GNSO
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference October 3, 2007 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Domain Tasting Ad hoc teleconference on 3 October 2007. 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-domain-tasting-adhoc-20071003.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct

Attendees:

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-coordinator CBUC (Council)

Margie Milam - Registrar constituency

Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency

Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registry constituency

Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)

Danny Younger - NCUC

Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Glen de Saint Gery: Patrick Jones and Olof Nordling and myself from the staff; Jeff
          Eckhouse, registrar; Jeff Neuman, Registry Constituency; Margie
          Milam, Registrar; Kristina Rosette, IPC and Danny Younger,
          Noncommercial Users Constituency. Have I left off anybody?

          Okay.

Man: Great. Thanks, Glen. Okay, so I'm hopeful that everybody has the documents I sent around last night. I know (Jothan) also sent around another document last night which we will consider when we get to 4.3.

Olof Nordling: While – could I just quickly comment on it because this is one half, the first half of the document which means that all internal links, of course, will be spoiled and ruined and the table of contents of course is completely destroyed.

                  So – but we got a little bit of problem would have been argument. So, I can't send it to the whole list as one document because that's – it clogs up the ICANN server, it seems though...

Man: I remember that from Sunday.

Olof Nordling: Yes. So, just a recall that – don't be surprised if you try to click a link -- that's an internal link in the document -- it would lead you nowhere.

Man: Okay. Thanks Olof. So, I'd like to just basically take it from the top of the red line that I sent around. And get - obviously people's comments not only on my changes but if anybody else's has any other changes or suggestions similar to what we did last week.

                  So, I was starting off in the background (version) 1.1.

Kristina Rosette: Actually, I just want to backup even further. In the table of contents, can we change how the IPC – how (annex) hide this title because it's not a survey.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Well...

Kristina Rosette: And I think I put something in my markup from whenever it was they send it around maybe this week Friday night.

Olof Nordling: All right. All right.

(Mike):   Hey, is (Jothan) on the call?

(Jothan):   I am. Hi.

(Mike):   Hey, (Jothan). Can you just make sure because I haven't read your version yet? Can you just make sure you interject comments when – because I have only looked at ((Mike)'s) version?

(Jothan):   Okay.

(Mike):   Oh, I'm sure we can count on that.

(Jothan):   Thank you for your faith, (Mike)

(Mike):   All right. So, in the 1.1 then, I just made a couple of small textural changes. Anybody have anything else?

All right, 1.2?

Kristina Rosette: I own new language for the paragraph at the bottom of one – of bottom of page four and I have not had a chance to see that yet.

(Mike):   Okay, I know you're going to do that right after the call.

Kristina Rosette: Actually, no.

(Mike):   All right.

Kristina Rosette: (Absent) for two days, I'm so far behind.

(Mike):   Is it something that we can hash out right now? And just get a draft in their placeholders?

Kristina Rosette: I mean I'm happy to do that. I'm basically trying to avoid the conclusary statement of the type that (Jothan) objected to in his email which is why I've requested the deletion of the corresponding text from 4.7.

(Mike):   Okay, I appreciate that. Unless seeing here, we use this in 1.2, right?

Kristina Rosette: Yup. The (paragraph) that it's the sentence paragraph at the bottom of page 4, "virtually, all 115 respondents".

(Mike):   Got it. Okay.

(Jothan):   We realized I didn't have fairly object so much to say, look, you know, come on.

Kristina Rosette: That's okay. We're deleting it. It's deleted.

(Mike):   I mean, I would...

Olof Nordling: Well, could you tell me what you delete?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Delete that whole paragraph in 1.2 "virtually, all 115 respondents".

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: And then, the corresponding length when we get to it in 4.7, I'll note that as well.

Olof Nordling: All right.

(Jothan): Are you going to replace them with something or you're just taking that out?

Kristina Rosette: I'm going to replace it with something that basically is kind of says, you know, "The IPC, you know, conducted a supplemental RFI, the results of which are, you know, contained herein in Annex 5. And speak for themselves..." or something like that.

(Mike): Yeah, I think that's appropriate for this section. Okay. So, Olof, I mean you kind of adjust to that. You can take a step in a draft because Kristina, I really don't want to wait long after this call because (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: No, no. I appreciate that. I appreciate that.

(Mike): Okay.

Kristina Rosette: I'm just crazy busy right now.

(Mike): No problem. Understood. Okay.

(Jothan) were you okay with the...

Olof Nordling: I'm – do I get out of this straight now? Sorry for interrupting but - well, you won't send Kristina any additional text but I add reference basically for this piece.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I mean, I would be perfectly fine with something along that lines of the following, "the Intellectual Property Constituency conducted a supplemental request for information. The result of which are contained at contained at annex blank and summarized in section blank." Something like that is perfectly fine for me.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Okay. I hope I can manage that together.

(Mike): I have a nit in the paragraph above on the inputs from a group of ccTLDs. Where's this monthly pricing schemes? Can you just change the word schemes to something like business models or...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...monthly pricing models. Models, yes, schemes just have that negative...

Olof Nordling: Monthly pricing models?

Man: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: All right, consider it changed.

Man: Thanks. All right. Again, it's just a nit but no problem. Now's the time. All right, 1.3, 1.4.

Man: There's (scroll) on here.

Olof Nordling: Move to right so far.

(Mike):   Yup. Good deal. Section 2. All right.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) that, (Mike).

(Mike):   Yup. Just trying to be consistent where I found things.

                All right, section 3.1. Shouldn't meaning changes there, it's been like this for a long time. At 3.2. And Olof confirmed this morning that he can update the report in the graphs with the latest info. So, that should be very helpful with given other point, I mean graph.

Olof Nordling: You made this very simple formatted and brought in the data that Jeff put in the mag.

(Mike):   Great.

(Jeff Neuman): But I am in – someone should check my (math) to make sure I interpreted that right. I mean, I...

Olof Nordling: Okay, we'll do.

(Jeff Neuman): I think I interpret it right but that's the least drop from 2.4 million to whatever it then which was a drop in about 15 fold.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Okay, I'll check it.

Jeff Neuman: I guess I would also refer back to the tickets you saw in this context. Refer back to David Maher's public comments on this in San Juan where he, you know, he basically said there was two tasters that they are dealing with. And this in fact did push them away.

Olof Nordling: Right. Should we – well, just talking a little foot forward...

(Jeff Neuman):   I feel like if we just incorporate the statistics, it's a little bit misleading without knowing. And in fact, it was really two tasters.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Jeff Neuman):   Two (unintelligible) registrars.

(Mike):   Okay. Outcome, the RFI 4.1.

    All right. To the top of page 10, 4.1.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan here, I just got on. Sorry I was late.

(Mike):   Okay. Good -- hang on. Welcome

    Anybody else joined late? Okay.

    All right, I'm to the top of page 11 now, still on 4.1.

Kristina Rosette: Can we go back to the top of page 10, please.

(Mike):   Sure.

Kristina Rosette: I had tried when I made some changes to and this is kind of picking up on something that Jeff had pointed out in one of our earlier calls when I kind of done the, you know, blanker characterizes that I benefiting from. I think we need to kind of carry that through to the paragraph at the top of page 10, you know, so other actors that are perceived as or were characterized as benefiting?

(Mike):   Okay, that makes sense.

Kristina Rosette: Since the time, you know, continue that same qualifier.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Yes, they're perceived.

(Mike):   How about that are perceived to benefit?

Olof Nordling: Oh, well, I think...

Woman: Why don't we just say, "are characterized" because it was the characterization, wasn't it.

Olof Nordling: That's all right.

                 Yes.

Woman: Okay, let's do that. I'm happy with that.

Olof Nordling: If you search elsewhere.

(Mike):   All right. Anything else from page 10 from everybody?

                   Page 11?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I might be still...

(Mike):   No problem.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, now I'm good. Never mind, sorry.

(Olof):   No (blink)?

Jeff Neuman: I was just trying to follow two different printouts.

(Mike):   Okay. I'm on to page 12, now.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

(Jeff Eckhouse):   (Mike), it's (Jeff Eckhouse). Can you just float in just for one second, I
                   just looking – just giving an extra second for the program just to
                   respond on before we just slide through the some of the pages. I
                   actually don't have any responses but I think we've just gone a little
                   fast.

(Mike):   Yeah. I think I'm on 12 now where I had -- I don't know, 12 or...

(Mike): Obviously, I'm, you know, I'm glad to have anybody's comments. If we need to go back, it's not a problem.

