

**GNSO  
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference  
September 12, 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 12 September 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/gns0/dnt-20070912.mp3>

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Attendees:

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-coordinator CBUC (Council)

Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency

Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency

Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registry constituency

Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)

Danny Younger - NCUC

Greg Ruth - ISPCP (Council)

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Nick Ashton-Hart - Director for At-Large

Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, thanks. So taking role this morning, it's myself, Mike Rodenbaugh from the business constituency, Jeff Eckhaus from registrars, Jothan Frakes from registrars, Jeff Neuman from registries, Kristina Rosette from IPC, Danny Younger from NCUC, Olof Nordling from staff, Patrick Jones from staff and Glen de Saint Gery from staff, have I missed anybody?

Greg Ruth: Yeah, me, Greg Ruth.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Greg Ruth from ISP is good, hey Greg.

Nick Ashton Hart: And Nick Ashton Hart.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And Nick from staff. All right. Sorry didn't really get an agenda out before this meeting, the fact is I don't believe the agenda's really changed much since the last meeting.

I'm not sure we have a whole lot to talk about. We did just start talking through the issue we're having with VeriSign and with (Paul Stahera) trying to get further information from his zone files.

(Paul) had promised his own copy to Danny Younger at least a month ago now so Danny could do some analysis and has not come through with that state, so nothing has been done.

And VeriSign has essentially refused to provide any information in response to a request from myself and Jeff Neuman.

So we're talking about what we can do about that essentially which is, it seems at this point given the timeline that we're under with counsel, we're not going to have much choice but to document what we've tried to do in our report and leave it at that.

Unless anybody has any other suggestions for how we might, yeah, go ahead Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Mike, I was just hoping that you could clarify for those of us who haven't been involved and so we've got a record of it, what the obstacle is or what the issue is not only with regard to (Paul) providing Danny with his own file, you know without getting into kind of verbatim responses, what the objection has been from VeriSign.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yep. Well (Paul) we just don't know, he's pretty much dropped off the face of the earth, is not responding to requests from staff or from myself or from Danny as for status.

So that's the situation there, with VeriSign we, the list essentially agreed on a set of questions, or set of statistics that we would like from VeriSign and they've essentially responded saying that we don't need the evidence, we haven't shown any good reason for it.

And therefore they're not going to provide anything further.

Man: Yeah, there's a little bit more, is the first day question the definition of the terms that we were using, and so I clarified that with you know that data that dot.bus and dot.org provided.

Then they said that they didn't see the reason, we have to show good cause as to why we wanted that specific information and then when I explained that and in the return email then he came back and said well we think that data is sensitive, registry sensitive information.

And that registrars wouldn't want us to disclose it, and when I responded back and said well can you at least give us the data in the aggregate, maybe not by registrar, the response was well it's still registry sensitive information and you should have all the data you

need by looking at the monthly reports that they started giving us back in Q1 of this year.

And so it's kind of been going around and around in a circle, and we haven't gotten a response since.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Basically what they're saying, (Chuck Gomes) is the one that's been responding saying essentially we don't need anything, any other information and we haven't shown sufficient reason for additional information and he's escalated it to his legal team for some sort of further response to us.

Kristina Rosette: Well, I mean I agree with what you were all saying earlier, I think at this point the only thing we can do is to clearly document what we requested and why we requested it and what the source of the objection was.

And I think in some scenarios, the refusal on the basis for it or at least the articulated basis for it, would frankly be more helpful to us in the long run.

And with regard to the data from (Paul), I do know that there are certain IP owners, I'm sure this doesn't come as a surprise to anyone who do analyze that zone file.

Is there a reason that I mean do we need to get it from a registrar, does it need to be paid for, I mean is there a particular reason that we would need to get it through (Paul), or is just, okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No. There's no particular reason other than he promised it a while ago so we assumed it was coming, and obviously didn't make any alternative effort to get the information.

But yeah, a lot of people have his own file information, Danny Younger and I discussed this a few days ago, you know essentially what he's been looking for is a sample of a randomly selected sample of zone records from any you know recent one week period.

Put 2000 on (unintelligible) records. But at this point again, just given the timing, even if Danny were to get that information today, you know what he could do with it is pretty limited.

Man: So we just push it forward into the PDP cycle, that's all.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yep. I think Danny it would be helpful if you could circulate just a couple sentences or paragraph about what you were planning to do with the data.

Danny Younger: Sure, be happy to.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, any other questions on either of those two issues, or points of discussion on those?

