

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
11 January 2011 at 19:30 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 January 2011 at 19:30 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-20110111-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Present:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Chair Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Mason Cole – RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Siva Muthusamy - At-Large
Ted Suzuki - IPC

Staff:

Marika Konings
Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Oliver Hope – RrSG
Jeff Eckhaus - RrSG
Tatyana Khramtsova - RrSG
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: Thank you. I'd like to remind all participants today's conference is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone.

On today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 11th of January we have Alan Greenberg, James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Siva Muthusamy, Ted Suzuki, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Berry Cobb, Ron Wickersham, Mike O'Connor, Mason Cole, Paul Diaz.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies this evening noted for Jeff Eckhaus and Ollie Hope. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Gisella. I see there's a message from Paul saying he has to leave at about 3 o'clock. And I was going to do the - try to get easy ones done first in terms of going over the unresolved issues but given that Paul has to leave I think we're going to start on the difficult one and somehow we'll have to get off of it and go back to other ones as we go along if that's okay with everyone.

The current situation in - and the difficult one of course is the number of days of guaranteed renewal. And going along with that there seems to have re-risen out of the ashes the discussion on whether the domains should go dark - go dark being our euphemism for redirected and/or disabled.

That item had been generally agreed up on earlier and - but I gather as the result of discussion that happened perhaps in Cartagena there's a strong feeling amongst some registrars and that includes Michael Young for the affiliates that the going dark is something that we cannot support - they cannot support at this point.

On the other hand a number of us are really concerned that without an out of band indication like that this whole thing is just too subject to gaming. So let's start that discussion. James, you have your hand up.

James Bladel: Yes...

Alan Greenberg: If I - by the way if I misrepresent any position please call me on it.

James Bladel: Well I don't think it was a misrepresentation, Alan, but I do think that there's a subtlety that was missed which is that I think that a lot of registrars agree that going dark is, you know, probably a good practice; it is a good option. But they just - there are so many unanticipated possible scenarios where requiring or mandating that a Website go dark could cause problems.

But I think that, you know, it gives pause at least to myself that it's not something I would like to see required because I think that we're looking for some discretion here. That's all.

Alan Greenberg: Okay and Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Alan; this is Berry. You know, I guess with respect to going dark or not, you know, I'm a business continuity guy and, you know, I certainly know whether I'm a small, medium or a big business I wouldn't like that to happen to me either.

And so I guess, you know, it's really not a question of dark or no dark; eventually through this process it's going to go dark one way or another it's just really a question of when at least for the current registrant that owns that domain.

So but at the same time our existing methods to communicate to the registrant that they're about to expire or have expired, etcetera, don't seem to work as clearly as we would like them to.

So the only other thing that I can think of to propose and perhaps this is technically feasible, maybe it's not, but I know that it's already a part of the process in general with registrars at the moment the domain expires or at

some point in their process they do swap the name servers and it either becomes a parked page or a page that says the domain is expired or something along those lines.

At some point the registrar made the threshold decision we're going to make that domain go dark. Again going back to that this is really a question of when not a question of if.

So is it technically feasible that at some point along that process when there is a swap and name servers for an expired domain is it possible that instead of just a normal name server that sets up a splash screen or a parked page that there's kind of what I will use a non-technical term kind of like a pass-through name server.

And what I mean by that is that as the traffic comes through to Port 80 to access example.com because the domain has expired and it's already routed to a different name server that there's some sort of splash screen that pops up that just says this domain is expired; you will be directed to the production domain in 10 seconds or 30 seconds or whatever.

And so that within this pass-through name server of sort that somehow keeps track of where the production domain is so that we don't so - I see hands are raising; you get the idea, I'll move on. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Berry, before we let you off the hook how would you implement this for the non-Port 80 services?

Berry Cobb: It's Berry. I haven't thought that through 100%. I'm at least wanting, you know, right now we're focusing mostly on the Website itself so let's start there and we can see about the other services. I'm not even sure if this is technically feasible but, you know, maybe it does satisfy both worlds.

Alan Greenberg: It is technically feasible whether it's practical or not I'll let the other people speak. Michele.

Michele Neylon: It's not technically feasible.

Alan Greenberg: It is?

Michele Neylon: No...

Alan Greenberg: Not technically feasible, okay.

