

**GNSO**  
**Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team**  
**27 July 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 27 July 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-20100727.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

Present:

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

Staff:

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

Absent apologies:

Avri Doria - NCSG  
Karim Attoumani – GAC  
Michael Young – RySG  
Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the PEDNR call. On the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tatiana Khramtsova, Michele Neylon, Siva Muthusamy, Paul Diaz, James Bladel, Jeffrey Eckhart, Ted Suzuki, Berry Cobb, Ron Wickersham and Alan Greenberg and for staff we have Marika Konings, Marge Milam, Glen de Saint Gery and Gisella Gruber-White. Over to you, Alan. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much Glen. I welcome you all and for those of you who have come back from vacation I hope you're refreshed. And those who are about to go on vacation try to bear with us.

The first item on our agenda is to look at the public comment period. Typical of a number of the other comment periods that are open we have effectively gotten no responses. We have had a number of surveys filled out. Marika, do you know how many the current number is?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. We actually had 151 visits but we only have had 12 completed surveys so far.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So not very impressive but infinitely better than the zero comments we have had. We have had one comment, which said I'm not making any comments but I don't consider that one substantive. Now we're in good company.

The PDP working team, which is working on something of I think ultimately far greater importance than what we are doing has similarly gotten zero responses to date and there are a number of other ones that are not very different from that. In my mind we have no choice but to extend it for a few weeks and all of us beat our respective constituencies and stakeholder groups' bushes or beat the bushes. Yes, that is the expression.

And try to get some at least contributions for the survey if not substantive comments on the comment form itself. James.

James Bladel: Hi Alan. James speaking and this is just something I raised on an earlier call. And just to note that in a lot of these comment periods a lot of folks will mark the due date on their calendar and will submit comments at the very last minute if they are going to submit any at all.

So I'm not entirely convinced that extended comment periods necessarily translates into more comments because I think that everyone is kind of looking at that deadline and then shooting for that. Just my experience.

Alan Greenberg: I'd put more strength in that if we didn't have things like the PDP one, which has already been extended and still has no comments on it. I understand the new deadline may be the deadline people are working towards but given that we only did a 20-day period and it is holiday period for a significant part of the community that we're serving, I think we - I believe we should. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just echoing what James says, I can't see how anything is going to change by extending the comment period. Generally speaking the stakeholder groups and other parties who do submit comments will do so at the eleventh hour. So you're likely to see comments coming in within the closing 24 to 72 hours of the comment period.

The other thing as well is according to the bylaws there is no provision laid out for an extension of comment periods.

Alan Greenberg: Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Sorry. I meant to lower my hand. I don't have anything to say.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. The bylaws indeed do not say anything about an extension but it has become common practice to extend comment periods and the IRTPB was the most recent one that was. So I don't think anyone is going to criticize us for doing that. Any other comments pro or against? Paul.

Paul Diaz: Alan, you say that we haven't had any comments at all. (Where is ALAC)?  
Are you guys working on something and was it posted?

Alan Greenberg: ALAC approved a comment today and there will be one there, yes.

Marika Konings: We don't need the extension.

Paul Diaz: Okay then. Fair enough. If you do it as a group proposal where else are we  
expecting or hoping to get comments from because...?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry. Say again, you're inaudible.

Paul Diaz: ALAC is doing a group comment.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Paul Diaz: If it's the official position of ALAC then that captures a lot of folks that  
probably are tracking this and interested in this. I'm just wondering why are  
we extending? Who else are we hoping to beat the bushes and get to come  
out?

Alan Greenberg: I guess from my point of view if nothing else we are hoping to get more  
surveys completed than the 12 we have so far of which I'm suspecting a few  
of those will prove to be less than valid but I may be wrong in that. Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah. I will be a lone voice then in encouraging a longer time. I find that the  
20-day period barely gives prospective contributors time to study an issue  
that they are not familiar with and come up with it.

I wish that there were additional comments early especially from those that  
represent groups because often comments provoke additional comments on  
those strings where they are heavily contributed to. But we have the situation

we have. So I'm not entirely convinced that we should disregard the one comment that was made. I think it deserves - okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. He has made that comment in a number of different forums and it's not likely to be disregarded but it doesn't provide substantive input for our report.

