GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference
11 August 2009 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 11 August 2009 . 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-20090811.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#august

Present:
Alan Greenberg ALAC
James Bladel RC
Berry Cobb CBUC
Mason Cole RC
Phil Corwin CBUC
Paul Diaz RC
Tatyana Khramtsova RC
Cheryl Langdon-Or ALAC Chair
Glenn McKnight
Michele Neylon RC
Mike O'Connor CBUC
Michael Palage CBUC
Garth Bruen
Matt Serlin RC/IPC
Philip Corwin CBUC
Sivasubramanian Muthusamy At-large
Michael Young RyC
Sergey Gorbunov

Staff:
Marika Konings - Policy Director
William McKelligot - Compliance
Margie Milam - Policy
Glen de Saint Géry- GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:
Tim Ruiz (Council Liaison) RC
Karim Attoumani

Alan Greenberg: So do we have our roll call of who's here?

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly, Alan. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon everybody. We have on the call today Tatiana Khramtsova...

Tatiana Khramtsova: Khramtsova.

Glen Desaintgery: Khramtsova, excuse the pronunciation. Michele Neylon , Glenn McKnight, Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mike Palage, Mason Cole, James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Alan Greenberg, Garth Bruin, Paul Diaz, Michael Young, Matt Serlin and Philip Corwin and we have some other participants on the Adobe Connect.

We have got (Trish Habramenin), Sivasubramanian Muthusamy on the Adobe Connect and we have got Sergey Gorbunov who is not on the call but on the Adobe Connect.

And for staff we have Marika Konings, William McKelligot, Margie Milam and Glen de Saint Gery. Have I left off anybody either from the Adobe Connect or from the call? I think that's everybody then Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We're not using the voice bridge on Adobe Connect are we?

Man: No.

Alan Greenberg: I assume not so anyone on Adobe Connect only is only going to see what documents we have or what goes on in the chat. Okay I'll make an editorial comment first. I wish we could have the kind of participation we've had in the last two or three hours on the email list throughout the rest of the inter-meeting gaps. We would make a lot more progress if we did.

However, that as it may the first item on our agenda which I thank Marika for preparing, is the definitions and the prime definition that we're talking about is

what do we call the - what I was defining as a new definition of the original domain holder registrant and that (Michael) sent around a more precise but more complex expression.

And I guess I'd like to hear how do we want to do this. I'm a little bit worried that if we don't carefully define this we are going to use terms in ad hoc ways and never be quite sure that we know what each other are talking about or the documents are saying.

At the same time I'd like something that's short enough that we actually use it and don't generate new abbreviations of it on an ad hoc basis. (Mike), you sent in the other comment other than mine, do you want to speak to it and then we'll take other comments?

(Mike): I think I just did another proposal. I appreciate the long-windedness. So did you see - I think my abbreviated term was registrant at expiration and then I defined it in my more long-winded term. So registrant and expiration would be a good way of - I mean, that's what we're focusing on; what are the rights or interests that we're trying to protect of the registrant at expiration.

Is that short enough for you?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: It's short. It doesn't particularly flow when we're talking.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Let's have some other comments. I don't want to be the only one to criticize your hard work. Is there anyone else who cares?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Cheryl here, Alan...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I certainly care because all of this has to be interpretable in many ways beyond this group. I think it is important that we have that clearly defined the nomenclature that we're using and just understand - understandable and doesn't allow ourselves to be confused let alone others who are reading the work.

I think at expiration works fine for me and we can make it a set of letters in the good ICANN tradition. Does it clash with anything else? Does our RAE or whatever is decided upon conflict or confuse could be confused with any other set of terminologies there?

(Mike):   Not that I'm aware of.

Alan Greenberg: Does anyone object to using registrant at expiration or the pronounce the acronym RAE or RAE using the three interchangeably?

(Michael):   I think - it's (Michael) - I think we should settle on one. If we use three interchangeably it'll get...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, just one would be better.

(Michael):   I just have a problem that we're - if we use the three words some people will end up abbreviating it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) if it's going to be abbreviated let's use the proper - admit that it's going to be abbreviated in documentation, you start it in full, put RAE in brackets and then...

Alan Greenberg: Okay so RAE pronounced as the letters will be what we'll use?

(Michael):   I like that. I think it's clear.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We have a RAE of sunshine. Hey, we've actually made a decision. I'm happy. And then as I said what we'll do is when we use RAE we'll just define it then with...

Man: See, you just pronounced it RAE not RAE.

Alan Greenberg: RAE, I'm sorry. RAE...

Man: Thank you for making my - reinforcing my point.

Alan Greenberg: I had (CRAE) on the brain. I'm a little worried that RAE will be interchangeably thought of when people read it with RAA.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Look, we can't...

Alan Greenberg: We can't help everyone, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay may I suggest RAE or RAE whichever this organism ends up using generally as an abbreviation for registrant at expiration.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is that the beast we're trying to protect? Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, then let's not legislate how one pronounces the acronym, we'll see what evolves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, put it this way it's been merely six years I've been asking people do they remember how to spell (AUDA) because that's what we're called not (AUDA).

Alan Greenberg: On the other hand I've never heard anyone try to pronounce RAA - RAA. Okay. The next item on the agenda was update on gathering - data gathering from ICANN compliance, registrar, liaisons, ombudsman and whoever else may have complaints.

Do we have William on the call? I didn't hear his name.

William McKelligot: Yes, I'm on the call.

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay.

William McKelligot: So I assume that all of you read the email I sent out to the list. And so I shared the most up to date number of complaints that we have received at ICANN for the different categories.

And so kind of delving into the transfer category and then doing more of a mining of the text included in the complaints revealed that, you know, to my point I guess that even though there's a category for redemption depending on what angle the complainant is taking on his complaint in trying to identify it, there could be some level of confusion as to what the exact nature of the problem is.