(Jeff Eckhouse): Okay. That's fine.

(Mike): I just don't want to be wasting time.

(Jeff Eckhouse): No, that's fine.

(Mike): Where's the statement...

Man: (Mike), you're using you're red line page numbers?

(Mike): Correct.

Man: Okay.

(Mike): Where's the statement on these 30 million to 32 million names being chided? That's where I wanted to stop.

Man: That's at the top of page 13.

(Mike): Yeah. I think we talked about on the last call that we wanted to reverse the order of those that are either registered via tasting or chided.

Olof Nordling: Okay. I think I didn't do that.

(Mike): Right. And I...

Man: So, what is the change exactly (Jeff)?

(Jeff Neuman): And what is the origin of that data?

(Mike): Yeah. But that's – I mean, it's totally untrue but the origin of the data is CADNA's submission.

(Jothan): Right now.

(Mike): I understand, (Jothan) what you're saying and unfortunately, CADNA and their submission didn't specifically identify that it was (Mark Monitor) report. Although I happen to know that's where they came from. But...

Man: Well, if (unintelligible).

Man: ...I don't think it matters for these purposes.

(Mike): At least, they didn't write it down in a piece of paper and then quote it.

It seems – I don't know how to identify that, you know, it's extrapolated from another document that doesn't quote it's numbers.

(Mike): I think it's accurate as it says right now. CADNA states this for whatever its worth.

Man: Yeah. But like it says it states it with some data and saying "with some data" it means that there's actually some statistical data that backed it up. If you could – as we use of the word data, it says that there's actually something that has been proven behind it versus just saying it's a comment...

(Mike): But may be we should put that in an annex. I mean, that is something because, you know...

Man: How about we delete the phrase "with some data"?

Man: That's of now.

Margie Milam: Hey, (Mike) this is Margie.

(Mike): Hey, Margie.

Margi Milam: I don't think we say there's 30 million to 32 million as chided. I think we'd say – (unintelligible) I mean, I look my branch, (unintelligible) by I don't…

(Mike): Well, it's chided or were identified as registered as via tasting.

Margi Milam: Oh, I see. Yeah, I'm not sure that data came from us but I'll like (unintelligible)...

(Mike): I'm just telling you, I asked them about it a while ago. And that's what they told me.

Man: Well, it seems like – what was it we were saying eliminating the words with "some data"?

Man: How about this? If we can do that and this will say, "additional comments are provided". For example, "CADNA suggesting" or "CADNA..."

((Crosstalk))

Man: How about "CADNA believes that".

Man: Right, then I would switch to chided or the order of chiding and tasting.

(Mike):   Sure, that makes sense to me to put those clauses.

              Okay. So, I believe that it will read then, "additional comments are provided, for example CADNA believes that 30 million to 32 million names are either identified and registered via tasting or being chided. And the 2 million names are being tasted everyday."

Olof Nordling: Okay. Got that.

Man: Fine.

Man: Okay, yup.

(Mike):   Anything else then on page 13?

Man: I'm sorry, one more thing, "30 million to 32 million names", is that a time frame or it's all they said?

Man: At any given time.

Man: Oh, at any given time?

Man: That's the way I read it.

(Mike):   Olof, you might maybe check in their exact submission and...

Man: Is everything else has...

(Mike):   ...verify that a little more?

Man: Yes, I'm per year, per day, at any given time.

(Mike):   Uh hmmm.

Man: Because, I mean, there's not 32 million names registered that day so...

(Mike):   Right.

Olof Nordling: I think, I mean the way I read it and I try to remember it is that, well, you have one of aspect here which identify and registered via tasting. And that sort of account, a total count which can be a state of a particular date and are being chided which is sort of – that's a flax...

Man: But tasting is a flax too

Man: Well, tasting is what's -- chiding as a relative study state. It implies regular re-registration via with the AGP. So, chiding is definitely a study's state issue.

Man: So may be if CADNAs believed that 30 million to 32 million names have been tasted or chided?

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Well, I can't defy them (unintelligible).

Man: Oh, no.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: By it's sort of an accruing number.

Woman: Yeah, that's a different statement.

Man: But, that I don't understand their...

Man: I think we should not be trying to interpret what it is they believe. We should look at their statement.

Olof Nordling: Jeff, I – I'm pretty sure I copied it from it because I was taken it back and that's the way I am just (unintelligible) as well. I mean, that's – well, one is ours being chided which is sort of state of the proceedings today or any of particular day or were identified and registry of our updates in which means that this is an accruing number that could have – has been then identified and registered through tasting or in the course of time. And well, it's a upon the addition, actually.

Man: Can we just (Mike), can we just ask the guys to put to leave this working to say, to leave this out and then until they come back clarify so that we're not trying to interpret what they're thinking or saying when we just can go back to them and say...

(Mike): Well, that's why I suggest that we just put in exactly what they said. If Olof has already done that, then I think we just leave it as that.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I'd do that. I take it straight from their comments and I think I did so but I didn't put bracket on it but I've bracketed or rather (unintelligible) with commas.

(Mike): All right. The problem I have is that it's not true. And I have a problem with even if it's someone's belief?

Olof Nordling: Not, I mean...

Kristina Rosette: Be careful.

Olof Nordling: I think I'll understand it.

Kristina Rosette: No. I don't think you want to start this conversation.

(Mike): No, we don't. Remember, this is factual. We're just trying to report what people have reported to us whether it's true or not just honestly that comes later.

Man: Well, but - however, if the statement is one that we really can't parse, then at the very least, we should put a footnote saying that we had trouble figuring out exactly what they meant.

Man: Yeah, I'm fine with that.

Olof Nordling: We've...

(Mike): I'm fine with that as well. And maybe we just quote this and put it in quotes, "CADNA believes quote" put exactly what they say.

Olof Nordling: Actually, yes.

Kristina Rosette: Yes, (unintelligible)

(Mike): And then drop a footnote that says, "This maybe subject to interpretation and perhaps need to follow-up from CADNA."

Man: And the group has not undertaken to substantiate, I don't know if...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: I don't think we should do that. Why are we picking on this one comment?

Man: I don't think we believe that.

(Mike): Right, exactly.

Man: We're already highlighting against something we don't understand.

(Mike): So, let's just quote it directly and leave it at that.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, because otherwise, if we put footnote that means that we have investment everything else and we have it.

(Mike): Great.

Alan Greenberg: Well, but this one is one that we don't understand. I'm not sure if we don't understand it why we're putting it but…

Olof Nordling: I will.

(Mike): That's a fair enough point, Alan. I guess, I'm interested to see exactly what they said. Right now, we don't know that so let's leave this as an open issue. Get the exact language from Olof. If there's still any uncertainty...

Man: Is there some way to put although this could not be verified?

(Mike): I mean, we could say that on everything in here.

Woman: Yeah, and that assumes the others are verified.

Woman: Yup.

Olof Nordling: Exactly. And then, so, what we could do although, it's not the most beautiful but putting a question mark within a parenthesis occurred indicating that well, the draftsmen didn't really understand all this.

Man: So, we already mentioned that. It says a forth coming study from CADNA but now we've put as – you know, that's in the paragraph above it. But now, we quote their data, I mean, I'm the most airing on the side of why do we single this comment out from all the comments that we received and put that in here?

Olof Nordling: Maybe we should quit spending too much time on it and we should leave it to one side as poorly understood.

(Mike): Yup.

Olof Nordling: And, that's two million names are being tasted everyday, that's still an understandable statement.

Man: That's right. I think if there's something – a direct quote that we can put in there that makes sense then we should do that.

(Mike): Yeah, I mean, I'm fine with the two million names are being tasted because you can at the zone file and see that or see how many names are being – you can extrapolate that.

Man: Okay. I am comfortable than deleting the entire sentence that a bunch of people don't like and saying that for example "CADNA states that two millions names are being tasted everyday". Leave it at that.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Man: All right.

Olof Nordling: All right. Solved.

Man: Yeah, that would solve a lot of --that's good.

Woman: Yup. Good solution.

(Mike): All right. Excellent. Let's keep going then. Page 13, anything else on this page?

Okay, page 14?

Page 15?

Man: Did the – okay, the APWT, you put in there?

Man: Full text good, okay. Sorry.

Man: Hello.

(Mike): Okay, then I'm into now 4.2.

Man: And we're going to update these charts?

(Mike): For now, is it too late?

Olof Nordling: It's kind of too late.