Ron Wickersham: Agreed. Yeah. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, you're next.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Okay. Now I do - and my comment here is I guess it will be on it's relating to extending this but it has nothing to do with the actual - it does have to do with this group but this is going to be a consistent comment I will have for every single working group about extending comment periods.

Unless there is some sort of really crazy circumstance where there is a need like let's say something was broken or people couldn't accept comments because what I'm worried about is that people let's call it in any working group, whatever it is not related to this. I don't want anyone to think there is any sort of accusations, especially since we don't have any comments.

But say there are comments that were in there, there were just a couple and they were pro one side and then the other side said you know what, I need more time to get through, have people send in comments. As we have seen, some companies said hey send in these comments and fill in the blanks and which was funny.

You saw some of the companies didn't even fill in the blanks. They just left it out saying I support XYZ's comments and it says I the undersigned and they left in the undersigned. So what I'm worried about is if this becomes a habit of people asking to extend comment periods that people will do it to sort of gain momentum or sort of rally their troops or Astroturf or whatever term you want to use.

And I think it's a very dangerous precedent to set of extending it because hey, we want more comments or hey, we want this because the next person will say I need it for this, I need it for that. And I think that the comment periods are for a set amount of time. We should keep those in absence of real extenuating circumstances. I am against extending it for this working group or for any future working group.

Alan Greenberg: Paul.

Paul Diaz: Alan or James or anybody who is on the PDP working group, do you all recall how we handled the comment period in the draft recommendations or Marika, perhaps you'll recall?

James Bladel: What do you mean by how we handled it?

Paul Diaz: In other words, did we recommend extending instead of 20 days a longer timeframe? I can't remember what the group proposed.

James Bladel: That's not a PDP so the 20-day number doesn't apply. But Marika, you have a better handle on it than I do.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think we started by 45 days but I think Jeff might have indicated that he wanted to give more time in Brussels. So that's why it was extended. And indeed I must say I find it quite concerning as well that we still haven't received any comments whatsoever there, not even from George.

So hopefully people are waiting for the deadline to prepare, but as Alan said, I think it's quite an important issue and I hope that some people are just working on it and getting it submitted. But that one was indeed extended beyond the initial time.

Alan Greenberg: You will get one from at large today.

Marika Konings: Good.

Alan Greenberg: If that counts for anything.

Paul Diaz: I wasn't clear. I meant in terms of recommendation for PDPs in the future when comment periods come up. What was the recommendation of our group because everybody complains about 20 days?

Alan Greenberg: I did read that recently. The recommendation is a minimum of 30 days.

Paul Diaz: So we only added ten. I couldn't recall. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: No but explicitly it said that's not the definitive time. It's a minimum of 30 days.

Paul Diaz: Minimum. Okay. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Can I ask what the downside is of extending it say to 30 days other than violating some prior principle that some people seem to have? Is there a downside to extending it because if there is no downside I'm not sure why we're getting quite so.

Jeffrey Echkart: It's Jeff. I think the downside is it sets a dangerous precedent is what I believe.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Have you looked at the number of public comments that are out there at the moment?

Jeffrey Echkart: Yeah. It could be because we can't assume it's because people don't have the time. We could also assume that there is a lack of interest, that people

don't want to comment on it. I don't know. I can't read why people aren't - I don't know why people aren't commenting.

I know myself I always wait until the last day until usually due to procrastination and other things it's usually late in the west coast when I post my comments. But I can't sort of say this is the reason why but what I'm saying is I just think it sets a very dangerous precedent. I think people will ask to extend other comments if they don't like the way their comments are going. And I think we have set periods of time for a specific reason and that's my reasoning.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: And yet you're saying that 20 days is a little short and in fact in the future a minimum of 30 is what is recommended?

Jeffrey Echkart: In the future if we recommend 30, if we recommend 45 and that's it, I'm okay with that.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: It was too the matter of what is the downside if it's extended by ten days? The precedent will be to terribly set it to be what it will be in the future?

Jeffrey Echkart: No. The precedent will be that people will ask for - will start to start asking for comment periods to be extended even if it's 45 days. Somebody might say I need another ten days. I have no problem with the length being 30 days if that is uniform or 45 days or if it's 60.

If that's uniform for every PDP, for every working group and that is a standard. What I have a problem with is ad hoc extensions is the issue I have.

