GNSO

Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
16 November 2010 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 16 November 2010 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-20101116-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

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

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

Absent apologies:

Michele Neylon - RrSG
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you. I would like to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 16th of November.

We have Alan Greenberg, Berry Cobb, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, James Bladel, Ted Suzuki, Siva Muthusamy, Tatiana Khramtsova, Oliver Hope, Ron Wickersham, Paul Diaz, Mikey O'Connor. From staff we have Glen de Saint Géry, Margie Milam, Marika Konings, and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from Michele Neylon and if we can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you.

Over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Okay. Two items on our agenda today. One is the Cartagena meeting and the second is the proposals that are currently on the table.

The Cartagena meeting, we have a number of problems in that it would appear that the meeting has been scheduled against at least one meeting that is critical to some of us, that is an ALAC Wrap-Up meeting, and I gather from what Cheryl was saying two other meetings, both of which are somewhat important to a number of people on this group.

Cheryl, you were saying it's the JAS meeting and the GEO Regions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct. Geo Regions review, a public workshop, the JAS workgroup, which of course is a joint ALAC and GNSO workgroup, the other one is a cross community workgroup. And I was aware that there was no avoidance of an overlap between this PEDNR workgroup one and the ALAC Wrap-Up session, but ALAC Wrap-Up session had to move back in time because of

the public participation space required. And no things can clash with the public forum after...

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...lunch that day.

Alan Greenberg: I thought I gathered from the JAS discussion this morning or earlier today, yesterday, that that one might move because of the known - now known conflicts. But I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No...

Alan Greenberg: ...wasn't really following completely...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I don't know who...

Alan Greenberg: ...so I'm not sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know who would be able to do that, but I would have assumed that by the time the schedule is released to public as it was yesterday that meetings and the staff has gone every way they possibly could to minimize conflicts. So whilst we could ask staff to look at it, my guess is it is what it is and there you go.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So that sounds like for PEDNR the only option if we really want to have the main people who have been very active in the workgroup all there, we either meet very early in the morning, which we have been avoiding doing, or recognize we probably can't meet other than maybe late at night. Is that analysis reasonable? Is there any other option?

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, you were asking me.

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, I mean, I...

Alan Greenberg: ...you're the one who's studied the schedule more than anyone else. I don't see any option other than something like a 7 o'clock breakfast meeting and even that may overlap somewhat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But it may overlap somewhat but the minimal overlap is better than total overlap. I just - when it was just PEDNR and ALAC Wrap-Up, I figured, well, you know, I'll be in one space and you'll be in the other and there you go. But that's really...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I think we're going to have to take...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...up to the rest of the group.

Alan Greenberg: I think we're going to have to take this under advisement. If there's anyone who feels that an early breakfast meeting is absolutely out of the question as opposed to just undesirable, then I ask you to speak up quickly either now or on the list very soon afterwards.

Otherwise, I think that's going to be the only chance we have, other than meeting in hallways, to try to get closure on anything, assuming we're at the stage where we're ready to get closure.

Marika, you have your hand up. I just noticed.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Looking at the schedule for Wednesday morning, I see there are less items there and, you know, apart from the (ASU) meeting that's starting at 8:30 and there's an At-Large Improvements Work Team B

meeting, and I have no idea whether it's possible at this stage to still change the meeting to another day as we've been told quite (specifically) that, you know, no changes are being made.

Woman: Yes.

Marika Konings: But I'm happy to ask whether that will be an option if that would make more people available and I think especially Cheryl and yourself that have conflicts on the Thursday.

Alan Greenberg: Key people who have four conflicts I think is a moderate rationale for perhaps changing it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm (also in) all of the work team, so Work Team B I, you know, I had to (tip) a coin, I guess. But...

Alan Greenberg: All right. Let's take this up after - I haven't heard anyone vociferously saying they couldn't change or wouldn't accept an early morning meeting...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Yes).

Alan Greenberg: ...so let's assume that we have some options and Marika perhaps...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, it would have to be early morning...

Alan Greenberg: ...you and I can...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...it would have to be probably still that morning because from my perspective every morning is booked up.

Alan Greenberg: When you say that, you mean - when you...

Marika Konings: I'm (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: When you say that, you mean Thursday?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: And to note, Alan, because the meeting, the (moment) is already scheduled at 8:00. I mean, it can go a little bit earlier, but I don't know how much earlier do you want to go with than 8:00.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Let's do this offline because there's no point in 12 people listening to us talk about a calendar...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...that I - that in my case I'm not even looking at right now. But clearly I think what we have right now is not going to work very well. So...

All right, anything else before we dive into proposals? All right. I would like to go through the items that are on the list, the ones that came out of James' proposal, registry comments, and my proposals. There was a question we - we heard from Michael Young saying that the registrars were - registries were supposed to be meeting last Wednesday. Is - are the items on that list from out of that meeting or was there anything more definitive out of that meeting?

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes, (off my hand, mate), what I put in there is what Michael Young sent - said in his email as tentative to be confirmed options. I haven't worked out...

Alan Greenberg: Right, that was prior to the meeting and prior to my sending out my proposals. So we didn't get anything back after that.

Marika Konings: Correct. I didn't at least.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I didn't - I don't believe I did either. All right. I would like to omit from the discussion, however, any discussion of number of days. Clearly that's a contentious issue and I think we may be able to come to closure on some other principles without trying to fix that problem today and I would like to keep it off the table altogether if no one objects. Okay, and Cheryl says yes.

All right. We'll start at the top. Now we're looking at questions which are related to Charter Question Number 1 on opportunity and the first...

Ron Wickersham: It's Ron.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry.

Ron Wickersham: It's Ron.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Ron. Ron, yes, I see your hand.

Ron Wickersham: Hi. Yes, this is Ron. Yes, my only concern about leaving off the number of days completely is some of the - if some of them are so short that it's like adjusting five days and that may be the end of everything, I mean, at least note that some people object to a very tiny number of days. I don't know. But...

Alan Greenberg: Clearly because James' proposal had five and mine had 30 and there are some people who are saying 45, I think it's a given that we disagree on that.

Ron Wickersham: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And clearly we will have to either come to closure or have majority, minority positions if and when we finally come up with a hard recommendation and a report. I just don't want to discuss it today. Because I don't think that's conducive to trying to come to closure on other things.

