

GNSO
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference
August 22, 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 22 August 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/domain-tasting-22aug07.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-coordinator CBUC (Council)
Marilyn Cade - CBUC
Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency
Margie Milam - Registrar constituency
Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency
Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registry constituency
Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)
Greg Ruth - ISPCP

Absent apologies:

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to Council

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager
Nick Ashton Hart - Director for At-Large
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: ... (now) being recorded.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): All right, thanks. Good morning or good evening everybody. Let's see I'll start with just taking the roll as I see it in the meeting view window here. we've got (Glen) from staff, (Olof) from staff, (Patrick Jones) from staff, and (Nick Ashton-Hart) from staff. Then (Jothan Frakes, Margie Newham, Jeff Eckhouse) from the registrars, (Jeff

Newman) from the registries, myself Mike (Rodenbaugh) for the business constituency and (Kristina Rosette) from the (IPC). Did I miss anybody? Okay.

First point on the agenda was statements of interest that you hadn't checked up on in a little while. (Gwen) (unintelligible) everybody...

(Gwen): (Unintelligible) haven't - no I haven't received any and I'm just about to send out a notice for people to do that as soon as possible.

(Mike): Okay. Probably just one or two people that don't have them already on file. All right let's try to get those. Okay (Olof), how are we looking on the (RFI) results so far?

(Olof): Oh well it's advancing and it's up and running. It took a bit before we got to everything synchronized with both the ICANN posting and the (BigPulse) posting, but now it's there since midweek. And we have so far got eight responses on the ICANN (email) posting. (Unintelligible) 19 on (BigPulse) so far.

So it's advancing and we've also tried to boost the - make some publicity around it through our liaisons. We've already seen some results of that in the form and shape of articles and newsletters sent to - by (Pablo Inojosa) in South America to the (LAC) (TLD) list.

And also there's been quite some coverage in various articles. I've seen one in French actually appearing on yahoo.fr website. I don't know if you had anything to do with that, (Mike), but there it was.

(Mike): No, I didn't. So it showed up on Yahoo's French home page you said?

(Olof): Yes, indeed. Indeed. That's news. It's - came from that (Dnet), which is...

(Mike): Oh yes.

Man: ...(I) called (unintelligible) right in there. But it's very nicely put in French. And there've been a few other articles as well, so I guess we could be pretty satisfied with the kind of coverage we've got so far.

Of course, more results expected and hoped for. When it comes to my immediate impression from the (BigPulse) is that - well it's easy to get numbers and (people to vote) yes or no, but when it comes to free text input, there's precious little of it, you compare it to what we received so far on the icon side.

So we have to - well there is (the usual) mix. We got a very in-depth contribution from no less than (Danny Younger worth to check out). And also quite an interesting response from the postmaster of University of Cambridge. And - well, few other bits and pieces, but that's where we stand right now.

(Mike): Now, the posts right now are not visible to anybody else, correct?

(Olof): (BigPulse).

(Mike): (BigPulse) posts are. Okay.

(Olof): Oh. On yes.

Man: Yes

(Olof): They're all - they're both visible to whoever would like to see them. So it's you've seen - I sent out a link...

(Mike): Yes.

(Olof): ...but they're also available on the icon posting both for the icon response mail and for the (BigPulse) current results.

(Mike): All right. Well it sounds like we're doing pretty well with all this so far then. Obviously it's middle of summer holidays for all to of people. We have it open until September 15 so still plenty of time. I'm assuming that everybody on the call or, you know, the people that are usually on the call have sent out, you know, a note -- to their constituencies at least -- with the link.

(Olof): Yes.

(Mike): (If) not then hopefully that will happen very, very soon.

(Olof): Okay. About which perhaps we should mention also what (Kristina) and (Nick) have planned for a separate to run the constituency (polling) with additional questions on (BigPulse) as well.

(Mike): Yes.

(Olof): (Nick) or (Kristina), could you perhaps fill on that where we stand?

(Kristina Rosette): Well I think (Nick) probably has more current information than I do.