Michele Neylon: No. Well and - for the very simple reason that you have no way of knowing what host name the actual Website in (unintelligible) lives on. You have no way of knowing that.

If you were to - let's say if Berry were to register a domain with us and then use a third party's name servers we would have zero visibility on what A records or C names or any other range of DNS records existed for that domain name. And basically unless you rewrote the entire DNS protocols there's no way that you could do it.

Berry Cobb: May I - this is Berry, may I counter? So that even applies for Web traffic? Forget about the other ports but at least...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Berry, any traffic because I have no way of knowing with 100% certitude which records are active, which records are actually being used or how they're being used. I have no way of knowing that; I have no visibility, it's not using my name servers.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Alan if I may ask this a different way then? For Black Knight at some point along the process of managing a domain that it does expire and that

there is an active Website behind it whether you host it or not and whether the - at some point in time in your process there's a name server change on an expired domain, yes?

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Okay so what is the criteria by which that event happens that you as Black Knight are taking that action on an expired domain and when that happens that traffic is still somehow rerouted to whatever name server you put in that field.

Michele Neylon: No it's not...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: You're not understanding how DNS works because the thing is you're making an assumption that www.domain.tld exists and is used and that Web traffic on Port 80 is being directed there. You can't make that assumption. This is the fundamental problem; you cannot know that that is actually happening.

The only way that you could technically capture all of the Port 80 traffic would be if you were to - and this is purely theoretical - if you were to change the name servers and create a wild card A record, a wild card that - just basically wild card the domain then you're going to capture all the Port 80 traffic on that domain.

But, you know, that's - and that's about the only way you could do it. But there's no way for you to know where the traffic was going originally if it's not using your name server - like if it's not my - if I don't control the name servers throughout I have no way of knowing.

And even technically speaking I have no actual way really of knowing which A record or C name or whatever is the name that the previous registrant was actually using.

Alan Greenberg: Okay so Michele if I can summarize, clearly we can intercept traffic, registrars do that all the time, but you're saying you cannot redirect it back to the original site after the splash screen because you don't know enough about where that would have gone if the domain - if the route zone entry had stayed the same?

Michele Neylon: Basically, yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Michele Neylon: The problem is, Alan, is that technically if - in a very - if the world were very simple and only one type of DNS record existed and people only created one A record for a domain then it would be, you know, technically possible I suppose to do various different things.

But the reality is that if I were to make a, you know, before someone contracts to assure anything like that - I can just see myself in a world of pain.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, no, no but I'm just trying to clarify; the problem is not intercepting, clearly we do that all the time; the problem is once it's no longer the route zone entry for this particular domain routing the traffic there is the problem.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, let me put this - I'll put it this way. I'm trying to think of a simpler way of putting this. If - let's say for example if the - in a kind of real world type scenario, you know, post offices offer services where you redirect mail from one house...

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Michele Neylon: ...to another. So in that case you are declaring and making known where it was, where you were originally and where you were going to. So in that kind of scenario...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: ...in other words the single A record type scenario then that's fine. In this scenario it's more like okay stupidly kind of silly analogy; imagine like the flooding in Australia floods the entire continent of Australia so all the Australians are uprooted and scattered to the four corners of the globe. You've no way of knowing where the hell you were in Australia originally...

Alan Greenberg: No I think we get it. Since we're very limited on time I want to go on to the other speakers right now and give them a chance. Ron had his hand down but gave up and James has his hand up.

James Bladel: Yeah I'll just be brief. You know, Berry I think that there are a lot of good ideas of what could be done but I think that what we're saying is in all cases we're talking about 80%, 90%, 95% of scenarios as long as there's going to be those outliers I think that we need discretion in this area and therefore I'm against consensus policy. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Ron did you want to get in again or not?

Ron Wickersham: No.

Alan Greenberg: No I guess not. The original proposal that I had made was that we set a policy but have an exception process. That is a registrar could say my business model doesn't meet this. I will have another way of making sure that the registrant has an opportunity to renew or at least, you know, that they will be taken care of.

And that would allow registrars the discretion to handle completely different business models or scenarios, you know, where the customer is so good they're never going to kill the domain no matter what - how much money they don't pay.