Marika, is that a new hand?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to point out a relation to the charter questions under which each of these recommendations have been grouped, that basically that was done on an assessment I made looking at the charter questions and looking at our recommendations.

And I would encourage everyone to review the list and then make sure that (performance) (breeze) (where) those recommendations have been grouped together as some of them I could see as well appearing on the other charter questions.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine. And I - yes, I think it should be done. I haven't done it yet, but certainly some time before we publish a report we need to do that.

Paul asked in the chat that we'll come back to the number of days later. No, we're actually going to leave it blank on - from the workgroup and I'm going to fill it in privately just before submitting the report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You wish, Alan. You wish.

Alan Greenberg: That was a joke for those who didn't sense that. Yes, we will have to come back to it, but I prefer to avoid it today. I'm having a really good day otherwise and I'd like to keep it that way.

All right. So the first one is essentially the concept of a period where not only will the domains still be redeemable, but the registrars will not take any action

towards auctioning or other disposing of it but could delete it if that's the registrar practice to delete it.

How do we want to do this? I don't really want to start setting up polls. Do we use tick marks? Or people shouting out if they greatly disagree and if they don't disagree we'll assume they agree? Is that a reasonable way to go? Cheryl says yes. Okay.

Yes, my position on this one is I don't think from the point of view of our mandate and scope it is important that the auction hasn't started yet because if that were part of our scope, then it would also be part of our scope to say there shouldn't be any auctions and I think we decided not to go there.

On the other hand, it is certainly a nice proposition and I don't think anyone would object to it and it does show a certain amount of - a fair amount of good faith on the part of registrars. So I certainly support the concept that we're talking about there.

And I'm assuming that there are no other hands, negative hands - James has a hand up. James, since these are yours feel free to just butt in when we're talking about (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Oh no, I would never do that. I always stand on protocol. But I wanted to...

Woman: (I'm just sorry, that was a joke).

James Bladel: ...point out that, you know, we - from the registrars that have participated in this group and have described their practices, this is a good faith gesture, but we have been discussing the outlier scenarios or what a registrar could and couldn't do, so I think there's a little more substance here than just good faith when you start to talk about, you know, some of the folks outside of the registrars who participate in this group and in ICANN. It's a little more meaningful for some of those outliers.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So I guess from my perspective it - the start of the auction is not nearly as critical as when it is finalized and irreversible, which it - and certainly in my mind is clearly a hardline between the before and after state.

James Bladel: Yes, but for some folks we've described, although we haven't been able to identify them, we described the possibility that that could be irreversible from day one. So I think that this (undermines that) opportunity.

Alan Greenberg: Ah, so you mean people - people put it up for auction but without the caveat that it may be withdrawn.

James Bladel: Right. I mean, we've discussed that that's possible, although I don't know that we've identified any examples. This would close that potential loophole, if that makes sense.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, agreed. There may be a less onerous way of closing it, but yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Yes, this is a question for James. Because when this was initially introduced, there was one aspect that wasn't cleared up and I think it - and I think it's important, which is what happens on the first day after expiry? Does the - is the person aware that their domain has expired by the ser - by the root servers being modified to delete their zone or not because - and that I think you said was going to be cleared up later, but I don't believe I ever saw an email deciding one way or the other. But if that's left optional, then it doesn't - then there's no warning to the registrant that the expiration has actually happened yet.

James Bladel: I'm trying to remember the specifics of that conversation. I think that we discussed the, you know, termination of services and how long those would be active or inactive and I don't believe we came down on any sort of agreement on that, so I think you're correct in that statement.

We did, however, discuss notifications, required notifications that were secured by policy according to some prescriptive schedule, which we also haven't agreed upon yet but I think that that's a principle that comes later on.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, and we will be discussing the concept of, you know, what we have generically called going dark, although it isn't necessarily going dark, later on because it shows up on the list that I put together.

Barry, you had - I thought you had your hand up, but it disappeared. Is it - you want - anything you want to get in on? Yes, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes, thanks, this is Barry. James, just another quick question as well, and I think maybe you had mentioned this on the last call and I'm just still trying to picture this out from a process perspective. But you had mentioned that this initial grace period, regardless of the number of days, would essentially kind of run in parallel or be a portion of the auto-renew grace period, correct? Or would - does...

James Bladel: Yes, it would overlay the first end stage of the auto-renew grace period?

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. All right, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And I don't think we could stop it from doing that since that's really a registry function, not a registrar function.

James Bladel: Correct, and that's where our ability to propose changes sort of ends.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, other than us...

James Bladel: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...recommending that they not have one anymore, which I don't think we're about to do.

James Bladel: No.

Alan Greenberg: Or at least no one has raised that one yet. All right. Number 2 is - I think is what we just discussed. It's essentially the one with - but with an X instead of five and that is what we were just discussing and we decided - I recommended that one not be discussed right now.

The next one is the - that RGP be adopted as a consensus policy, but with allowing exceptions. Not knowing exactly what the exceptions are and since a similar one shows up later with some exceptions being explicitly mentioned, I would suggest that we wrap the two together and discuss it under the second item if no one has any objection.

The next one is registrar must allow recovery of domain name by the registrant of the record prior to the RAE. Or no, sorry, by the registrant of record prior to expiration, the RAE.

There was - has been some discussion in various forms that for the registrars who change WHOIS, technically the domain is no longer recoverable by the original registrant because of that. So it was suggested that we make it clear that just changing WHOIS is not sufficient to change who the - who has the rights to recover at that point.

James.

James Bladel: Hi, James speaking. And doesn't this seem as though if we were to reach some sort of an agreement on Item Number 1 that we could cover this scenario just depending upon how we structure the language?

Alan Greenberg: I would think so. I was just trying to be explicit when I was listing these, but yes.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Number - no objections. Number 5, recovery - okay, that's the number of days, which we're not discussing. All registrars must offer the RGP for gTLDs where the registry offers it.

                    Mikey is asking are the birds in the background. Not my background, but somebody's.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry, it's morning here in the world of the Antipodes and the birdies are waking up. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: And birdies are always welcome in my world.