Patrick Jones: Mike, can I just clarify that when I wrote to you -- this is Patrick, when I sent my email to you it was that staff does not have sufficient resources at the time to pull the you know the zone file information and that hadn't changed from about a month ago when I made that same comment.

So that's when (Paul) stepped up and offered to make the copy and send it to Danny and take it from there, and you know as Kristina mentioned there are others that pull the zone file on a regular basis and you might want to see if there's another group out there that could do the same, you know pull information on a faster basis.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think everyone understands, there's no question we can get the information, unfortunately the timing right now is just that even if we got it I don't know that we could do much with it that would matter for these next steps.

So bottom line I just think we kind of ran out of time on that project for now.

Okay, the only other issue that I had to discuss was one of timing, actually there's one other, Olof if you wouldn't mind giving sort of a brief recap of where we're at with the RFI responses which you're going to close on Saturday.

Olof Nordling: With pleasure. As (Paul) writes today, we've got 40 responses by email to the RFI. And quite a big increase recently on the BigPulse survey, I think it's 151 total respondents, not all of which have responded to all the questions, but that's the total.

So that's increased considerably since last time.

Man: Probably a record for response to any consultation I would imagine.

Kristina Rosette: Well and I know the reason for that. This is Kristina, I didn't want to go ahead and let everybody know and I'll post something formally to the

list for those that are on the list but aren't able to participate in the calls.

The IPC has extended its polling deadline till the 20th in part to take into account the religious holidays this week, but in greater part because we realized, I realized over the weekend that we had not, frankly we didn't have a whole lot of respondents for the IPC RFI which didn't make any sense to me given that the International Trademark Association did in fact send out an email message to about 3000 members asking them and encouraging them to participate.

And when I looked at where people were taken by clicking on that link I realized that the format of our introduction could easily result in people clicking on the link to the general RFI and completing that without realizing that that's what they were in fact completing.

So we've tinkered with the introduction to basically make it clear that you know you need to select proceed below to continue.

And because of that we've also extended the time and talking actually with a number of colleagues for example on my INTA internet sub-committee, it basically, it's unanimous that they all completed the general RFI thinking it was the IPC one.

So I would expect frankly that you will continue to see a surge in those general numbers and hopefully in the next few days a surge in the specific ones, in the IPC one as well.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, I think we have perhaps another reason was that Glen, following last week's call, sent out reminders.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, right right right.

Olof Nordling: But I think, well all contributed to it. But I do see a lot of respondents with intellectual property address, that's correct.

Danny Younger: Olof, it's Danny. Out of the 151 that I'm seeing so far in the poll results, I'm still not seeing any hand written comments so to speak, have any come through?

Olof Nordling: Oh, no text comments or anything of the sort.

Nick Ashton Hart: Shall I address this? The reason that you don't see any narrative results is because if you think about this, every single count is unique, but what is being presented on that page is all the yes's combined, all the no's combined.

So every response that is received in narrative form were to be sent along side the results wouldn't be individual, you would see a very long page with the results and the questions for each individual.

It's actually possible, easy, to download the entire result set so that you can see the answers and the comments that were left along side those answers.

Danny Younger: Still, shouldn't we be able to see 14, 15 and 16?

Nick Ashton Hart: And it's the same sort of question. I can put up a save results page that shows all of the responses just as long as everyone's aware of it



won't really be calculating the yes's and the no's and how many yes's and no's there are and that sort of thing.

You'll see, you know a yes, and the responses to all the questions, and then next person and then all of their responses if you see what I mean.

Danny Younger: Nick I understand, it's just when I'm looking at 16 you know please provide any other comments, and I'm getting no results of being what's shown on the screen, it makes it hard to understand whether we've actually gotten any comments.

Nick Ashton Hart: I will speak -- this is obviously a good point, I will speak to the BigPulse people and suggest that they need to put up a different message than that, because it would lead you to believe there are no comments when in fact there are comments, just not easy to display them.

Olof Nordling: Nick, that's very useful information to me because I tend to put in BigPulse things and I interrupted this laterally, so would it be possible for them to, instead of making well all of the individual responses with their individual comments, rather to have them collate the comments, the written comments, as well as who made the comment.

Nick Ashton Hart: I have actually looked at just that, and I will show you how to see that Olof by the way. Yes, but in many cases people's comments are directly related to the answers that they made in the boxes that they ticked.

And so you lose context if you look at the -- both parts of the answer to each question if you see what I mean

Olof Nordling: Well yeah, well when it comes to 14 to 16, they would really, an array of responses would.