To what extent is there a belief now that cannot work at all? Because that was proposed for exactly the kind of scenario we're talking about. I'll ask the question - I'll let people answer in their own time. Ron, you have your hand up now?

Ron Wickersham: Yes. Yes I'm in support of the general way of having a policy with exceptions that are - that are more generous that the registrar can extend courtesies but complies with the minimums standards. I think this was the point of earlier in the process where we had suggestions of minimums rather than outlining absolute numbers.

But my mute button was working wrong. I'll go back to Michele's thing. The - it is possible on simple Web pages through DNS. The registrar certainly knows the name server that the registrant normally had been using before the domain expired.

So you could have the slash page come up and then the redirect automatically delivers that address to the Web page. The difficulty - so you get the first initial transaction. The difficulty comes that every element - and with current Web design you may have 40 elements on the homepage - some even many times more than that.

So that delay and splash would happen for every one of those. So it wouldn't be - so I agree it wouldn't be a successful thing. But we certainly know the - we can certainly supply the same address because the name server didn't go dark; it's an IP address. It's not longer referred to by the record in the route servers but it still exists.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: But of course there's a real problem that for Web servers that host multiple Web sites they rely on the name being the correct one to recognize which of the multiple Websites had that IP address to go to.

Ron Wickersham: Yes so the redirect - you know what came into your Web server because you received it for your splash page. You're, you know, clearly through something like a (unintelligible) it informs you what the...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Ron Wickersham: ...what the incoming request is. So it would take some effort but technically I believe it's possible. I just think that on modern Web pages with many elements it wouldn't be a...

Alan Greenberg: Okay...

Ron Wickersham: ...it'd be transparent with a single splash that works. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we, on this call anyway, can host the battle of the experts on it's possible, it's not possible. Certainly it's an idea which has been tossed out a number of times and, you know, it may be one which if we decide is the one we want to pursue understand the dynamics a little bit more.

But at this point given we only have a few more minutes I'd like to try to understand what other alternatives we may have that address the given problem. And I'll toss one out that addresses Berry's comment on it's not a question of whether it goes dark it's just when it does. And again go dark is the euphemism for a redirect or something.

And, you know, what if the policy, number one, allowed exceptions for real edge cases but I think we could cover most of the exceptions with a policy

which said something like the domain must be renewable for at least 10 days; that notwithstanding it must be renewable for at least eight days after going dark.

Which says a registrar that chooses to make it go dark on Day 1 or 2 can delete in 10 days. A registrar that wants to provide their customer with another month of service free while they try other mechanisms of waking them up would have to guarantee at least 38 days all of which of course always allowing deletions.

Would that address some of these concerns? That is we cover most of the special cases using that level of policy and then the exception process for the real edge cases.

Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Right. It bothers - I agree with the concept - part of the concept. The aspect that the registrar can pursue any edge cases by any policy that they choose so long as the going dark is - when they finally give up with whatever attention they're giving to attract the registrant to renew should they abandon that even if it's years later then make the domain go dark?

But I feel strongly that eight days is not sufficient time. I believe that 30 days is a reasonable...

Alan Greenberg: You're saying 30 days after it goes dark?

Ron Wickersham: After it goes dark. And the registrar is free to use whatever business practices or things including renewing the domain for three years without any contact to the registrant. You know, whatever makes sense for their business model it's what happens while the registrant is still in control and still able to exercise their position.

I'm troubled by small amounts of time at which it goes to an auction at which time there's - it goes to no defined thing of what the charges are going to be. You know, the charges may be based on the auction price, etcetera. So I think I've said enough for that. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Anyone else who wants in at this point? We seem to be close to an impasse. I guess - I guess I'm curious about comments own that I had just proposed and how much of that addresses the concerns of the registrars. Berry. Are you there, Berry?

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry I was - mute button problem. Based on what Ron was saying have we moved onto the discussion about the number of days for the - this initial grace period? Is that what we're really...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Well without any methodology at all I'm not sure why - I'm not sure that it's worth going to the specific number of days at this point. But yes if no one else wants to speak go right ahead.

Berry Cobb: Okay. So I guess I have a question. And, you know, certainly there was a little bit of chatter on the list yesterday about this. Mikey had mentioned in his response about the number of days.

Am I coming in clear or is there an echo?

Alan Greenberg: You've got a little bit of static, an echo, but go ahead, you're understandable I think.