                    All right. There was some questions raised off list on does that imply that all reg - all domains must end up being eligible for the RGP, which means the registrar had to delete them. No, this was not a backdoor intent to sneak in you must delete domains and not auction them off.

                    This was simply saying if it ever gets into the RGP, the registrar must offer at a published price, which is required by the EDVP, the ability for their RAE to get it and, in line with Item Number 4, it must be recoverable by the original registrant even if WHOIS information has been changed along the way.

                    This chat is getting very distracting. If all of you - if any of you haven't read it, you should read it quickly.

Man: I'm sorry.

Alan Greenberg: And (Mason) is not on the call, so I want you to read it to him - on the Adobe, someone should read it to him. Mikey O'Connor said, "It's snowing here. We kill the birdies and eat them." And Paul Diaz said, "Yum". Okay. I think I'm going to stop looking at the chat.

                 All right. Number 7, all unsponsored registries - gTLD registries shall offer the gTLD for currently existing registries. For gTLDs that do not currently offer the gTLD, a transition period shall be allowed. All new gTLDs offer the - are - must offer the RGP. There could be an automatic exemption for TLDs that do not sell the domains to the public, what were called in the VI group SRSU ones. And there was also a mention on the registry group of exempting Dot-Name I think or Dot-Pro, but that's a sponsored gTLD.

                 So, so far we haven't heard of any that - where the concept of a recovery makes any sense and we are not requiring it. But clearly the registries will have to get involved in that if there's any other exemptions or changes that would have to be made.

                 (Jeff).

(Jeff):   Hi. Could we, I mean - maybe I spaced out for a second because I was reading the chat piece, but did we skip Number 6 or did we discuss it and I somehow just missed it?

Alan Greenberg: We did discuss it. I remember talk - saying words about it about a minute ago.

(Jeff):   Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Just before the eating birdies comment.

(Jeff): I think that's what happened is that - so what was - I'm sorry, you know, if you could humor me, could you - what's our resolution or what the discussion on that one was for Number 6?

Alan Greenberg: Nobody objected to it as worded and there was just a clarification that the prescription that registries - registrars must offer the gTLD did not mean they had to delete every name, just that when names were deleted that they offer the redemption to their (registrars).

(Jeff): Okay. All right, good. I - that was the last - I missed that one little specific piece. Okay, then yes, I think that...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): ...where most of the registrars were.

Alan Greenberg: It is actually written in the comments, so, you know, even if I speak with forked tongue it's in writing now.

(Jeff): Right, okay. Perfect, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Barry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Alan, this is Barry. Yes, kind of to what was just being discussed about question six and question seven and I hate if this is causing us to backtrack a little bit, but can somebody quickly explain to me what the difference of RGP from a registry perspective is versus a registrar perspective? And what it means if a registry has the RGP and a registrar doesn't honor it versus...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Or vice versa.

Alan Greenberg: Well, the current situation is most of the original registrar - registries, dot-com, net, org, info, biz offer the RGP. If a registrar chooses not to then the name that - a name that is deleted would go into the delete status, but could not be recovered - or could go into RGP status rather for a month, but could not be recovered because under the current rules it can only be recovered through the registrar of record.

That's why in the charter there was also a question of should we allow transfer of a registrar during the RGP, which would allow you if, you know, to name - only name people on this list. If Go Daddy said we do not offer the RGP, which is not the case, then you could transfer it to eNom and then get an, you know, who does offer it? But since we're now talking about making it mandatory, the concept of transfer is moot, relatively moot.

But the issue is you can - it can only be recovered by the registrar of record and that registrar has to choose to offer that service to their customers. I'm not sure that answers the question. Is - does it?

Berry Cobb: Kind of, sort of, but not really.

Alan Greenberg: Well then ask it again. I'll try - if someone else - or someone else will try if I can't.

Berry Cobb: I just, you know, (how in the industry).

James Bladel: Hi, Alan, this is James. James, can I take a whack at that real quick?

Alan Greenberg: Sure. Please.

James Bladel: Yes, in order to recover, I don't know if this helps, Barry, in order to recover a name both the registry and registrar have to offer a RGP and what - I guess

what we're saying is that not all registries do, although the major ones do, and it's still an optional service for registrars, although most do offer it. So what we're talking about is essentially, you know, making that mandatory on the registrar side. But both the registry and the registrar would have to support that function in order to offer it to registrants.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I mean, there's added complexities in it right now. Even for registrars that offer it, either their agreements or the agreements of their resellers often say it is - there is no recovery after deletion. So even though the registrar is physically capable of doing it, the end user is presented with a statement saying that we don't offer it. So this would address that variant of it as well.

Berry Cobb: And just so I'm clear, so when, you know, the - in Brussels I think it was during one of the GNSO sessions, a briefing about this very topic, when (Chuck) says, you know, and I'm not quoting specifically, but when he says I don't know why the RGP didn't become consensus policy when we created it, did he - does he mean for both registries and registrars to honor it and therefore...

Alan Greenberg: I suspect he did mean that, but, as it turns out, it didn't become consensus policy for either because the GNSO did not go through the process to do that. I don't think there was any plot to not do it; it just didn't rise up in anyone's priority list.

I mean, at the time the RGP came out, initially it was before the current concept of PDPs and consensus policies and before there were any other registries. So given that all of the registries at the time were supporting it, no one took any action. Since we're now at a position where there may be a lot more registries, and some of them may well become large registries, it becomes more critical.

Just for the record, there are currently about, I don't remember, 5000, I think, RGP recoveries a month typically among com, net, and org. So it's not something that isn't used at all.

Barry's hand is down. I presume we are - we - either he's gotten tired or is satisfied with the answer now.

All right, Number 6, I think we finished Number 5. If anyone else thinks otherwise, let me know. Number 6 - 8 is - are all RAA provisions that are applicable to registrars must be passed down through their chain of resellers, which could of course be nested.

In Michele's email, he had said but you're already obliged to that based on the new RAA, but in fact that is not the case. The RAA lists a particular set of things, which include notices which the reg - which resellers are responsible for. But as an example, they are not responsible for offering the RGP. And there's a whole bunch of other things which don't fall into the particular laundry list that was included where there is no responsibility.

(Jeff).