Man: Oh, it is. I thought – I understood you were going to update them, okay.

Olof Nordling: Well, it's not down in the jiffy, not by me, at least.

Man: I understand. I'm sure it would take me hours as well. I don't know that it's that important. I don't – I haven't actually compared the latest report to what would happened in March as far as the numbers. Has anybody done that?

Man: It were - might be interesting as in the second chart, Olof because there's just that huge drop-off in March that is obviously a question mark.

Olof Nordling: Right.

Man: Or if we could add org to this where the footnote is to why org dropped. But I guess it's that (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah.

Man: I think we've covered .org okay with the numbers. I'm not going to ask Olof to create another pretty chart right now.

Man: Uh-huh.

Olof Nordling: I think we have - we're running very close to the line here and are I already got it…

Man: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: …get it out and...

Man: I think we just go ahead and leave it as March and...

Olof Nordling: We could rather – I would perhaps an auction would be to come on send us separately to the council's updated graph.

Man: Yeah.

Olof Nordling: I like that.

Man: That's not a bad idea, all right. We'll do that. And we'll just – in my
                cover notes as the council will say that we've got the June reports and
                Olof will circulate the revised version when he has a chance.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I'll try to.

Man: Okay.

Man: Big deal.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

(Mike):   And I'm into page 19.

Man: Sorry, underneath the – I'm sorry I don't know what page is this -- I
                believe some of the registries – like(unintelligible) have been providing
                the ADP data since – from the beginning but there's a sense on page --
                I don't know what page I'm on here.

(Mike):   Are you looking at a printout or online or..?

Man: I'm looking at it on the...

Woman: Why are you looking at the first?

Olof Nordling: I think I know what you are referring to.

Man: Page 19.

Olof Nordling: section on deletes within the ADP was only recently made publicly available by...

Man: I would say by Verizon.

Olof Nordling: By Verizon.

Woman: For common note so...

(Mike):   That's fair.

Kristina Rosette: Yup.

Olof Nordling: Right.

(Mike):   Okay.

Man: And by the way, we have – (Patrick) does have the totals from the last report because he was kind enough to send me a copy. So, staff does have them available.

(Patrick):   But they're not put -- this to (Patrick) -- they're not put it in the monthly report, we had to create that. So it takes time. We can't do it every month but we can do it (unintelligible).

Man: But at least, it should facilitate Olof's efforts to update a graph.

(Mike):   Right.

Man: Oh, yeah.

(Mike): Good.

Olof Nordling: Okay, if I may cross communicate with my colleagues, (Patrick) do you think – well, I've drafted this graph but do you think (Karen) would have a second to update the graphs?

Man: I'm driving right now and so, I'll talk to her when I get in.

Olof Nordling: All right. (Unintelligible).

(Mike): Okay, and I am now into page 20 unless anyone has any comment.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, I have a question actually, about number 19.

(Mike): About 19?

Kristina Rosette: Page 19, where we say registry representatives look in the Ad hoc group.

(Mike): Uh hmm, near the bottom, okay.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, I mean, are we basically only talking about registry representatives from PIR and New Star and if so, should we just say that?

(Mike): Yeah. Registry representatives from PIR and New Star.

Man: And put a capital S for New Star whenever it's mentioned. It's kind of protect my intellectual property.

Man: All right, as long as you don't add an exclamation point.

Man: I would add the names in brackets because we didn't single them out specifically to get the data. They just happen to be the ones on the group.

Man: Yeah, we're going to delete within the Ad hoc group because actually, PIR was not in the Ad hoc group.

Olof Nordling: Ah, okay. That's fine.

Man: We'll just say registry reps from PIR and New Star provided more data. Okay.

Olof Nordling: You are at New Star and was there anything in particular that are just about how protecting your...

Man: It's a capital S. It's a capital N and then a capital S.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Mike): All right. I believe that takes us then to page 20.

Man: Where it says there's some (adjustments) to provide similar information for not calling .net that has refused. Can we soften it a little just say, but has not to date? The reason - I just want Verizon to post some negative thing about the report because of us.

Man: But to date has refused?

Kristina Rosette: Well, have they actively refused or they just not responded?

(Mike): They've pretty much actively refused and said they were going to give us a response from their legal team that we have not received.

Kristina Rosette: I think we should say that.

Man: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: That's more accurate.

Man: Yeah.

Man: If they happen to said. "No we are not giving you for the weekend" then they refused.

(Mike): Right. Okay. Well, they did say that they didn't. What they did is to kept questioning why we need the data and kept arguing that we already had the data. And then, finally said their legal team would provide a response and nothing...

Man: How about – but to date has not provided the data?

Man: Yeah, that's what I said but softer.

Man: I'm okay with that.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) has walked...

(Mike):   But has not provided the data as of – but has not yet provided the data.

Man: That's good.

Olof Nordling: Not yet provided the data, okay.

Man: Well and it's -- it's also its capital V, capitalized.

Man: Jeff.

Man: That's correct.

Man: Is it really?

Man: It is.

Man: It is.

Woman: It is.

Man: Oh, boy.

Man: All right. Make that change everywhere.

                 All right, 4.3 then.

Kristina Rosette: Before we go into that, can I just note that we've got the sections out of
                 order in four as compared to how we've outlined them through the rest
                 of the report in the sense of, you know, if we're going to track how we
                 initially laid them out, the order after 4.2 should be the ccTLDs, the

UDRP, the IPC and then the Registrars. And if we're not going to track how we did it in the beginning...

Man: I don't understand what you mean how we did in the beginning.

Kristina Rosette: Well, I probably outlined it in the introductory sections when we talk about the various data collection sources, we always talk about them in those sections in the same order, RFI, ccTLD, UDRP, IPC, Registrars.

Olof Nordling: Then, what changes into the introduction in that case?

Man: It would be the easier probably for Olof. And I think I'm okay with (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: I mean I'm going to just go on and record that I have an objection. Given that, you know, the other responses were all, you know, the other sections were all it might be much more transparent. And to put the one that is least transparent upfront is about (unintelligible).

(Mike): I think you're reading a little too much into it. But, yeah, I mean, I'm not sure that too many folks would make that, you know, distinction or think that it matters much, Kristina. All, I mean, I agree with your statement. Clearly, this is the least transparent, I'm not sure that really matters the order.

And frankly, now that it is going to be edited down to the factual substance of the submission, I think we should be okay with it.

Okay, so 4.3.

Man: Drum roll.

(Mike):   The substance, the edited version. So (Jothan), I would really, strongly like to work from this text rather than the text that you submitted last night. And, you know, unless you have...

(Jothan):   Well, I have some compelling reasons why we might want to take advantage of the 4.3. I did in fact get some quantitative metrics that come to where the methodology was, where does this arrive from? And there was a 50 use of...

(Mike):   Right.

(Jothan):   ...(PDP) that came in that got included in the document.

(Mike):   Okay, I'm obviously glad to have that in here. And let me just try to find that exactly what was the fifth thing.

(Jothan):   The fifth was Buyer's Remorse.

(Mike):   Buyer's Remorse.

(Jothan):   Addressing buyer's remorse.

(Mike):   Uh hmm.

(Jothan):   Now…

(Mike):   Okay.

(Jothan):   …in fairness, I believe that the responding registrar was discussing the price points inside of pro, that pro where the registration is I guess going higher than that in com.org infobiz 50, you know, in the case where they've got a registration sometimes the cost of registration can be $100.

              And that they – they get…

(Mike):   Frankly, I think that buyer's remorse is essentially the same thing as mistyping or typographical errors.

Man: I don't think so. I thought it was a two separate items…

(Jothan):   They really are two separate items because one's accidental and the other one is, you know, it was done with intent but then, you know…

(Mike):   It actually sounds like domain tasting to me.

(Jothan):   I mean I'd agree with you except that the case that was provided was really not sort of volume. I mean what's describe was, you know, at $100 an item which I couldn't see somebody tasting, that, you know, they might get as many or 13 items in the card and then hit submit and then come back and say, "I didn't – I don't know I really want it all (leave)."

              And that's really different from…

(Mike):   Still sounds like tasting no matter what the price.

Man: I don't know as to why does that sound like tasting. If there's somebody comes in and buys ten names and they've spent for example, .pro which is an expensive one and not at all tasted and they decide, "Oh, you know what, I spend too much money. I can afford this." Why – how is that – why do said that's equivalent of tasting?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure we need to analyze it whether it's different or not. I do have a problem that it's capitalized any of the term is not defined anywhere.