Nick Ashton Hart: Those would stand on their own of course.

Olof Nordling: But it's interesting to know that there are -- there is data in free form somewhere.

Man: So Nick, I guess the question I have for you is how quickly, I'm assuming we're going to go ahead and close as planned on Saturday, you know at the end of Saturday.

Next week can you circulate to the list a summary document of the responses?

Nick Ashton Hart: Yeah, I can pull the raw data down at any time actually, I'll show Olof how to do that. So I can send along the actual raw information and responses, and then obviously the questions which are simply a narrative responses invited.

There is no box ticking and then a narrative. Those are very easy to simply state, okay there were 412 comments on those questions and here are the results.

The others are somewhat more difficult to prevent them. So we'll just have to look, I think Olof and Glen and I, we'll send out the raw

information but then we'll have to look at how do we present this in a way that's (unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, how are we going to summarize it for the report to counsel, the next step, I think we've agreed -- and Olof, you mentioned earlier that all these responses are in the public domain as of now?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes. All the responses, I wasn't aware of the BigPulse text responses, but all of the responses on the ICANN website, well or rather by email, ICANN are in the public domain obviously.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, because those are on a public list. But then the BigPulse responses are not necessarily, is that correct?

Olof Nordling: Well the BigPulse response, I mean this overview that says, I guess I don't know how to get anything else but that one for the time being, but that is the poll results, well they're accessible for anybody.

Mike Rodenbaugh: They are.

Nick Ashton Hart: Yeah, there's a link on the page showing, you know live, you can look at the live results here. For the aggregated results.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. So the issue then is just basically going to be to pull this down when it's over, then send it around to the list and figure out a way to also aggregate the write in responses.

Olof Nordling: Indeed, but I think that's well, it's comforting to know that they are written responses there as well. I think that's -- and I'm sure we will find a convenient way of presenting that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. And Kristina you mentioned that you, that IPC was hoping to keep the IPC specific RFI open until the 20th only? Okay, I thought it was going to be longer than that.

Kristina Rosette: Yeah. Well I don't want to extend it out very long, I'm trying to get the shortest time possible in large part because if there is -- if it does turn out that a significant number of the responses require validation I want to have sufficient time to do that.

So I guess it's theoretically possible we would want to extend it again, but I don't anticipate that at this point.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. So then the same drill, the week after next, you and Nick and Olof will work to circulate a summary of those responses?

Kristina Rosette: Sure, absolutely, and in fact it would be particularly helpful to the extent that the general group has decided if there's any particular format in which they should be reported so that I can have that ahead of time and just follow that model.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I guess we'll see what Nick and Olof come back to us with early next week, and hopefully that's in the ideal format and model for you.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Danny Younger: Mike, I need to leave the call at this time.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay Danny, thank you. Okay, so that's the data. I did want to talk generally about next steps. Olof and Patrick and I have reviewed a sort of straw outline of what our report may look like to the counsel, and we will circulate that to the group after the call and ask for any comments.

But the idea is to basically start plugging in pieces into that outline. The goal of having the report done and final and out to the counsel as requested by October 4th, that only leaves us three more calls after this one.

I guess we just leave it at that since nobody's seen the straw report yet, there's not really much we can do to discuss it without the data.

So the only other question I had I think was on the (VDRP) provider responses Kristina, maybe a quick update on if you've gotten anything further back from those guys?

Kristina Rosette: I haven't gotten anything further and I am still waiting to hear back from (Christopher Poe) I believe his name is as to whether we can make the Hong Kong one public.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. With the other guys, the big guys at (YFO) and (NAF), do we also have to check arbitration provider by the way?

Kristina Rosette: Well would there not.

Olof Nordling: They're not accredited yet.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh well they are for EU, not (GTLBs). Okay, but anyway for (YFO) and (NAF), is there any follow up that ought to be done, would it help or if I or if staff sent a note as well?

Kristina Rosette: I was going to send a reminder email tomorrow. I did get an email from (YFO) indicating that they turned it over to their legal advisor which you know I can say this because I'm a lawyer, generally is not a promising response.

So you know again I'll follow up and you know maybe it makes sense for us to have a you know to talk off line to see whether, I don't want to put (Tim Cole) out of -- I don't want to impose on anyone within ICANN staff but you know it may be that we get to a point where we need to talk about whether it's appropriate to have somebody with perhaps more influence reach out to them.

Nick Ashton Hart: Do you, does anybody know (Edward Quaqua), the legal counsel for (YFO)?