(Nick Ashton-Hart): Well yes. I can say is that - I mean there's been a request to have a secondary survey. We just have to make it up. We've made up a link account to the ICANN account so (Kristina) and I can give you administrative access to the poll once it's done.

(Kristina Rosette): Yes.

(Nick Ashton-Hart): And it's just a question of asking if everybody else is okay with, you know, constituency question as being listed as (constituent questionnaires) alongside the main one in the announcement.

(Kristina Rosette): I thought we had already talked about that.

Man: Yes, I think so too. We had - what do you mean in the announcement, (Nick)?

(Nick Ashton-Hart): On the ICANN's (subtle), you know, (domain taste) announcement.

Man: Oh, okay.

(Nick Ashton-Hart): Basically the sort of form that Kristina had kindly put together, which she and I talked about when we talked about...

(Kristina Rosette): Basically the idea would be that if you go to the ICANN home page -- and (Nick), correct me if - how it's translated on your end is different from how I envisioned it I'm my head -- but basically if you go to the ICANN home page you'll see that the August 10 announcement and the link.

If you click on that link, you'll be taken to a page that has text about, you know, the request for information, here's the PDF, here's the online form, here's where you can click to the results. And the idea was that further down on that page, clearly separable and clearly identified as such, there would be introductory text about the (ITC) questionnaires as well as a link to the online form of it.

And I should note that notwithstanding the fact that it's been prepared well, by me, it's really open to anyone who wants to complete it, with the caveat being that because we are asking for very specific information about brand and trademark owner experience, we are asking that respondents provide their name and affiliation, organization name and contact information so that we can just spot validate some of the results.

Man: Yes. Okay, that sounds like a good idea. Certainly I would send out the business constituency. (Margie) might want to - they might want to consider - (Mark) might want to consider sending out the link to some of their customer and...

(Kristina Rosette): Well as of right now, the international trademark association is planning to send out an email announcement to all 7500 members.

Man: Wow.

(Kristina Rosette): So I anticipate that we'll get some participation.

(Olof): Yes, that's great.

Man: So what's - now the purpose of this is to help the (ITC) to come out with a statement about it, or what's the purpose?

(Kristina Rosette): Just - because this - my understanding was that very early on, the group made a decision that the - because there was on the one level very broad information that the group wanted to have as well as an acknowledgement that there was going to be particular information about the experience, particular constituencies, which would obviously (vary), that the idea was that the request for information would be very general and that any constituency that wanted to, was free to create their own questionnaire.

Man: Correct.

Man: Okay and that's just one input amongst many...

(Kristina Rosette): Oh yes. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Man: (All right).

(Kristina Rosette): Yes. Yes, yes, yes. Yes.

Man: In fact the (NewStar) could wear its brand owner hat and reply to (unintelligible)...

(Kristina Rosette): Yes, absolutely.

Man: All right.

(Kristina Rosette): I mean seriously, anybody who wants to can fill it in. You just, you know, so it - and it says there that, you know, just keep in mind that you will need to provide that information. And if you don't want to provide it, then...

Man: This is the question you sent out like on July 30 or something like that?

(Kristina Rosette): It's been revised, but generally yes. I mean what I've basically is put in like yes, no, and number ranges to just kind of check the box and make it easier for people. But that's the general gist of it, yes.

Man: And how does - so like I was looking at the question and this is a separate topic just for you, then (Mike), just let me know, but how does an IP owner know if there name is pasted or read - you're just - you're not involved in - let's say you're not involved ICANN at all. How are you going to know whether their name is pasted or whether someone registered it, right? because there's a difference.

(Kristina Rosette): Well because many large brand owners receive watch notices when a new domain name...

Man: Is registered.

(Kristina Rosette): ...is registered. And if you're getting sequential notices for the same name...

(Margie Newham): Yes, this is (Margie). We have a report that actually tracks that, so our clients will see a name registered and then they'll see it drop and then they'll see it re-registered.

Man: Well I mean, you know, the - say it's not that often that a name is registered, dropped, registered, dropped, registered...

(Margie Newham): I beg to differ, but that's - let's keep this conversation offline because I think it probably is not, you know, I mean if the group wants to continue, I'm happy to, but I think it might be...