                I mean I'm not sure I know or someone in other culture will know what buyer's remorse is.

(Jothan):   So, Alan, would you say just to edit it, that's that it makes sense to multiple cultures or to define the term?

Alan Greenberg: I would define the term especially if you're using it in capitals. I'm not sure capitals are warranted but I…

(Mike):   I agree we should probably not capitalize it. And then the first sentence down, you know, where we're dropping, starts explaining about (use five). I think the first sentence should have a brief explanation of what buyer's remorse is.

Alan Greenberg: I mean I assumed it means, I changed my mind. But I'm not – I'm…

(Mike):   That's right. That – I think that's (unintelligible). Buyer's remorse is situation where a buyer changes his mind shortly after purchase.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, and you know, changes in mind essentially with no – never actually pointing it to a live website.

Man: Uh hmm.

Alan Greenberg: I mean we're not tracking whether they do or not but that's the intent that it's – it was never used…

Kristina Rosette: In any way.

Alan Greenberg: …but it was decided it wasn't really needed. I mean if that's the intent, then I think you need to say something like that.

Kristina Rosette: And if it was one registrar identified – well, can we just go back to the bigger issue. I'm a little confused as to where we are. Are we working from…

(Mike): We are working from…

Kristina Rosette: …((Mike)'s) provision of 4.3 or are we working from what (Jothan) did or (unintelligible)?

(Mike): We working from – we're working from my version but I've agreed that generally we could add the fifth reason here if either we could add buyer's remorse in.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, I mean I have no objection…

Man: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: …to identifying the specific ways in which registrars use the ATP. Never have.

(Mike): Great.

Kristina Rosette: It's all the extra stuff that I have problems with.

(Mike): Okay, so that's it. I think we're fine and with adding it – this text (Jothan) AGP (use five) with the explanation of buyer's remorse, he changes his or her mind without activating domains. And the next two paragraphs are okay. And then the conclusion stuff is back to my draft, much of it's out. But will be annexed.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So, to go through and include some of the quantitative information from the 4.3 I submitted.

(Mike): Great, okay. So, you did…

Alan Greenberg: I'd like to argue that that's there. In fact, I'd like to argue about the document that I've submitted simply replaces the 4.3 that's there. If we took a lot of what Kristina and you had put in you had put in, and answer a lot of questions that were there as to the methodology. And spend a significant (unintelligible) in addressing them.

(Mike): Okay, that's some of the other things I think we're still – have not been incorporated. So, for example, you have in your second paragraph, what follows is the result of (straw pulled) at the registrar constituency. Yet you said that this was never submitted to the registrar constituency. So it's a (straw pulled) of some registrars.

Kristina Rosette: An it's also not correct to say that it was the Ad hoc group that pulled the registrars constituency.

(Mike): It should definitely say the resolve of the (straw pulled) out of some registrars.

(Jothan) This was sent to the entire registry – registrar constituency group.

Jeff Eckhouse: Yeah, this is Jeff. I want to – that's why I was just about to make that point that this was sent to the registrars constituency mailing list which is – as somebody had sent – (Francesca) had sent to this group that that is the primary way that the registrars constituency respond with each other through the list. And this was sent to all the registrars that are on the registrars.

(Mike): When?

(Jothan): September 14th.

Olof Nordling: September 14th, it says in (Jothan)'s papers.

(Jothan): I mean I lay all these out which -- so in essence to a registrar constituency which consist of 65 registrars represent hundreds of registrars.

And it was submitted on the 14th for people to either respond to the RFI to the process. Either to the big post poll or the mailing list. Or they could respond to me with some uses of AGP.

And I got 38 responses, three of which were not used because they have submitted either to either the big pull or the RFI mailing list. But the last 35 are registrar businesses, they didn't extrapolate how many registrars were represented by that. But this was just individual registrar representatives. And only one of them allows domain tasting as part of their AGPUs. I think that really speaks volume to the volatility of data.

(Mike): It's definitely more helpful than yesterday, so I appreciate that. I'm still reading through some of this again. And it's quite late last night when this came through.

Kristina Rosette: I can tell you that I'm having a difficult time trying to figure out even what we talked about in times of – what maybe some of what (Mike) have suggested growth. I'm having a hard time figuring out how to apply the instructions I've gotten from my constituency and context the fact that 4.3 is still influx. So…

Man: Can you explain that I – maybe I…

Man: That was constituency.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: In sections I have for my constituency are that, if anything – if what ends up in the section 4.3 is anything other than a purely factual – this is what we ask, this is how we ask it, these were the what the specific uses that were identified.

You know, don't care characterize them as benefits. Don't characterize - don't make sweeping assumptions about registrant behavior. If it's anything other than that, I've been instructed to object and request that the ICC be provided to submit a letter in objection that we included as an annex.

(Mike): Well, you are always permitted to object, And you are always permitted to submit a letter to the council when they consider it. But I think your constituency is a little bit...

Kristina Rosette: No, you know. Honestly, I don't think so. I mean, I really don't think so. For example, there was a very interesting sentence in the first draft. That indicated that none of the polled registrars participated in tasting or guiding. That's gone. So, you know, was that wrong? I mean, you know, is it that some of them do, some of them don't.

I mean, looking at some of the language about for example, where it should be – when you're talking about, you know, most registrants are selfish in a confusing world of provisioning protocols and techno classic, you know, I expect that kind of nonsense when I go to the tool pile in Home Depot not, you know, not in a report that is going to represent the (that you see) Ad hoc group.

And I think that's probably my problem is that a lot of the way this is drafted, somebody reading it and just reading it kind of start to finish, let's see what they came up with not kind of examining it.

Is it going to realize that 4.3 is simply the opinion of the registrar constituency? And that the poll is conducted by the registrar representative of the registrar constituency, that is wasn't, you know,

the ad hoc group saying, "Okay, we're going to do specific polls over the (unintelligible)…

(Mike): Okay, we just solved that by putting a first set of thing this poll is done by the registrar reps and ad hoc group. Because I got to tell you Kristina, I have a ton of problems with the number of your survey but I kept it, you know, going to live with it.

Kristina Rosette: But you have six weeks to object.

(Mike): No, no, no.

Kristina Rosette: That's specifically why we needed to move on.

(Mike): I'm talking about the characterization. I have a severe problem with an IP owner making a claim as to what the security stability of the internet and especially with domain tasting. I've a huge problem with it. But, you know, that sentence deserve to stay in there, that you have that, you know, 100 and whatever people view that that there is (unintelligible) security (unintelligible).

I think that is completely…

Kristina Rosette: Is that in my section?

(Mike): Yeah, 139 of the 180 believe that domain tasting is…

Kristina Rosette: No, no, no. That's in the general archive.

(Mike): It was in the general archive.

Kristina Rosette: Yes, (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, right.

Man: Quickly.

Kristina Rosette: That's (unintelligible) me.

(Mike):   But the majority, our IP owners that responded. And I've a huge problem with that because I think that's total be (unintelligible) then we're going to leave it in there because that's what they believe. If we start to set this up, I think registrars believe and then do the rest of it. And I don't there is an issue.

Kristina Rosette: But, you know, the problem is that even then, I mean it still not objective. You know, even – and I do appreciate the efforts that (Jack) have went to, to put some transparency on it. I think it really lends to, you know, the credibility of it. But I still have a problem with, you know, the result of the (straw polls), the registrars have yielded five benefits in the AGP other than domain tasting and chiding.

Your (unintelligible) benefit. It's only your perspective. And if you're talking about a benefit, you know, the result of the (Straw pull) yield it five ways in which the register has used the AGP and perceived this uses to be a benefit to their consumers.

You know, saying it that way as opposed to saying, you know, these are benefits. I mean this whole report is the report of the group.

(Mike): Okay. I think, you know, your suggestions are good. I think job continue not put in, these are perceived rather than facts. I mean, I think we can solve it but, you know, we can say basically five perceived benefits to the AGP. I think that solve that.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, that's fine. I mean, I'm fine with that. It's just through out the whole section…

(Mike): So, we do that – okay, (I've added that). But Kristina, I mean, write through this a little more carefully. It doesn't have made a lot of yes, so we suggest it. And there are some more that we – with that I will go on definitely. For example, where you says, "In contrast, the restocking fee are more powerful options. So, just that's an opinion, not really necessary here. And it's repeated five times I think.

