

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
24 August 2010 at 18:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference on 24 August 2010 at 18:30 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-pednr-20100824.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Present:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC – Chair
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair
Oliver Hope - RrSG
Tatyana Khramtsova - RrSG
Berry Cobb – CBUC
James Bladel – RrSG
Mason Cole - RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSG
Ted Suzuki – IPC

Staff: Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Michele Neylon – RrSG
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Avri Doria - NCSG
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Michael Young – RySG

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Sharon). Good morning, good afternoon good evening to everyone on today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 24th of August. We have Alan Greenberg, Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Tatyana Khramtsova, Oliver Hope, Paul Diaz, Berry Cobb, James Bladel, Ted Suzuki, Mason Cole.

From staff we have Glen DeSaintgery, Marika Konings and myself Gisella Gruber-White and we have apologizes from Ron Wickersham, Siva Muthusamy, Michele Neylon and I believe Jeff Neuman.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you Gisella. In accordance with the new working group rules we're supposed to check for changes in statements of interest or conflicts of interest at the beginning of every meeting.

The rules formally call for a roll call but I think we will replace them with asking for is there anyone who needs to inform us of any changes? Not hearing any or seeing any hands, we'll assume there are none.

I see we have Oliver Hope on the call and I don't believe you've participated in these calls before or maybe I missed you. Would you like to introduce yourself?

Oliver Hope: No, hi. I'm here from Mesh Digital Limited or domainmonster.com. I'm new to the group truly and so start getting involved in this side of things since Brussels.

But since then I actually got married and went off on honeymoon so it kind of knocked out the - you know me being around until around about now.

So yes, that's me in a nutshell, looking forward to getting involved.

Alan Greenberg: Well you haven't missed a lot because we in fact haven't done an awful lot of work since then. I believe we only had one meeting so welcome and thank you for joining us.

Oliver Hope: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: All right. On the agenda today is the analysis of the public comments and the survey which Marika has been doing significant work on.

And I'd like to add one more - one item on there that arose out of the discussions, if you'll remember quite a while ago we talked about the issue of can a registrant transfer domain post expiration.

And the general consensus was yes they can. ICANN compliance came up with a slightly different answer and I'd like to raise that issue when we have the time either at the end of this meeting or at the next one.

So I'm going to turn this over to Marika to lead us through the summary of the analysis of the public comments and the survey.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What you see up on the Adobe Connect is the actual summary of the public comments. I don't know if you want to go through them one by one or how would you - everyone has reviewed them.

I mean something that we've done for some of the other groups is - and I've prepared a more detailed grid that helps to go through the different comments instead of you know using this summary as the basis.

I don't know if that will be helpful for the next meeting or now having a more general overview.

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest yes, sorry we should have talked about this ahead of time and we - both of us have been slightly busy. Why don't we do just a quick summary and then try - if you can try to present it in grid form at the next meeting that would be useful.

But you know just perhaps quickly summarize, I hope most of us have looked at either the actual comments, the raw comments or your summary.

But perhaps you can just give us a quick overview for those who haven't had the chance.

Marika Konings: Okay, so first on the public comment forum there were actually nine community submissions from nine different parties.

You can see a list on page 1 and 2, some even by members of the working group and actually a number of the constituencies and stakeholder groups submitted comments as well as the at large advisory committee.

And I'll leave the survey for maybe after this because there's a separate document that goes over the main result of that and to my great surprise when I came back from vacation I saw that instead of 12 submissions that had been made before I left there were now 412 responses.

So what I've done is basically created a separate document with the main highlights of the survey basically summarizing the - their percentage questions.

And I've created a separate annex that provides an overview of all the separate submission text submissions that have been made to facilitate review as I think the annexes almost take up 100 pages because a lot of additional comments and then suggestions were made there.

Alan Greenberg: Marika we've always been told that vacations are good for us, we just didn't realize this kind of result.

Marika Konings: I'm glad I didn't go for another week. So moving into the summary and analysis, there's one comment by George Kirikos I think he has been posting to most of the different public comments that are open asking the question whether meeting comments is relevant because he doesn't seem to be that public comment - public interest actually valued.

So I hope the working group can prove them wrong and review these comments of course in detail and then share that (unintelligible) account.