So these categories because they're self-reported are only as good as the person making the complaint is under - is knowledgeable of what he or she is complaining about and his or her understanding of how that problem came to be.

That is my read into this; certainly it's up to the group to interpret to what they are reviewing as well.

Alan Greenberg: Okay just a clarification on the transfer ones you don't have any breakdown on how many are just plain transfer issues and how many are transfer post expiration.

William McKelligot: We don't have that breakdown, no we don't.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mike Palage: And, William, this is Mike Palage. With the main name renewal it's also possible that someone who was trying to renew but didn't do it in a timely fashion but then fell into some type of redemption grace period, it's also possible in self-identification they themselves could perhaps identify this as a domain name renewal problem as well. Is that possible based on your experience?

William McKelligot: That is possible.

Mike: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Well I mean there's almost no end to what people could have classified them as, it could have been reseller problem.

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah, I think so. (Unintelligible) a lot of our clients have some complaints (unintelligible) agreement and...

Coordinator: Excuse me - excuse me - (Matu Sami) is joining.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Tatiana Khramtsova: It's Tatiana.

Alan Greenberg: I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...statistics as they stand don't tell us a lot. I suspect at least some number of people who are looking at the problem who are experiencing the problem that we're looking at would report this as a problem because they suddenly go into WhoIs and find someone else's name on a domain.

So we're not going to learn a lot from these raw statistics I'm afraid.

Mike Palage: Well I don't disagree with you on that, Alan. But I do think what William has done here, which is important, is at least provide a initial threshold to validate some of the anecdotal concerns. Or at least show that there's a basis for some of the anecdotal concerns that form the basis the original ALAC requests because if we came back and we saw a bunch of zeroes we would then be in a situation of well, you know, did the ALAC - was the ALAC really listening to its constituents?

Here I think we do appear to have some basis to say yes, concerns that have been expressed in the original ALAC issues report as well as some of the anecdotal issues that I think Tatiana was raising shows that yes, you know, what we're doing is the right thing.

Because I think, you know, Mason, you know, we've had this discussion back and forth, you know, are we trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist? I think that's the one issue that you've raised.

And I think we've at least cleared this initial threshold that what we're doing is justified and we need to, you know, continue to move forward. At least that's my assessment on this initial work that, you know, William had put together for us and I appreciate it.

Mason Cole: Well, Mason here. I, mean, obviously I disagree a bit, Mike, I, you know, out of - I disagree in two ways, one is in raw numbers if you take, again, if you take the number of complaints that have been lodged with ICANN and you

divide that by the number of registrations the level of the problem is miniscule just using raw numbers.

The second thing is as has been pointed out we don't know what's underneath those numbers that William reported. And, you know, how many of those, in fact, were resolved to the satisfaction of the complainer?

And, you know, was the complainant the effected party or was it, you know, someone else? I just I fundamentally disagree that, I mean, as an operating registrar, you know, I can tell you that the majority of complaints that we get we're able to resolve favorably on behalf of the customer.

So, you know, looking at number of complaints alone it's probably misleading. Looking at number of complaints against number of domains registered worldwide not statistically significant in my estimation.

Garth Bruin: This is Garth Bruin and if I could just oppose that a little bit. The issue was about when domain names expire. Not every domain name expires. You know, I think that we need to look at this particular population. You can't compare it to the general population of all domain names worldwide.

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: ...that number a bit, again, you know, what is the actual extent of the problem? The fact is we just don't know, we don't know. I don't think there's any way to responsibly say that we have an idea about how significant this problem, if there is a problem, really is.

Alan Greenberg: Mason, taking the devil's advocate role - this is Alan. How would you suggest that these numbers - we could get such evidence given that in an email you sent earlier today you pointed out that registrars are not likely to very actively participate in this kind of thing.

And as was discussed at the workshop in Sydney registrars are likely to be the first - the ones who receive the first lines of complaint and they're the ones with some measure of understanding of if there's a problem or not.

So we're in a catch-22 of how do we get the information?

Mason Cole: Well that suggests that there is an extent of a problem being experienced by registrars that is greater than what, you know, the anecdotal evidence shows. And I would not make that assumption. I think by virtue of the fact that there's not - we don't see the - a public, you know, outcry about all this.

I mean, anecdotally, yes, you see once or twice somebody forgets to renew a name and makes, you know, makes a big deal out of it and that's understandable. But, you know, to believe that registrars are seeing more of that than is actually being publicly reported I think is not correct.

So, I mean, but that's my whole point, Alan, frankly is because you don't see anything beyond the anecdotal I don't believe there really is anything beyond the anecdotal.

Alan Greenberg: And I see no way of trying to convince you of it otherwise regardless of what the underlining facts are that neither of us actually know.

Mason Cole: Well, yeah, I'm not trying to be combative but, you know, the - if there is more than I can see as an operating registrar then I'm willing to have a look at it. I just don't - in my experience as a registrar there just is not that level of problem.

Now, you know, one thing that you and I discussed in Sydney or at least was discussed in the Sydney workshop was that resellers are a big source of problem. And I just don't - I'm not educated enough on that channel to know what exactly has been experienced in terms of resellers creating a problem.

If that's true then I would, you know, I'd love to hear more about but I just - I haven't heard anything more than that.

Alan Greenberg: I hear other people trying to talk but not getting through.

Marika Konings: Alan, there's some people as well in the queue on the Adobe Connect.

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay, sorry I hadn't been paying attention to that.

Marika Konings: Yeah and maybe that's a good tool to ensure that everyone gets in the queue and raises their hand and that way to avoid people speaking through each other.