Alan Greenberg: Well, in each case, you know, it's being presented as part of the feedback that came back from the registrars on each of these. And the concern would be that, you know, no consideration of the impact of each of potential remedies would be considered as part of the process of a review of this document, you know, by the council as we've ultimately going to proceed or not proceed in the PDP.

And the, you know, to use Kristina's analogy, you know, the Home Depot analogy, you know, to create the – you know, when you get a Home Depot, there's no instructions on how to use a hammer. But…

Kristina Rosette: I was talking about like the like condescending tone of it of it, frankly. That's…

Alan Greenberg: Oh, you mean like the sales people? Oh my God. I have the same (unintelligible). Okay, I got you.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I mean, I just find some of the tone in here to just be (unintelligible). I mean, you know, as independent. In fact, whether I think it's a smart move to insult registrars. I mean, I guess I can't find off my language that if I read this and I was the registrant, I would find defensive.

(Mike): Well, then you should proposed specific edit.

Kristina Rosette: I did.

(Mike): Okay.

Kristina Rosette: And I'm happy to kind of go through, you know, what is now second (unintelligible). And again, you know, I don't have a problem at all with having a section of the report that says, "The registrars were asked in this way, blah, blah, blah. How to use the AGP? This is what they said.

This is why they think eliminating it is a problem but unless you've got kind of consistently through out the section, the qualifiers that you need – I think people who aren't frankly going to be reading this for the find (unintelligible) comment most are.

I'm not going to get – they're going to (unintelligible) impression that…

(Mike): I have the same objections to your section too. Forty-four of 99 respondents stated that they're brand or companies they represent having this subject of tasting. What don't you – I don't believe that. I

believe that they perceive it to be tasty. But there's no – if we're going drop in the word "perceived" or "believe" everywhere, we're going to do it in your section too.

I mean, you may believe that your sections are fact. But I have the same opinion of your survey that you have of the registrar. We just have to leave it with a trust with each other a little bit.

Man: Yeah. I mean, it's very clear in both cases. I mean this is tiled opinion polling and registrars. Every cases are quest for information and opinion very clearly, both of the (unintelligible).

So, you know, I don't want to be too hanged up on (unintelligible) put perceived as benefit everywhere in this report. I think it's necessary. It's too wordy and silly. I mean, (unintelligible) have time for right now. So, not only – I'm okay with it if either you guys have it in a couple of places that you really think it should be particularly at the (unintelligible) section is okay. But otherwise, I just don't want to be getting into that right now. I think it's too late.

(Jothan):   Well, another thing that point out in this is that, you know, there was – of those 38 registrars, 35 of them opted to respond through this method as opposed to through the general RFI process. And, you know, right or wrong…

(Mike):   I understand what you're saying. That's what they say they did and you've stated that our registrar.

(Jothan):   I just tried to characterize it. And frankly, I've tone down the opinion.

(Mike):   You have, you have.

(Jothan):   I've tone down the significant quantity of the opinion. And, you know, I've tried to keep this as objective or – excuse me – as factual as possible. There are maybe places where that leak. I can certainly respect what Kristina is saying.

(Mike):   Okay. Let me propose this, that Olof take (Jothan)'s text inserted it. Also, take please review the edited versions from Kristina and I that will have some nits to some of this text which is stay the same. And let's go with that for now. Everyone's going to have one more chance to comments, express outrage et cetera.

                Does that sounds fair to everybody?

Man: Yup.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, I can live with that.

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: I'll do my best.

(Mike):   No, no. I was specifically directing that question to you Olof. I think it's fair to everyone but you. But I know you make a really good effort as you have in so many instances on this report.

                Okay. Then at that, unless anyone has any further strong opinions or views that they want Olof to take an account when taking that next step, then we move on.

Okay.

(Jothan):   So, what page do we get to?

(Mike):   We get to Section 4.4 page (unintelligible).

(Jothan):   So, in this document without (pasting in it) it's page 25 for me, that everybody.

Olof Nordling::   Yup, right.

Kristina Rosette: Perfect.

(Mike):   I do want to go back Olof to Kristina's comment about the ordering. So, I tend to agree with her that – I mean there is order. It doesn't necessarily, certainly that written in stone. And I do think that it make sense at least to put the two RFI responses back to back since one was supplemental to the other.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Mike):   I'd like those upfront. There are also the things that we've been working on the longest. And then, this we can stay 4.3 and we can move the charts. Are those what's 4.2 right now or forget?

Olof Nordling: They are.

Kristina Rosette: I actually – I'm inclined to say the chart should come first, frankly.

Alan Greenberg: I'd like that too because that was the first thing we did actually.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Because I mean that's kind of probably the most un-objectionable part (unintelligible).

(Mike): I think that's fair. So, let's do the chart as 4.1, the RFI response 4.2, the supplemental RFI 4.3 and then the registrar…

Man: 4.4.

Man: 4.4.

(Mike) And keep the rest.

Olof Nordling: Uh hmm.

(Jothan): Can we retain the current numbering at least for the process or review for this call?

(Mike): Yeah, of course.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

(Mike): That's like, yeah.

Okay, so…

Man: I didn't had enough copy.

(Mike): So, then I think that takes us to Section 4.4 which is on page 26, at least where am I right now.

Olof Nordling: Soon to become 4.5.

(Mike): Great. So, can we – this section is a little bit harsh. I think.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Well, actually I replaced to already in a sort of the working draft, I've got on the screen. I'm reading this from paper but I got text from Danny Younger and I've introduced that instead. When he refers to the original question put forward by Bruce Tomkin, that it sort of explains about the general thought was.

(Mike): And I do thing that make a lot of sense to generally use Danny's text. I do think though that we need to call out the fact that we thought this information was coming and it was promised repeatedly and never came. And it really undermine the work of the group. We don't have to go that far. But that's the truth. So, I mean can we just say that this way, we hope that the data would come but it did without saying a large registrar or…

Olof Nordling: You know, in my text I simply indicated unfortunately owing to unforeseen circumstances the study was not for growth.

((Crosstalk))

(Mike): I personally would like to be a little bit more direct. I can't believe that Danny Younger have a more mild version than other people. To me that's just historic.

Olof Nordling: You know, that happen now.

Man: Not noted as an objection.

Man: No,no that's...

(Mike):   Alright.

Man: …I'm impressed.

(Mike):   So, Okay. I'll go to change text. I know what happened, it's document
                   on email it's what happened. And (unintelligible)?

Kristina Rosette: Do we want to suggest additional work in that area or that not really or
                   that not really (unintelligible).

(Mike):   We do that in the (unintelligible)…

Man: Do the final language.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: The final language states that, yeah.

Kristina Rosette Okay.

Man: And you know, frankly I think that's good work.

(Mike):   Yeah, it was unforeseen circumstances. That's true.

Man: Ah.

Kristina Rosette: Well (Mike), you're going to get – you're going to be asked what those circumstances were. I'm not saying we have to put it in a report. I agreed we probably better not to but somebody at some point is going to ask so…

(Mike):   And that's fine, we'll refer back to the – we can refer back to the email I that I sent last night. That will get a response to.

               They (unintelligible). Okay. So, I think I covers up 4.4. Let's see anyone has anything else.

               All right, 4.5.

(Jothan):   So, DE actually allows registrars to – this is second paragraph. DE actually allows registrars to register and delete on a monthly basis.

(Mike):   So...

(Jothan):   It's (read) between may and delete.

(Mike):   Uh hmm. And register and delete domains on a monthly basis. Okay.

Man: And (Patrick), did you…

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Did we change anything here?

Man: We did on second paragraph and 4.5 Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Man: Between the words "may" and "delete". The words "register and"

Olof Nordling: "Register and", okay.

Man: Right.

(Mike)   Okay. It should – that would be registrars or registrants.

Alan Greenberg: May I know what's done through registrars?

Man: But domains maybe registered and deleted on a monthly basis.

Man: That's clear.

Man: That's clear enough.

Man: Yup.

(Mike):   But I think to answer the question I think it is registrar because

                   registrars may not – some may not offer that to their registrants.

Alan Greenberg: But presumably, it's not under wrong deletion.

Man: It will say but domains may be registered and deleted on a monthly

                   basis.

Olof Nordling: On a monthly basis, yeah. Yeah, I got that.

(Mike):   Yeah, great. .PL, I just kind of have to follow up for Patrick on that. I remember when they gave us the data. We were thinking we might be able to get follow up data for those reports. Was any effort made on that or not?

Man: I don't anything further from them.

(Mike):   Okay.

