see eye to eye on this has been a real challenge. You know, I always kind of giggle whenever one says, you know, registrars or registries act as a block.

You know, I can tell you first hand that that's possibly the more lengthy cat herding exercise is getting everyone on the same page there. So, you know, this is what I think that we can confidently put forward that would be palatable to most individuals under most circumstances.

So I think when we start talking about well we would like to have X, Y and Z added into this then we start to immediately see support for this drop away. And so I just wanted to put that out there. I know this isn't a negotiation, I'm just trying to emphasize that boiling things down to common denominators, you know, we have a lot of downstream consequences when we start tweaking these things.

So I was hoping that they would come forth with a little bit more inertia than apparently they had. Oh we'll go through them individually here and I'll just mind the queue, Alan, but if I start to ramble then just talk over me, okay?

Alan Greenberg: Understood.

James Bladel: Okay? Okay. So the first part is we're proposing a new grace period. Haven't come up with a catchy name for it but clearly it needs one to distinguish it from existing grace periods.

And during this grace period it would - the name would be essentially untouched and only the RAE can recover or renew this name during a grace period. It will not go to auction; it cannot be - I'm sorry, it could be explicitly deleted by the registrar but that would simply commence the RGP, the Registry Redemption Grace Period.

So that's the first thing. I know there's been a lot of discussion about how much time is appropriate, five days versus - I saw some other ideas floated out there.

I think that, you know, we want to preserve the intent of this. This is to ensure that, you know, there are no - that names are not lost due to checks crossing in the mail or, you know, the electronic equivalent thereof or, you know, someone being on vacation or being a bank holiday in one country and not the registrar's country, etcetera.

So it's not, you know, at least the initial intention is not that this be a overriding grace period to cure all ills; this is really just to put some wiggle room in there for coordination of payment purposes.

And I think the analogy we're drawing from here is that, you know, if I forget to pay my electric bill if it's due on the 1st of November and I say oh, you know, shoot I forgot to pay that and I send the check out today, you know, that's no problem.

But if I were to...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Uh-oh.

Woman: The subscriber's cell is switched off...

James Bladel: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I think that was the conference call's way of saying that Cheryl has something to say.

James Bladel: Okay. Well I just wanted to finish my analogy. You know, that if I were to wait 20 days or 30 days before sending my electric bill, you know, I shouldn't be surprised when I wake up in the morning and the lights are all off. So we're trying to build in that type of a grace period.

And Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks James. And I can assure you that was not anything from Asia-Pacific that I was responsible for. However I thought the timing was kind of cute. And I also can't help myself by saying of course, James, you'll have at least received in my country one if not two notices and final notice before the power is disconnected and a clear note that says how much it'll cost you to get reconnected as well.

But that aside the reason I put my hand up was what I liked about what I saw when I did read this as it came through - and thank you, James and everyone involved for putting something on the table using the Australian and New Zealand meaning of being on the table, for us to start interacting with, is that any time that we have a known amount - a piece of information that registrants can be assured is a given we're already starting to see something that most of us desire and that sort of degree of predictability in how this whole thing runs.

So I just wanted to wave my hand and say that one of the great advantages I could see here not discussing numbers, not discussing how numbers are generated but what I do like is an amount of time that is a given that people can then understand and we can then educate about. Now I'll put my hand down.

James Bladel: Oh I agree, Cheryl, that's a good point. And I think that's a key theme before I jump into the rest of the queue is that, you know, this really in some respects provides some certainty to how a registrar will disposition a name upon expiry. They will hold it, they will not, you know, execute - whatever their business practice is.

And believe me, you know, through the course of trying to put this together we've been discussing this and there's hundreds if not thousands of different approaches to skinning these particular cats. And I think what it does is it provides some uniformity and I think that's what I liked about it. And Alan, I'll turn it back over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Well no I'm not taking it over I'm - I put my hand up as a speaker. You're still the acting chair at this point. The - what came through in what you said was different than what I read in the text. And whether that's the fault of the text or the reader we'll leave up as a decision for later.

James Bladel: Probably the reader.

Alan Greenberg: Probably. I put this as...

James Bladel: Oh you mean me reading it out just now, right?

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no, I meant me reading it yesterday. This is getting difficult. This is a difficult audience.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: No what I took it - and I think the way a number of the other people who responded on email took it as this is the 30 days or the 45 day or the 60 days or whatever that is being cut down to five. And what you're presenting is a different new grace period which is a different thing than what has been discussed before.

And in that light I think it has a lot of merit. I'm not 100% sure all of it comes within the charter as Jeff was discussing. For instance I'm not sure to what extent under the charter we could demand, if you forgive the expression, that something not go to auction. All that could be discussed under the charter I think is that the auction not be finalized.