Alan Greenberg: I think to interject, I think you'll find if you look at the history over the last N months or N years extension is the norm, not extension. Michele.

James Bladel: Alan?



Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Who is that?

James Bladel: It's James. I was going.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I thought your hand was up from last time. Go ahead.

James Bladel: No. I just wanted to point out that there would be one possible downside Cheryl, which would be that if the reason we're not able to get comments is because we have too many concurrent comment periods open at the same time, every one that I'm participating in is asking for an extension.

So I don't know that that has necessarily solved the problem of we're simultaneously moving the deadline for all of them. They're (still asking for it).

Cheryl Landon-Orr: If I may just respond to that, it may for example depend on when the normal group meeting cycle is from a group input. And I'm thinking here that most of your constituencies within the GNSO probably have a particular periodicity.

For example, this is the first time we have met since this public comment period has opened to formalize the ALAC response. So there was no chance prior to the 27 today. Now I don't know how and some of you more mathematically minded individuals might be able to work out what the difference is likely to be on a cyclical meeting of between 20 and 30 days. But I can say absolutely why today is when we voted on our group statement because it's the time of the month when ALAC meets. And I don't know if that may affect (another 20 rounds).

Jeffrey Echkart: Again I'm not speaking for this particular working group. Just in the general case I think the other danger is that what will happen is that extensions will cause working group comment periods to bunch up around ICANN meetings. And then we get into the situation we had in Brussels where you're just

inundated with documents and reports coming from all directions the week before you're supposed to get on an airplane. And it just makes it very hard to (focus).

Alan Greenberg: Or the week after, which is when ours opened.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm not going to really add much to this apart from saying I agree with Jeff. I mean I don't have an issue with a comment period being extended but if all comment periods are being extended then surely just setting the comment period to be X number of days longer than is the norm at present would make a hell of a lot more sense to me because otherwise what's the point of having deadlines?

Alan Greenberg: Well, if you remember I did suggest that and Marika's suggestion was the bylaws say 20 days so let's say 20 days and then extend if appropriate because the original intent was remember - this is peak vacation period for an awful lot of people at this point.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. Well, anyway.

Alan Greenberg: Can anyone give us the rationale why the IRTPB was extended?

Michele Neylon: The rationale behind the IRTPB being extended was and as Cheryl asked, I'd be more than happy to answer that, it was put to a vote amongst the members of the working group and there was a vote that was quite vocal in various different places.

And as we were not meeting for the next two weeks eventually we said there was enough interest in extending it so let's extend it. But the discussion here I

still think is quite valid. I mean okay maybe after this PDP or whatever it is on PDPs maybe that's having longer comment periods would make more sense. But a lot of valid points from other people have been raised and shouldn't really be ignored.

If we are going to set comment periods for X number of days then extend it, then they all end up being bunched up again. And unfortunately the reality is the only people who tend to comment are going to get their comments in anyway. Trying to extend it further probably won't involve or attract any further comments. But Cheryl does raise a very valid point about the meeting cycles.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And in our case we're also looking at surveys. And clearly since we have gotten no comments, the survey answers are not directly related to surveys. Marika, let me just a point of simple process - you're going on vacation. When are you back?

Marika Konings: I'm back on the 11.

Alan Greenberg: So essentially even if we close on the 1 you're not going to be doing any work with the data until you get back?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. My recommendation is still to extend. I would say 15 days, that puts it or 12 days, pick whatever number is right to put it roughly when Marika gets back. Give her a day or two to catch up on other things. We have the benefit of the possibility of more inputs and I don't - I mean I we can certainly meet at this point without Marika.

I mean Margie is fully capable of handling this. I don't really see a purpose to meet until we have the results analyzed or really summarized and I think Marika is in a stronger position because she has been involved in these

surveys since the beginning to actually do that. So I think I would add that as a purely process based rationale why an extension can't hurt, asking Cheryl's question.

And it may well help. If we get nothing more out of it then we're back where we started. I personally have gone on record as saying I think the ICANN comment period, comment process is broken. It just is not functioning to result in substantive comments coming back on very important issues. But we are stuck with it for the moment as the only vehicle we have.