Olof Nordling: I remember you sent a request to them but no response, right…

(Mike):   Yeah, okay. And we just take my comment on that. All right, 4.6.

Man: So, what does the summary now say?

Kristina Rosette: I'm not – well, I'm not -- I mean we need to delete the one concern so far because all three have provided responses and have authorized those to include them.

Man: That's right. Right before we came in today.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, right. And…

Kristina Rosette: And I'm not doing the summary because A: I don't want to go there, B: I don't have time, and 3: I just don't think that you can – there's different responses. I don't think you can summarize them.

(Mike):   They all colored outside the lines. Okay, so we won't go at the summary. We'll just live it to what they are and refer to them in the annexes.

Olof Nordling: And I'd delete the – and the responses are available. I delete what's in parenthesis.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah.

(Mike):   Great. (one confirmed) so far, right.

Olof Nordling: And I need to verify those actually got policies additional ones. I saw the (unintelligible) I'm flattered by from you Kristina and we already had the…

Kristina Rosette: We got the – we got Asia first and then NAF came in I think probably last week sometime. Or at least permission to use it came in last week.

Olof Nordling: And the Asian, the Hong Kong guy, have they – I have that somewhere.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, yeah. They came in like before, you know, almost immediately after we send it to them.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, they did but they didn't agree to…

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, they did.

Olof Nordling: …have any faults.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Olof Nordling: Okay, okay, okay.

Kristina Rosette: And if you need those, just for your file, if you've got it, I'm happy to send them but I'm not going to be able to get to that for a couple of days.

Olof Nordling: No. I'm pretty confident I've got them all three. I mean I…

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Olof Nordling: …not to mention – not all of it.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Olof Nordling: What we're trying – I thought that…

(Mike): Okay, 4.7.

Man: Drum roll.

(Jothan): I had a question.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

(Jothan): I think I raised attention to this earlier, the going from question seven to question eight that a potential respondent could get confused based off the way of the structured.

And in looking at the quantitative results, it looks like 39% responded that they had an experience in increase while 13% others responded with a decrease or stayed the same.

My question was that question eight seemed targeted towards an outcome and…

Kristina Rosette: I'm sorry I couldn't hear that last that…

(Jothan): Seemed targeted towards an outcome.

Kristina Rosette: No, it's actually the opposite. Question eight was in time to determine. You know, the people is actually – is the tasting really increasing or the people just think it is because there's more out in the press about it.

(Jothan): Right. So, what happen though at least, the numbers indicate that (unintelligible) in response – excuse me, is that the right number – indicated that there was an increase. And yet 46 people responded to the next question though it's, you know…

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. I mean we had a huge problem with people thinking that the skip to a question that you basically – there was a lot of problems to tell answers were recorded.

(Jothan): Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: And in fact, there was a huge under recording of answers because people saw that the skip to the next question met that they'd answered and that's how you move on to the next question. Whereas skip to the

next question means, "I'm not going to answer this one. Don't recruit my answer. Take me to the next question."

So, if anything that -- you know, that's why you have in many cases, numbers that are just lower. But as of the day, that you raised the issue about putting seven and eight being confused, only six people have responded the RFI.

And the change that you requested and that you and I had talked about was made pretty much instantaneously.

Man: Well the – you know, I'll just – I mean I never peeked in. We've probably went through enough time previously. But it does seem like, you know, it's human nature to get confused in a survey.

(Mike): Well, yeah. Particular when the survey is done by volunteers on limited time and…

(Jothan): Yeah, certainly.

(Mike): I think – I understand (Jothan) that, you know, everyone has issues about the RFIs and they're not being perfect. I just don't feel like that (Warren's) mentioned in the report, I think it's self evident, frankly. And did you have anything specific…

(Jothan): Sure.

(Mike): …any specific comments or text that you want to add.

(Jothan): Sure, I mean the reason that I had raised such attention to it was the concern that it might be – that the facts that there were the numbers statistically that come from it might be taken out of context to use in a focused manner. And I'm…

(Mike): You know, it can happen with any piece of information in this report.

(Jothan): Indeed.

(Mike): And probably will.

(Jothan): You know, I'll let get it go.

(Mike): All right. Thank you. Any other comments on 4.7?

Kristina Rosette: And just so we're clear, the entire last paragraph of 4.7 all (unintelligible) is coming out – ah, here we go...

Man: I've got some many respondents provided detailed comments?

(Jothan): Clear through.

Kristina Rosette: No, no, no. Virtually, all respondents that should have been a separate paragraph – as least it was on the graph that I submitted, and so from (Mike) to lease them that last sentence is – I'm fine with that. And then, the last sentence "virtually, all respondents made clear".

Man: Which was also deleted…

(Jothan): Is that from the CADNA response, specifically?

Kristina Rosette: Which? The detrimental effect?

(Jothan): Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: No.

(Jothan): Okay.

Olof Nordling: Right, I mean, my (unintelligible)...

Kristina Rosette: Because as of right now, section number 7 will just end with this comment as just of one of many because it is.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: If you go back to an Annex...

(Mike): And then how about adding another clause "one of many, all which are copied in the annex and all."

Kristina Rosette: That's fine. All of these appear in annex blah, blah, blah.

Man: Put the link.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Mike): Great.

Olof Nordling: Point all of which.

Kristina Rosette: All I can tell you is that I think (people) should pay us for working out all the data problems.

Man: Yeah.

(Mike): So that one comment that you went back to them and ask – did you asked them if they would identify themselves or not?

Kristina Rosette: That one comment was provided by somebody who did in fact identified themselves but, you know, I've deleted all of the identifying information from the annexes.

(Mike): Right. Just like we have no identifying if information has any of the registrars, I don't think that that's an issue.

Man: Other quotes from the registrar section or is it just the summary?

(Mike): I thought the registrar section was just a summary.

(Jothan): There are no quotes.

Man: I think they're quote if they're - certainly if they're willing to identify themselves probably should be in there. We'd probably give them more credibility, I would assume.

(Jothan): I have one that comes to mind for the buyer's remorse situation.

(Mike): Yeah, that was on the public list, right? I saw that.

Man: Yeah, I'd ask the registrar if we could use that on the list and we
                    agreed to it so, we can have that end and he said we could use his
                    name. It's not a problem.

(Mike):   Okay. Who is that so Olof can record it?

Man: It was (Thomas Bericks) from Incirca.

(Mike)   Okay.

Olof Nordling: Okay. And what was the comment? If that's on the…

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's in (Jothan)'s email, the fifth reason -- buyer's remorse.

Olof Nordling: Yes, but the action quote?

(Jothan):   You'll have it by email.

Man: We'll send it to you, Olof.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Mike):   So I guess – and that's great I was actually talking to Kristina if we
                    could include the – if they agree and we can include their name, I think
                    that would more powerful.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. No, I mean, I'm happy to ping them.

Olof Nordling: And again, who did make that comment?

Man: Okay. But I think it doesn't have to be in there but if Kristina can get it today then we will put it in there.

(Mike):   All right. Any other comments on 4.7?

Man: So it – so that was the second…

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Now, I mean, that there was quote under five the buyer's remorse...

(Mike):   Yes.

Olof Nordling: ...that we should exemplify that as back into 4.3 soon to become 4.4 then. And that was – if I understood it right, it was an example or a quote from a registrar here.

Man: Yes. So...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...as I said (Jothan) or I will send you the exact information so you could quote it.

(Jothan):   Well, and Olof?

Olof Nordling: Yeah?

(Jothan):   I've made a couple of changes like adding the word perceived and I'll put some definition into buyer's remorse.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Jothan):   And then I will add this quote so I will give you a 4.3.

Olof Nordling: All right.

(Jothan):   Yeah.

Olof Nordling: When is that?

(Mike):   Yeah. And we…

(Jothan):   I mean a 4.4 I guess, now.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: I have just to tell guys now, the person who submitted the comment that I'm going to go back to is located in Asia so, you know, I'll get an email out right now but given the time difference. I just want to keep - have everybody keep that in mind.

(Mike):   Okay. Do you mind, I mean, I know it's a quote but for the word clients, do you mind if we put apostrophes after? I'm sorry.

Man: I don't mind.

Kristina Rosette: Where are you talking about?

(Mike): In that quote.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, yeah. That's fine. I don't care.

(Mike): Clients is mentioned three time...

(Patrick): Microsoft clearly identifies it as bad grammar.

Kristina Rosette: Wait, (Pat), I'm just glad that they actually typed something then I might get worried about the grammar.