Man: Well I mean I sent the group - well at least in (Biz) anyway. I don't know about (com) but I sent the group statistics -- hard facts -- as to what, you know, it's less than 1% of means that were registered during the (ad grace) - (I'm sorry), that were dropped during the ad grace period that were actually re-registered.

(Margie Newham): Yes.

Man: Okay, that's - and maybe that's - and (Mike), maybe that's questions that you and I want to work on to send the registries for that kind of hard information as well.

(Mike): Yes, absolutely.

Man: But - and I think (VeriSign) I know I asked them - they're going to prepare those statistics. So you're going to see that it's less than - I mean (Chuck) - I was talking to (Chuck) today. He said it's less than 1% also.

So I think there's going to be a lot of confusion when brand owners answer this question. They're just going to just think - they're not going to know whether a name's registered or pasted, most of them, right? I mean if you sent it out to audiences 7500 members, no one - (as) being one of their members, yes I am familiar with ICANN, but I think

you're going to get - maybe one of the questions should be, "Do you know what (tasting) is?"

(Marilyn Cade): Actually - it's (Marilyn). I thought we were going to have an FAQ that explained some of these things.

(Jothan Frakes): There is an FAQ.

(Marilyn Cade): Right.

(Jothan Frakes): I don't know if it makes a distinction between some of the monitoring services that - into the trademark folks might be watching as far as brands go, because I know some of the services don't - some of the services hold back for five days before they send out brand mark notices to kind of shelter from the pasting activity, kind of shelter out the noise.

(Marilyn Cade): And I'm sorry, who's speaking?

(Jothan Frakes): This is (Jothan, Marilyn). Good morning.

(Marilyn Cade): Thanks, (Jonathan). Sorry I was late.

Man: Actually, you know, I think it might be useful to make the distinction that (Jeff) is mentioning at the start of this IPC supplemental request that what you're really asking about in these questions is domains that are still within the (ad grade) period...

Man: Right.

(Jeff): ...because I could tell you that even as a brand owner (of NewStar) we have a number of names that I don't go after the ones that are tasted, but I go after the ones that are registered, you know, for longer than a certain period...

Man: Right.

(Jeff): ...of time. And there's a bunch I'm going after now, but I'm familiar with pasting and I'm familiar with ICANN. I can guarantee you that most of the 7500 (unintelligible) members are not.

(Kristina Rosette): (Jeff), I can assure you that, you know, we're taking care of the educational (efforts) on that end so, you know - and if the, you know, if the ad hoc group ultimately says that it's going to discount the results of what the IPC comes up with, it is free to do that.

Man: Yes, and (I don't think we're going to be making) qualitative analysis of the results at all. Our job is just to essentially get the results, summarize them.

(Jeff): Yes, but don't you want - when you get the results you want to make sure that, you know, if the (IPC) comes forward with at, you know, 75% of the people responding says that their names have been targeted for pasted domain (name) - their brands have been targeted for pasted domain names and then they've answered the rest of the survey accordingly and its not actually true that it was pasted, but they're just normally registrations targeted, you know, for domain traffic purposes or whatever. Don't you think that's an important bit of information that we need to now?

(Kristina Rosette): But that - I mean that's in the question, (Jeff). I mean, you know, we use the same FAQ and the same definitions that are in the standard (RFI). So if you have a concern with those, then we have a bigger problem.

(Jeff): Well, but in the standard (RFI) though, the - we're not really asking for the sort just the (IPC) is asking for.

Man: Right.

(Olof): But we do define...

(Jeff): We are, but generally speaking. You know...

(Kristina Rosette): Right. Well as a practical matter, if someone doesn't understand what pasting is, when they go into the, you know, the same people that (Jeff) is concerned about, you know, if they are in fact not going to get it after they read the definition, they're not going to get it regardless of who's questionnaire they're filling out and what statistics are being provided.