Berry Cobb: Okay. So per Mikey's email, you know, we chatted a little bit last week. And I left last week's call kind of feeling like I had missed something. And so I finally - after talking with Mikey I finally realized that you guys did get together in Cartagena for some informal meeting and I had felt like I had just missed

something and it revolved around the chart supplied by Go Daddy about when domains were renewed.

And that seemed to be the kind of the crux for determining the number of days for this initial period. And so I guess my point is that I wasn't really privy to the discussion about the data to that and I've got a couple of questions about it if James were willing to respond back to them. And I guess my questions would probably still have bearing with respect to how long this window should be.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, there was an email...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: There was an email I sent out with a brief summary of that meeting but I think you've captured it in any case. We have Mason's hand up. I don't know if you - since James has to drop off in one minute if we want to give him a chance to respond or not?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Just because I have to drop off the call please send your questions to the list.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Oh I guess...

Alan Greenberg: Berry, back to you then.

Berry Cobb: Okay well I'll just - I'll...

Alan Greenberg: You can certainly summarize your comments or questions right now because I also have some and there may be others also.

Berry Cobb: Okay well let me start off then - so I'm referencing the chart for renewal percentages. And please anybody pipe in and correct me if I'm wrong in my interpretation because - and I guess, Alan, I didn't see or I just overlooked your summary of this discussion in Cartagena.

So anyway what I see here is six months worth of data in 2010. And, you know, I definitely am a numbers guy and I like the percentages behind these. And, you know, by first review, you know, there's some good takeaways from this.

However, you know, percentages are percentages that are very vague absent the numbers behind them that make up those percentages. And so, you know, in terms of looking at this chart I'm making some generalities here or some ballpark, you know, I'm trying to backdoor my way into a number.

So there is generalizations made here and they're not 100% accurate by any stretch but they are ballpark and I'm trying to get to this one specific number. So, you know, if I take a look at six months worth of data that's half of a year and when I go and review out from webhosting.info that approximately Go Daddy has around 36.4 million domains and registrations.

If I were to split that in half or, you know, because there's six months is half of a year that would basically and ballpark equate to about 18.2 million domains that would expire in that half of the year.

So if I continue to backdoor my way in through the numbers I've got 18.2 million domains that are supposed to expire, divide that by six months and I get about 3.03 million domains that expire each month.

So now if I consider these percentages here based on this chart so it says for the month of October 31.8% of domains were expired on or before the day of expiration. So that equates to about 963,843 domains that were...

Alan Greenberg: Were renewed, not expired.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, okay.

Berry Cobb: The day after expiration is 23.3% and that equates to about 705,000, 2-10 days, 3.9% equals 120,000; 11-30 days, 2.27% equals 68,000; 30 plus days is .06% so just for Go Daddy alone 18,180 domains were renewed greater than 30 days.

While that's only .06 of 1% that still seems like a significant number that does get renewed. And so when I look at does the proposal for the initial grace period of Alan, yours being 30 days and the other proposal being only 5 or 7 days, you know, that's a pretty significant gap for still 18,000 domains.

So when I roll all this up just based off this chart here that's the potential for 218,000 domains a year that get renewed 30 plus days over. So my point is is, you know, if we're going to use this chart and this data to help try to find our number of days for the window then, you know, I think we need to think about the numbers more. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Mason, you had your hand up, do you want to go back in the queue or not?

Mason Cole: Not yet.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I mean, my largest concern, although I acknowledge the numbers and, you know, when the numbers are so big small percentages matter. My largest concern with this was the fact that there's a huge number of renewals the day after expiration and that doesn't go along with human nature to some extent.

And I was really concerned about the very low number and the apparent no blip at the time that Go Daddy makes the domains go dark or redirects which I was - I'm not sure which, I think it's either 3 or 5 days. And that seems to be counterintuitive. And I think, you know, we needed to understand that. Michele. Berry, you still hand your up; do you want to get back in or was that the old hand?

Berry Cobb: Sorry, I'll take it down.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm - as far as I'm concerned the - look the statistics that Go Daddy provided - forget the numbers; the percentages are the key. I mean, obviously if you're dealing with a large volume then a small percentage equates to a large number but that still doesn't change the fundamental facts.