(Patrick): No, I was actually looking at the printed copy but...

(Mike): Okay. So, (Jothan), one thing, you got to get that to Olof, you know, within an hour or two because...

(Jothan): Absolutely.

(Mike): ...he has got to take mine and Kristina's comments against what you provide.

(Jothan): I think that's reasonably accomplished.

(Mike): All right.

(Jothan): It's a matter of cut and paste and I've already started on half of these changes since it's Friday since I proposed that. I think that's completely reasonable.

Olof Nordling: Great. I trust you.

(Mike):   Okay, anything tells on 4.7?

(Jothan):   I mean, do we want to apply the word perception? The comment is just one of many perceptions.

Kristina Rosette: I just want of many submitted my respondents. I'm happy that, you know.

(Jothan):   Many of the perceptions were submitted by respondents.

Alan Greenberg: I think if you're going to put it into 4.3 it's only fairway or 4.4 we'd only put it in together and it's their perception?

Kristina Rosette: All right, or just one of many opinions.

Man: Yeah that's fun.

(Mike):   Okay. And then, we will of course, we'll link to all of them.

                  All right. Getting there. Anything else on 4.7?

                  All right. Willing to bet that Kristina that never wants to do a survey again.

Kristina Rosette: It's not a survey. And you guys are still getting pieces of advice, just haven't got around to it.

(Patrick):   All right.

(Mike):   4.8?

(Patrick):   Two things, the New Star should have a capital S and the last
                  sentence to dates.

Kristina Rosette: We need to match up to what we said before.

(Mike):   Right.

Olof Nordling: Before we leave 4.7, could I just verify that what we've got at the title
                  for 4.7, it's actually what you would like to have as a title for the annex
                  as well.

Kristina Rosette: You bet you.

Olof Nordling: Got it, okay. Thought so. Thanks

(Mike):   Great.

                  All right. And then 4.8 you've changed the New Star branding and then
                  we'll copy the sentence that we agreed to up above on Verizon.

Man: Actually, you need to change the Verizon printing as well.

(Mike):   In a couple of places, yes.

Man: Yeah.

(Mike):   I think Olof will make the global change on that.

Olof Nordling: If I actually did the global change because I realized it's an early version that has a smaller (unintelligible) the caps left. So, I'm used to it, yes.

(Mike):   My bad I've continued to forget that. It will never happen again. All right.

Olof Nordling: Actually, (he left his ride in the heading there).

(Mike):   Yup. Then, 4.9?

(Patrick):   Yeah. Can we use another word other than verdicts? It says these are included in the archive and the verdicts on them makes us sound like we made a judgment.

Olof Nordling: That's the opinion.

Man: Silly.

(Mike):   That's his report. (Unintelligible) in the – okay, here. I'll make a note opinion from him from the RFI.

Danny Younger: (Mike), it's Danny. Let me just jump in with the question. I recall that back in Marrakesh off to (unintelligible) foot forward what he called the long tail proposal. And If I remember right, that proposal also hinted at a way to reduce domain tasting. It may hit particular take on there was extend the AGP, that's 365 days, but even so it still is one of the proposals that's out there in the realm, I'm just wondering if it should at least be referenced?

(Jothan):   It seems like it would make sense.

(Mike):   Frankly, it's a little bit late now.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, I'm not out to say I don't support it but I think in terms of fairness, the goal here is to bring out all possible proposal.

(Mike):   Okay. I understand what you're saying. I actually agree with the concept. There's plenty of other potential measures as well that we have not addressed. For example, enforce better enforcement of existing RAA provisions on this point.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

(Mike):   So, I think that what we – what I would suggest we do is we add a sentence here that says something along the lines of "there have been identified number of other potential measures that could – that were proposed to reduce domain tasting that have not yet been considered by the group because there was not factual information that we saw could easily be obtained in relation to that.

(Patrick):   Yeah, I mean, I agree with that. There were some proposals that says "as you require waiting period before activation".

(Mike):   Great.

(Patrick):   There's a bunch of proposals that were mentioned but we didn't have time to really look at them.

(Mike): Great. And also, it didn't seem like anything that we could do to get factual information on those things that would be useful.

(Jothan): You know, maybe just to mention that they exist.

(Mike): Well, and we did that at least with the activation situation, we do that in the ccTLDs section.

And the only problem there (Jothan) is honestly, is that...

(Jothan): Timing is.

(Mike): ...timing.

(Jothan): Yeah.

(Mike): And the fact that if we include two or three examples that we've just identified called RAA and Activation in bulk payment.

(Jothan): CADNA, CADNA suggest that a couple I think…

(Mike): There's a bunch of others. So, I'd like say that there are likely a number of other measures that have been proposed or could be proposed which this group did not feel the factual…

(Jothan): It's not in our remit.

(Mike): I'm sorry.

(Jothan): It's not in our remit, I mean we're here…

(Mike): Yeah, that's what I mean exactly. We didn't feel like it was within the scope of our work.

(Jothan): Perfect.

(Mike): Okay. Olof did you capture the adjust to that?

Olof Nordling: Yes, something of this sort.

(Mike): Okay, I'm sure you will make it every eloquent.

Alright, any other comments on 4.9?

(Jothan): That was a good point there Danny.

(Mike): Section 5 then, next steps.

5.1.

5.2

All right, then the annex is...

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

(Mike): Yeah exactly, I mean, unless anybody has any comments on that I'd…

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. 5.2, when you're talking about further research, is that what you're talking about following up with the – does they own file research re-edit the file earlier or is that – or did I miss them at somewhere else?

(Mike): Actually this is more of general I think to include all of the different measures.

Kristina Rosette: Right. I guess my question is do we identify some more or should we identify somewhere in the report that we still think it's – would be useful research to follow up on that zone file research that…

Olof Nordling: We do that. Actually this was the last line and Dan has suggested that …

Kristina Rosette: Ah okay. Okay, I wasn't looking at Danny's. If it's in there, then I'm fine.

Olof Nordling: It is.

Woman: Can I make a suggestion though? Does it – in the interest at having kind of one spot where the council can just look at and say, "Okay, this is what the ad hoc group recommended or this is what came out of it." And to the extent that they thought further action might be helpful or not, whatever, that they have identified the specific things.

I mean – not to mean that it's not a good idea to include at where we've got it before. But I think, you know, personally, I think it would be helpful to the councilors to have just kind of one section that (unintelligible) could stand on its own in terms of like a to-do-list.

Olof Nordling   So, are you suggesting that we had in 5.2 a reference back to the zone file study suggestion?

Kristina Rosette: Yeah I mean, I think so.

(Mike):   Yeah, and how about for example the zone file – and that's a good idea. For example, the zone file study at section blank and put a link back to it, will there anything else?

(Jothan):   Will there be the further scrutiny of the PIR success, or further review?

(Mike):   That's to further review of the...

(Jothan):   Of the empirical experience of PIR.

Olof Nordling: And then the reference back to that as well.

(Jothan):   Yes.

Olof Nordling: Section, okay.

    Okay.

(Jothan):   Okay. I don't know if we want to suggest that councilors look at the mailing list if they've got questions about how some of this was arrived at.

(Mike):   Well they identify that at the back round section wherever is it, there was an open mailing list and there's a link to it.

Man: Is there a presentation at LAM method?

(Mike):   I don't know, that's we're going to decide next step as a council next week in our meeting.

Man: At this point I believe there's nothing on that have some email with every hour over a few days ago.

Kristina Rosette: I think there is like something vaguely for Saturday. At least I thought I saw something that went for.

(Mike):   Yeah, and, you know, and it's quite likely to be the agenda again. I well - It really depends on what happens.

Man: Yeah at this point there is nothing on the agenda.

(Mike):   Okay.

Man: But there maybe because of the (unintelligible) of next week's meeting.

(Mike):   All right because we would make ourselves – some of us we can make ourselves available if they had questions.

(Jothan):   I certainly offer myself for that process.

(Mike)   Yup.

(Jothan):   Should it happen.

ICANN
Moderator: Glen de Saint Gery
10-03-07/10:00 am CT
Confirmation #5358502
Page 71

Glen de Saint Gery: Could you just send me a note and then I'll put you on the mailing list with the numbers for the call?

(Patrick): Now, it does make sense to me to have some sort of forum on the domain tasting again since I think we've done it with the last three or four meetings.

(Mike): But now that we have a report, we can at least – yeah, discuss it.