Man: Yes. I guess all I'm suggesting - I think maybe all is (Jeff) is suggesting is that you clarify that in your question, starting with number 4 really, you're asking for - and I really don't have (unintelligible) your band and the target of pasted domain names, (unintelligible) doesn't - it's not really worded the best way I don't think. You really want to ask, "Have you see domain names registered and dropped within the (AGP) that corresponds to your brand remarks or that are confusingly similar to your brands or marks I think is really the question you really want to ask, right?"

Man: And maybe it would say confusingly similar or include your brand or marks.

Man: Right, (unintelligible), yes.

(Olof): (Unintelligible) what you mentioned, (Marilyn), the confusingly similar definition as its used in (unintelligible) and such...

Man: Right.

(Olof): ...really includes the including - I mean that you put, "Hey I like Yahoo! don't I?" -- that kind of domain name. Our consider (unintelligible) part and parcel of the confusingly similar concept.

Man: Yes.

(Kristina Rosette): I'll take your suggestion back to my constituency in (INTA) and then proceed accordingly.

Man: Yes. I don't think we need to spend time on this call. Obviously the place to do it has out working on the questionnaire would be on the list.

(Kristina Rosette): Well - and frankly, you know, (Jeff) (unintelligible) you all, I have spent...

Man: I'm with you, (Kristina). It's yours. It's the (IPC's) questionnaire. I understand that.

(Kristina Rosette): Exactly.

Man: So - that's true.

Man: Well the only reason I'm raising these points, (Kristina), is I'd rather raise the concern now than after you get the results and you've gone through all these steps after the things that, you know, the things I'll be looking at.

(Kristina Rosette): No, I understand that. I mean I just, you know, I'm really not at liberty to get into the details of what (INTA's) educational efforts are going to be on this point, but I can assure you that it will be taken of.

Man: Okay. well on its face right now, you know, I got to say I agree with the concern that it's not real clear what exactly you're asking about here. You know, and there is a difference between domains pasted and dropped and (meet) within the (AGP) which is really sort of the information we're looking for.

(Kristina Rosette): Oh absolutely. I know - yes. I mean...

Man: Okay.

Man: Yes, and then the other question then -- maybe (Kristina) you and I can talk about I offline -- is I don't - I mean see to me it seems amazing that someone could file a (UDRP) on a pasted name, I mean because they only have - they'll find out about and they - most they have is four days to file it.

(Kristina Rosette): Well, that very well might be the point we're trying to make.

Man: Yes. But there certainly are other legal options, right? I mean the (Marilyn Cade): ACPA or otherwise to go after pasted names. Okay anyway, let's let (Kristina), if she wants, go ahead and edit the survey. But of course you want to get it up and live as soon as we can so that people have plenty of time to answer it by September 15.

(Kristina Rosette): Yes, (Nick), if you would just kind of go ahead with what you're doing and I'll get back to you. And if we need to trade out that question or, you know, tinker with it a little, or maybe...

(Nick Ashton-Hart): No problem.

(Kristina Rosette): ...you know, revise the FAQ, which I think is probably going to be the easiest way to do it, for that question.

Man: And on that note, if we could just make it clear when it is posted on the ICANN website that this is strictly the (IPC) and it's not the ad hoc group that made this step.

(Kristina Rosette): Oh absolutely. That's very clear.

Man: That's - yes that's part of (this).

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Man: All right and again I think the concern, (Kristina) is just that you - make it very clear to people that you're asking for stats for domains dropped with in the (AGP) not for domains. Of course very registration is - goes

through (AGP). I mean we're really just concerned about the ones that are dropped during that period.

Woman: Preaching to the choir.

Man: All right, all right. Then let's move on. So we don't - and I take it (Nick) then you have everything that you need from the group or from (Kristina)...

(Nick Ashton-Hart): Yes.

Man: ...other than that particular issue? All right. All right so hopefully that'll be up and live end of this week or beginning of next. So looks like we don't have (Danny Younger) or (Paul Staherra) to give us any status on the research that they're working on, so we'll skip that.

Verifying (ad based (unintelligible) data -- so I talked with (Chuck Holmes) yesterday. He thought that VeriSign would have fairly readily available or be willing to give us historical data on this from, you know, we just got the data point from April showing the number of the leaps within the (AGP) and that was the first time that they'd reported that.