Alan Greenberg: All right we have Tatiana.

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah, I have one question (unintelligible) statistics for different regions of (unintelligible) because I think that for example in Russia all registrars use their own model perhaps they use for (unintelligible) domains. And for example we have no (unintelligible) problems with (unintelligible) but with resellers and other gTLD we have a lot.

So I think...

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Khramtsova: ...for different regions there different pictures for this issue.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think the - for the ccTLDs the experience is relevant that if indeed there aren't then we need to perhaps look at what the differences are. And of course any policy we're looking at only applies to gTLDs but how other (DCTLD)s are implemented...

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah, yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Khramtsova: But I mean that all registrar decide to use model for ccTLD to
(unintelligible) because they start to work with (unintelligible) and then they
get (unintelligible) and gTLD (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) model
towards gTLD. The main problem I think.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. James?

James Bladel: Sorry, a little slow on the mute button there. Thank you, Alan. And I just
wanted to - I think it was incorporated somewhat in Mason and Tatiana's
comments but I just wanted to point out that this part of the conversation is
possibly setting up to bog down. And we should once again maybe take a
step back, take a look at how to quantify the problem or the harm to
registrants that is presented by the existing - both existing policies and
existing practices and then look for ways to obtain that information.

And while I thought Mike's proposed questions were very comprehensive I
think that any attempt to survey registrars will be voluntary in terms of their
participation. And I don't know that that's going to be a thorough or
comprehensive basis of data to, you know, inform this group.

I mean, I would certainly love a peak behind the curtains at Mason's
operation and I'm sure that he would like that as well. But I think that we're
going to have some reluctance in terms of participation and registrars and
that's not a nefarious statement, that's just what happens when you have a
group of competitors that are participating in these data gathering exercises.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. I would like to go back to William sometime and find out if he
thinks there's going to be an opportunity whether from these statistics or
simply just talking to the people in the compliance group to get further
information from ICANN. But right now Marika's hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, no I just wanted to know because I had on my to-do list as well to contact the ombudsman and our registrar liaison team. And I just wanted to report that the ombudsman basically indicated that he refers all registrant complaints to the registrar liaison and unfortunately that person has been on holiday so I have not been able to get any feedback from him yet on this issue.

But I hope to have it for the next call.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. I don't know who MDP is that's polling. Oh okay.

Marika Konings: And Alan if I can say one more thing.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: The people in Adobe raising their hands once they have spoken if they can please clear their status.

Woman: And, Alan, could people please say their names when they speak because it adds to the value of the transcript. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: There is nobody with their hand up yet. Michael, were you trying to? Okay.

Mike Palage: Yeah and I was - Michael Palage - and I was proactively listening to Marika and I put my hand down before I got to speak. I was a good participant. I guess the question is, James, you know, we talk about the survey, again, the registrars are the ones that kind of have the mother lode of information here so to speak.

And I guess what we need to do is we need to - we need to put the survey out there and what happens is they will either answer it or they will not

answer it. And then we as a group need to take the data that we have and we need to move forward.

And then what ICANN - the ICANN institution as well as the board needs to do - is as we the group come up with recommendations whatever they may be, when those recommendations eventually go to the council or the board or whatever happens if certain registrars come forward and start complaining, what the board needs to do is - did they ever take the time in the beginning of the process to participate?

Because not doing something and then waiting until the last minute to object that's really not consistent with the letter and spirit of how the bottom-up consensus building process is supposed to work.

So all we can do is try to gather information from those people that are willingly going to provide that information. If Go Daddy feels that answering a data point might provide some competitive advantage to a competitor in the marketplace obviously one cannot compel one to answer it and would not expect you to.

But those where you feel that you are just providing data to advance this it would be welcome. And we will then take that data and move forward.

Alan Greenberg: James, you wanted to get back in?

James Bladel: Yes, this is James. And I agree with your Michael. I just wanted to point out that an alternative to a survey might be a research effort on the publicly available information that's on the various registrar Websites. And for example - and I can post a URL - is that we actually have an FAQ on this very subject.

You know, it's out there, it's on our public-facing Website and it explains the entire process. And I think that that might help address a lot of information

that you're getting at within your proposed survey questions. And it's something that doesn't require registrar cooperation.

It's kind of - it's out there, it's in the public and it's the same basis of information that a registrant or prospective registrant would use to make a decision of which registrar to take their business to so...

Mike Palage: I guess - I guess the question there, James, though is is, you know, we can, you know, we can ICANN or Marika go task somebody or we the group can agree to do, you know, I'll take one, you take one. I mean it just seems kind - I guess what I don't understand is you, you know, you had an FAQ where a lot of these answers may be able to be quickly gained.

Just asking the registrars to do this it just - I don't understand why we have to do so

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay let's not try to make this a one on one debate. Mikey has his hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey, can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Perfect. No just coming back to this thing about the questionnaires, if the questionnaire were conducted in a semi-anonymous fashion with the data being collected by ICANN and so that basically you'd have Registrar A, Registrar B, Registrar C, Registrar D instead of GoDaddy, (E Nom) whoever.

Would that be something that people like Mason could live with?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'll make a comment that I don't think we could do anything but have it if not anonymous certainly private. No registrar is going to say I have thousands of complaints. Not in a public forum.

Mikey O'Connor: No obviously not, Alan. I'm just...

Alan Greenberg: So at the very least it's going to have to be private whether it's also anonymous we can decide.

Mikey O'Connor: Well the thing is, okay, for a variety of reasons Go Daddy is not going to share data with (Blackpipe), we're not going to share data with (E-Nom), etcetera, etcetera, etcetera because, apart from everything else, we really can't.