But, you know, from the statistics that James provided, you know, if people are going to renew they're going to renew and they're going to do it either before the expiry, at expiry or within a day or two of expiry. And after you go past that figure they just don't - they just don't renew.

Alan Greenberg: So you're saying the current redirection is not a trigger for people to renew?

Michele Neylon: It doesn't seem to be. I would have thought it would have been. It actually surprised me, I mean, a bit like you that it was kind of like I would have expected to see, you know, the minute stuff start getting redirected people going oh my god, oh my god.

But then I suppose that's because I was kind of thinking, you know, this is - I was applying some level of logic to how people handle these things.

Alan Greenberg: But certainly all of the - virtually all of the anecdotal cases that we are continually, you know, flooded with - and I think the term is close to that - all

seem to be triggered by the Website stopped working or the - my mail stopped working or something.

Michele Neylon: The thing is, Alan, I mean, just to give you one example that we had, we had a client contact us in September - this is going to back about a year or so ago - going hey my email suddenly - has suddenly stopped working. So we looked into it; the domain had expired like four months or five months previously.

I mean, it had ceased to exist. It wasn't a case of it even, you know, somebody else even re-registering the domain or anything like that. The domain ceased to exist. But it took the person that length of time to realize. And so, you know in those cases...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah but those cases I think everyone acknowledges fall under the category of tough.

Michele Neylon: But what I'm trying to say here is that realistically, look, we're going to go round and round and round in circles about this. And we're not -we're going to end up with a total impasse. This entire working group PDP is going to just collapse, implode, whatever way you want to word it. You can try to be upbeat about it or down beat; I frankly don't care at this stage.

Look, we've agreed on certain things after discussing this thing to death. And at this stage now I'm so - I'm bored. I dread these phone calls; I dread having to drag back up topics that we've already discussed at length. You know, there's certain things that I think we as a group can agree on.

There are other things that, you know, we could be talking about this in about three or four years time. Or better phrased you could be talking about it in three or four years time because I will resign from this working group long before then.

We can agree that registrants should be given an opportunity to renew their domain names. They should be told in advance about when their domains are due for renewal and how to renew them and various other things that we've all agreed on at this stage.

This entire thing about, you know, rewriting Internet protocols, pulling stuff from DNS, traffic shaping and all sorts of other things that open up a whole range of cans of worms or whatever analogy you want to use. And even for the very, very highly technical large registrars they're going to have problems implementing; forget the small little guys and forget the resellers of resellers and basically it's just going to be a total mess.

Can we just move on; agree on certain things that we can agree on and just bring this to closure? Because to be perfectly honest, Alan, I can't take any more of this.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan. So I just had one question then. Again this was probably brought up when I wasn't in the session. Looking at Go Daddy's chart then at what day do the services go dark? Is it on Day 3 when we see a large drop...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I believe it's either three or five and I can't remember which and James isn't on the call.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Thank you. That was my question.

Alan Greenberg: Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Yes. This is Ron Wickersham. Yeah, I fully support Michele's admonition to the group that we not undertake complicated technical solutions to a problem that percentage wise is small.

That doesn't mean that I agree that we should not have good policies though. It's just not these complex fundamental changes. And even if they're possible the can of worms is, as Michele pointed out, enormous and would take years to get resolved and would probably never get resolved.

I would like to bring up one other point though - well two other points. One is I think there's a difference between a registrar such as Go Daddy who primarily is, if I understand right, and I don't mean to mischaracterize them so if I do it's unintentional. But they're primarily a hosting company that supplies domain names as part of the hosting and that's the customer relationship that they're concerned about.

And this doesn't represent the same thing for registrars who are more into pure registration where registered...

Michele Neylon: Ron. Ron with all due respect - this is Michele. I mean, I understand where you're going and what you're trying and that argument would be valid except we are the largest registrar in Ireland; we're the largest hosting provider in Ireland. And we see that a very large percentage of Irish registrants who actually host their domains with us would register the domains with Go Daddy and other American registrars.

So they're - it's not a case of, you know, the 40 million odd domain names equate to, I don't know, let's say for argument's sake 35 million plus hosting accounts with Go Daddy.

Now obviously a Go Daddy person would be able to speak better to that than I can. But based on what I'm seeing with our own experience, with our own

hosting accounts, with our own clients a lot of people use Go Daddy just for domain registration and nothing else.