But I have no problem with registries volunteering to do that. And in that light I take it as a different period than the 30, 45, 60, 15 that we've been talking about in much of the rest of the PDP.

James Bladel: My understanding is that's correct, Alan, that there is a 30 day RGP which, you know, if the registry supports it and if the registrar offers it is available. There's a 45 day ARGP, Auto Renew Grace Period, if the registrar supports it and offers it, etcetera. And this is where all the, you know, the wonderful diverse business models that form our industry start to come into play.

Essentially what we're saying is hang on a second, let's take five days and regardless of all of those different variations let's say that, you know, during these five days this is what the registrant can expect. So it's not - it's really not adding to or subtracting from existing grace periods it's providing a common baseline of grace periods that no matter, you know, who is, you know, who is involved in the provider chain, you know, the registrant can expect the same thing.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. One more question before I give up the mic. For a registrar that redirects websites to a splash page would the implication of this be it not be done until after five days or might this be done in parallel?

James Bladel: You know, I don't think we made any discussion about...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: ...whether it does or doesn't redirect, you know, there was a healthy debate about whether it should shut off entirely and go dark. And we really didn't dive into what happens to it during those five days just that...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: ...you know...

Alan Greenberg: That was just a question if it was understood or if it's still up for discussion.
Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Ron also has his hand up.

Ron Wickersham: Yes this is Ron. The - I see it as an additional grace period rather than a uniformity of current grace periods. But that may be because I don't understand if this will in a sense eliminate some of the other grace periods and combine them into this one.

But as far as being predictable the current method is - I don't find anything unpredictable about a domain name expiring and the date it expires it expires. That's predictable. So having a grace period in a sense - a five-day grace period doesn't make it any more predictable it just is another little in one sense complication.

But I also respect some of the discussion you've brought up in presenting it about some of the goals. So I think it may come out more. I sort of felt that it did go beyond the charter but I don't think that we should be - it doesn't seem to me that some of the other things that we've discussed that go out to the edge are justifiably removed because they don't have absolute explicit definition in the charter.

So I'm quite agreeable to seeing this additional grace period be implemented and wouldn't object to it on the basis that it didn't have an explicit indication in the charter.

James Bladel: You know, if I can touch on the first thing that you said, Ron? I think that one way to look at these - this five-day window is that the auto renew grace period is a 45-day window should the registrar choose to offer it, etcetera, etcetera.

I think what we're saying is regardless of what the registrar's practices are five of those 45 days must be allocated for use by the registrar - RAE, sorry and made available. So in a sense it's taking that 45-day period and it's taking the first five days, the most critical five days, and it's reserving them for this one and only person or entity to execute this one and only function which is to renew.

And all of the other things by all of the other parties essentially, you know, can wait until Day 6. So we're trying to take this, you know, kind of, you know, this flow chart that quickly turns into spaghetti after the expiration date and trying to say, you know, let's just tack on five days after that and, you know, and all of that stuff can still happen it just has to, you know, wait a second.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

James Bladel: And that's kind of what we're getting at here.

Ron Wickersham: Right. Yeah, I appreciate that clarification because you added that it is part of this other grace period, it's just an additional definition of that 45 day grace period then it's an additional thing.

I would point out that currently, I mean, renewing the domain name before it expires even if it's an hour before it expires only the RAE can renew it at that point as well. So you say recover renew, is there - is that - that's confusing if we haven't - if the domain continues to operate then in a sense it's not recovery it's still renewal it's just that the due date is extended by five days for any practical purpose or is there another thing of the recoverer/renew aspect...

Alan Greenberg: Ron, if I could interject? This is Alan. I think we have not - we have not used the words renew and recover during the post expiration period uniformly starting in the issues report and going forward. And I think something that needs to come out when we finish is to make sure we do use these words uniformly.

And I think there's rightfully some confusion right now so your point is well taken but I don't think it's unique to this particular paragraph; I think it's something that we've - a sin we've been committing all along. So it's something we have to be cognizant of as we go forward I think.

Ron Wickersham: Okay thank you.

James Bladel: Okay I'll - I see the queue is clear so I'll move onto renewal notices. And this is the second element that we'd - tried to put some common proposals around. And this was the idea that there would be a prescribed minimum number of renewal notices set out to - according to a predictable schedule with the understanding that registrars can always send more.

And in fact I think that in the case of Go Daddy we, you know, our renewal notices schedule has been called annoying or pestering but, you know, we conduct dozens.

But just to take a look at this one here is, you know, we want to leave the method open-ended because while I think email is pretty much understood to be universal we didn't want to hard-code that into a policy where a certain business model, for example, you know, dictated that registrars like to maintain telephone communications or SMS or some other product or service with their customers that a renewal notice would be sent to the registrant no later than 10 days prior to expiry.