However ICANN can be seen - ICANN's compliance team or whoever - which particular section within ICANN can be seen as being a neutral...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...disinterested party which might make it more feasible. I don't know, I'm just throwing an idea out there.

Alan Greenberg: Marika and William is that reasonable that ICANN takes on that task if this group decides we need to do it?

Marika Konings: I think we can definitely look into that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

William McKelligot: Agreed.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I think I'm the only one with a hand up now. I think one of the things we have to do is we do need a small group of people - I don't think we can do it

in this meeting, but we need a small group of people to look over the questions that Michael started with and try to put some measure on are these the questions we really want to ask.

Some of them, for instance, the question of what do you charge, I don't think is relevant to this group. Whether what they charge is made public and available to a registrant certainly will be - I think will be relevant. But I would question whether we really need to know quantitatively if one registrar is cheaper than the other or not.

So I think we need to go over that list and any other questions that other people provide relatively quickly but in a small group offline and review those. And anyone who's willing to work on that I'd - I think we need to hear from.

Is there anyone else who wants to talk about the data gathering effort at this point?

Woman: (MDP) has his hand up. Mike - Michael?

Mike Palage: I'll - as I said I will respond to James's discussion about price point and why I do think it is not totally irrelevant that it does have some relevance to our discussion but not on this call, just do it off list - or on list after the call.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, on list. And there were a number of other comments also that perhaps we need to look at. All right I'm happy to go on the list with whoever is willing to participate. I'm afraid it gets a little bit too complex when we have a large number of questions and then multiple answers to each of them but let's give it a try.

(Teva).

Siva Muthusamy: Yeah, me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Siva Muthusamy: Yeah, this exercise of gathering data, the survey questions are related to registrars. (Unintelligible) include (unintelligible). Can it go beyond registrars and (unintelligible)? That is one point. And the other thing is apart from gathering data from registrars (unintelligible) by which we can collect information about domain names related to (unintelligible) pending and consumer calls and other forums?

And can we make this exercise a little more comprehensive?

Alan Greenberg: To what end I would ask? We're really looking at a very narrow particular subject. I mean we're not trying to fix all of the ills that...

Siva Muthusamy: No not...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...domain names.

Siva Muthusamy: That is not what I'm suggesting. Even (unintelligible) domain name directory. Is there some way by which we can gather data from sources beyond the registrars, I mean, go down to the level of resellers? Can we maybe include registries to ask them what kind of complaints they're getting or receiving? And can we also take a look at what kind of (unintelligible) what kind of (unintelligible) lists?

Alan Greenberg: Well we can certainly ask registries if we choose. We can't ask resellers because at this point we do not effectively know who the resellers are.

Siva Muthusamy: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: Alan, can I get in queue because I'm not online?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

(Teva):   Okay.

Mason Cole: This is Mason.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Go ahead.

Mason Cole: Oh okay.

Alan Greenberg: You're on.

Mason Cole: Okay. So are we or are we not going to look at resellers because I heard that
                come through loud and clear in Sydney?

Alan Greenberg: I think - my personal answer is we need to look at the concept of reseller. I
                don't know what the mechanism is by which we do it since ICANN has no
                knowledge of resellers and all we can do is either registrars who heavily use
                resellers tell us who a bunch of them are or something.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Again as long as we're using self-identification we're not likely to get the bad
                guys but...

Mason Cole: Okay that's fine. I wasn't clear on that.

Alan Greenberg: I just don't know how to, you know, we have this brick wall between ICANN
                and resellers and it's not clear how we address the issues.

Mason Cole: All right, okay, that's what I wanted to know. (Teva) still has his hand up, I assume that's an old one. Is there anyone else who wants to speak on information gathering at the moment? We do need to continue this offline and we have a spirited enough conversation going on now that I hope we will.

No? Okay. The next item on the agenda was update on gathering of anecdotal information. Tatiana has given us an interesting document is I guess Tatiana do you want to talk about this a little bit and then do we have anyone else with any other type of information that we can start talking about?

Tatiana Khramtsova: So (unintelligible) information so (unintelligible) all clients don't know the involved life cycle of (unintelligible) domains. And they need their own information for ccTLD and gTLD domains. So it's very strange but sometimes when one client call us and ask why my domain is for other person three months after expiration date so it's very anecdotal.

And other problems are with our resellers too because we - a lot of registrars send emails to resellers not to our end clients and clients don't have full information about the expiration dates, about his domain name and what should they do in this situation.

And of course in Russia we have our own auction center (unintelligible) for domain names. So user of the information about ccTLDs (unintelligible) domains that it will be deleted after 30 days after expiration date. Registrars register or (unintelligible) change owner for ccTLD domains and make - take orders for it and make auction.

So the ccTLD domain don't have the lifecycle which is at ICANN Website. I think the main information from my records.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I have a question. If I heard you correctly you said that in some cases registrars send renewal letters to the reseller and not to the registrant.

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Is that because the information in WhoIs is - shows the reseller as the owner?

Tatiana Khramtsova: No I think sometimes yes but in domain cases registrars were thought to work with resellers because the resellers put some signs for URL domain. And they think that it isn't necessary to (unintelligible).

As for our center we prefer to make some emails about expiration dates to our registrars directly - (unintelligible) directly.

Alan Greenberg: Okay so you're saying in some cases the registrar notifies the reseller and presumably expects the reseller to notify the registrant?

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: And perhaps they don't always do that?

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Certainly I think one of the things in - that it would be useful, and I think that was in Michael's original list of questions, is to identify what the practices are among at least some of the larger registrars and particularly those with resellers. Because just, again, anecdotally talking to a number of the people their practices are quite different in terms of ad expiration.

At what responsibility does the reseller take versus the registrar take? And I'm looking even at US-based ones or North American-based ones. And the practices end up being quite different so it might be enlightening to at least know what the registrar thinks the practices are within their own organization.