Is that acceptable to do that extension? And cancel any meetings until I guess the 17 of August when Marika is back and we have the possibility of looking at whatever the input is from the surveys and any comments if there were any? We have one checkmark from Ron.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Alan, it's Jeff. I guess Michele had said that in that group they took it to a vote then I think it's only fair. I mean I know that's sort of an off hand process but that we take it to a vote of the group. Does that make sense to see what the opinion is?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think it makes sense given that we didn't announce this ahead of time.

Jeffrey Eckhart: I didn't mean right now on the call. I meant over the next two days or something to do something formal to do a vote. I didn't mean right now that we vote and everyone raises their hand.

Alan Greenberg: Without going into the poll issue that we have had on vertical integration working groups are not sufficiently balanced to have the numbers really indicate a lot.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: So I would strongly object to that.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Alan, that's a presupposition that certain people are going to vote a certain way, which I don't think is fair to say that.

Alan Greenberg: No. That wasn't a supposition at all. It's a statement that I don't think number based voting should be part of the work group process. Any further?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: So how are we going to move forward from this point because simply asking this group right now is a form of polling if not voting?

Alan Greenberg: I guess my answer is the answer to your question of I don't see any downside and the concept that the Pedner group should be the one to put the stake in the ground and stop this concept of extending comment periods I think is putting more importance on our group than the rest of the world will perceive. So I just don't see this as the group that has to make the show of not extending periods when to date most periods have been extended recently. Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Yeah. But the only thing is that I don't think it's right that you as chair can make that decision solely. So that's why I said there should be some sort of - this is a working group. So it should be the group that makes that decision. So that's just my point on this. It's about the process here that I actually really care about.

Alan Greenberg: Then there are a whole bunch of people on this call who haven't spoken up at all and maybe we should go round robin and try to get everyone to speak up.

Jeffrey Eckhart: I think Cheryl just put it in. I think either a doodle vote or some sort of thing, should this be extended, yes or no? Just a simple yes/no question, put a date. If you want to have a date put a stake on a ground on a date. They should send the comments by this date. Send it out maybe today and just have it by Friday or something like that, a due date or Thursday. That's my recommendation for it to be fair.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Sold.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I do want to point out that as the comment period is supposed to close on the first of August that leaves very little time to actually announce that extension because if we close the vote on Friday for example it means that for most people it's already the start of the weekend when those changes actually get made.

Jeffrey Echkart: I didn't realize the dates when you said that. So whatever it is that would make it right for you Marika. I didn't even realize we were at the 27.

Alan Greenberg: What are you suggesting that's workable Marika?

Marika Konings: Well, my preference would be that we have a vote open for tomorrow and see the results on Thursday. I do want to point out and I think Alan you pointed out as well that working groups really shouldn't be about voting. It should be about consensus.

And we did do a poll in IRTP working group, which resulted in others outside of the working group putting in their votes. And we had actually people submitting comments to the public forum asking for an extension inspired by the discussion. So I'm just wondering if it's not possible to find a consensus here on maybe not extending it by two weeks but shorter?

I don't know. I'm just suggesting trying to find a way forward. And I do want to note even if the public comment period closes on the first, it won't be until the 11 or the 12 until the group will have a summary, which of course doesn't prevent you to actually look at the comments that have been submitted.

Alan Greenberg: If there are comments.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: The first is a Sunday, the 31 is a Saturday. It's already the 28 in part of the world. I'm not convinced. I mean we can run a poll, doodle or whatever in the next 24 hours but looking at the dates, I'm certainly less concerned if anybody wasn't going to start their comment until a minute to midnight on the 31, they're already working over the weekend.

So I'm not too sure that or even on the Sunday that they've going to start that. I'm not overly concerned if the poll finishes if we decide to go that way for fairness' sake up until and including the 30 or the 31. It's just a matter of an announcement going out would be extremely difficult over the weekend to ensure that it did happen although it's not unprecedented.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: If someone works hard to get something in by the first and then it gets extended afterwards, I'm not really going to worry about it. In any case, Berry, you have a comment? Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Alan. This is Berry. I mean I hate to sound like the fence rider on this one. I definitely agree with Jeff and others, it is about process and all of that kind of stuff that we have already talked about. I'll just go on record as saying in terms of trying to show some kind of consensus with this or whatever I do welcome the extension.