And I may need some help with that because I'm trying to think if it's, you know, earlier than 10 days prior to expiry but maybe I'm just over-reading that. And that there would be a second notice prior to - the day before the expiration date that would also notify the RAE that the five-day grace period proposed above is now in effect.

And so I think that's, you know, this is a minimum of two notifications. If, you know, probably would augment or possibly replace some of the language in the EDDT but of course we'd have to take a closer look at that. But it's the idea that, you know, here's a minimum bar that registrars are free to exceed in the service to their customers.

They're free to choose the method of - or the communications channel that is most likely to elicit a response and they're free to build upon this minimum. But at least registrants can understand that they'll have a predictable experience no matter which registrar they choose.

And it looks like we have Cheryl first and then Alan. Go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much. Cheryl here. Just again just to share my kneejerk reaction when I read this there was a high degree of comfort from me

because it fits with familiarity at least from the CC-space operation that I'm most familiar with where we do have a - actually a requirement that's part of the code of practice that at least a notice goes out 60 and 30 days prior to expiration.

And then what people do on the day of expiration or post-expiration does vary. And so I didn't read it coupled with the first half but reading it separately from the first part, you know, it made sense to me because you were talking about an amount of time that appeared to be at least reasonably distanced between each other.

It is possible for people to be away from a given method of communication for, you know, in excess of three to five days. We could argue perhaps that, you know, you could be away from that method of communication for in excess of 10-14 as well.

But I thought I just would place into the mindset here that not - again hardwiring the amounts of times - the fact that you've got a no later than helped me there. But it seated with a method that we've had no consumer discomfort with where a required 60 and 30 and then usually a little bit before if not on the day or in some cases after the expiration date further notice with different information goes out.

So I just want to put that on the record.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Cheryl. Alan, did you still have your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm - I guess I'd like to delve a little bit more into the logic between the numbers. We had a lot of discussion earlier in this workgroup and there seemed to be a general consensus that one notice round about a month ahead of time fits very well with monthly bill payment in companies with the amount of time it takes to issue a check within a company.

And, you know, was likely to be acted on within that timeframe assuming someone was paying attention to the notice of course but assuming that is the case that a month is a reasonable time given the cycles and the elapsed time that things take.

And it strikes me that 10 days although you're saying no later than 10 days so a registrar could choose to do it 30 days out or 120 days out for that matter but 10 days seems to be a bit short as the first - as what might be the first notice that the expiration is coming up just based on how businesses react to these kind of things.

And I'm curious as to where the - what was the logic in coming up with this?

James Bladel: Well, you know, I think there's a couple of schools of thought and I'll certainly open up to other registrars to share their experiences. But, you know, sending something too far ahead of the expiration date doesn't get the desired results. And sending something, you know, too close to the expiration date doesn't get the desired result.

And I'm sure that arguments can be made all over the place of why some folks respond to early notices and some folks wait until the last possible minute and exhaust whatever grace period they're currently provided. You know, I do believe strongly that there is a diminishing return, you know, that the benefit between let's say two notifications and three is much more striking than let's say the 99th notification and the 100th notification.

So, you know, I think this is probably an area that's open for discussion. And I think that your point about sending a notification that includes some time to account for businesses' accounts payable processes it's probably a valid one and should be factored into our discussion.

But I see that Mikey now has his hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yeah but that's on a - it's on a slightly different topic, James, so if you want to let this one play out a little longer I'm happy to wait.

James Bladel: Well I guess I'm - at this point, you know, I'm kind of taking the, you know, being the spokesperson here but I would like hear from some of the other registrars as what their thoughts are as far as, you know, 30 versus 10 versus 5 or what the right number is. And Paul has his hand up now.

Paul Diaz: Thanks James. Yeah, you know, from Network Solutions' perspective I guess we would be open to talking about pushing it out maybe 30 days, something like that.

Just from my perspective and my two cents here when we cobbled this language together we really were focusing on that no later than 10 days and felt that that was the bare minimum recognizing that, you know, a longer lead time than 30 days is probably, you know, more comfortable for people and we can talk about it but of course we're working within the construct that there are two required messages.

And so what James is saying if you start pushing it further out, you know, we do run the risk that people are not focusing on those messages because they think they still have plenty of time, etcetera.

So I guess, you know, we've put this one out there and at least from my perspective I'm willing to entertain a different particular day but, I mean, it was at least from my perspective focusing on that no later than 10 days with the view that there's only going to be two messages required.

And for the record just like Go Daddy Network Solutions sends out a whole heck of a lot more two notices so, you know, there's plenty of room for us to maneuver.