We're going to try to get that going back as far back as they'll give it. (Jeff), you just raised another good point that we ought to try to go after - go to the registries and see about...

(Jeff): Yes. And I talked to (Chuck) this morning. We had a regular constituency call. And we - VeriSign's going to respond to the questions that you ask them, but the questions that I brought up on our call were much more specific for data. And (Chuck) said, Well I need to

have the (ad hoc) group submit those specific questions to use formally because that's not the questions we're answering. So in other words...

Man: Okay.

(Jeff): ...why don't you and I off this call go over the specific questions. Like they're requiring us to be very detailed. For example, you know, list all the names that were registered in a certain month that were deleted within five days that were re-registered. You know, like you got to be - you can't ask them the general question of, "Please give me the stats on the number of domains that were pasted," right?

Man: No, understood. Understood. Okay. so why don't you and I do that workup on a list of specific questions and then put it to the list and then get it to VeriSign.

Woman: Can I just ask a clarifying? Did I understand this correctly that VeriSign -- or at least I understand your question to suggest that VeriSign actually (unintelligible) and can provide data as to which specific names are added and dropped within the five day period?

Man: Every registry should be able to do that, yes.

Woman: Okay, thanks.

(Marilyn Cade): It's (Marilyn). Is that - (Patrick), are you on the phone?

(Patrick Jones): I'm on the phone.

(Marilyn Cade): I think this would be helpful to verify because the data that's been available so far has been registrar report -- registrar by registrar. But not specific (aim) reports (unintelligible).

(Patrick Jones): And that's because that's not public information.

Man: Right.

(Marilyn Cade): Right. So my - right. But the - I just wanted to be sure that I understood what the discussion was. But the discussion is, VeriSign as a registry has that data. The question is, is it going to be - is - will it be shared for purposes of understanding the issues and how will it be made public.

Man: So let's...

(Marilyn Cade): (Unintelligible) will it be shared?

Man: So let me go back to - I sent an email to the group on July 26, 2007 that was entitled Information Statistics - Actual Information Statistics for .biz on Pasting. And in that email said that there were between 20,000 to 45,000 domain names per month that were registered and deleted between January and June 2007 for a total of approximately 195,000 domains.

Of that 195,000 domains - and then I went through 183,000 were never re-registered, 402 were deleted and re-registered more than 10 times. You know, I went through stats.

(Marilyn Cade): Right, right.

Man: (Right)? That's the kind of stats that I'd like to see from VeriSign and other registries.

(Marilyn Cade): Right.

Man: It's not individual name by name like, "Give me the top - give me the name that's most often re-registered," or, you know, not name by name but more break that down. So you said 195,000 domains you suspect were pasted. You know, of those, how many were re-registered, of those, how many were re-registered more than once, more than three times, more than five times. That's the kind of stats that I'd like to get.

(Marilyn Cade): And - exactly. And I'll just say that our - the experience that my client had is something like - so a name may disappear for a year and then it pops up and is pasted repeatedly for a frantic period of time and then it may disappear again. So over time, is also a very important element.

Man: That's - someone - I mean if registries have stats as to the last time a name is - should have stats -- historical information -- that's tough to make an association on. Like if there's a year that goes by, it's tough to say that that's related to the first instance, but after the year, if it's registered and re-registered, you know, during that period of time then you can make certain instances. But...

Man: What period of time were you using, (Jeff), for your stats?

Man: So what I did is is went from January through June this year.

Man: And so it's just whatever was registered and re-registered within that six month period.

Man: Within that six month period. Correct. Now I can go back now and do a revised one from January through July or at the end of August I could do January through August. I could do months before that as well, but I could tell you that according to what we noticed - we didn't really have (biz) tasting until - to any really expense till November of last year.

Man: VeriSign of course was before then.

Man: Right.

Man: I think it'd be interesting - I think it'd be good to probably see what was registered and re-registered within a one year period and that's probably reasonable.

Man: Yes, and I think in a couple months, (biz) will be able to do that. We just haven't had a full year. But I can go back to November and do that.

Man: I think that's what we should - (you're) sure you should aim to ask VeriSign for, though.