I'm going to give my personal comments together definitely in by the deadline. However, a comment from the trying to put together a position for the BC as to which I'm trying to lead through, I would welcome more time. If we get it, great. The BC will have a position on that. If we don't get the extension then the comment period will go without an interim report position and we'll just catch it at the final report. So that's kind of where we're at.

Alan Greenberg: I mean I would hope our target is to get valid information and whatever that takes. Siva.

Siva Muthusamy: Yeah. First I feel that the comment period should be extended by about ten days and second I have a question. Is it in order for a member of the working group to make comments?

Alan Greenberg: Nothing prohibits it. To what extent we factor those comments in may be an issue once the comments are processed by the group. But there is no rule against it as far as I know.

Siva Muthusamy: Okay. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Right. My question was essentially the same being new to participating on a working group. Are comments welcome from other than our participation the group? I'm just not familiar with how that goes.

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: I find this one of the more bizarro concepts about an inverted now public comment process. To me and I'm not saying that it shouldn't happen because there are no rules against it and if there are no rules against it, fine.

But it seems kind of odd that when you've got opportunity from minority reports coming in at various points, you've got opportunity for influence and discussion as a member of a work group that the priority is then also to say the same things in what is a reaching out beyond the work group principle of a public comment period.

I certainly don't encourage on the few times that we have had considerable difference of opinion of work groups that I have been involved in including the fast track IDNCCTLD and those things that that's quite the right place to put



your stake in the ground. But that said, I wouldn't not take into consideration any individual's contribution as public comment.

But to get a group piece of policy opinion or opinion on a piece of potential policy together during public comment is hugely important as far as I'm concerned.

Jeffrey Echkart: Right. And if I could add Cheryl, it becomes even more bizarre if the PEDNR working group itself makes a public comment. I hope that's not likely to happen.

Alan Greenberg: We'd have to come to consensus on the comment.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Yeah. That will never happen. You're right. I don't know. I feel like I'm in the Twilight Zone. Maybe it's just me.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Cheryl, I tend to agree with you that the public comment period should not be the prime vehicle for comments from people on the working group. On the other hand I can imagine I might do it on some things and it's certainly not against the rules. Berry, is your hand still up from before or is this a new one?

Berry Cobb: Sorry. I'm away from my computer. Ignore it please.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yeah. Just real quickly I've noticed in previous comment periods that maybe I have missed the deadline and I sent one in perhaps on the subsequent or following day. And it shows up in the forum as of that deadline were in a formally extended 24 hours.

So maybe the path forward for this group would be to maintain the original date and not formally announce an extension but not necessarily close the door if comments come in 24 to 48 hours after that for any folks that need a

little bit more time. I don't know if that's a reasonable path forward or not. It just seems to me like something that certainly has been done before and which gives folks a little bit of extra time without formally announcing the timing.

Alan Greenberg: James, as far as I can understand from watching it, it's a purely manual process. Sometimes someone goes in and closes it at the moment. Other people are less anal and I think it has more to do with the person responsible for it or maybe IT, I don't know than some conscious policy.

I've had comments refused and I have seen the summary posted within an hour after the closing. So I don't think there is any predictability in that. Siva, is your hand up again?

Siva Muthusamy: Yes. I asked the question because the person who spoke before me, he was saying that he might post comments after the weekend or something. So I want to have a general clarification. It's not that I definitely intend to make some individual comments.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I'm not 100% sure but I think the system has slightly changed and I think there is an automatic way that public comment forums are moved into the awaiting summary analysis category, which I think makes it impossible to submit comments.

Although now I think there is a policy request to move it back or forward anytime that it's needed. But I think that's going to change because I think it used to be manually where you would have to request moving it to the closed section. But now we have an intermediate awaiting summary analysis category where closed public comment periods are moved that don't have a summary yet.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I think we decided that we would hold a doodle. I think Cheryl's argument is persuasive that if we do not get the decision made until Friday or early Friday that's enough time to fix the date and the fact that we're changing the date late in the process should not be a problem.

So I would suggest we open a doodle as soon as possible after this meeting for let us say 48 hours or until the end of business on the west coast on Thursday and see what the result is. I'm hearing more of a tone that an extension would be valuable rather than the negative one right now. But I'm really not sure how the group comes out in general. And I would - Marika, you are here this week?