James Bladel: Alan, can I jump down to Jeff and get, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Just a quick - a very quick comment. Just for the record I wasn't really trying to haggle here or negotiate the number; I was just curious as to the logic which moved from what we originally had talked about as allowing enough time for business practices but not too far early that, you know, a notice six months ahead of time is clearly going to be ignored.

You know, I just got a renewal for Consumer Reports for a subscription that expires in February 2012. I'm not honoring it. And so I was just wondering why you went to one that was so short with a minimum time but could be as early as six months out instead of the kind of window we were looking at.

And as I said I really wasn't trying to negotiate I was just trying to understand if there was some logic or pattern behind it. In any case you can go on.

James Bladel: And the original registration possibly is a factor as well. I mean, if I register something for 10 years I would probably want to know when there was only six months remaining on it - on its active cycle. If I register something for one year...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...you know, I think that's, you know, I think that there's a lot of variables here that it's not a one-size fits all. And so Paul was correct that by saying, you know, it's no later than, you know, we're essentially putting some stakes in the ground here and saying, you know, you know, registrars know their customers and they want their customer to renew.

You know, you know the best way to contact them and you know how frequently or, you know, you know, you have the statistics on what works the

best. But just so you're aware here are some, you know, common minimums that should be, you know, readily agreeable to everyone.

Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. You know what I was thinking was maybe instead of looking at it this way is to say - because I was thinking about, you know, no one is haggling about the dates but about on the number of days.

Is I know we - maybe Marika had done this in her previous analysis to say, you know, looking at most of the registrars and how much of a grace period they give now and to say how many domains - let's call it under management - was the average length of time.

Because this might be a moot point because if, you know, 99% of the domain names under management their registrars have, you know, an average of 28 or 30 days then, I mean, we could mandate, you know, this guarantee but then I think that would also, you know, sort of say is the number of days an actual necessity for us to discuss? Is that the issue? So we could sort of maybe move on.

We had put - Alan, to address what you said. We had just put that in to just say it's a bare minimum. I mean, I know our - I can't speak for any other registrar - we're not planning on changing it, you know, to that five day if that's the number or 10 days if that's the number. We're going to keep it at our, you know, at our date which is closer to 30 because we want renewals.

So I think that might be worth delving into and looking into to see what those - what the, you know, the average domains - average amount of time registrars give to their customers based upon our earlier research.

James Bladel: Thanks Jeff. Mikey is this - have we swung around to your topic yet or should we just continue to hold the plate for you?

Mikey O'Connor: No I just didn't want to disrupt the days conversation so if we're feeling like we're done with that I'm ready to slightly change the subject.

James Bladel: Well that's Alan then I guess, that's up to him if he wants to continue on this thread or is that something new?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I just wanted to remind people that from the very beginning we've always said we are not worried about what some of the bigger players are doing; we're trying to find the bad actors, the people who don't have good standards and looking at providing some way to make sure they do things responsibly.

If we had been in this just to change what Go Daddy does we've wasted a hell of a lot of time because although I'm sure people can pick out - pick things that they don't like about it it isn't the kind of issues that we went to the trouble of starting this PDP over. So...

James Bladel: And I think that's...

Alan Greenberg: ...but we just need to keep in mind that it's not whether your practices or Jeff's practices are going to change significantly it's are we going to put in place something to make sure that the people who don't follow those practices do in the future. And that was the rationale to begin with.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And that's exactly the rationale, you know, between some of these ideas, Alan, is that...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...there's a lot of space between, you know, what we're all doing here as part of the registrars that participate in this group and indeed the registrars who participate in ICANN versus the outliers. And I think that it's pretty clear that we can draw some lines here that, you know, would bring those other folks into the fold.

Alan Greenberg: That's the hope.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Jeff Eckhaus: And guys, can I just - it's Jeff again, one last comment. And I think the other reason why is besides getting in those, you know, whoever these bad actors are or the ones who do this or actually they're not bad actors because they're within their regulations to do so but I think it's to bring in what everyone has said the level of predictability for those ones that don't advertise and don't keep, you know, out there.

I think everyone will know and this was getting out there saying you're guaranteed, you know, that you have that time versus, you know, 30 days versus 29 versus 31 and allowing those people to renew it. I think that's the - that's a piece for those what, you know, these guys - whoever they are that may be that, you know, the ones who have - the unpredictable or whatever processes that I guess started this whole PDP off.

James Bladel: That's a good point, Jeff. And you're absolutely right, they're not bad actors if there's no policy to guide them. So go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. This is Mikey. The thing - well first this is really the first time I've spoken about the proposal so let me chime in on the same theme which is I think this is a great start and I really appreciate the effort.