(Kristina Rosette): Can I just ask-- and we don't need to decide this now, and in fact it's - we have a lot of things to get to -- but something that I would like to talk about at some point is if we can in fact get that information, to what extent we want to be somewhat guarded about releasing it, simply because it would be - I would imagine kind of (unintelligible) arrows as far as trademark owners are concerned in the sense of, you know, I wouldn't want to be releasing, you know, a list publicly of, you know, these are the, you know, all the names that are pasted, which I think, you know, I think realistically are most likely to be...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: ...trademark infringement. So I, you know what, I'm...

Man: Yes. No, no, I wasn't talking about releasing names. I was talking about numbers.

Woman: Okay, good.

Man: Like I said, like 183,000, 935 names were not re-registered and deleted out of that original 195,000. Then 402 names were deleted and re-registered more than ten times. And that to us, you know, indicates probable (hiding).

(Kristina Rosette): No, no, I realized that. I'm sorry. I should have been clear. I was talking about, you know, if we do in fact get this information from VeriSign as to the specific names...

Man: Oh I don't think we're going to ask.

Man: We're not going to...

(Kristina Rosette): Okay.

Man: ...I mean we're not going to get (unintelligible).

(Kristina Rosette): Okay. all right. Never mind. I was misunderstanding then.

Man: We're basically going to ask them to provide stats...

(Kristina Rosette): Okay. All right.

Man: ...in response to specific questions.

(Kristina Rosette): Okay, okay.

Man: (Jeff) and I will take a draft of those questions and submit them to the list for comment...

(Kristina Rosette): All right.

(Mike): ...and then get them to (VeriSign).

(Olof): (Mike)?

(Mike): Meanwhile...

(Olof): This is...

(Mike): Yes, (Olof)?

(Olof): Could I get back to where you started actually, because you had a (context) with VeriSign saying that they seem to be positive towards providing more data on the (leads) within (ad grace) period for some time. And - well that's of course (dearly) needed if we want to make a (graph), because for the time being the graph over time only consists of one point, and that's not much of a graph.

So I just wanted to have - well did you get a promise that would be delivered or is it is still to be checked and verified, or is it part of what you and (Jeff) would forward as questions?

Man: It was not promised yet. It was told - (Chuck Holmes) told me that he thought that they had the data and would not have a problem providing it but that I should ask (Pat Cane). So I did that yesterday.

(Olof): Okay.

Man: I am in - I'm anticipating positive response, but we will see. And then (Jeff) and I - and the questions that (Jeff) and I will come up with are additional.

(Olof): Okay.

Man: This is (Patrick). They've also been some other high level discussion between ICANN staff and VeriSign on getting additional data, so I hope they'll be able to share more at some point soon. I can't share much more than that right now.

(Olof): Okay. I'm sure we probably all have questions on that, but we will - we'll hold them at least till next week.

Man: That's like a teaser.

(Mike): Yes it is. That's okay.

(Margie Newham): (Mike), this is (Margie). The other thing you could do is if you don't - if you're not satisfied with the kind of information that you've got

historically, you know, if we had a longer period of time to look at it, you know, a lot of companies just like, you know, email doing or we do for our reports. We could, you know, we could actually analyze that data going forward, you know, as long as we scoped out what we were looking for.

(Mike): Okay. So (unintelligible) say just talk a little bit more on that (unintelligible)...

(Margie Newham): So in other words, you know, we - obviously we do our reports. You know, I submitted a copy of our brand (jacking) index to the list. What we do is we look at daily zone file differentials. We look at what's been registered, you know, every day and what's new. And so to the extent that you're not getting cooperation or, you know, information from VeriSign, at least from historical perspective, as long as we, you know, decide what it is we want to look for, someone can do that analysis. Maybe it's what (Paul's) doing or maybe, you know...

(Mike): Right.

(Margie Newham): ...but just need to figure out, you know, what it is. And it's just something we, you know, you start now and you do, you know, and you look at the zone files every day for a month for two months, for three months. Whatever, you know, the period is that you're interested in. I mean it's not that difficult to craft, you know, the analysis once you know what specifically what you're looking for.