Marika Konings: Yeah. I was just about to ask that. As far as the doodle, would you want the question to be an extension for 15 days, yes or no?

Alan Greenberg: Well, given that the next natural meeting would be on the 17, which means if we extend for 12 days until the 12 you'll have a day or two to work on it after you come back. Is that sufficient or do you want a full week?

Marika Konings: No. 12 is fine.

Alan Greenberg: I'm saying that would just give you a couple of days to do the work in which case I would extend to the 12. If you wanted a bit more time I would say to extend to the 15 and we don't have a meeting until the 24.

Marika Konings: That's fine too.

Alan Greenberg: That gives you a full week and gives you time to recover from your vacation. Okay. So the doodle is a 15-day - it closes on the 15 - a 14-day extension or not and we'll see how it comes out. And I would say if it's roughly evenly split we go for the extension. If it's easily in one direction then we honor that also. Does that sound reasonable? Steve, is that a new hand or an old one? He's not here. Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhart: I wanted to say that I think that's a good plan and I'm behind that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Then we go for that. And I think the fact that we have just decided that assuming we extend this the next meeting will be on the 24. We'll have three weeks off for vacation and if we do not extend it, when do we want the next meeting? We still will not have a summary until the 17. So I would say the 17 if we don't extend or the 24 if we do extend. Does that sound reasonable to all?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Yep.

Alan Greenberg: I will take that as a positive being that there are no negatives. Okay. The next item is I did a bit of analysis on the work group survey and I'd like to present it because the raw numbers I saw there don't quite show the split and there are a number of splits in the working group.

And I tried to do it in a way that is as simple as possible, which was to look at there may be some argument over whether it's a reasonable way to do it or not. But let's take a look. What I did is took all the inputs and I don't know if this all fits on one screen for the rest of you on this. It almost does for me. Marika, are you - thank you.

If you do that it seems to get - I still get cut off in the same way but the type is bigger. Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. You can size it yourself on the top of the page by scrolling the little bar with percentages on top of it.

Alan Greenberg: You're right. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: You'll find 75 or 77 is almost perfect depending on the screen size.

Alan Greenberg: On mine 108 is perfect but I have a big screen. What I have done is I have taken the responses and I have categorized them and you'll see as we go through them that I have tried to summarize them in a few words, which means I have occasionally grouped things together and I'll talk about that when we get to them.

And then sorted them or organized them by the groups we're representing to try to see is there any consensus within groups or are there diverse opinions? And if we look at the first couple of questions it's clear that there is a strong belief among users that there should be a consensus policy. There is a strong belief among registrars that there should not, that it should be best practice.

Michael Young's comment was originally he put a best practice in but in discussions with him he says that he doesn't know why he did that, that isn't what he meant. And we've asked him if there are any other changes to let us know but that is in line with what we have done in previous surveys when people change their views along the way.

So there is a clear view of consensus policy or not. The time to recovery you'll see is all over the wall. There are a few less than 29 days. The majority of people or at least the largest single number is 30-39 and a few are greater than 40 but clearly highly variable. Any comments or thoughts on this before we go ahead? Okay. Let's go on to the second page.

The second page has to do with notices and again the question is should it be consensus policy? Should it be - I think here I lumped together status quo and best practice because essentially it would not be a consensus policy. Typically the answer is even among those who say consensus policy there should be two of them.

But you'll notice the first question is should the RAA be explicitly saying you should be sending notices? And there is a wide majority of the group both

registrars and users who have agreed that there should be, that the consensus policy should explicitly say messages. Jeff.

Jeffrey Echkart: Sorry. No you were explaining. What I was going to ask is what you were just explaining. You're already ahead of me. Go ahead. That's what I was going to ask you.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry. I tried to abbreviate the titles so they showed up and occasionally I forget what they mean myself. But this was should there be an explicit comment as opposed to the backwards one right now or what happens after the second message.

The next question was on should there be explicit timing specified and I think if I remember correctly the timing that was suggested in the survey was one month plus or minus and one week plus or minus. We did ask a question of if you think these times aren't right, what times do you think are right? And I believe no one answered that in that direction.