(Jeff):   Yes, I think that I can understand what - your point there, Alan, but I think that we would need to tighten up the language where it says registrar, registrant interactions...

Alan Greenberg: Oh, I...

(Jeff):   Sorry, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I have no doubt and I used a different set of words in the clarification note. And before we would finish, we'd need to tighten up that language a lot.

(Jeff):   Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But essentially what we're saying is what is probably contract law in most jurisdictions around the world that if there's an obligation just because you subcontract doesn't remove the obligation. Now how we word that, I won't even try to guess. But I think - I hope the intent is clear. No other comments?

Then we'll go on to Number 9. All right, this one is - do we want to do best practices in the first pass or should we come back and do them? I think - I would suggest that we come back and do them because I think we need to talk a little bit about what is a best practice before we get into the - what the details are. So if there's no objection.

And we're on Number 10 then. The registration agreement and registrar Web site if one is used must clearly indicate what methods will be used to deliver pre and post expiration messages.

Now this was not intended to prescribe what methods are used, simply that the registrant is told ahead of time where they should expect the message coming in, or the alert or whatever it is, based on the concept that it's unreasonable to - for them to be able to take receipt of something not knowing ahead of time whether it's coming on a phone call, whether it's coming on an email to a specific address, they may have given multiple addresses, letter mail, or whatever. So at a minimum, the registrar must say ahead of time what they will be using.

From a personal point of view, although I don't know if we want to write that in, it would also be useful to know what address it comes from because then one could white list things and make sure they don't get classified as SPAM, if you're diligent enough to do that.

Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Alan. You just touched on a point I was going to raise. And I would say I would not want to see that potential for white listing put in because in the course of a registration lifecycle it's very possible that the email addresses that we would use will change and, you know, we don't want to find ourselves, you know, trying to do the right thing, announcing it, and then, you know, two years later we've changed and now things aren't getting through and suddenly we're accused of doing something wrong or dastardly because a white list had been set up but it's now overtaken.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no, no, I - I'm not - I wouldn't disagree at all with that. I think on the other hand though, we need to look at things from the registrant's perspective, okay, what is poor registrant supposed to do, you know, especially those who use systems which are more diligent in - at protecting them SPAM than other ones are, if they have no information at all. And, you know, maybe it's an issue that the Web, you know, somewhere on your Web site you will identify it and if you change it, you change it. If they don't notice it, they lost out.

But, you know, I'm not - again, I don't - I'm not sure this should be in policy. It may be in a best practice.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: But I think we want to try and put in place mechanisms that registrars can use to make sure that their registrants receive messages. And, you know, this is more in line of not a policy but how do you - how are you kindly suppliers that treat them in a way that allows them to do things properly. I don't know the answer and I don't think we're going to put it - write that into the RAA, but I think we need to think of things from that perspective.

So (Jeff).

(Jeff): Yes, Alan, I just - I'm curious like, you know, would it - like just thinking about how would this help? So if somewhere you said it's on the Web site or

somewhere else, if every registrar had a laundry list saying these are the ways we may contact you, do you think that would really make a difference here?

Alan Greenberg: It depends. I think the answer is yes. Some registrars for instance, you know, say we will contact you by email and for an extra dollar in the registration we'll also contact you by SMS or telephone call, you know, or something like that.

And, yes, I think for providing - telling people what you're going to do in a predictable way and perhaps even giving them options, not that we're requiring it here, I think if nothing else it removes some of the potential criticism and ways that a registrant can complain saying how was I supposed to know, you know. Right now when I sign up for a domain, I typically give the same contact information for all of the, you know, for the admin and tech and whatever.

(Jeff): Right.

Alan Greenberg: Not everyone does. And I don't have a clue which, you know, when I get a renewal notice from you, I don't know did you send it to the admin address, the tech address, or what. I don't know because they're all the same. If I had different ones, I wouldn't know where to expect them. I'm hypothesizing. You probably send a bill to admin, but maybe not. Some registrars probably send them to all of them.

(Jeff): Yes. I mean, here - my point being I don't have a problem sending it - putting that in there. That - there's no objection to it. I'm just curious if we really think we're just, you know, putting in extra work that it really - will it make a difference or not? I mean, I have no problem putting that in. There's no - I just want to be clear there's no objections. It's more like (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's lending a - it's lending a level of predictability that the registrant, if they're diligent enough to actually read the documentation, will know what's going to happen.

(Jeff):   Okay. That sounds fair.

Alan Greenberg: James.

James Bladel: Yes, Alan, I think this may have already been covered. But just to kind of build on what (Jeff) is saying, I think when we start to talk about these communication mechanisms, whether it's email, postal mail, telephone call, or SMS, carrier pigeons, or (semaphores), you know, I think that we can make recommendations on what the registrar has to send and when. But there has to be some - I'm not sure how to do this actually and I'm still working this out in my head.

But there has to be some point at which the responsibility is on the RAE and that, you know, there's essentially an obligation involved that if they do not receive the information or go in search of this notification or, you know, add this to their white list or whatever, take some action to ensure the communication is received then, you know, that there's a - I want to say some form of indemnification on the part of them and versus the registrars for inadvertent use.

I guess what I'm saying is, you know, we can - like I said, we can document, we can record, and we can prove that something was sent, but we can't prove that it was received, understood, or acted upon. I think that's the tricky part here and I'm open to any and all suggestions that would help us, you know, as a stakeholder group and, you know, if not that then just my company alone. You know, anything that we can do make folks, you know, (try and take) these messages to heart, I think I'm open to that, so...

Alan Greenberg: When I started with email, email was reliable. If you sent it, it got delivered. If it didn't get delivered, you were notified. You could tell if someone opened it or not and you could guarantee that the from address was legitimate. We've progressed a lot since then, haven't we?

But we're stuck with an email system which is essentially unreliable right now and the fact though we are using email as a prime notification method for domain registrations and there's not much we can do about it. So all we can do is try to make it predictable within the unpredictability of the medium, I think.

James Bladel: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: You know, it - I think it all comes down to some mechanisms are more outrageous than others. But if you're already at least telling people that - what you're going to do, if you're only using psychic energy and I have to turn on my psychic receiver to get it, I should at least get a warning I need to turn on my psychic receiver. I'm sorry, that was meant as a facetious comment, for the record.