And there were a number of general comments, one from the registrar stakeholder group and I think the point has been made on numerous occasions around the working group, there's a lack of data.

And encouraging as well the working group to make sure that any potential outcomes of this group you know don't have any unintended consequences linked to them.

The CBUC, the database constituency submission contained a detailed response to the working group survey so that the survey that the working group itself took as part of the reports, I would encourage everyone to have a look at that if they want to see the more detailed conclusions, responses in relation to those questions.

And also there's a chart that Mikey I think already circulated as well to this group showing that the co-host expiration process basically has a demonstration of you know how complication - how complicated that is and the inconsistency that registrants are facing as a result.

The registry stakeholder group also made a point out of the fact that the report actually doesn't contain any recommendations or draft recommendations and encouraging the working group that when they get to that stage there will be another opportunity for public comment before the report is finalized and submitted to the GNSO council.

So then there are a number of responses specifically provided input on the charter questions, on the Charter Question 1 was both Michele and the registrars of the opinion that there was adequate opportunity to redeem expired domain names.

On the Charter Question 2, there were more comments from Michele who actually suggested that maybe this question should be slightly reformulated and talk now about whether registrants are aware of what can happen and will happen to their domain names after they expire.

Noting that this is the link to the point of education which comes back later on as well, the registrar stakeholder group points out that they are already required under the EDDP to provide that kind of information on the website and those opinions that the information that is provided is clear and conspicuous.

Charter question three, again Michele and the registrar stakeholder group are in agreement that sufficient notice is given as multiple notifications are sent by most registrars.

On Charter Question 4, there's again agreement where between Michele and the registrar and the registry and stakeholder group that - and I think the registrars as well that clarification of Whois outputs might be worth exploring further.

Michele notes as well that the holding page if one is used should contain a notice that the registration has expired and then maybe how it can be renewed.

The registry stakeholder group points out as well that the working group does consider clarification of Whois output that might not need to make a distinction between thick and thin registries as it would apply to both.

Alan Greenberg: Marika I have a question on that. The registry paper you know talked a lot about the thick versus thin. I don't recall us making a big distinction in our report.

Am I forgetting it or?

Marika Konings: I'm not sure, I would need to look back if we (unintelligible) registries.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly in our discussions we always said thick, thin, the registrant should get useful information. It may be easier to implement in one versus the other.

But I don't recall the paper actually making this a strong distinction of recommending it for one and not the other. James?

James Bladel: Yes Alan, I was going to mention I also don't remember whether or not the paper made a distinction because I don't know that we made the distinction. If we're just talking about things such as create an expiration date, those should be available in both as opposed to other contact information which would only be available in a thick registry.

So I guess I'm confused as to why they're making the distinction. And then we could ask for clarification, why does it matter I guess.

Alan Greenberg: Well I understand why it might matter in the implementation and we may have eluded to that somewhere.

But I don't think we made a statement saying we want to see it in one and not the other. So I think we need to go back and perhaps get back to the registry constituency, registry stakeholder group on that one.

And Marika if you could perhaps get a reminder that we do look into that and then get back to them. Because certainly what they're recommending I think is what we were saying all along, that the implementation may differ but the intent is uniform across the two.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll check what's in the report and I guess I have to check back. I presume Michael Young was involved in drafting this so maybe it's worth checking with him as a member of the working group.

Alan Greenberg: Right. Okay.

Marika Konings: Then to make a second point, a technical point which I know that it's important to keep in mind that all the renewed and grace periods are actually not EPD statuses.

So if it is reported in Whois output it should not be shown as a status. I'm not really sure what that means but I'm sure it's a practice people among us will know what to do with that.

Alan Greenberg: Well luckily most registrants don't know about EDDP statuses. So I think we know what our target is.

Marika Konings: So and then they know that if it would be recommended it might be worthwhile to consider recommending that the same is done for other similar periods. And they also noted that it's recommended that registries do this and it should also be recommended for registrars.

Registrar stakeholder group doesn't believe that additional measures need to be taken and although they do recognize that there might be confusion related to Whois and messages they actually proposed to work together with the registry stakeholder group to see what could be done in that regard.

So on Charter Question 5 Michele believes that there should be no transfer allowed during the RGP. The registry stakeholder group makes this point that at this point in time when they talk about original intention behind RGP and what is current practice.