Kristina Rosette: I don't.

Nick Ashton Hart: I do, that's why I'm asking that question. If there ever is the need to you know ask the question I am actually about 10 minutes away from him in that building.

Kristina Rosette: Fabulous.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Good to know, thanks Nick. Okay, I don't have anything else but I was planning to discuss today, I think we just need to have some list discussion about the reports, start getting that shaped up.

But you know obviously we're waiting for the statistics now too so that should spur some discussion next week once we get the RFI information.

Anybody else have any other topics or concerns they want to discuss today?

Kristina Rosette: I just have a question, a clarification question?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Before you ask, who else had something to say?

Nick Ashton Hart: Just me, Nick.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, go ahead Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I just wanted to, I wasn't -- I honestly don't remember whether or not we had talked about whether we expect that our report to counsel will provide basically draft terms of reference for PDP or not.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, that's a -- definitely a point of discussion we need to have as well. It seems to me my personal view is that you know absolutely we need to do that. Especially the sort of problems we're having just getting data, seems to me that we're going to have to initiate a PDP if we're going to have any hopes of getting some of that information.

And you know I've always been pretty open about my intention to request counsel to do a PDP on this issue because I think it's important for new (TLB) operators coming on line in the future as well that we have some policy on this.

We do have representatives from all the other constituencies on the call today so I'd love to hear what people are thinking on that question.

Man: What's the question again?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sorry, whether this group should move forward to draft terms of reference for the counsel and include them in our report for PDP on the (main testee).

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. I'm personally in favor of that, I think we should, if we're going to make a recommendation to counsel that a PDP should happen I think we should since we've been looking at this issue we should be the ones to provide the initial text.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It is specifically within the charter of this group to do so.

Olof Nordling: If I may, this is Olof, in the straw man full report there is also a straw very much straw of terms of reference for well at least to have a starting point somewhere for your consideration once we get that out.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So is anybody feeling that a PDP, or their constituency might be opposition to a motion to launch with PDP on these issues?

Jothan Frakes: This is Jothan Frakes, I suspect that there will be registrars who are opposed.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman I'm confident that there might be one registry that might oppose a PDP. Not us, but there will be one.



Mike Rodenbaugh: Understood. Okay, so that said you know we probably will aim to draft up something, some proposed terms of reference and those can be you know in the alternative form if people don't like the draft that we're -- you know it's not really a working group, it's really an effort to provide facts and information to the counsel.

So what I'm thinking is that the registrars for example, if they're in a different place than the rest of us as I think they are, then they might want to consider drafting their own terms of reference, or some sort of a statement saying that they don't think the PDP is warranted for various reason, to include the report.

Jothan, Jeff, do you have any comments or thoughts about that?

Man: Just my thoughts are is that I know you're saying it's in the charter for us to do, but are we -- you know I'm kind of saying that the mission of this group was a fact finding mission not to launch the terms of references, to write the terms of reference.

I'm not -- just I'm unsure about how this is within scope or is this what we want to do when there hasn't even been a decision to launch a PDP yet.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct, there has not, but it was put in the charter that this group would draft proposed terms of reference for consideration by the counsel based on the fact finding that we're doing.

Man: Right, but is that under the assumption, is that a post-decision on a PDP or just before that decision is made, I just want some clarification on that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh it's definitely pre -- prior to that decision being made. In other words, this group would ideally come to consensus on a draft terms of reference that the counsel would then consider and vote on and decide whether to launch a PDP.

And of course counsel could modify it at that time as well.

Man: All right, it's something we need I guess we go back to our constituencies because for us, I mean as Jothan said, I believe you know what he stated that we'd be against launching the PDP and as Jeff said there might be some you know division within his constituency about launching or not launching a PDP.

So I don't think maybe to go ahead with a decision now about writing the terms of reference, I think maybe to keep that on an email on our list to make that decision

Let us go back to our constituencies first.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I mean again, we're not intending to have any sort of debate or make decisions about what should be in there, and that's why I said that we can frame alternatives, paths for the counsel.

But I do think it's within the charter and I think that most of the constituencies are interested in taking a stab at drafting up terms of reference to recommend to the counsel.

And of course as you know Jeff it doesn't even require a majority of the constituencies in order to launch the PDP.

Jeff Neuman: Oh I understand.

Kristina Rosette: Well and we don't even actually have to come up with draft terms of reference, it could even be something more along the lines of, you know based on the fact finding mission this is what we know, this is what we don't know, and here are a list of things that if you are going to proceed with a PDP you may want to consider including.