All right, anything else on this one? I am not reading the chat. If someone else is saying there that is crucial then please shout it out.

Okay, the price charge for post expiration recovery must be stated. There was some discussion about whether that meant you must tell someone ahead of time what the price will be or is it simply posting the then current price. And my intent was certainly the then current price. I, interestingly, did look at the wording that's in the current RAA on posting the RGP price and it doesn't go to any great pains to say its then current price, but of course that is what it is all the time.

So I'm happy to say we will be explicit if we set a policy on this that we specify you must post the then current price at the time it is displayed or sent.

But, you know, the exact wording the registrar will use at any given time will be set by their people to minimize number of complaints they get. So I'm assuming that it will use words like that. But the intent was not to ask you to guarantee a price ten years ahead of time. Although, as I point (out), any registrar is free to do that if they'd like.

Questions, comments? Okay.

Number 10 - 12 rather. In event ICANN gives reasonable notice to registrar that ICANN has published Web content providing educational materials with respect to registrant responsibilities and the gTLD domain lifecycle and such content is developed in consultation with registrars, registrars who have a Web presence must point to it.

At the advice of Ron in an earlier version of this, he suggested that we go and figure - we look at the same words that are currently used in terms of the charter of rights and responsibilities and I just freely copied them completely. So I'm assuming there will not be any great problem with that, if we can in fact get anything written.

Number 13, requirement to send by a method at each registrar's discretion a minimum of one renewal notice to registrant no later than ten days prior and another one five days prior. So this is the notification one that was in James's proposal. There is a similar one in my proposal with a different number of days mentioned and a slightly different way of framing them, but I think they're both essentially the same thing and we just need to come up with a - some periods that make sense.

(Jeff).

(Jeff):   Yes, this is one where I think I actually disagree with everyone on this on setting - prescribing to each registrar those number of days because I might

have found that I have a higher renewal rate and better responses on a different number of dates.

And I think that the regis - you know, this one would maybe be somewhere where you could say or, you know, some sort of an exception or if the registrar, you know, asks for a specific time. Because, I mean, I'll tell you, just the fact, you know, (that we) want as many renewals as possible, we want to everyone to come through.

So but if we find out that - I would - I'm going to be very annoyed that if I find out that we are losing a lot of renewals and customers aren't finding out because we've switched to this whatever number of days that other people outside of our business have told us we need to do with this number of days and this number of days, where we find out that we are losing renewals. And I think there are going to be a lot of other angry registrars. And also registrants who may find out they're saying this isn't an ideal for me.

So I liked to be able to put in, you know, some sort of discretion or exception process on this.

Alan Greenberg: And, well, in a rare feat of cooperation I have suggested that we have an exception process. I think the whole concept of exceptions needs to be discussed separately, but I tend to agree that there needs to be some latitude for people who don't follow this method but have a business model that is quite different.

And I think particularly once you get outside of North America and Western Europe there may well be some very different business models. And certainly if, you know, for places and there are some that do monthly renewals that renew month-by-month, clearly a notification a month ahead of time may not be the right answer.

On the other hand, if someone comes up and says I want an exception that I will send two notices, one four seconds before expiration, and one two microseconds before expiration, I don't think that would be deemed acceptable. So...

(Jeff): No, I understand.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

(Jeff): You know, I agree with you and I agree that the exception I - discussion should be shelved.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

(Jeff): But I think this would be one where I could see - where I would say for an exception or a, you know, core equivalent, you know, as determined by, I don't know, compliance staff or somebody else.

Alan Greenberg: No.

(Jeff): But you could say that...

Alan Greenberg: Which becomes an exception. I'm agreeing with you. James, you had your hand up.

James Bladel: So, I think so, and that's more of a question for (Jeff), is that is there a concern that including this in a - this prescription, or whatever it is, in addition to whatever you have found to be effective will diminish the efficacy of what you are currently using? I'm just trying to understand here, you know, if there's a prescription to send these, but you found that something else worked better for you, why wouldn't you want to do them both?

(Jeff):   Because my point being is saying I don't know what's going to happen if they're in conjunction. Do you know what I mean? Like if it could be - I could say doing it X date and Y date, but if it's X date, Y date, and this one and this one and if it doesn't fall into these then I have to do these as well...

James Bladel: Right.

(Jeff):   ...then there's a drop off is what I'm concerned about. And I don't know the answer to it. Do - that's what I'm saying is...

James Bladel: Okay.

(Jeff):   ...your proposal might be ideal. It might be the perfect one. But, you know, I don't know that and it might be, you know, it might change things around and it might make it worse, but I'm saying not having that selectability is what concerns me.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I mean, and (what there remains to be challenged)...

James Bladel: ...I think that - Alan, if I could just respond.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, yes please.

James Bladel: Yes, I mean, in that case then maybe we would be better served, because (Jeff) has now found he needs to think about this a little more carefully, we would be better served to design windows rather than exceptions. I'm just concerned that exceptions leave, you know, a lot of open - openings for folks to just disregard, you know, what we're trying to accomplish here.

                  But the windows, you know, no sooner than but no later than or something like that might give (Jeff) the flexibility that he needs to do what he feels is most effective.

And I'm just putting that out there as a brainstorm because I hadn't considered that when we were cooking these up and (Jeff) has caused me to take a new look at that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I mean, the one I did does have windows, but they're narrow. Now if (Jeff), you know, if eNom has a large enough user base that they've actually run experiments, which is possible that they could have, maybe they even did, and found out that six weeks and two weeks is the optimal notification periods then having to also do a one month and one week would make it four messages instead of two and would be deemed to be SPAM and people would be annoyed. I'm giving you sort of a worst case scenario.

(Jeff): Yes, no, that's exactly it. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. But on the other hand, I'm - I suspect you want to annoy people who aren't renewing their domains. But...

(Jeff): Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...it depends (even if)...

(Jeff): It's a fine line.

Alan Greenberg: ...your business model includes (anointing) or not.

(Jeff): Yes, there's a fine line between the two. And I think like James - what I could do is talk with James offline about it and I think the windows idea could work as long as you said, and Alan as you said, the windows aren't, you know, like five seconds and three seconds...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

(Jeff): ...that sort of thing.