Basically noted that the way the system works on the renew grace period there's no guarantee that the person, that the original registrant is the one trying to redeem the name and how they can actually go about that.

And who has actually the right to initiate the transfer and how can a registry actually identify initiating the original registrant if they're actually no longer the current registrant of record.

There are a number of questions that they raised in relation to this question and I think as a result of that they would prefer to keep RGP and transfer at separated events.

And the registrar stakeholder group also recognizes - and this is a complex question and if it is to be for the pursuit of the (unintelligible) and different future working group and might be convened to specifically look at that question.

So I've grouped together a number of desired outcomes and several of the comments people especially stated and what they would like to see as the outcome of this working group.

So the ALAC statement notes that they would like to see a level of predictability and security and as an outcome and they list a number of different requirements that they would like to see in the form of consensus policies, so you can look through the nine different items that they provided here.

I think it links to several of the questions that map to the survey and this could take the option of having consensus policy, or recommendations to that regard.

And they do note that there might be a need for some limited exceptions and also recognize that there might be a role of all the best practices above this minimum set of requirements.

Jothan Frakes, he points out that of course obvious solution is actually pay before a domain name expires, I think something we've talked about in the group as well.

He will also welcome an outcome of best practices under our consensus policies also noting that there should be some kind of minimum baseline that would also provide like a consistent experience

for registrants and upwards the community bank can be informed and be made aware.

Registry stakeholder group also emphasizes it's important of constituency and transparency and they know that the idea of registrars displaying explicit information around the domain exploration processes would be helpful for registrants.

IR had a short comment in which he basically noted that to drop a (unintelligible) policy is unfair and he talks about a system whereby they say everyone would have the same opportunity to recover a domain name following expiration.

The CBUC or the business constituency has also petitioned that consensus policy changes would be appropriate and they also talk about the issues of open and transparency and predictability in relation to post expiration practices.

Then there were several comments that pointed to the importance of education and information, Jothan Frakes amongst others, he provided some examples of maybe developing a diagram and a narrative that could be made - could be developed once the working group has finalized his recommendation that you know possibly could be put on website by ICANN or used as a way to explain to registrants what happens after post expiration and what they can expect.

He also uses an example of this misunderstanding on a specific comment that was made where someone was pointing out that in their view that the domain name never expired or shouldn't - after expiration

should have been granted to them as they had a trademark in that specific name.

And kind of seems to be a common misunderstanding that there's no exception for a trademark linked to expiration of a domain name or you know the different rules apply.

Michele also pointed out that you know more time and energy should be spent on educating registrants and making sure that they take care of their issues before the domain name actually expires and that the business constituency also proposes to create some kind of consumer education possibly responsible for ICANN around the expiration of domain names.

The auto renew grace period, the registry stakeholder group actually points out that apparently we indicate somewhere that all registries use the same auto renew practices and they point out that's actually not the case as there are some differences in when registries actually change auto renews.

So there might be something back there that needs to be updated in the report. Then some comments in relation to the redemption grace period, this is again something that came up before as well that assumptions related - when the redemption grace period was developed, it no longer seemed to apply.

So their raising the question whether the auto renew grace period so offers opportunity and the RGP whether they're noting that you know the intended goal at this stage of RGP cannot be guaranteed by the behavior of registries alone.

But they actually know that if the original intentions of the RGP are so valid there will be a need to actually apply consistently by all parties involved and if that would be the case then they would be willing to explore the RGP as a consensus policy.

Then there were some other issues raised that had been raised didn't seem to fit with any of the previous categories. There was one issue raised by (unintelligible) who pointed out that he had experienced registrars trying to invoice registrants for domain names that had expired but had already moved to another registrar before that time.

And he's wondering whether a registrar should be required to check with the registry that they are still - the registrar back up for the name before they actually send billing and related materials to registrants.

And the business constituency listed as well a number of issues that they would like the working group to explore in further detail, a number of terms that they would like to see addressed that are confusing.

The use of domain status flags, I mean some of the points link to some of the charter questions but there are also some new issues, for example the conflict of interest point in the last sentence, whether that should generate revenue from renewal or the after market exhibiting.