You know almost like a kind of like a tiny, like column A and column B.

Man: Yeah, I'm much more comfortable with a statement like that.

Kristina Rosette: So, there's a lot of different ways we can go about it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I can see that because I agree Jeff, I don't think that this group was constituted to you know debate policy directions and make policy recommendations.

Jeff Neuman: No, of course not. I think the trick is that we shouldn't operate under a foregone conclusion that it will go to PDP and intend, you know sort of prejudice that outcome.

But what we ought to do is focus on you know the fact finding that we were chartered to do.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think honestly we ought to start looking at next steps, that's all.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, exactly. And what I can see is an alternative or complementary route would be to go deeper into well hiring consultancy that would get

deeper into the substance matter and make, well and that could either be in parallel to a PDP or precede a PDP.

And rather than making some kind of straight forward recommendation that rather indicate that there are alternative routes to proceed.

Jothan Frakes: Yeah. Well and I think there's a little more comfort with the way Kristina worded it, I thought that that seemed a little more reasonable, that there would be sort of an A or B.

Mike Rodenbaugh: In fact that's how I started it off as well Jeff, again in the alternative.

Jothan Frakes: This is Jothan, I probably misunderstood you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: But I think at this point we do want to go back and check with our constituencies and acknowledge that we're coming to the point where this group is going to need to create a report for counsel.

And part of our charter was to suggest possible terms of reference for a potential PDP and get your constituency's views on what those should look like.

Man: I'm completely in agreement and I agree we should move forward and next steps and I'm just going to echo what Jothan said and that I just when writing the terms of reference might be prejudicing the decision and I actually as I said I like Kristina's idea of saying this is what we found, here are some of the issues, these are what we should look at and the whole column A, column B maybe even column C kind of approach to it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. I'm with you on that as well. Any other comments on that approach? Then Kristina, I suppose you and I should maybe talk off line to see what you're thinking or your draft would look like so we're not duplicating any efforts.

Kristina Rosette: Sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And leave it at that for now. I'm intending to have a first draft of the report done the week after we get those RFI responses for the IPC, hold on, let me pull out my calendar right now, get some dates here.

Kristina Rosette: I would suggest that you just leave a slot for them. You know and when I expect I'll provide is basically a report ready summary that you can just slot in.

Man: Will there be any access to the raw information Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: At this point, I don't anticipate only because people have been required to provide their names and organizational affiliation.

Man: Let's say that item was scrubbed so there wasn't any personally identifiable information. Would you be providing that information detail?

Kristina Rosette: To be perfectly candid with you I haven't even thought about it. I'll have to (unintelligible).

Man: I think it would go a long way to support the legitimacy of the findings.

Kristina Rosette: I'll take that back to the IPC. I mean I -- don't get me the wrong way, I'm not foreclosing it I just honestly haven't even considered it.

Man: Okay, okay. And then you know for the benefit of the call I appreciate we were able to get somewhere with the modifications or tweaks to the survey. I apologize if we bumped heads there a little bit.

Kristina Rosette: It's alright.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. I'm going to actually shoot for, we're going to send around the straw man report today, Olof I'll ask you to send that out to the group if you haven't already, and I'm going to shoot for a draft report by Monday the 24th.

That's only going to give us 11 days from that point to finalize it.

Jothan Frakes: So we're working with a document that Kristina's going to draft, and then who's going to be able to provide input or feedback on it, are you going get it to the list, how does that look?

Kristina Rosette: Whoa whoa whoa whoa wait a second. Hold the phone, what is this I'm involved in?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm not sure what you're talking about, that's Jothan right? Are you talking about the draft report or the IPC summary?

Jothan Frakes: The draft report.

Kristina Rosette: I'm not drafting the report. Just so we're clear.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Kristina's certainly not drafting it.

Jothan Frakes: Well no, I think I'm talking about the A, B thing where we're talking about the terms.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. So that we're going to try to have a first draft of that in the draft report circulated Monday the 24th.

Jothan Frakes: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes Olof.

Olof Nordling: Before we close the call I just recall one outstanding little issue, and that's a question to Jothan, if you have got more responses from the registrars on alternative uses of the AGP.

Jothan Frakes: I have, and there's one more, I'm a little bit underwhelmed. What I've been talking with the constituency, different people in the constituency and basically what they said is they'd like to submit their comments to that as part of responding to the RFI.

So we'll see those between now and Saturday.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Jothan Frakes: That summed it up best.