(Patrick): Exactly and the next step so the council which, you know, of the many likely going to be a PDP has been initiated, sort of a kick off.

(Jothan): I think we'd have to formally propose a session to ICANN .

(Mike): Maybe we're a little bit too late for that.

(Jothan): And the timing on it. Yeah.

(Mike): Isn't there a policy like – is there agenda set for the Saturday and Sunday?

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: It seems very loosy.

(Mike): Yeah, and there's a lot of loose schedules as usual. About two weeks left to go. So I think what I'll do is – Alan, I'd like to know – if you wouldn't mind, just loop in me into discussion with Avri. I'd like to follow up on that a little bit.

Alan Greenberg: I was just asking her if there wasn't in schedule because I have potential conflicts with daylight meeting. And she said as of this point, there is nothing scheduled for L.A. but it is on the conference call next week.

(Mike): Right. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: That's all I know.

(Mike): Am I hearing note from everyone on the call that they would be supportive of having some sort of a public forum to present our report?

Kristina Rosette: I would on the condition that it's not on a Monday only because there is a six hour council session on Monday anyway.

(Mike): Oh, I mean, you know, join the schedule and in between all these council, like 25 hours of council meetings a week so...

(Patrick): Kind of constituency meetings, I think are...

(Mike): Right, it's going to be a challenge. I'm just – again, I'm just trying to take the temperature of this group if we can make it happen and sounds like we've -- we'd like to make it happen and we have participants to do it.

(Patrick): Given that there were significant interest and we have something to say if we can fit it in schedule, we should be there.

Danny Younger: And (Mike), it's Danny, I'm putting in (unintelligible) tutorial on the RAA Wednesday morning at 9:00 so that's my particular conflict.

(Mike):   Okay, I think we're going to have conflicts and Glen will probably have to propose one or two potential time -- hour slots. Probably on Wednesday is a day for a lot of folks so that might…

Kristina Rosette: Well, but aren't we having our council meeting on Wednesday morning? Don't we want to have the forum -- if we are going to have a forum, does it make sense to have one before the council vote?

(Mike):   Well, the council would kind of vote this week Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, it is?

(Mike):   Well, I'm assuming it is.

Man: It's what's supposed to happen.

Kristina Rosette Okay. Excuse me.

(Mike):   Frankly.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry. Can I just butt in there? On the council meeting – in the council meeting in Los Angeles, there is the domain tasting to one of the four proposed...

(Mike):   It is on the (unintelligible)?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes it.

Man: But when?

Glen de Saint Gery: And it is on – we're having the council meeting and the (TNS) have forum in a different way this time. And that it's topic by topic. And then there is input from the community. There is council discussion. And then if there will be a vote on that will be on the council meeting but it will all take place at the same time.

(Patrick): You're talking about the Wednesday meeting though.

Glen de Saint Gery: I'm talking about the Wednesday meeting, yes, which would start at 8:30 and go on to 12:30 in one session.

(Mike): That's four hours and one fourth of it are they generate now as domain tasting.

Glen de Saint Gery: That's what it looks like. That's what...

(Mike): So, perhaps Avri just forgotten that when she was talking with Alan and (unintelligible)

(Patrick): I was asking specifically about Saturday and Sunday so that maybe the reason.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh, okay.

(Mike): Well, okay. Sounds like we're covered then.

Kristina Rosette: Can I -- I'm sorry to ask an (untopic) question. I'm getting ready to send the e-mail to the person who sent this comment. If I say, you know, I need to hear back from you in 24 hours, is that fast enough or do I

need it faster? Kind of keeping in mind if there's any other (unintelligible).

(Mike):   Immediately tell them that the report is going to be submitted to council tomorrow evening.

(Jothan):   So that's over 24 hours from now.

(Mike):   You know, adding his or her name in there is going to take five seconds so...

Kristina Rosette: Right. No, I know.

(Mike)   Okay.

(Jothan):   Communicating and facilitating that, I mean you may want to build a little management reserve in these process but 24 hours should do it.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Let me just see what time it is where they are. All right I'll take care of it.

(Mike):   Thanks, Kristina. Alright. Anybody else, any comments issues, questions? All right. Well, I just personally will thank everybody for a lot of effort for the last several months. I think we've done some good news for work.

Olof Nordling: Is this our final comment?

(Mike):   It is.

Olof Nordling: Excellent. I'm not saying it'll be fun.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, come on. You guys are going to miss talking to me. I know you are.

Man: Kristina, I hope call me afterwards. I hope you'll call me afterwards.

Man: (Mike), if there's a PDP well, there would be many of the same people, I'm sure.

Man: (Mike), you did say will one have more pick-up-at-can. Does that implies an email pick-up-the-can?

(Mike):   Yes.

Man: There's just no more meetings? Okay.

(Mike):   I said in my email that Olof and I will endeavor honestly and Olof, honestly, endeavor to get this next draft out as soon he can after this call. I don't know if he wants to give any more specific estimates than that. And I've asked for all comments but tomorrow (since with) 24 hours for people to send the comments.

Kristina Rosette: Can I ask a favor? If there is a specific time cut-off for comment, can you make sure that sending email so that I something to kind of plan against?

(Mike):   I did say it last night...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: ...it's 2:00 pm pacific.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, right. I mean my next step, what I will have to do again, since I've sent it to the list, I'd have to chop it in two pieces. I've tried to get read within an hour and a half because I really need to get going by then.

                        And then I'll send the full document that's possible to do. To (Mike) -- you (Mike)…

(Mike):   Uh hmm.

Olof Nordling: …a single sending work and you take it from there and make the final edits on it.

(Mike):   Yeah, I think Olof, don't send it to me. I don't want to bother like I'm in the conference today. So please send it to entire list.

Olof Nordling: No. I exactly I'll send the documents and chopped up into pieces into the full list clearly so, but if you're going to work on it, you're going to need the full document, otherwise...

(Mike):   Correct.

Olof Nordling: ...its -- you can't glue it together.

(Mike): No. I understand. I understand what are you're saying. I'll just submit two parts for the council. I mean frankly, the second part shouldn't change (all) annexes. So, I really – it's really just this first that I'm worried about and hopefully, there won't be too many suggested edits or any we think controversial edits that we have to back and forth on.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: To sim – sorry. To simplify it, if you can say need the whole document that should be posted, I can get the posted in one piece.

Man: Yes.

(Mike): Yes.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) then I mean if I send it now...

Glen de Saint Gery: Uh hmm.

Olof Nordling: ...for posting then there will be a final, final, final thing that (Mike) has edited.

(Mike) Right.

Olof Nordling: …than to – and that's the one that should be posted to actually…

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay. And when can you do that (Mike) so that I can edit.

(Mike): That will be tomorrow sometime after 2:00 pm pacific time.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay.

(Mike):   Then I will send it to the Council list so you'll get it that way.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yeah, but you won't be able to send that big thing so, end it to me and I can get it posted immediately.

(Mike):   Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: I can get it posted to on the website.

Man: Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes.

Man: I thought you were offering to post Olof's hour and half from now version.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh if that was going to help anybody.

Olof Nordling: But I mean that's what…

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Gery That it's still must be

(Mike):   I don't just think – I don't it helps because they still going to have to edit the first of it anyway a little bit. So – all right.

Olof Nordling: …and what we're doing back. That does not help or is that confusing?

(Mike):   No. I don't think that helps.

Glen de Saint Gery Okay.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: So, as soon as you get me over marked, I can get it posted up on the website and then that takes away these huge ball keepers that might not come through the email service.

(Mike):   Great. Okay. Well, thank you Glen and thank you (Patrick).

Glen de Saint Gery: And you said 2:00 pm your time – 2:00 pm pacific time. Okay.

(Mike):   Tomorrow, yeah. You know, it's probably going to be two or three hours after that and you'll be sleeping or not wanting to do it but you'll just deal with it your next morning.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yeah.

(Mike):   That will be fine.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay.

(Mike):   Alright. Well, thanks Glen, and (Patrick) and specially Olof for killing an effort on several months.

Glen de Saint Gery: Well, what actually what, that (Patrick) can do the posting for you because he can put it up. He's there in your time concern.

(Mike):   Then I'll make sure I…

Glen de Saint Gery Okay, I'll get to the with our (unintelligible) (Patrick).

(Mike)   I'll make sure I copy when I send this council list then.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay.

(Mike)   All righty. Thanks everybody.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks.

Man: Okay, bye.

Man: Bye-bye

Glen de Saint Gery: Bye.

END