Alan Greenberg: Marika on Jothan's comment, I didn't catch that when I read his comment directly. I think what he's saying there is there are cases where a registrar - where a domain is transferred from registrar A to registrar B but registrar A still invoices it after expiration or after the expected expiration.

And he's suggesting they change - they check with the registry to see if there's still the registrar of record. It's a little bit scary if a registrar has transferred a domain away but their records don't indicate that.

Am I reading that correctly?

Marika Konings: That's how I read his comment as well. I don't know if that has something to do with you know records that may be kept differently from the administration billing department and you know the technical sides.

I see James raising his hand so maybe he has some insight on that.

Alan Greenberg: I can certainly imagine it if the domain is transferred a month before renewal time and the records lag, but anything else I'm - I guess I question. James?

James Bladel: Yes, I guess I'm kind of in the same boat here. I would state that if a registrar is unknowingly or through error and confusion billing for a name that's already transferred then I'm not sure that a policy can clean that up.

And if they're knowingly doing it and collecting money for names that they don't manage any more then that's fraud and call the cops. I don't really know where to go with this comment.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you for saying that because I was a little bit leery of saying it.

James Bladel: Well no, I mean I just - I don't know where to go with this.

Alan Greenberg: If the timing is tight it's understandable, otherwise it's either incompetence or fraud and neither of them is all that attractive.

James Bladel: Well and one is a law enforcement matter and the other one is not likely to be fixed by anything we do here.

So I guess I just don't know where to go.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I think I in any case will go back to his original comment and make sure we're not misunderstanding it. But it's a little bit interesting.

Okay, Marika back to you.

Marika Konings: And I think as well that someone where he indeed mentioned that you know it might just be fraud in that case so basically what he says, while there is a consequence to the registrar who is doing these things of chargeback of all charges against the registrar placing these competent handling requirements into the rules would help to expose if he's getting practices as I've described are deliberate or not.

But I guess we can - you know once we get to the grid we can review that a little more. So those were the main summary of the comments that were submitted as part of the public comment forum.

Would you like to discuss this now in more detail or move forward to the survey results?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think I need you know - clearly I think there are a few cases where we do want to follow up with people which will prove to them, at least to some of the people that we actually read these things.

One sometimes wonders if people deliberately put things in to cause questions like that. But that would be cynical wouldn't it be.

I'm satisfied with this at this point if you can summarize things in a nice grid then that - you know if the effort is not unreasonable I think that might be worth doing.

Any other questions on the survey before - on the comments before we go on to the survey? Okay, it's all yours.

Marika Konings: All right, let me just pull up the survey.

James Bladel: Alan this is James, and this is out of fairness to Marika and also wanting to make the most of our time. I think that we should go through the surveys in a general case but I would hesitate to go through actually going through all the annexes and reading the responses to the group over the phone.

I feel like that's something that grownups should be able to do off line. That's my opinion.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think anyone's going to disagree with you and I certainly wasn't planning on looking at it at that level.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. And for Marika's vocal cords as well as anything else.

Alan Greenberg: We haven't exercised her in weeks now. We have to keep her somewhat warm.

Marika Konings: Well James I do appreciate your concern.

James Bladel: Well I'm being selfish, we need to save her vocal cords for the next working group that we get.

Marika Konings: To be fair I mean I haven't had the time yet to actually go into detail in the annexes and some of the comments that might be as well you know overarching themes where we can actually summarize instead of going through the 300 submissions there will email or three or I've seen several where there seem to be you know similar kind of answers that are being made.

But I think I would take a little bit more time to actually analyze that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, there's one or two that I was going to ask questions on here but not necessarily expecting an answer at this point.

But let's - yes, I would say let's go ahead with it and try to understand where we're going in the future. But let me just summarize on a per question basis right now.

Marika Konings: Okay. So the main summary is up in Adobe Connect and was also posted on the wiki. So first question there is question four, should registrars offer renewals for a period of time following expiration subject to explicit exceptions.

So there's an overwhelming majority saying yes, 97% of respondents agree with that statement. So here also there are 51 responses made and we probably need to review that part in one of the future meetings.

Alan Greenberg: Marika I assume one of the things you're going to try to do and I say try in quotations is to see if we can generalize on affiliations to try to understand where these people came from.

In terms of registrars, users, you know as - and any other people with vested interest in the process.

Marika Konings: Right, I've actually tried but not so sure that's possible.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, let's go ahead.