Olof Nordling: Okay. And the straw man report you will find one of the headlines being something like you -- that particular piece but mind you this is straw man report that we can model and replace.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yep, I think at minimum Jothan we're shooting for a list of bullet points of you know quote legitimate uses of the AGP. Is that what you're shooting for?

Jothan Frakes: Basically yes, and you know the presumption would be you know if AGP changed or went away, these could be potentially the undesired or unexpected consequences of that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. But I also understand you're not really anticipating having any sort of statistical information about how often in fact the AGP is used for any of those reasons.

Jothan Frakes: You know I'm not really -- that might be something that you know the registrars themselves could post or we could theoretically get from VeriSign.

But you know my thought is I think what we could reasonably accomplish is just a list of here are some uses for AGP that you know don't necessarily focus on domain tasting that would be affected if AGP was closed, if it was eliminated.

I guess what could be best accomplished as part of the process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that sounds about right for now based on what you've said on past calls, and I guess the logical next step would be you know if a PDP was launched then that group could go back to the registrars and ask for more specific information I think.

Jothan Frakes: Okay.



Kristina Rosette: This is Kristina I have a point of clarification that I just want to ask. With regard to the data from the general RFI, how do we anticipate that that is going to be presented?

Will it be presented in basically kind of the aggregate form that you can see it in now with the addition of the kind of per question comments?

Olof Nordling: At least that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: My understanding is that we would get essentially aggregate report showing the final numbers, how many people you know, check which boxes, and then a summary from staff of the text responses.

Kristina Rosette: Right. But to the person who asked whether the IPC, and I don't remember who that was, I apologize, to the person who asked if the IPC was planning to release its data, if that's what is going to happen for the general RFI, am I correct in assuming that that would be acceptable to you as well with regard to the IPC data?

Jothan Frakes: If it were the case that would be great. The one, I mean you know I keep going over that question 8 thing and I think it's good to let it go, but you know the net product is looking at the survey results from the current BigPulse survey.

It doesn't -- it just shows you in the summary like this, it just shows you the question and what the most common responses were.

But the overall concern is that that particular item might get focus in on and paint an incorrect picture to somebody who might just pluck that and focus on it and take it out of context from what it really is.

So if there's an opportunity to see the survey results in aggregate.

Kristina Rosette: Oh yeah, okay, I just want to make sure that I, okay, yeah, I would, again I need to talk with the constituency leader set but I can't imagine that having aggregate responses in terms of you know we had 400 people respond and this is the breakdown in terms of self identification.

And this many people answered question one and of those who did you know 37 said this and 47 said that and blah blah blah.

I just -- if that's what you're talking about I think that's much more likely to be provided. What I had thought you were asking about is basically the per respondent answers stripped of identifying information.

So in other words, you know my responses and stripped out Kristina Rosette and said this is how this person answered.

And frankly I'm not willing to even consider that if that's (unintelligible).

Jothan Frakes: Yeah, that's not something I'd expect. I think it's more towards the point of what Danny had been asking for which is, you know like for example can you see what people typed into the freeform boxes.

Kristina Rosette: Oh yeah, sure the only reason we are not providing those real time is because we are going to be validating, I didn't want to end up in a situation with because we had provided real time and then gone back

to that validate and realized that you know there was one response that was you know by anyone's standard bogus and the numbers changed.

We didn't want people to start getting confused or concerned or you know whatever. So yeah, we fully intend to provide aggregate data, that's the whole point of doing this.

Jothan Frakes: That's perfect, I mean the goal is to make sure that the data has that support so that it's -- you know it can't be called into question.

Kristina Rosette: All right. No, no that's fine. And I apologize, is Nick still on the line?

Nick Ashton Hart: I am.

Kristina Rosette: Okay, I'm going to need to email you, I've got about 25 emails from IPC people who can't get into the poll.

Nick Ashton Hart: Okay. Yeah, I've sent some emails to you in the background as a -- my apology by the way, I did send out an example of what comes in the comment boxes. Unfortunately the first time around I picked the IPC survey.

Hopefully Kristina will not want to shoot me. I didn't actually provide the last two answers of the main survey so that you can get a flavor of what the raw report looks like.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Looking at that Nick, it looks good, thank you.

Okay, I think we have some indication of where we're going with next steps, I think that seeing the straw man report will help people a little bit better visually and everyone will have a chance to email it on the email list and on next week's call.

Does anybody have anything else they want to bring up to this group today? Okay, otherwise, thank you everybody and we will talk again in one week.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, bye.

END