And we may well find that they differ considerably from one to the other. So I think that's one of the things we need to discuss in talking about the questionnaire.

Tatiana Khramtsova: And I for one have one question more. The matter fact that Russian reseller thinks that they can put any price for reseller from (unintelligible) domain as they wish. So this price is a very big and different from the price of registrar.

And for client it is easier to wait and try to get the domain name again than restore the domain name from redemption. So the price is about 1000 euros...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay so you say the price varies and, you know, the example you give 1000 euros. Does it vary based on a particular name or does it just vary based on which - on which reseller?

Tatiana Khramtsova: It depends on if you work with reseller or with registrar. So for reseller it is better to not to delete the domain name but to sell it to the registrants because then you will (unintelligible) registrant. So for redemption of it which very large sum prices - some...

Alan Greenberg: Okay but the question I was asking was if for a particular reseller do they fix the amount they will charge or do they charge a different amount depending on how valuable they perceive the name to be?

Tatiana Khramtsova: Depends on the reseller.

Alan Greenberg: On the reseller, okay. So some do one and some do the other.

Tatiana Khramtsova: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Is there anyone else with any who has had the opportunity to try to collect any other information? I can give a couple of examples.

Paul Diaz: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Alan, it's Paul Diaz. I've had my hand up in the queue forever in Adobe.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, my apologies. Go for it. Paul and then James.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, Paul Dias from Network Solutions. I wanted to echo something actually you said Alan in that based on our own experience is I very strongly agree that you're going to find a very wide range of differences and experiences when it comes to resellers.

    And it's going to be very, very hard to sort of come up with sort of a grand statement about what's going on. I know in our own experience we have some resellers who very much want to maintain the customer relationship and therefore, you know, our relation with the reseller is almost - think of it as sort of as like a white labeling relationship.

    We remain behind the scenes and all communication with customers is handled by the reseller. Now what Tatiana was explaining, you know, with the notifications that are going out they are sent but, you know, we sort of have a point at which the reseller, as part of our agreement with them, then takes over. And we don't have a lot of visibility beyond.

    One thing that I think is very important for this group to remember though is that with the new RAA in place and the extension of a lot of the requirements and the notification requirements, as the work of this group goes on and those agreements and the requirements begin to come enforced, you know,

we may see or we should be seeing some change in behavior in the marketplace as well.

As those responsibilities are now spread - explicitly spread beyond just registrars to resellers as well. James?

James Bladel: Yeah, just wanted to - this is James - and I wanted to reiterate Paul's point relative to the new version of the RAA. And just to - setting aside our earlier conversation and not trying to be difficult, but if the deliberations continue to discuss detailed pricing information I think I would have to play it safe and drop off the call. Just because I don't want to get in trouble and I certainly can't speak for the other registrars especially those that aren't US-based.

But I just wanted to put that out there, if we could please not go into too depth of a detail of those comparisons. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Anyone else who wants to talk about examples of, you know, anecdotal examples of the kinds of problems one has experienced?

Mikey O'Connor: It's Mikey.

Alan Greenberg: Oh if you want to speak you don't have to raise your hand, you're speaking. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank you. Now this is...

Alan Greenberg: I'll try not to mispronounce your name again by the way.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: That's quite okay, everybody is allowed to make the mistake once.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm keeping tabs and this is more than once for Alan.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, well we'll forgive him. And with the - Tatiana's examples are pretty similar to the kinds of things that we've seen as well not just with gTLDs but also with ccTLDs. One situation that we've had huge problems with was with companies that set up shelf companies.

And what they tried to do is to register the domains in the name of the company that organizes the shelf companies if that made sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Even - and the problem then that arises of course is that I go along then to this company and I buy my limited corporation through them and all the domains and things like that would end up still being held by this third party. And they're not too - it's not a particularly nice situation for the user to end up in.

And the other problem, which is a massive one and it's not something that's any of us is going to be able to solve overnight is that no matter how many times we within the registrar community might send out notifications to end users to remind them to renew their domain names, so many of them will just ignore the emails completely or fail to update the email contacts that they have on record.

And then they'll come back and try to make out that it's our fault that they didn't get the email even because we're meant to know somehow using some kind of supersensory perception if they've changed their email address.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Or, you know, so a lot of the complaints that I think people have with regards to domain deletions, expirees and everything else, a lot of them could

probably best be solved through more proactive education of users but not - it's hard.

I mean, we in the registrar community can do a certain amount but, you know, I think it's something that, you know, people in general need to work on. It's not something that we can do alone.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's an interesting situation regarding the email addresses. And I think it's one we do have to talk about. I was talking to a registrar who said they are so good they even send out a mail after expiration to tell people they still have an opportunity.

Unfortunately if the gullible registrant has used their own domain as the email address it's already been taken over by that time and the mail never gets - never goes to the recipient. So, you know, it's party registrants who do stupid things but registrars are also somewhat compliant in some of this.

Mikey O'Connor: That's something which I think needs to be discussed more to be perfectly honest.

Alan Greenberg: Indeed but let's say this, Glen sent an email at the beginning of this meeting that I didn't get for quite a while. I've had ICANN emails that I never get. The email system is not the robust thing - most robust thing in the world right now. And I think we have to acknowledge that and can't simply hide behind it.

Okay I have a couple of anecdotes that I'll put in email, I won't take the time to do it right now. Is there anyone else who wants to talk about anecdotal issues?

Garth Bruin: Sure, this is Garth Bruin again.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Garth Bruin: We're actually documenting several situations where a so-called reseller is actually the registrar or run by the registrar. And we're putting together a report about that. And I think this just feeds into the general so-called reseller problem.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Is that something we'll see soon?