Alan Greenberg: And...

(Jeff): So...

Alan Greenberg: And as I read this over it dawns on me that that statement also needs a caveat saying for periods of one year or more. If you're doing a six month or a two month domain renewal or a one month renewal that may not apply at all. You know, if it...

(Jeff): Yes, but Alan, just one point on that...

Alan Greenberg: ...just the windows make it quite different.

(Jeff): I think just one point on that. I wanted to just tell you that I do un - agree with you that there are people who have models where it's, you know, different sorts of monthly and it's other pieces. But for gTLD registries, none of the registries offer - it might be a synthetic one month period or something along those lines, so I don't think we need to take those into account because those are synthetic periods that (people in a domain)...

Alan Greenberg: No, none of the registries offer it, but there are registrars that offer it.

(Jeff): Right. But I think - I don't think we - I don't know if we could delve into that. But I'll - I - or I could just leave that point alone.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

(Jeff): But I don't think any - it would be a synthetic period, the monthly that's offered by the registrar. That's not something that would be a registry related thing. And I don't know if ICANN would be able to follow that, but that's a whole other can of worms.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. In any case, we're - I - this is not the stage I think that we need to refine the details and I think we're agreeing that there should be two and we should prescribe when they come in some reasonable way so that they can't be outrageous. So they can't be all, you know, both of them can't be eleven months ahead of time, you know, long forgotten be - by the time the renewal actually comes up.

So let's not try to come to closure on this. I think we're understanding the concepts and we still have work to do.

(Jeff):   It sounds good.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. The next one is a hairy one. And that's the modify WHOIS to make it clear that the domain has not been renewed by the registrant.

Now there's a number of things that have been said along the way. There was a comment, I don't remember if it was in (Michael)'s statement or something or somewhere else, or maybe it was in the - their comments for the report, on thick versus thin. And clearly the implementation would be different. I don't believe we made any statement that it should be implemented on one and not the other.

The real - the point I think I made when I was talking about this is that it's the only change that's being suggested which will require significant amounts of programming effort for all registries and all registrars and, therefore, if nothing else, the timeline for implementation would be different.

And in other PDPs we've seen whole P - whole implementations be delayed because of one sticking point of one part that's harder to do than the other and I would want to make sure in any future recommendation we make that we make it clear that the timeline should not be frozen for all things because this one is more difficult.

That being said, there are other discussions going on reworking WHOIS and it may be more appropriate for us to make a recommendation that this be addressed by those groups. Although if we did, I think we would make it as mandatory as we could and not optional at their discretion. Because it - it is the only item, I think, that all throughout this whole discussion we've had close to unanimity on.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This is actually an issue that has also come up in another working group meeting, the IRTP working group, where we've also talked about this and, you know, a possibility to clarify (with status matches) for people to know what it actually means.

And there we actually had a discussion with someone from (Baris Management) involving actually drafting the - I think the RFP (file) for the EPP protocol.

And as he explained it, to me it sounded relatively simple and how we can actually assign a certain message to a status value which might provide an explanation. So I think (a limited edition), yes, it definitely needs more exploring, but there might be different options that could be explored, you know, so maybe be more complicated than others.

So I think there's an item where maybe it would be - I don't know which direction the IRTP working group is going on this issue, but there definitely might be a link between the two items that might be considered by, you know, a separate working group or initiative and in the IRTP working group they already had some discussions on how that might work in practice. And I can try to dig out that conversation if it's of interest to the members here.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. Yes, when I said a large amount of work, I wasn't implying that it was difficult for any of them, it's just there's a large number of entities

that would have to change things. And that implicitly makes it difficult because it now needs to go into everyone's lifecycle. And it can't be done centrally by only one group.

But all of that being said, I think we would like - it's clear that we would like to see this and what the right mechanism is that we get through - that we get to that end point, without causing unreasonable hardship, I think we need to look at as we go on.

All right. The next one is a relatively simple one in that we're saying that at least one notice goes out afterwards, after expiration. And if the contact - if the message - if a domain name is being used to get - provide that notice which is the same as the domain name which is being - which has been suspended, then the registrar has an obligation to attempt to use some other communication method in lieu of it. In other words, you can't get away by sending out an email message to an address you know is not going to work.

There was a comment from Michele saying we don't know how he sends out messages and I suggested in my last message to him that perhaps he needs to explain it to us.

Any comments from this group? James.

James Bladel: Yes, hi, I'm James speaking and I'm looking here at this notification. If it's post expiration then doesn't that assume that the name is not being explicitly deleted and, if so, do we need to carve out an exception to it?

Alan Greenberg: Oh yes, of course.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Marika could maybe a note in the notes saying this applies only if the name hasn't been deleted. (Jeff).

(Jeff):   Yes, I still - I thought that, you know, if you - what you're saying is the notification has to be sent out. So if it's, you know, if it's let's just say alan.org is your e - is your domain and alan.org is your email address that you've given here and that's the only one that we have - I'm sorry, what would be my requirement here?

Alan Greenberg: If it's the only address you - if the only email address you have for me and you don't have a phone number for me and you don't have anything else, well you're probably in violation of WHOIS, but ignoring that, you have no obligation.

(Jeff):   No, no, not a phone number, if you're saying - because it says an additional - at least one notification to the registrant after expiration and that has to be - but you're not saying the method that it has to be done.

Alan Greenberg: No, well, I'm assuming you will send that through your normal mechanism, but with the caveat that since the normal mechanism may involve using the DNS entry for that domain, which may have been altered at this point...

(Jeff):   Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...you cannot - right now, when we talked earlier there was a question in the registrar's survey saying if you send out messages post expiration, do you check to see if it's going to what is now a dead domain based on what - you know, based on what you do to the domain after expiration. And the answer was uniformly no, we don't bother checking.

(Jeff):   Right.

Alan Greenberg: Our SMTP agent sends it out, it either bounces or goes into the bit bucket and we don't bother checking ahead of time. This is saying you can't be that - you shouldn't be that blind.

(Jeff): Right, but I still don't under - so what you - what I wanted to ch- by the way, to say here's the point is that after the expiration period why - what happens is for a lot of us, we - like I know for us, we disable the email.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

(Jeff): And so on that domain if there is one attached. But I think that - the way this reads it does - it doesn't seem to make sense just saying that if there isn't, you know, to send it out, but I don't - here's the - my other problem is how would you ever or how would anybody, either ICANN or anybody else, actually audit this or look at this?