Ron Wickersham: All right. I stand corrected on that. Yeah then I want to bring up one other thing that is technical but is not a proposal to new technical but an explanation of why for some people the drop in the root servers does not immediately affect them because some people put very long time to live on the - on its own records especially for stable things like email servers.

So you may find 30 days and then - and I see people around with 90 day - so that those records are kept in the cache of frequent correspondence so frequent correspondence communication happens even after the root servers are changed.

And it's only new people who look up the MX record and get the - find that there is none and that the domain has gone dark. But the frequent correspondents are using old cached data so that's one of the reasons why some of these are - is longer to take notice than immediately when the root servers are changed so just a minor point.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you Ron. I put my own hand up because I have initially one comment but I'll add a second one now. With regard to the last point that you just made, Ron, I think that's true but there's not much we can do about it. If people are going to have outrageously long time to lives then they live with the results, you know, to semi-make a pun.

You know, even under the best of the worlds, you know, at the - with the implementation of (EDGP) registrars have just 45 days with which to renew the domain or drop it. And the RGP time was 30 days. So even that 75 days would not live past the 90 day time to live. So I, you know, I think you can't save everyone from themselves.

Ron Wickersham: I would agree. My point was just to explain that...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Ron Wickersham: ...that some people don't get that. I don't support...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah then that's a...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Wickersham: ...take that into account.

Alan Greenberg: Then that's a practice that we need...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yeah it's a practice we need education on. But I don't think we can fix it with policy. The other comment I was going to make in regards to Michele's original comment of rehashing things forever and ever and I'll simply point out that the Proposals 18 and 19 to blacken Web service and other non-Web services was agreed to by all the registrars on the call on our call of the 16th of November.

So this is being reopened but it's not being reopened, you know, it's being reopened by the registrars who have decided that for whatever reason there are problems with their agreement to that. So I would like to say we don't reopen things that are already addressed but this isn't one that I can claim as my problem.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I mean, okay I'm not going to get into an argument with you about that, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't trying to argue it was just a fact.

Michele Neylon: No, no, no the thing just with respect to the entire really long TTL thing. I know some people weren't on the Adobe Chat, just putting it on the transcript as well. I mean, if you have a TTL that long then it's technically - it's going to cause other issues.

And, I mean, I think Mikey might be able to speak to some of the weird setups that some people have on their server results in him getting weird (unintelligible) he wasn't expecting.

And (unintelligible) examples (unintelligible) get a stupid amount of emails they don't want (unintelligible). I mean, you know, just because something - if somebody insists on implementing something in a technical fashion that's quite broken and causes lots of headaches there's nothing that the rest of us can do about that.

Alan Greenberg: Other than recognize that it's yet another area where education is needed and probably won't be effective to be cynical about it. Okay where are we people? We seem to be at a complete impasse on this and I guess I would - I'm going to take to the list the suggestion I made a little while ago because no one has commented explicitly on that either to knock it down or support it.

And I'm not sure where else we go. Mason.

Mason Cole: I was just going to ask if you wouldn't mind repeating what that suggestion was.

Alan Greenberg: Oh certainly. One of the problems with the original suggestion of exceptions was that exceptions are too difficult to process; it's going to be difficult; it leads to vagueness for many users. So I tried to formulate a policy which was not as someone - as some people suggested sort of a Chinese menu of A, B,

C, D or E but to try to word it in such a way that registrars had a lot of flexibility.

And one can argue with the specific numbers but the suggestion was that the policy say something to the effect of that registrants will have at least 10 days to renew guaranteed. That notwithstanding the registrar must provide at least eight days following the redirection and the going dark.

So in other words a registrar who chooses to give their customer a month or six weeks or five weeks anyway of continuity without going dark simply says fine but whenever it does go dark which is typically prior to either the auction being finalized or the name being deleted it must - there must be a period of time that it can be renewed over that time.

So for a registrar that wants to give a month of free time while they try other methods of contacting the registrant they simply have a longer period of time that they're guaranteeing.

And I think that will take out the vast majority of the exceptions. It certainly takes out the case of the Brazilian registrar who says they don't want to disable the Websites or disable the domain name until the last possible moment because they want to try to make sure that the system functions while they try other methods of contacting the registrant.