Garth Bruin: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Anyone else with any comments on that general issue?

Tatiana Khramtsova: It's Tatiana.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Tatiana Khramtsova: With email sometimes companies have their own administrator for all domain names and then he will change the lock. But these - his email (unintelligible) sales for domain name. So the email is - and the company doesn't receive letters about their domain names - has a problem with email.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we're going to find any shortage of email related problems. And I'm not sure given that people sell domain names for $7 each I'm not sure we're going to find a good replacement. We're not going to send Fed-Ex notifications on these kind of things.

But I think it's an issues we do have to look at is there anything we can do to make it somewhat better.

All right the next item is the review of the public comment announcements. Marika you want to start with that?

Marika Konings: Yes, I'm just putting it up on the Adobe Connect as well. I sent it out I think last week. Just for those of you that weren't on the call the last time or are

new to the group, ICANN bylaws prescribe that a public comment period should be opened on initiation of a policy development process or part of the policy development process.

So that end I've drafted - I've provided a draft text that could be allowed for this public comment period. And I just need to know whether you have any comments or suggestions for changes. A request was made to specifically ask for supporting data or information related to the questions raised in the charter and this has been called out here as well.

So there was no - there were no comments on the mailing list so I just wanted to check here whether anyone has any suggestions before we actually open the (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm - it's Alan. I was negligent that I did look at it briefly but didn't comment. I do have a couple of comments that I'll put onto the mailing list within the next day or so.

And may I ask that if anyone has any comments that we get them in moderately quickly so if necessary Marika can do a revision and we can get this out perhaps within a week or so? Is that reasonable on everyone's schedule?

Marika, if you don't seen sign from me within 24 hours bug me please.

Marika Konings: Okay I will do so.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sure she'll give a similar notice to anyone else who needs the reminder.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, could you resend that the list please?

Marika Konings: Yes I will do so.

Mikey O'Connor: My problem - I'm not too sure about others but one of my problems is I get so much email...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...it's very easy for me to - I see something, think that I'm going to read it but don't get a chance.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's good to be on the top of pile isn't it Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh God.

Alan Greenberg: I used to foolishly move things that required an answer but required thought into a separate mailbox which I then never looked at again.

Marika Konings: Yeah. What I do try to do is normally in the header if I want people to review something to put it there so I hope you people do take note that it's not, you know, just a call detail or just another email but hopefully that does help people to focus on what they should review before our call.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm currently looking at 26,000 unread emails so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's all?

Woman: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I have mine...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I have mine going back to 1980.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...very long holiday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think I'd don't want to look at my inbox if there was that many.

Alan Greenberg: I don't, I put them away to other places.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay the next item on our agenda was development of constituency statement template. I recall a discussion on whether we should have one or not. I don't actually recall that we made the decision to do it.

Woman: Can I get in the queue, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, please.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I think you are the queue.

Woman: Okay, this is just a note that for some of the other working groups, for those of you that are new to the process part of the development of the initial report is a request to the different constituencies for their views on the issues.

So some of the working groups in the past have decided to develop a template in which they ask different questions that they would like to get feedback on for the constituents so that can inform the group and as well, you know, help to shape the actual report.

So the questions for the group would be whether they would just like to put forward like the five charter questions or whether they would like to take the opportunity to maybe redefine or add some sub-questions where they feel the input from the constituencies might help to come, you know, to a better informed report.

Alan Greenberg: I have a comment, did anyone else want to go first?

Mike Palage: I have a comment as well, Mike Palage.

Alan Greenberg: Go, (Michael) go.

Mike Palage: Okay, I think it would be helpful to have some questions here because, I mean, the group - I would say the people on this group a coming to grasp with certain terms and concepts. So sending out some questions to help frame the discussion within these constituencies would be a good thing. So I do think sending out a questionnaire would be a good thing with some questions.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I understand that doing it with a template and requiring it makes analysis easier. I also believe it limits the opportunities for expressing what they may feel so I support a template or at least things that we want answers on. I would not want to limit it to those or restrict them though.

Woman: Alan, just to maybe add, you know, from past experience not all constituencies actually use a template from just...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Woman: Some use a template or add things they want to add or some, you know, ignore the template and just (unintelligible) respond. So and I think most of

them do see it as a template and feel, you know, they feel free to add or disregard it if they...

Alan Greenberg: As long as we use words that support that concept as opposed to a mandatory template I have no problem with it. What about content? Do we just limit it to the questions in our charter or do we want to be a little bit more targeted than that?

Of course if we are targeted we actually have to come up with the other questions or other issues.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Sorry?

Siva Muthusamy: Yeah, this is Siva, can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, please.

Siva Muthusamy: Usually (unintelligible) there must be some directions on the part of people filling in and documenting something. And (unintelligible) for them to (unintelligible) employ another method.

If you can choose some registrars at random as a scientific sample and ask one of the staff members or the other working group members to go and interview them or have an informal conversation with them for some of these issues and gather their reaction, based on that we can get a much better idea.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I think we were talking about registrars. I think what we were talking about now is the request for formal input from the ICANN...

Woman: Constituency.

Alan Greenberg: ...GNSO constituencies. Now one of those is registrars and how they handle it within their constituency is their decision but we're just looking at the formal call for input from ICANN constituencies primarily GNSO but normally we include the other supporting organizations and advisory committees as well.

So this is a...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...this is a formal request not a survey as such.

Siva Muthusamy: Okay thanks.

Alan Greenberg: How do we propose - if we want to do something more than just the questions in the charter - and I think we - how do we put together that list in a moderately quick time?

Is anybody still on the call?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The fact that nobody...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...means no.

Alan Greenberg: Well my Adobe screen also just went blank so I wasn't quite sure if the world had technologically come to an end.