And the question I have on this particular topic was whether during your discussions amongst the registrars the alternate form of letting people know

discretion came up. You know, we've talked a lot in the working group about the registrant who is - there are really two forms, one is the registrant whose name has gone dark and the email is going to the same domain and so that's not an issue before expiry. And this is all pre-expiry so that's kind of moot.

What I'm really interested in is the person whose name was acquired through a vendor that has gone out of business kind of scenario. And I was just curious if there were any conversations during the formulating of this around those kinds of sort of alternate forms of notification.

James Bladel: You mean a registrar who has gone out of business Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: No the...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Joe's pretty good Web builder who got a domain name for you and built a Website and now the Web builder has gone out of the business but they registered the name to themselves rather than to the owner of the actual site.

You know, part of this I think goes in the education pile for sure...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...which is, dear registrant if you think you own your domain name go check the Whois and make sure that your name is in the contact information and that your email is there, blah, blah, blah. So for sure I think, you know, part of it is education.

But the other part is the notion of, you know, an alternate form ala SMS, ala phone, alternate email address outside the domain that's been registered, that kind of stuff and whether there's any room to, you know, I'm a little cautious about mandating specific solutions but I am kind of keen on the idea

of some kind of alternate communications channel to the registrant just to make sure that because, you know, the example - the personal example that I've got is a guy who never got any of the notices because it was going to the wrong place and he didn't know it.

So that's just my...

James Bladel: Well, I mean, I think that that's, you know, that's something worth discussing, Mikey. I'm not sure where to fit it into this or the other. It probably belongs to this one but, you know, I mean, I would point out that if your Web hosting pretty good Web builder place has inserted themselves in as the registrant or, you know, as the contact information for phone number and email and fax number then they're going to do it probably for SMS or whatever other methods we include in here.

I mean, I guess there's no - what am I trying to say here? I think that they could just continue to bypass whatever intention we're trying to get at with that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I don't disagree. I'm sort of making this up on the fly. I have to kind of cogitate about it. That's why I was curious if you all had thought about it at all because frankly you guys deal with it more than I do. You know, I...

James Bladel: I didn't even think about it, I just don't know that there's a universal solution. You know, one of the things that I think we kicked around very early in this group was giving some additional responsibilities to the billing contacts which is a required element that we have to capture and maintain for each domain name registration but really doesn't have a whole lot of responsibility or purpose.

You know, but if we made the billing contact essentially the end all be all, you know, renewal entity, I mean, that's - and this is, you know, you're brainstorming so now I'm counter-brainstorming.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay I see your brainstorm and I raise you two brainstorms.

James Bladel: But it was just something that I think, you know, came up earlier. But, you know, if I can kind of - I see we're getting close on time so I just wanted to go to Paul on this topic.

Paul Diaz: Thanks James. I mean, you guys have already touched on one - I was going to try and interject. You know, I guess a two-part answer for you and Mikey, one, yes we have at least considered alternate communication channels but in the ICANN world it's rare that something - technologies are ever mandated so that's why we had the clause by a method at each registrar's discretion.

It's certainly available, registrars can do something else. But email is going to remain I think the industry norm or standard. And then as far as, you know, the scenario and I think I found the particular case you're talking about where, you know, some middle man, a Web host or graphic designer, somebody else goes out of business.

You know, as James has already touched on it how does the registrar know that that person is no longer in the loop? So when we have these other communication channels we build out a very sophisticated way of reaching out. And we're still reaching out to a black hole.

You know, I mean, ultimately as we've repeatedly said there is an element of education and, you know, if people value their domain names, good lord, they have to understand the rudimentary fundamentals one of which is check the Whois; if it's not in your name as the registrant you better find out why.

And, you know, you can't expect registrars to be all knowing and doing all things. This isn't a nanny world we live in that we can lead everybody by the hand and make sure that everybody is constantly taking care of it exactly the way they want. It's just impossible.

James Bladel: That's a good point, Paul. And I think we - really early on we just, you know, discussed the idea that a registrant who doesn't know they have a domain name through an intermediate party or doesn't want a domain name looks exactly the same to a registrar as someone who wants to keep their name but is having, you know, communication troubles getting that renewal through.

And, you know, we can put a lot of systems in place to guard against that but I think we'll always be able to brainstorm up exceptions of why they will fail in individual and specific cases. And I think that if we - we're chasing that last percentile I don't know that that's going to be a successful effort.

Mikey, your hand still up or you want to continue on this one?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yeah, I'm hiding out far away from my spouse so if somebody else can take my hand down there, that'd be good.

James Bladel: Okay, Alan's next.

Alan Greenberg: I'm going to uncharacteristically put on my registrar hat now which I don't have. I mentioned something - a scenario similar to this early on in the process where a registrant had created a Website, registered a domain name and the Web hoster put the name in their own name unbeknownst to the customer.