So that was the basic intent to capture the various business practices where it will eventually disappear or go dark but we're not specifying it must go dark on Day 3 as it had been suggested in the original proposal.

Mason Cole: Okay, I'm sorry, Mason again, I didn't raise my hand but...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, go ahead.

Mason Cole: ...you mind if I go ahead?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Mason Cole: So let me make sure I understand what you're proposing. So a name expires and a registrar by virtue of whatever policy this group puts out or doesn't put out but according to your idea there would be either 10 days of free name or the registrar would be obligated to keep the name alive for eight days following whatever day the name goes dark; is that right?

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm not sure the characteristic of free because if it gets renewed ultimately they're being paid.

Mason Cole: Well, okay, whatever. But...

Alan Greenberg: Essentially...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...essentially the current practice for most registrars that is it gets redirected at some point; some do it on Day 1 immediately; some do it on Day 3 or 5 and some do it on Day 30. And this is...

Mason Cole: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...simply saying that we are accommodating all of those flavors in this - in the policy. So if you do it on Day Zero immediately on expiration then you have to provide 10 days. If you do it on Day 32 you have to provide 40 days or again, you know, subject to what the exact numbers are. Yes that is the proposal.

Mason Cole: Okay. And so then setting aside how the policy would be worded then what mechanism would there be for a registrar to make the election for whatever path they wanted to follow and, you know, and I don't know...

Alan Greenberg: It's just in those guidelines they don't have to do any election they just implement and they - and their registration agreement says what they're planning to do.

Mason Cole: Okay but it's - but if it's a result of a PDP of this work group then it's binding policy right?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But the policy doesn't have to be specific in terms of a specific number.

Mason Cole: A specific number meaning days or - is that what you mean?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I mean, the proposal that was originally made said it must go dark on, you know, by Day 3. This says...

Mason Cole: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...you have several options; you can delete it any time, you know, that's always there today and this doesn't change that. If you choose not to delete you must provide a - some number of days of window after it goes dark prior to auctioning it or doing something else with it.

Mason Cole: So if one of the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...prior to finalizing the auction that is.

Mason Cole: Right. Okay so if one of the options is delete it any time after expiration if I delete on Day 2 after expiration, I mean, is that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Sure. That's something you can do now and it still would be - and it would work. It would of course drop into RGP for most of the TLDs we're talking about and that gives the registrant 30 days of dark time also then.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We're not taking away any registrar rights on this.

Mason Cole: Okay I'm - okay I think I follow you. I'm going to...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mason Cole: I'm going to have to work this out. Okay, all right, I...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I put it - I'm not sure I put it in an email. I will certainly put it in an email and try to make it clear as possible with examples. The only case that is not covered is for a registrar that wants to say I'm going to renew it, I'm going to go past the 45 days and I don't care if they haven't paid me I'm still going to provide service continuity.

And I'm told there are such cases because of existing business relationships or whatever.

Mason Cole: Okay I'm going to yield the floor for now.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan, this is Berry. So I guess in - to keep the passion alive for what just transpired in this little bit of conversation in terms of not only documenting it in an email so that we can read it, yeah, now I don't know how one demand something in a working group but I'm going to demand that an output of any change or recommendation that we try to get consensus on is that there's going to be a corresponding documentation, aka, a picture, that highlights exactly what your exception would be talking about.

And the reason why I'm trying to be adamant about this is I will refer back to the diagram that was drawn out by Rob Hall and whether we all like it or not or whether it was a self serving purpose or not there has been made reference to it several times by the community.

And so, you know, we're - both recommendations that are on the table now are introducing a new grace period although it's really just a ARGP of another hat or another color. And then essentially from what I perceive on the front end diminishes the - the need for an understanding of an RGP or an ARGP from a process perspective.

So at any rate in terms of trying to document those exceptions that you're talking about every time we mention exceptions it complicates the process and we owe ourselves and the community the right thing to do by documenting this so that we're sure that we're not introducing more unintended consequence by these exceptions.

Alan Greenberg: Ron, I'm not sure what you mean by - or not Ron, Berry - I'm not...

Berry Cobb: My - simply put...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm confused.