Marika Konings: The next question then is question states should the policy specify the minimum amount of time allowed for renewal past expiration? There again 92% says yes and 46 of those have actually specified for how long that should be.

Three percent says no and 4% has no strong view either way.

Alan Greenberg: And I think this was one of the ones where analyzing the comments will give us some information although I looked at some of the raw data and some of them go all over the map, things like a year.

But the sort of what bins they fall in will be interesting.

Marika Konings: Right. The question eight should offering renew up expiration be a consensus policy best practice or is there needs for registrars to offer

competitive services. Eighty four percent here are of the view that it should be required by ICANN policy.

Eleven percent is of the view that it should be offered at that registrar's discretion and 5% has no strong view either way. Next question, question ten, should the policy specify the minimum number of notions that are required prior to expiration.

Eighty three percent says yes, 7% says no and 10% has no strong view either way. And again here 332 people actually provided further information on what they consider the most appropriate number of reminder messages.

Question 13 then asks what are the policy issues specify when such notices are sent, 76% of respondents says yes, 7% says no and 17% has no strong view either way.

Again quite a number of people here responded as well to Question 14 which asks if you answered yes to the previous question what time level reminder schedule would you suggest?

Question 16, should the policy specify how such notices should be sent, 44% says yes, 42% of respondents say no but the registration agreement should tell registrants how to register or content them with reminders.

Three percent says no and 11% has no strong view either way. And here again question 17 if you answered yes or no box to the previous question what message should it specify, 288 people provided additional details there.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, that one also should provide some interesting insight into what people think is reasonable.

Marika Konings: Then Question 19 is an open question, what in your opinion is the most effective means to remind a registrant that their domain name is about to expire? Again I think this is one we need to have a closer look, we're probably going to have some similarities.

We had 291 people providing further details. Question 20, should Whois be changed to make it obvious that a domain has expired and not yet renewed by the registrant or the agent?

Fifty eight percent says yes, 27% says no and 15% has no strong opinion either way.

Alan Greenberg: This is one that I found rather curious, that 111 people said it should not be obvious from Whois whether a domain is expired or not. And I'm just wondering did we word the question poorly? James?

James Bladel: Yes, that one jumped out at me as well Alan when I was reading and the only thing that I could come up with, and this is pure speculation on my part is that some folks thought that perhaps indicating the domain had expired would possibly make it more vulnerable to something, hijacking or something like that.

And that's the only think I could possibly think of but yes, it did catch my attention as well, so.

Alan Greenberg: All I can imagine is we worded it - it's something about the wording didn't take because if we had asked the negative of the question I can't believe 27% would have said yes, make it obscure.

So I'm not sure we're going to get any better insight.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I'm wondering is well and it's all pure speculation whether the way we phrase it as saying should Whois be changed, is some people are wondering whether that would mean changing the policy, whether we're actually saying should Whois status messages be changed.

So I don't know if some people interpreted it as well as being a more you know...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, maybe Whois is just so fraught with question that...

Marika Konings: So I don't know if that's - you know might be part of the reason as well.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe that's why we're not professional survey writers.

Marika Konings: Moving on then to question 22, again 309 people responded to the question on what in your opinion is the most effective means of alerting a registrant that their domain name has already expired?

So again we need to have a closer look there to see if we can group some of those answers together.

And again Question 23, what in your opinion should be done to educate registrants to ensure that domain names are renewed without incident, 228 people provided input there.

And moving on to Question 24, what should happen post expiration when a domain name is accessed via the web when email is sent to an address at a domain or other IT services are used.

Twenty seven percent said that it should stay working if at all possible as a courtesy to the registrant, 60% responded it should stop working to alert registrants to the expiration and 12% has no strong view either way.

There were quite a number of additional comments so it will be worth as well seeing what feedback is provided there.

Question 26, should offering the RGP be mandatory for all gTLD registries, 86% of respondents say yes, 5% say no and 10% have no strong view either way.

Should - question 28, should offering the RGP be mandatory for all registrars, 83% there says yes, 5% say no and 12% have no strong view either way.

Question 30, should the registration agreement be required to provide predictable statements about what will happen after the expiration?