((Crosstalk))

ICANN
Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
08-11-09/1:30 pm CT
Confirmation #8320591
Page 34

Alan Greenberg: All right could I ask that anyone who wants to have input into what the template looks like other than the specific questions in our charter send them to the list again let's say within the week. And...

Marika Konings: And, Alan, I'm happy to put that together...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Marika Konings: ...into a template that is used for other groups as well - or for the other groups as well so...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: And if no one puts anything in the next few days I can just put that out for comment so people can then just add to it. So we can hopefully review that on the next call?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Marika. And that's actually the subject I'd like to - was this call announced as an hour or an hour and a half? Marika do you know?

Marika Konings: I don't think we announced it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Does anyone have any problems staying around for a little while more?

Mason Cole: No that's fine with me.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Woman: Fine.

Alan Greenberg: There was one more item on the agenda and then we have another item that I omitted - I didn't ask Marika to put on the agenda and that is the schedule of our next call.

I'd like to actually do that one first because two weeks from now which is when our call normally would be I will not be available. Does someone else want to take over the chair or do we want to defer the call to another week? We can either do one next week or in three weeks or both.

Mike Palage: You want to do one - this is Mike Palage. Considering that Marika said she wanted to get something out within a week let's continue to leave you and let's put that as a hard code to meet and get that out instead of letting three weeks where some stuff will slip by. Just my suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry so you're saying maintain the meeting in two weeks?

Mike Palage: No do it in a week.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: In one week, okay so actually have a meeting...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...so we can come to closure.

Mike Palage: Yeah, come to closure and put it out. And then in two weeks time perhaps we get some feedback from the constituencies instead of waiting because if we don't do anything...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay I fully support that but I didn't want to impose upon people if other people's schedule doesn't allow it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'd like to do that - that...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ..works for me.

Alan Greenberg: So the next meeting will be one week from today, same time.

Mikey O'Connor: That's fine by me.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Now let's go back...

Marika Konings: Glen - let me just - Glen, did you note that? Glen? I'll make sure that Glen has the details on...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay I don't think there's anything that's been conflicting with us but if necessary let us know and we'll do something.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: So the - at the same time it's 1930?

Alan Greenberg: Yes correct, well...

Marika Konings: Eighteen-thirty...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Wherever you are perhaps, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: This one was 14, this one was 2030 UTC I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: So it's 1930 mine.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, indeed.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry, I'm totally self centered, I don't care about other time zones. I get completely confused because I keep on dialing into calls an hour early or an hour late so.

Alan Greenberg: Okay the only other item on our agenda is talking about the Seoul meeting. And I don't really think we've made enough progress at this point to try to focus on what that will be.

Marika Konings: Yeah. Alan, if I could just make a point there.

Alan Greenberg: Yes certainly.

Marika Konings: The reason why I put - the reason why I put it there is that from a planning perspective they've already started asking us to provide input on which meetings should take place when.

So what I would like to know for now is whether there's any preference for a particular date and for a particular amount of time that should be allocated, so that at least we can block that time. And then the group can decide whether it's either an update or a workshop, a meeting or, you know, whatever shape or form it takes but we just need to book in the time and place basically for...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I have no particular (unintelligible) in time or place other than it would be nice if it doesn't inflict with either our GNSO schedule or an ALAC schedule.

Marika Konings: Yeah, yeah.

Alan Greenberg: An hour and a half or so...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...I think will be sufficient.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And I think you can take it as given we will have something to discuss - hopefully something good but regardless I think we are obliged to do something there. So there's no question...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...in mind about scheduling something.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Just as long as it's not too early in the morning.

Marika Konings: Which time zone you are talking about now?

Alan Greenberg: I was going to say are you talking about remote participation?

Mikey O'Connor: In Seoul I'll physically be there so that's fine.

Marika Konings: Yeah the problem is that's often when it doesn't conflict with anything when you do it early in the morning but I'll do my best to find a good time.

Mikey O'Connor: If you do it early in the morning - if you do it very early in the morning I'll be sending my apologies already.

Marika Konings: You'll be jet lagged anyway; you'll be awake at that time.

Mikey O'Connor: No.

Alan Greenberg: I would - typically I would think Wednesday which is when we had the last one is a good day. Things are starting slightly to slow down by then. And if we can fit it in I find Wednesday a good day, Wednesday afternoon after the GNSO meeting. But we'll leave it to you and your colleagues to try to find a good slot.

Marika Konings: Okay, yeah. I'll look into that.

Alan Greenberg: Is there anyone else - anyone else - anything else anyone wants to add to the agenda at this point?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. No, Alan, I didn't want to add anything but if people wondered why I had my hand up and took it down I was simply going to say please really look at clashes when we're doing things. We definitely want the people who are interested in this being able to come to any workshop or meeting that's done on this topic.

Alan Greenberg: Well I assume it will go on to the formal GNSO agenda and at large agenda...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...and both of us...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...wearing both of my hats we'll try to be (scrupulent).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But again we need to know this sooner rather than later.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm also keeping this as an agenda item and revisiting it again next week because Seoul creeps up real fast on people. And then we'll be fighting for not finding a space that's going to clash.

Alan Greenberg: It's going to happen anyway. If nothing else I thank you. I think it's been a productive meeting. I think our challenge is to try to keep the inertia going (unintelligible) right now. And Seoul is creeping up fast and we would like to have something substantive to talk about not just that we spent all of our time discussing how do we go forward without actually doing anything.

Mikey O'Connor: That would be to our point.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry?

Mikey O'Connor: I was just - my sense of humor, don't worry about it.

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You can tell it's still early in the morning in Ireland can't you?

Mikey O'Connor: I operate a lot better later in the evening.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's getting evening there.