(Mike): Okay, that makes sense. I think what we ought to do is we ought to figure out exactly what (Danny) and (Paul) are doing, and then figure out exactly what (VeriSign) is doing. Hopefully we can figure those

things out within the next week and then we can figure out if (Mark Monitor) or anyone else might be able to supplement or fill in any holes.

(Margie Newham): Right.

(Mike): Okay. All right. So obviously we will come back to the list with further questions to VeriSign. I will follow-up with (Danny) and (Paul) and see if they can give us sort of a brief write up of exactly what projects they're doing and we'll take it from there.

All right, any other questions on the data -- the zone file data or otherwise? Then we'll move on to (Jonathan). Can you tell us what is the status of your pulling of the registrars?

(Jothan Frakes): Yes, the - I'm going to need until next week to provide anything substantive. I mean the feedback that I'm getting from within the registrar constituency is kind of underwhelming for this, but unless it's the specific to individual questions, that's kind of a common occurrence -- fairly typical.

So the feedback that I'm getting actually just discusses, you know, the - of all the three choices that are on the questionnaire that vanishing of the (AGP) would be the most significant that they'd prefer a restocking or those other options to the (AGP) because of the programmatic impacts. But again, that's obtuse to the (straw pole) that I'm putting out just as far as what the impact of, you know, how many of them are doing testing per se.

(Mike): Yes, I think - I mean that's (unintelligible) one of the questions of the (RFI), which obviously we want as many registrars (unintelligible) as possible, but we understand that you were separately going to ask them what their specific uses of the (AGP) have been and try to build some statistics around that.

(Jothan Frakes): Yes, predominantly I'm going to need until next week.

(Mike): Okay.

(Jothan Frakes): Otherwise, I'd...

(Mike): No problem.

(Jothan Frakes): ...it would be completely subjective.

(Jeff): (Mike), this is (Jeff) here. One other things is that some of the registrars might be using it for, you know, when I know ourselves that for certain purposes we might not want to disclose what we're using it for that, you know, they're within the guidelines and (unintelligible) we could - I would just put it under testing as the broad category, but I don't want to give out specifics because I consider those certain, you know, trade secrets on our business.

Man: I'm finding that's kind of common without going into a lot of detail -- that the registrars -- many of them are using the (AGP) for, you know, very, very legitimate purposes that they consider very proprietary.

(Jeff Newman): I mean I - it's (Jeff Newman). If things like - I mean I'd be happy just to get an answer like, you know, (if) testing purpose or - but not pasting, you know, something...

Man: Yes.

Man: If they could say testing or other - some general category of purpose other than...

(Kristina Rosette): (Product) development or service development.

Man: There you go.

(Kristina Rosette): But telling us, you know, we're not going to tell you.

(Marilyn Cade): I have an - yes. (Mike) I have a question about this that I think we need to ask the staff. If a policy or practice -- and I'm not sure that any of us exactly know what the (AGP) is determined to be -- but let's use the word policy for just a minute. If a policy is defined for purpose A and purpose B, what kind of flexibility exists to continually expand the uses of that policy. And let me use - let's see, let's use something neutral as an example.

(Mike): (Marilyn) I'm not really sure where you're going on this. I mean we want to keep things focused (on) I mean what sort of statistical information can we get. This group is not going to be involved in any sort of policy drafting in any way. So...

(Marilyn Cade): I - no I understand, but I think it matters in how we ask the question. So I do agree with the last speaker that, you know, it's good if we can give

some categories that people can respond to, such as product testing or et cetera, because at some point the council is going to have to decide if they are going to do a policy development (process).

(Olof): Could I respond, (Marilyn)? Just quickly from my little simple persuasive. I believe that it all depends on whether the purpose has been stated in the policy or not. If it has been specified and that this or that or the other are the purposes and the reasons for having this or other feature like the (ad grace) period, well then it's - you have - may have some demarcation line.

But I doubt that that is the case in - when it comes to the (ADP). It has not been stated as such in conjunction with the policy, has it?