Berry Cobb: My point is we've got a process diagram today that roughly shows how the expiration world works. That process diagram again whether you like it or not has been referenced to. And if we were to move forward with either proposal whether it's yours or the registrars and whether it's five days or 30 days it's a new grace period so our documentation should reflect that. Part of that documentation is the new diagram on how this works.

And the exceptions that you're proposing which, I mean, on the surface even kind of sounds like Mason may bite on, we need to be able to document that...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just to be clear I haven't proposed any exceptions. I'm saying that we may need an exception policy which means a registrar can make - after the policy is enacted the registrar can say please sir may I do something different with whatever...

Berry Cobb: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...process we put around it. But what that is would be up to that registrar. So we're not talking about the content of exceptions in any policy. And whether we need exceptions or not is something we still need to discuss.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: You know, certainly if we come up with any policy that we're all excepting we need to document in as clear a way as possible, yes; I don't think anyone is arguing with that.

All right my screen has just gone dark unfortunately so I don't know who has hands up or not. If people can speak out if there are any hands up while I figure out why my screen went dark.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All this talk of going dark, Alan, you've jinxed yourself.

Alan Greenberg: Let me power off and on and hope it comes back. Is there anyone else with a hand up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nobody has their hand up at the moment, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I have a screen. The gods are not happy with me apparently. All right I will put out what I suggested which may or may not address some of the problems that have been - that have been raised here.

We - and I ask registrars - registrars are known as being perhaps some of the more innovative business people on the globe - to try to come up with alternatives if the one I'm suggesting is not viable as to how we can meet the objectives of some of the more vehement users on this group of the need for out of band communications with their need for being flexible enough to address their business needs.

I'm not sure how else we can address that. Not seeing any hands can we quickly scroll through this list and see what else is yellow that still needs resolution which is not involved with the renewal or going dark?

Number 1 is number of days; 5 is number of days. Number 15, WHOIS, I think that one we said we wanted to talk to registries a little bit but the general feeling is it's a target but probably not something that we could put a definitive recommendation for in this report but we should have the conversation with registries prior to making that formal decision so it's nothing we can discuss at this point.

Where else do we have yellow? We had yellow on the registrars' discussion of best practices. And my understanding is that in Cartagena it was not discussed so it's back in the - on the table for some future discussion but certainly nothing has been - no action has been taken to try to institute the concept of a best practice at this point.

And the changing of the term auto renew grace period to something else we had general agreement and I think we need some suggestions at this point for names.

I'm not sure it's worth wasting time on this call but I would like to request an email that we come up with some alternatives so that we do not have policies and registration agreements which talk about an auto renew grace period and auto renew period or an auto renew practice in ways that are confusing to users.

And I think that is all we had so we are in fact almost at closure with the exception of the one item that we spent most of today talking about. I would like to suggest that we adjourn to the list but let's try to keep the list active and maybe we'll actually come up with some ideas or at least if people don't like the ideas that are being put forward that you try to document what the problems are so we - the innovative ones among us can try to find a way forward.

And I'll remind you, Marika, what is the deadline for comments on the existing part of the report? I think it was the 24th but I'm not sure.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, the email I sent on Wednesday of last week you'll find the latest version of the draft report including line numbers and people are requested to share comments, suggestions and/or proposed edits with the mailing list to the latest by 24th of January.

Alan Greenberg: Okay and I would suggest that to the extent we can do it for the 21st which is the end of next week we'll be in a better position to discuss it at the meeting of the 25th. Any other comments before we end just a little bit early today?

All right I thank you for your patience and time and let's try to keep the mailing list alive and see if we can make some progress there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, Cheryl here.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are we going to match the deadline for the list discussion on the yellow marked items to - back for the other drafting or not?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, Cheryl, you were slightly garbled and I didn't quite say, are we going to mention the deadline for...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no, match the deadline for the list discussions on the yellow marked items to that same deadline of - before the 25th or not?

Alan Greenberg: No I think the deadline for that is so that we can - in the best of all possible worlds wrap those up next week at the meeting next week, a week from now. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...looking for comments this week preferably.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it's preparation not final action on this?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just wanted to understand.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you all. And there seems to be have been a significant discussion going on which I didn't follow. I will capture it and read it just in case it's relevant. Okay. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you everyone.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah, bye, Alan.

END