Eighty six percent of respondents say yes, the agreement should specify what will happen, 9% says no but all documents on a registrar

website should - actually 0% of the respondents say no and 5% of them no strong view either way.

And I think that's it for the survey.

Alan Greenberg: All right, we've completed this in record time. Anyone have any comments? We obviously have a lot of work to do. By we, of course I mean Marika. But we should - how to divide up this work and how to analyze it I think is worthy of some thought.

And I'm not sure I want to conduct it on line right now but maybe on email we can talk a little bit about how to summarize these and what categories. James?

James Bladel: Yes, Alan just to follow on with what you were saying, I think that the next big question in front of us is what do we do with this?

I was reading through this the past couple of days and I think I've been sending some emails here and there about some of the things as they pop into my head, sort of stream of consciousness so apologize if they don't make any sense.

But I did come away with just a few takeaways relative to the survey. One is that I think this is a really great tool and I'm already thinking of ways we can use it in other working groups and in other areas.

Two, maybe mentioned a little bit about you know the anonymous participation, whether we want to discount or discard those responses or try to follow up with them if there are other identifying information

and see if we can't get those folks to identify themselves as per the ICANN working group conventions and bylaws.

Next you know this one's a little trickier, I wanted to say that you know some things would seem to be clear, like when we see something as 83% in favor of this or 90+% you know against that.

But I think we should be very cautious about giving in to the temptation to say that something is clear because then when you dig down into the annexes and see what people mean with the details of implementation, you know as you mentioned Alan it's all over the place.

And I think that that's where we get both the benefit of getting an outsider's perspective on these questions and these topics. But we also get the hindrance of having outsiders come in and weigh in on topics that are below the surface a little bit more complicated than they might appear in the survey questions.

So I think yes, the question in front of us is where do we go now with this? And I'm open to...

Alan Greenberg: I mean exactly where we go obviously that's the whole issue of this whole EDP and working group. On the shorter term I think we need to try to break the text answers down into categories so that we can get a handle on them.

The 86% and 83 and 92% are not particularly surprising because we already established way early in this working group that the majority of

registrants who deal with the largest registrars already have access to these various things.

So the expectation of registrants I think is set by the largest of the players and it's not particularly surprising that they want to be able to redeem a name after expiration because today the largest majority of people can.

So there's not a lot there that's really surprising if you analyze it from that perspective. So I don't think there's big surprises but the details may in fact be interesting and the fact that we actually got a moderate number of people to respond. I think has a lot of value.

Now in terms of the - what we do with the anonymous ones and the anonymous ones come in a number of categories, you know clearly no identification in the world we're looking at here of surveys or email has any real value.

I mean I could have provided a survey answer for James Bladel and given you a right email address and it would look perfectly valid. But I could have answered whatever I wanted to.

And in fact if you look at the - I think it was Michele who referenced the bylaws on PDPs, what they actually say is comments should be accompanied by the name, the affiliation and why the person is interested in this subject.

And in fact that level of specificity is virtually never done in any of the comments on virtually any subject.

So I think we have to take following the bylaws with just a grain of salt because the words that are there are not necessarily you know followed at any level.

However if you look at the list of people and say how many would we exclude if we take out the people who only gave a given name and didn't given an email address and the count comes out to be about 60.

You know without looking at any greater detail of you know is - I can't tell the difference necessarily between a given name and a surname.

So we may be excluding people who gave a surname but no other information. But if we exclude those 60 or so with the exception of only one or two questions it doesn't change the overall answer.

There's still going to be an overwhelming majority in one direction or another. And I wonder how much effort it's worth on Marika's part to start sifting through these one by one and trying to identify the good ones versus the bad ones.

Except perhaps in the situations where there really is a knife edge and we're not sure which way the question is going. Cheryl on the - on chat asked are there IP addresses and I believe I asked Marika that and she said no IP addresses were not available.

But there was a check to make sure the same computer presumably through a cookie did not answer the questionnaire twice. Marika, can you confirm I got that story right, then we'll go to James.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I didn't find a way to actually look at the IP addresses, but you're right, I did submit the option that you know you can submit from the same computer so I don't know if it was a cookie or verification of IP address.

I'm not sure how but I'm sure there's always a way around it as with anything but you know it should have required someone to take some additional measures if they wanted to submit it again from the same computer.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so IP addresses is not part of the information given to you but you didn't check with the survey provider to see whether it's in fact available from their logs or something like that.