And I was quite rightfully told that that's a business model which the Web hoster may have which indeed may be a selling point. That is we will help you provide a Website and maybe the guy who builds it or the guy who hosts it, whatever, and you don't have to worry about any of the technical details.

You will not receive any trash mail. You will not receive questions you don't understand. And that's a valid business model. It still doesn't address the issue of what happens when that guy in the middle goes out of business.

And I don't really see how we can fix that other than education other than saying the registrar should go inspect the Website and see if they can find any hen scratches or something that tell them who might be interested in the fact that the domain is about to disappear. And that's not a business practice that I think would be viable in most any of the worlds we're looking at right now.

So I see it as a real problem but I don't think it's one that we're going to be able to fix within our domain. Excuse the pun.

James Bladel: I think that's correct, Alan. I mean, and there's this gray line there, you know, there's some (unintelligible) logic that says once the middle man or the intermediary has substituted all or nearly all of the contact data with their own information then aren't they then for all practical purposes the registrant?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I mean, I'll be honest I did have a case where the registrar - the Web hoster put their name in Whois halfway through the year and then didn't renew it properly. But that's fraud and that's a different issue altogether also.

James Bladel: Right, right. So shall we jump to - well I see we had something in here about Whois and I'm afraid that if we dive into that now that we'll be here until - until Cheryl goes back to sleep.

So maybe we could skip ahead to the education section and defer on the Whois issue just for the purposes of managing our time?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh we do have a half hour left.

James Bladel: Well I'm concerned that any time you bring up Whois is, you know, you'd better have most of your call left.

But, you know, I think one of the things we put forth - and it just comes up, you know, in discussion of any of these substantive matters is this idea that, you know, we've got to make sure that the consumers whether they're registrants or intermediaries providing other services and are registering domain names on behalf of other entities, you know, we have to make sure that the folks who are interested in retaining names that they have registered are aware of their - are aware of their responsibilities and obligations, are aware of the practices that registrars are going to, you know, execute whether they're existing or whether they're changed somewhat based on this proposal here or whatever comes out of this group.

And that, you know, we have to leverage - it's not enough to, you know, sit in a room or on a teleconference as many of us - almost all of us ICANN insiders are apt to do and come up and solve all these problems without closing that loop and getting it back out into the wider audiences and making sure that they understand what's going on, what's changed and what mechanisms are available to them and at what point they have essentially - what's the word - missed their opportunity to uphold their obligations and their responsibilities as well.

So I think that, you know, we talk here about putting together some education and outreach. This would be a best practice recommendation. And I think that you would see that there would be a lot of support amongst the registrars for doing this.

Not just with expiration but possibly even for example for transfer issues. I think that registrars would definitely show some enthusiasm for developing sites that would be - have neutral content, that wouldn't take favorites amongst registrars but it would essentially talk about some of the important contracts and...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...obligations and benefits of domain name registration.

Alan Greenberg: So you're proposing that a registrar would do this but in the name of all registrars?

James Bladel: Yeah, I mean, you know, we have registrar stakeholder group within ICANN and we, I don't know how we select or whether we draw straws or play spin the bottle or something like that. But, you know, we're able to work I think together to come up with a designated registrar to host and design different collaborative Websites. And I think that we could do something similar for this exercise.

Alan Greenberg: Great.

James Bladel: I don't know. Jeff and Mason probably know a lot more about that than I do but I know that there are some let's say neutral, you know, referee-type Websites out there and I think that we could certainly do something as well.

And then we're also looking to the ALAC. You know, we feel like you guys have the closest...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...you know, outside of our commercial relationship with our customers, you know, I don't know how big the ALAC is but now I can safely say that we're representing the commercial interests of millions of folks who choose Go Daddy.

You know, I think that the ALAC has other avenues of reaching wider audiences and can leverage those relationships to build education and awareness and help get this message out as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan's got his hand up.

James Bladel: Go for it Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I would like to thank you for this. ALAC has been fighting for several years for us to get some money that we can then decide how to spend so I'm glad you're on our side when we go back and ask for it again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I had my hand up but it's not on that point.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Oh go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. You know, as you've heard me go on ad nausea and throughout this whole PDP process, you know, getting the information in a clear simple language and understanding mechanism out up the edges where the registrants are has got to be the key.

And I think that's where we have absolute unanimity in terms of, you know, where we want to be at the end of all of this. Just purely on an editorial point of view ALAC of course should be in a position which is of course a 15-person committee to advise ICANN.

James Bladel: Right, I made that mistake again - At-Large.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, I'm happy the way you've written it.

James Bladel: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ALAC - I think because this is what ALAC should be doing; it should be working directly with ICANN and with the component parts of ICANN to make sure these types of resources, etcetera, etcetera, are out there and facilitated and promulgated and that the information is sent out.