Mikey O'Connor: It can't be until the evening - it's evening. One other thing I think is important that we be careful with is not trying to cover things that aren't really relevant.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And try to keep us focused because I think a lot of the discussions going backwards and forwards are very interesting but it's possibly too easy to get bogged down in things that aren't - nobody is going to be able to change and aren't really relevant. In some respect defining what isn't relevant can probably help define what is if that makes sense to people.

Alan Greenberg: It does make some sense. I think one of the things we got out of this meeting is there are increased people who are saying there are problems someplace around the world even if we can't quantify them very much. And I think we need to come to closure on that issue on whether we have sufficient belief there is a problem that we should be addressing or not and not spend too much of our time revisiting that.

Either we decide there isn't a problem and abandon the project or that we go ahead and not continually question it. And I'm not trying to decide how we do that but I think we need to do that within a short amount of time. So - and comments on the list on how we come to closure on that quickly and I think are needed.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, what might also be relevant is to look at what the (FSAC), I think the (FSAC) are working on something to do with high value domains which is quite relevant.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Woman: Good point.

Mike Palage: Could you explain what you mean? Mike Palage. What do you mean high value domains?

Mikey O'Connor: Well they didn't really define that which was one of the problems I had with what I saw from them.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I mean basically the - I think - is James still on the call?

James Bladel: Yes, I'm here.

Mikey O'Connor: I think you - both James and Mason would know what I'm talking about. I think it was the (FSAC) draft document on...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...I can't remember the exact title but it had to do with protection...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...domain hijacking if I'm not mistaken. It's the most recent (FSAC) report.

Mason Cole: Alan, it's Mason, can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry I - whoever is speaking broke up, I couldn't hear.

Mason Cole: Can you hear me? It's Mason.

Alan Greenberg: Oh yes.

Mason Cole: Can I go ahead?

Alan Greenberg: I think you're next - I think you're on the list if there's no one else with a hand
                   up.

Mason Cole: So yes, the (FSAC) was looking into whether or not there were - I don't know,
                   I'm not sure how to boil this down. They were looking into whether or not
                   there were technical holes in registrars that allowed hackers to come in and
                   exploit registrar systems to the point where they could effectively steal a
                   domain name and reregister it and the make it difficult to get back.

                   And I had a discussion with (Steve Crawford), the chair of the (FSAC) in
                   Sydney about it and I don't believe I've talked with him since then. So I'm
                   unaware of the current status.

                   He asked for registrar input which we gathered and provided. And I'm just -
                   I'm unaware of the state of the document right now. I'm sure he would be able
                   to tell you. But when Mikey was talking about that effort that's - I believe that's
                   what you were referring to, right Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think so, yeah. I mean the reason I thought it was kind of vaguely pertinent
                   was because it comes back again that okay for the - it deals a lot with some
                   of the contacts related to domains and where notifications are sent.

Mason Cole: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Etcetera, etcetera which is pertinent to the conversation we were having
                   earlier.

Mason Cole: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And I mean prior to the problem I personally had with the document and things that I saw was that it, you know, where do you draw the line? What is considered to be a higher value domain and all this kind of thing. Because it wasn't just pure domain hijacking that the guides were kind of focusing on from what I can remember of the document.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I'm not sure that that was, I'm sorry, Mason here again. I'm not sure that that was actually well defined. I think it - in fact I don't want to speak of the (FSAC), but I wonder if that was just a - sort of a misnamed, you know, a badly titled document. Because I'm not sure it really had so much to do with high value names as much as it just did, you know, how easily can a domain name be stolen by hacking into a registrar's system.

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: I mean regardless of what it would, you know, what you would pay for it I guess if you tried to, you know, fence a stolen good or something I'm not sure.

But to that point, you know, there are some parallel efforts going on in terms of what happens with domain names and how can they be - if a registrant truly values a domain name in terms of its value to him or her or an organization, you know, what are the responsibilities of the registrant to protect it?

What are the responsibilities of the registrar to have a secure system? What are the responsibilities of anyone else involved in that equation? And I know that - I was also contacted - I'm sorry, Alan, I'm just...

Alan Greenberg: No go ahead.

Mason Cole: Do you mind? Okay. So I was contacted separately by oh shoot, Cheryl, you probably know who it is but I've forgotten his name now but he's in Australia. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I know everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: ...just because you've been involved in the Internet community so long down there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Mason Cole: And he is interested - he was interested in using a registrar channel to educate registrants about what to do to protect their domain names. So there's, you know, there's lots of this stuff going on left and right. And I'm not sure that they could be merged even if they were appropriate to be merged.

                 But there is interest I think in educating end users to be more careful with their names and in seeing if registrars can offer additional protections for names.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think they all illustrate something that we all know; domain names have value and there are people who are willing to try to make money off of it sometimes ethically sometimes not. I don't think there's any surprise with any of that.

Mikey O'Connor: No I mean I think the thing that was of interest to me particularly was that, you know, in many cases the registrant or the registrant organization more correctly might try to push through - the blame back to the registrar if the domain were lost.

But in many cases, as already has come up on this call, the fault lies with the registrant organization not updating the contact.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, there's no question about that.

Mikey O'Connor: So I think, you know, that was what I thought being kind of an overlap in some respects. So maybe if they have done any - if they've got any actual real statistics or real data it might save a certain degree of duplication.

Alan Greenberg: And I think that's one of the reasons that the charter for this group included best practices as a possible outcome because some of the thins we may not be in a position to legislate but there are actions we can recommend which may make things better.

Mason Cole: That's a good point.

Alan Greenberg: I thank you all. Let's try to continue the momentum on the list. And we'll convene a week from now.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Alan.

Man: Thank you Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Bye, bye.

END