Marika Konings: Yes, so basically it's an automatic system so I can - you know all the information is available to me and I didn't see their - the IP addresses. I can ask them whether that information they quote somewhere.

Alan Greenberg: It probably is worth asking if it's something you think they'll respond to quickly.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: James?

James Bladel: Hi, James speaking and yes, I mean just as an aside we in fact have contests or things like that with our website and there's always ways to get around those types of things.

So I wouldn't put a lot of stock in either IPs or cookies. Alan, you know mostly I'm on board with what you were just providing there by way of a synopsis.

I did - there were just a couple of points that I wanted to you know raise as possible areas of further discussion. And the first was that you know I - and this is consistent on all the working groups that I participate in, okay this is not specific to PEDNR.

But I feel very strongly about anonymous participation in ICANN and I think that you know that goes hand in hand with making sure that everyone's interests are known and public.

You know so I think that you know the strictest - you know taking the recommendations and the bylaws or the operating rules or whatever with a grain of salt, I think that doesn't sit well with me.

I think that you know they're there for a reason, that if folks are responding in an individual capacity they should say so and they should say who they are.

I think that there are a lot of aspects on - about online life where folks have come to expect or even require their anonymity be protected and I just don't feel that this is one of them, one of those areas.

I think that you know people should be willing to stand up and identify themselves.

And then the second thing is you know as far as how much of a clear direction you know there are in some of these topics, I would submit

that you know even you know 100% in favor of one issue or another again doesn't really give us a whole lot to go on until we take a look into the narrative comments and the text feedback and see is there you know a clear pattern emerging here or are they all over the map?

Are some of them you know way off the reservation like I should have a year to renew my - a year grace period tacked on to my one year registration.

And so I think that we need to sort through those things.

Alan Greenberg: And keep it working for that year.

James Bladel: Yes, that's basically - you know I'd say we have a need for that at GoDaddy, it's called a two year registration, right? You know and we'd probably give you a nice deal on that too.

But it's just that the thing is you know I mean I was kind of joking with a friend of mine that you know if it was a - you know if there was a question on the survey that said domain name registration should be free and last forever, I'm sure that that would get 100% response too.

And that's all I'm going to say there.

Alan Greenberg: Well there are people seriously saying you should be able to buy a domain name forever, not free of course. But yes, but we didn't ask that question to our credit.

James Bladel: Yes, I'm just pointing out that there are always going to be some outliers in these areas and we want to make sure that they're informing

our discussion because we're the ones that have been you know clobbering away on this work for about a year and not taking a rest.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. It's unfortunate we didn't home in on some of this anonymity as a possibility of anonymity and make for instance email addresses mandatory.

That's not to say you can't come up with whodoyouthinklam@gmail.com, and it looks like an email address. But we didn't unfortunately. But what I was saying was I really have no trouble ignoring or extracting the number of people who are completely anonymous that didn't provide a name or an email address.

I just don't think it's worth the effort. But you know we can decide that further as we look at the text answers and see to what extent you know taking out what is I guess 15% or so of the answers will likely make a real difference or not.

I'm just trying to avoid doing work which won't really tell us anything and takes a fair amount of Marika's time.

Do we have any more hands up? All right, we have a lot of work to do on this but apparently no more discussion at this point. The other item I wanted to bring up is the issue of post expiration rights.

And you will recall that one of the things that we've been looking at in our internal surveys was should a registrant have the right and the ability to do a transfer after expiration?

And there is an ICANN compliance advisory which says the losing registrar should not unreasonably refuse to do the transfer and there's a number of very specific exceptions.

The issue of whether the registrant really has the right to do it, that is can the registrar demand - registrant demand from the registrar the tools necessary to make the transfer requests to the receiving registrar, to the gaining registrar.

And compliance came out with an interesting answer and the answer was they do not consider it a compliance issue unless the right to do something is explicitly stated in the RAA as a post expiration right.

Which means in the case of a transfer post expiration since it is never explicitly referenced as opposed to expiration right, it is an offer right.

And I found that a little bit shocking and I haven't done any great analysis but I'm wondering what other rights might not be there unless we explicitly mention them.