It would use however - so I'm suggesting an additional sentence would be, you know, for the network of At-Large, that's capital A and capital L, which is our nearly 130 At-Large structures, which is global penetration which is what you were talking about, should then use those tools.

So I'd actually be taking it a little further and saying part of what ALAC's mandate - and it's the bylaw mandate part of ICANN that needs to be told - it has to then get this information out through its network.

And its network of At-Large to become an accredited At-Large structure you undertake to do just that, push out from ICANN and bring back to ICANN relevant information. So it fits absolutely with why the existence is there of the At-Large movement within ICANN and I think it's a great thing.

James Bladel: Okay well maybe you can...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can wordsmith this part together, yeah. We got this meeting on Wednesday the 8th in December in Cartagena, maybe this could be on the agenda?

James Bladel: For this group or for At-Large?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we've got an At-Large and registrar meeting.

James Bladel: Oh yeah, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ALAC and registrar meeting actually but, yeah, this is exactly where the educative process has to go. It's not good just putting up a really good looking site and no one knowing about it; we actually have to get it...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: People do that all the time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah and that's been a success.

James Bladel: Okay so we have 20 minutes so we'll maybe circle back and touch on the Whois thing. And I wanted to put here...

Alan Greenberg: I'd like at least 10 minutes at the end so let's start Whois but let's not try to finish it right now.

James Bladel: All right and...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Maybe I'll talk a little bit about what we do next.

James Bladel: Okay maybe I'll just put out the, you know, how we arrived at this.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: And the answer is we could not achieve consensus amongst the group that was working on these proposals. There are some - and I think one gentlemen who's very well known and well liked and outspoken that's not here today on the call but - feels pretty strongly that we should have some recommended changes to Whois.

Some folks feel that, you know, it could go either way and some folks feel pretty strongly that we couldn't. So what you see here is the result of lengthy discussions that we're unable to achieve consensus even amongst the smaller group that put together the compromised proposal.

So it's not saying that we're all agreed there should be no changes to Whois is that we can't agree whether or not there should be changes to Whois. And I think that, you know, that would certainly translate into a lack of consensus in the larger group as well.

So, you know, that's where we're coming from on this. And then I'm finished by the way, Alan, so it's all - it's all you from here on out.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I would just make a quick comment on Whois and basically it's what I put in the email I sent out just before the meeting that Whois is one of the few things that we've actually had reasonable consensus in this group. It perhaps was not unanimous but close.

On the other hand it is also the only thing that we're talking about which would have a significant work impact on virtually every registrar and every registry.

And therefore that I think need to be taken very carefully and judiciously and looked at as to how we would go ahead. And I think where I'd like to talk about - go in this - in the direction in future discussions on this one is is there some way we can structure something so that we aim N-years out to achieve what we're doing but not necessarily mandate it for everyone in a very short timeframe?

And that's going to require some voluntary efforts on behalf of some organizations both registries and registrars to implement it even though it's not mandated, you know, perhaps for a good number of years. And I think I'd like to investigate it from that point of view in that it's probably going to be too much to impose on everyone immediately on the other hand it is a target that most of us feel would really be useful. So I'd like to pursue it from that perspective as we go ahead.

Any other comments before we talk about what we're, you know, how we're going to proceed next? No comments. All right I'll address that in a moment. Some - let's do the housekeeping first. First of all we're at the point where we need to make a decision as to what we want to do in Cartagena.

The last time we talked about, I think two weeks ago maybe more, we talked about that we were probably not going to be in a position for a public report at that point, certainly not to get it out in the deadline for a formal discussion of things which is less than two weeks out from now.

But that we definitely hope to be in a position where a workgroup meeting would be viable if there were enough people attending. And Marika, I think there was a discussion on sending out a Doodle to find out how many people were attending the Cartagena meeting and I don't remember seeing that. Did I miss it or did it not get done?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think that got done. I (unintelligible) so people can indicate whether they're planning to attend or not.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: No I was saying maybe we can do as well a quick poll on this call so people can just, you know, raise their...

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Marika Konings: ..a checkmark if they're going to Cartagena.

Alan Greenberg: A checkmark if you plan to be in Cartagena.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm away from the computer but yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We have six ticks, one X. Ron hasn't commented. Seven ticks including Cheryl. Okay some people will not be there; many people will be there. Since we're definitely not going to have something ready to document in time to have a formal discussion on it I would suggest that we try to book a room at a time where there won't be too many conflicts for the people interested in this group and hope that we're at the stage at that point where we perhaps can make some very significant progress in the recommendations.

So that's a challenging demand, Marika. But see if you think you can do it.