Alan Greenberg: It's only going to be audited - it's only going to be made clear that you're not doing this if, you know, if someone complains and on the, you know, on investigation it turns out and you say, yes, I sent the mail to that address. I - it's not a matter of catching the people who are trying to be nefarious. It's trying to set the guidelines so people do reasonable things to begin with. You may not - you may not have auditing ability on a lot of these things, just like we can't on many of our other contracts.

(Jeff): Right.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, right now ICANN has no auditing capabilities whatsoever on anything going through your resellers.

(Jeff): But as the registrar you're responsible - but here's the point (so what I'm saying is)....

Alan Greenberg: So, yes, (what I'm) saying there's no auditing capability.

(Jeff): Right. So what I'm - the point being here on this is I - I guess, let me read this some more. I'll just stop for a - I'll just defer this because this one I - is one

that I still had an issue with, but I'll let - I'll just - let me read it and then I'll email on the list on this.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, Alan, this is Mikey. Just to follow up on this conversation a little bit. The way that I understood it was if the domain was registered and all of the contact addresses were to alan.org and it went dead and you didn't - and the registrar didn't have any other way to get a hold of you, there wouldn't be a liability on the registrar. The point being that if two of the addresses were to alan.org and one of them was to mikey.org that the registrar would make sure that they send one to the Mikey - to the still live thing.

Alan Greenberg: Well the one that they don't know is dead. Mikey.org...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...might be dead also, but that's not their problem.

Mikey O'Connor: It might be dead too, but that's what the if said, if it exists at the end is all about is to highlight that if you are a registrar and you've got something besides the dead domain, use that one. Right?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I mean, and this is indeed incentive for registrars - would be incentive for registrars to collect contact information that isn't an expensive medium. You know, so it's to your advantage if, you know, if, you know, I use the one SMS because I think it's a dandy mechanism that isn't used in North America nearly as much as it should be. You know, but there are mechanisms that don't cost a lot that are effective.

In any case, I think this needs more thought on the wording and maybe it's not implementable, but I think it is and I, you know, I think we need to come back on this one though. Proceeding, if no one objects. All right.

The next one says there must be some, what we're calling push technology used or push methodology used and specifically saying it is not sufficient to simply say that in the notification that something is going to expire has been placed in your registry maintenance panel or domain management panel, which the typical registrant that we're talking about who gets into these problems certainly does not review and look at on a regular basis.

And there was a question on whether email was push or pull and my politically careful answer was technically email is probably a pull technology, but the mechanism for pulling is relatively automated and we're treating it as a push technology.

James said it's something about inbound and out of bound. Is that in relation to something I was saying?

James Bladel: Yes, that essentially any message that would be delivered that would require, you know, an act of login by the registrant would be an (inband) signal and that anything that would go and notify them whether they were logged in or not would be an out of (band).

Alan Greenberg: Oh, I've never heart that technol- that terminology in that sense.

James Bladel: Well, old telecom days sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: No, this is Mikey. I'm an even older telecom guy than James and I tiptoe us away from this brink.

Alan Greenberg: And I'm a pretty old telecom guy and I don't - that don't - that's not a familiar technol- terminology for me. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Well and it's not quite right. So let's...

Alan Greenberg: I used to program...

Mikey O'Connor: Let's back out of the driveway (on that).

Alan Greenberg: I used to program support for 10 bit per second or 110 bit per second teletypes, so that's almost as old as it gets. All right, no hands, no comments, no shrieks.

Web sites or sites reached by the domain name must no longer be reachable within some timeframe. I said three to five in my recommendation. By the time this became a policy, we would clearly have to figure out what the right number of days is, but the intent being that after some moderately small amount of grace period that the failure to work will be an indication that it - that the registrant must do something.

And, again, this was one where I - I think - I cannot see it being sold to registrars around the world, some of whom have very different business models, without allowing exceptions. And the exception would be in the form of we don't want to notify them for the first two weeks, but we will be trying to get hold of them on the phone and we go knock on their door or, you know, something to that effect. So there would have to be an alternative method that is more reliable than email to getting people's attention.

But I cannot see that we can do this without some level of exceptions to handle different business models, including registrars who are dealing, you know, with, you know, what might be high reliability domains that they really don't want to kill until it's coming down really to the last moment of no alternative.

All right. Number 19 is the comple- is a similar statement for the other services if the Web is one is separated because registrars do, as a matter of fact, intercept Web traffic and there is no intent in this particular policy or a

suggestion to change that. And, in fact, having a notice up on the screen says - has some merit in it.

Number 20 says if there is a splash screen it should contain an explicit notice. Twenty-one is a best practice.

Twenty-two is a clarification that we have discussed a number of times that there is confusion when the term auto-renew grace period is used and often used in contracts and right adjacent to it is auto-renew, which is the registrar's service which says if, you know, effectively if you deposit a credit card or whatever, we will renew the domain name for you.

And the suggestion has been made that using words which are just so close together is bound to cause confusion. So I put this on the table to see whether we - it is viable to try changing the name. I don't know whether it's practical or not.

Yes, James. Passive and active I like better.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, we're still talking about Number 17.

Alan Greenberg: I know.

James Bladel: We're 15 minutes behind the call. Sorry about that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Man: You whippersnappers.

Man: Yes, I - okay, so if we can go past, I know you guys like to tell war stories about using the switchboards to connect calls to like KL7, but...

Man: Come on, those stories are fun.

Man: I was - I would say - I was thinking about some - I worked in telecom as well, but that was also in late 90s, early whatever we call the 2000s, so I'm going to skip away from this conversation. But I (won't say)...

Man: I won't start talking about my...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...battlefield switchboard that I used to have.

Man: I think - I - what number did we jump to because I had a question about 20 and I - somehow I think that we just flew by those.

Alan Greenberg: Twenty...

Man: Oh did we pass that one or are we not up to it yet?

Alan Greenberg: No, I - we flew by it. We...

Man: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I whispered something into the phone about it, but no one commented.