But it does give us some guidelines that anything that we want a registrant to have the ability to do according to consensus policy must be stated explicitly or compliance will take the view that the contract has - the one year registration has expired and the registrant does not have the right if it's not explicitly said.

I see no hands and no gasps and no one else is as surprised as I was apparently. Any thoughts on that or do we just factor it in as we're trying to formulate outcomes for this process? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I was just trying to agree, I hit the wrong button, sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Factor it, okay. All right, I was rather amazed by it because I would have thought that any right is a right as long as it makes sense to apply. But they were very explicit that if it's not stated in the RAA it's not a right post expiration.

One could question why they issued an advisory about that particular right if it's not a right but I decided not to go down that path.

Anything else on today's agenda we want to talk about? We've got a fair amount of time left. My inclination given I've already been on about six hours of conference calls today is to make this a shorter meeting rather than a longer one.

Is there anything else anyone wants?

Marika Konings: Oh that works for me. I'm hopping back to the vertical integration call, not just the last six hours.

Alan Greenberg: Did I miss a vertical integration call?

Marika Konings: No it was yesterday.

Alan Greenberg: Oh that was yesterday for me, okay. In terms of next meetings, I am not available next week and Cheryl is not available.

And given that the number of meetings that some of us are involved with seems to be on a fast path that is two meetings a week and very

intensive work. My inclination is to say go back to meetings every two weeks.

And try to make sure we do enough preparation that they're effective meetings and - but not try to draw us in every week. Is that agreeable to people? No checks but no one gasped and said horrors no.

Marika Konings: I typed it too.

Alan Greenberg: You did, fortnightly works for a while now and we can review. But you and I are the only ones on the call to know what fortnight means.

Mikey O'Connor: I know what that means. But that's because I read Winnie the Pooh.

Alan Greenberg: Actually there are several people on this call who are educated and sophisticated.

Woman: Thank you Mikey, I'm glad some people - once sixteenth of the football season. Very obscure.

Alan Greenberg: See I'm one of those who don't know how long the football season is, so...

Woman: Which football?

Alan Greenberg: Marika you were trying to get a word in edgewise.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just wondering if you know some point the working group would like to send some kind of timeline you know for which it would like to deliver their report.

I'm aware that there are a million activities going on that you know one more pressing than the other. But I'm also very aware that you know we have another deadline coming up for the (unintelligible) meeting.

And I think we have discussed that if there are firmer recommendations they might need to go out for another round of public comment before we actually finalize the report.

So I'm wondering if we should work on a kind of timeline that maybe can dictate a bit as well the - you know number or the frequency of meetings, and then you know fine tune - get to a final report at some point.

Alan Greenberg: I would say we need to set a timeline by sometime in September but I would not try to do it at the next meeting.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Anything else? Going once, twice, I thank you all for a productive meeting and we look forward to what we can do at the next one.

Marika if you need any either help or you want to talk about exactly how we analyze the rest of the data off line or with a small group of people we can pull something together.

Marika Konings: That's fine, I think I'll have a go, I have some time now as we're not meeting next week so I can put something out to the list and see if you know that's workable for people or if there are any volunteers to look at the data.

I know that there are some people in the working group that are very experienced at looking at Excel sheets and that kind of data and how to bring that all together and yes Berry, I'm talking about you. So if there's anyone willing to help you know that's always welcome of course.

Alan Greenberg: Well I can play that game too so maybe you want a small working group. Don't feel you have to slug away and just do it all yourself until we meet in two weeks.

Marika Konings: Okay, great. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Marika this is Berry and yes, I'll take a look at it and noodle it for a little bit.

Marika Konings: Yes, I can send you the Excel data.

Berry Cobb: That will be great.

Woman: I can help as well. You're getting swamped, you've got a major work group working with you Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Of course we'll all do different things that can't be incorporated into each other.

Marika Konings: Well I'll send them to Alan and Berry I'll send them to - I'll make a mailing list with the three of us for now so we can at least coordinate who's doing what so we're not duplicating or telling each other when we're actually going to do work and then sharing it. That might help.

Alan Greenberg: A good idea and we'll see who actually follows through with their promises to help. We'll see if I do. Thank you all.

Marika Konings: Thanks, bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Thank you (Sharon).

Coordinator: You're welcome, thank you.

Woman: Enjoy the rest of your day.

END