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was going to say, Marika, if it's any help the At-Large and ALAC schedule is out and I can give you the link for that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. I have a question. Would it work for most people if I would maybe look for a breakfast (spot) because that normally doesn't conflict with too many other things that people would like to go to? Although I do know that some people don't like to get up early in the morning either. But would that be something I could explore?

Alan Greenberg: From my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl.

Alan Greenberg: ...perspective if it's a catered breakfast so that we're not, you know, spending time - we're not in the, you know, in the hotel dining room or something and try to conduct business I think that could be viable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. And the answer again is yes but we already do have some breakfast meetings in the At-Large schedule so please have a look at that.

Marika Konings: I will do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay in terms of how do we go forward I - again I'd like to revert back to the model that's been used in a number of other groups. And I would suggest that based on this recommendation - this proposal and other issues that are raised as targets, as proposed recommendations over the next little while that Marika start drawing up a set of recommendations.

And as Jeff indicated group them so that we understand which charter question or questions, because some of them may overlap, are they addressing. And start putting together a - recommendations as discrete and simple as possible so that we can decide easily whether we have consensus on this, we don't have consensus on it or what the multiple options are if we have, you know, different variants that people are proposing.

And start slugging through them and see if we can start identifying at least a reasonable critical mass of things that we do have consensus on and then try to either attack the ones that we don't have consensus on and fix them or provide, you know, majority, minority or whatever partial consensus in, you know, as we start drafting a report. Does that sound reasonable?

At least we'll be able to see how close we are and identify which items are the critical ones and which are not. The last question is the timing for this meeting. This meeting was at a different time in Europe. By next week we will be - everyone in the Northern Hemisphere will be on Daylight Saving - or almost everyone who has Daylight Saving in any case.

And I would suggest that we move the time UTC for this meeting so that the North Americans and Europes are all back on the same time we normally

hold this meeting. Is that a reasonable position? And for those who are in different parts of the world does that make it too unreasonable for you?

Paul Diaz: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, yeah, sorry Paul, go ahead.

Paul Diaz: I would love to see it shifted back and for consistency in meetings times that's be a great thing. I was just going to ask a couple of us have a previously-scheduled call next Tuesday. It would begin at 3 o'clock so that means we'd only be able to do about a half hour on this call.

As we're not going to have a report or anything - a formal publication for Cartagena would it be horrible to push next week's off like meet again in two week's time?

Alan Greenberg: Given the few number of meetings we have - and we only have four more weeks until we leave for Cartagena I'm reluctant to say that we skip that one. To what extent - is - are all the registrars involves? You know...

Paul Diaz: At least two of us.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure who's involved.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, three actually.

James Bladel: Two possibly three. And, you know, I think we're in other groups, Alan, that are also driving towards Cartagena and some of them are trying to also drive towards getting some documents by the publication date. So I guess we'll just, you know, we're just trying to prioritize here a little bit and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy to - I'm happy to skip next week, Alan, honestly.

Alan Greenberg: Well I was going to make a proposal. We've seen more substantive traffic on the list in the last 24 hours than we may have in any given month. If we can actually keep the discussion up, you know, in both directions, not just tearing apart James' proposal but, you know, constructive things and trying to move forward then I'm happy to skip the meeting.

But we really need to keep moving forward on this so that by the time we get to Cartagena we have some - we can give a report to the GNSO of nothing else which says we're seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. If everyone things we can put the effort into it and the time into it to continue with that I'm willing to skip the next meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...despair - and there I've said it. I think the point was being made that a lot of the pressure on at the moment is stuff that has the same if not tighter publication pre-pub - pre-Cartagena demands on people.

And so we can all say, yeah, Alan we will but then I suspect we also know what's actually going to happen.

Alan Greenberg: I understand that. But I'm saying if we can keep up some level of work then we won't have lost the two weeks completely. And I think that's important. The publication date is just about two weeks from today or two weeks from yesterday. So I - yes Cheryl, I'm aware of that but to the extent that we can be - do something then I would like to see some progress continue to be made.

Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Alan. This is Berry. I was just going to say, you know, no problem about skipping next week but let's - if we can go ahead and plan on every Tuesday for the remainder of the month, so the 16th, the 23rd and the 30th, if that...

Alan Greenberg: That would be my intent.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Let's get them on our calendars now and - thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Marika is there anything else we've omitted that we need to do before we leave?

Marika Konings: I don't think so.

Alan Greenberg: Okay then I give everyone back - what it is 11 whole minutes of your day. Thank you all for a good productive meeting and let's continue on the list.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Alan Greenberg: Bye, bye all.

James Bladel: Bye, thanks guys.

Paul Diaz: Bye all.

Marika Konings: Alan, (unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much (Catherine).

Man: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you. Have a great day.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, you too. Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Bye-bye.

END