Man: Yes, no, so I was - the issue - what I wanted to say was that - to say that - where it says explicitly say that the domain has expired and give instructions there. I - we definitely need to work on the language on that just because, you know, I think it's - it would want to be that it could be a link or other method, but that if it's just a whole page of instructions on a screen maybe the registrant might think that's their old home page.

Alan Greenberg: If they can't tell the difference they deserve what they get, I guess.

Man: Yes, what I'm saying is we should think about that it can't be that we don't
                  need the instructions and other things and this should be sort of...

Alan Greenberg: I - there's a huge body of registrars that already do this, so I think we can
                  draw upon the knowledge that they have gained.

Man: Yes, (that would be) okay.

Alan Greenberg: Typically I think it's a statement in a link or something like that.

Man: Okay. Perfect.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, James, I think it - it was sold by the Canadian army. I'm not sure it was
                  the Canadian Army switchboard though.

Man: Oh we're back (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: It was Canadian Army surplus. I think we have finished all of the items except
                  for the best practices. I'd like to, if we could, talk a little bit about the concept
                  of exceptions. We have just about 15 minutes left, so that stops us from going
                  too far overboard on this.

                  I believe what is suggested is implementable, partly because I think a lot of
                  the exceptions are going to be repetitive. That is, similar exceptions will be
                  asked for and it will not be an onerous task to decide what is a reasonable
                  exception and what is totally unreasonable.

                  It's not clear to me whether it is important or not whether we publicize these
                  akin to the RSTEP process for registries. It dawns on me that there might be
                  some view that registrars consider it not quite proprietary information, but
                  they don't want to advertise to their competitors what they're doing. The
                  information isn't secret, but it's no reason to parade it out. And I don't know
                  how relevant that is or not.

I don't feel really strongly about whether these things are made public on the ICANN Web site. Clearly there will be - has to be some notification on the - each registrars' Web site as to what their own practices are.

Any feelings among the - particularly among the registrars of - or am I missing some crucial issue of implementability or is there some way around the exceptions and still get this accepted by registrars around the world?

Yes, thank you for participating. (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yes, thank guys, I need to drop out.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Any thoughts on this or are we all tired enough that we want to adjourn for the week? No thoughts right now. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I sort of want to jump on the retire for the week and give us - well, and give us a pat on the back because I think that we've made a lot of progress. And we should (nap).

Alan Greenberg: You're taking all the fun out of my position here, but yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I am. But, you know, I think that this is a remarkable week's work and I think if we can keep this going, we're well on track to getting something figured out. And I think all deserve an atta boy for that. So I think what I would do is give us all a pat on the back and say, you know, keep at it and let's work out the hangnails that we've discovered, but claim victory for today. I think this is a good day's work.

Alan Greenberg: I do not disagree at all. And since you've said it, I won't bother saying it. I found this an amazingly productive call without getting into some of the more difficult things that we've gone through before and I appreciate the goodwill on everyone's part.

We have the possibility of two more meetings before leaving for Cartagena. Three actually. I would suggest that we not try to schedule one for the - no, sorry, two, the 23rd and 30th. I would suggest we hold next week's meeting and try to make some progress keeping going forward on the list. And I will send out some thoughts on this. And I would appreciate maybe from the registrars also of it's fine for us to agree on this call, how do we get wider agreement? And if there's anything we can do as a group then that would be interesting.

And I suspect I would prefer to not have the meeting on the 30th given that it's a day or two before most people are leaving and our time is valuable, but let's see how much progress we make next week. And at the same time, hopefully we'll have some better idea of what we're going to be doing in Cartagena.

Anything else before we adjourn? Ron, yes.

Ron Wickersham: Yes, one thing that happens to us who participate on the Adobe page is that all disappears. So is it possible to put notes from the progress we made and then send that list of things out to the list - out to the mailing list that would be accessible afterward?

Alan Greenberg: Well normally Marika will - would be making notes on this thing, so say for the number of issues that we did, you know, make changes or additions to. I - you know, we weren't attempting to say does everyone agree, does everyone disagree on this, we were just trying to make sure that we're all talking about the same things in this call. So I'm assuming Marika will be making a number of additions or changes in the document because of that.

I'm not sure what else is on the screen. We also do capture the chats normally and I don't know if we - I don't think we've been reliably sending it

out to the list each time, but I know Marika or I typically do capture it. (Marika can you handle)...

Ron Wickersham: Yes, I was just thinking for those things that we said, well, we need to think about clarification of language and stuff...

Alan Greenberg: Ah, okay.

Ron Wickersham: ...if - because what does appear on the part of the screen is diff- is slightly different words than have been sent on the mailing list prior, so if we're going to be able to (help) during the week period before the next meeting then it would be handy to have that language.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Marika has her hand up, so she's going to tell us that she's in a position to do that or one of us will have to listen to it again and we'll do it. Marika.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. I - I'm not really clear on what Ron is asking for because it's no problem to send out the chats and I can do that immediately after the call. And the document that's up on the screen is the one that was attached to the agenda.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think what he was mainly referring to, not from what you - what was on the screen, but what we discussed along the way, and for a number of these we said we have to go back to this, it has to be clarified. Or we made some changes that, you know, James identified one area where, you know, the post expiration notice only is applicable if - and the name hasn't been deleted.

The windows was only applicable if it was greater than a year or a year or greater. So there were a number of things we said as we discussed, I haven't been diligently taking notes. I don't know to what extent you did. (About) an hour and a half of (listing).

Marika Konings: Yes, I just caught the one that James indeed had on there, you know, if the name hasn't been deleted for Recommendation 6, but I didn't note down any others.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Ron Wickersham: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Then one of us is going to have listen to the recording again and try to be more inclusive and capture the others and I'll be glad to do it later on in the week, Marika, if you don't have time, so just let me know. I can't do it in the next two days or so, but I can do it after that.

And we - yes, Ron, we'll try to do that. In terms of the chat, we will capture it as soon as people stop chatting. And anything else?

Then we adjourn for next - until next week. Thank you all for a great meeting and let's try to continue the momentum on the mailing list. Bye all.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thanks, Alan.

Man: Yes, bye.

Man: Yes, Alan, thanks.

Woman: (Bye).

Woman: Thanks everyone, bye-bye.

END