(Mike): Right. And (Marilyn) it's also - that - your question goes back to the age old debate of it's (contracts) and policies, you know, is that which is - do you interpret a contract to include anything that is not otherwise expressly stated or does it exclude anything that's otherwise stated? So even if a contract says that you may use data for a particular purpose, it doesn't necessarily - doesn't mean that you can't use it for other purposes.

And - I mean that's an age old contractual legal debate as to what's going on. So you'll get different sides from each and there's no definitive answer.

(Olof): Just to quote -- this is (Olof) gain -- I mean - well this is German, but anyway, once upon a time Germans had an expression saying that ((German spoken)). (Unintelligible) a very particular time, second world war, everything that's not specifically permitted is prohibited.

Man: I thought that was welcome to beer fest or Oktoberfest.

Man: (It was) in German. It was slightly differently.

Man: Yes.

(Mike): All right. So (Jonathan), I think what we'll do is we'll - we have some more concrete information about what exactly you're asking registrars and what (sorts of) responses you're getting back by next week?

(Jothan Frakes): I think that can be reasonably accomplished.

(Mike): All right, thanks. All right, unless there's any other questions on that. We can move on and just ask (Patrick) to summarize the (CCTLD) work that he has been directing. I know he's got some (dot) (unintelligible) just recently. Thank you.

(Jothan Frakes): Well I sent out requests to the top ten (CCTLDs) plus a couple others and I've made sure that I've forwarded the responses that have come back in. I do have a new response from (CAN Nick) -- the Chinese (CCTLD), and I'm waiting for permission to be able to post that to the list. If not, I'll summarize the response that I was given that there is domain pasting going on in (dot CN) and they do - a fee that they impose. So I hope to be able to post that to the web later today.

(Mike): All right. Thanks. So of the 10 or 12 that you sent out, I know we've got (D, Nick, Dot NL, Can Nick). Am I missing any others that we've already received?

Man: .eu, .au -- Australia.

(Mike): Right. Okay. so we've got them - almost half of what you've sent out so far.

Man: Yes I think we're up eight or nine right now.

(Mike): All right. Great. And are - and at some point - I assume you're keeping sort of the summary document of all the responses?

(Jothan Frakes): I will post the summary document.

(Mike): All right. Not urgent. We can wait for a few more to come in I think. Okay, anybody have any questions on that? Then I think we're to any other business, questions, issues anyone wants to discuss on the call.

(Kristina Rosette): Just that -- this is (Kristina) -- (Jonathan) and I have had a meeting of the minds on the (EDRP platter) questions. And we're just getting those flushed out right now. And hopefully we'll have something that we can send around to the group in the next day or two before we send those on to the providers.

(Jothan Frakes): We're definitely inches from goal.

(Kristina Rosette): Inches. Millimeters.

(Mike): All right. Good. Good to hear. Thank you. All right, anybody have anything else you want to discuss today?

(Jeff): Hi (unintelligible) this is (Jeff). I just had one last thing. This is from the earlier discussion about publicizing the (RFI) and the (other piece) -- that it would be nice if you guys could - if the - for staff if you could include it in the - something about it in the ICANN blog. I know a lot of people do read that and look at it and have as a (feed), so it might be - and link to it, so (it) might be a nice way to drum up some publicity for it. But I don't know what your policies are and what you've put on the blog, so...

(Mike): (Jeff), that can be done today.

(Jothan Frakes): Okay. Oh, great.

Man: And, you know, I mentioned this to the folks on list, but, you know, I think both (Mike) and I got opportunities to discuss it with people at the domain roundtable conference and that was kind of helpful. Hopefully that increased some of the feedback just from general registrants.

(Mike): Yes. All right. All right, unless anyone has anything else, I guess I would note for the record that (Greg Ruth) joined at some point after we took role as well as (Marilyn Cade).

(Greg Ruth): Yes.

(Mike): Other than that...

(Greg Ruth): ...late than never.

(Mike): Absolutely. Thanks, (Greg). All right, otherwise I think we've got a few action items -- at least a few of us do -- and we will reconvene again next week.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Man: Great.

Man: Thanks everybody.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye all.

Man: Bye.

END