So again we have a strong consensus on the user side that there should be some timing specified and a number of registrars also agree. And the last one on this page is the question of should the policy make any statements at all about how messages are sent? And the terminology I'm using - we asked a number of questions and that includes should the policy say explicitly what methods are to be used by registrars?

Should the policy require that a registrar state what methods they use? And I took any of the answers, which said they should either tell us what they are using or perhaps be bound to something specific. And I called that state plus. So anything that says there should be more specificity so the registrant knows what to expect is state plus.

And the others are either status quo or best practice so again a strong feeling among users and a much less general feeling among registrars that there should not be any statement. James.

James Bladel: Yeah. I just wanted to point out that you combined those two together but I personally may have answered them differently had they been separate.

Alan Greenberg: But in terms of the effect on policy there is no difference. In other words, status quo says the RAA is (filed) on a best practice because the RAA is silent but some other document may suggest something. So again from the point of view of this chart I was not trying to make a long-term statement but to just say what direction are we going in.

They have a similar net effect in terms of policy. You don't want to see the first version of the chart I had where I was attempting to capture all of these specific answers. There was another question on should there be other warnings, should there be other ways of informing registrants? There was a general feeling among users.

James Bladel: Sorry Alan. Jeff was right behind me in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'm sorry. I missed that Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhart: Okay. No this is just in general, yeah I think combining them actually can be a good idea and I think this is just helpful as long as Alan you explain the different headers and what they mean. The only thing is this survey, is this just for this internal group or is this going to be put out some where?

Just because I think that some of the pieces in here, it does show the votes but it doesn't show/explain the reasoning behind it. Like from my - I'll just give you my example. One of the things like some things people said should it be 30 days or should it be three messages or four messages. And I think like my

point and I think I had written this was that there is really no evidence that says that three is better or 30 days is.

Nobody has done a study and it could have the opposite effect by sending more messages. We could have more unexpected because people think of them as spam. So that sort of like - I don't want there is sort of more nuance to the answers than just the strict responses so that's why I just want to know. This chart is very helpful for this group and on this call and I think it does explain it. I just want to know is it going to be used beyond it because there is more to the answers than just the straight yes or status quo sort of answer. So that was my question on that.

Alan Greenberg: I certainly had no plans of distributing it widely. Typically we do post these things on our wiki and so it could be accessible. But I certainly wasn't planning to put it into the report in this form or something like that.

Jeffrey Echkart: I'm fine with that. Okay. No. I just didn't want if you did it could be an appendix or with the full information but the summary for this group is fine. As you know from my comments in other groups, I want all polls and all work done by a group to be published and put out and I'm going to stay consistent with that. But I just want it to be the full piece that's out there if we do put it out there in the report.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. And certainly if we were to put this in a report it would need a little bit more explanatory things because some of the comments I'm just making to you on the fly and I'll be candid, I did this over the last two or three days and the intent was to have something that we could discuss to try to start getting a handle on what are the beliefs of this group.

Jeffrey Echkart: Thanks. I think it's a good job and I think it's helpful.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And I notice as I went to the next page that it answered James' previous question. I seem to be quite inconsistent about when I summarized



the status quo/best practice and when I didn't. So if we ever do anything with this more formally it should be consistent if nothing else.

All right. We're now on Page 3 on the first column is other warnings. Now although there was a strong consensus among the user groups, the users that there should be consensus policy on other warnings, if you look at the actual answers they were split among different things. So if this is to have any real meaning and we're to act on it I think it would take some more analysis and perhaps I hesitate to say another survey.

But more understanding of what we're trying to achieve because the raw answers did not give us a very strong direction in which to go. The next one on Whols, this is the one to change it to make explicit whether the domain has been renewed at the registrar/registrant level. And I don't think we're ever going to get more consensus than this.

I think we should just stare at it for a moment and hope that we could ever do as well. On the next one where we have far less consensus we have the issue of should there be messages post expiration. And if I remember correctly the actual wording of the question is at or after expiration. And there is again strong feeling among users that it should be a requirement.

The number varies and strong feeling among registrars that it should not. I will add that if I remember correctly there were also some caveats in this one about exceptions and messages were only required after certain conditions. No hands. Let's go on to the next one, Page 4 and this is the one on what happens to the various uses of the domain name post expiration.

And I'm using again this title for this group, I'm using the term kill. Kill will have different meanings depending on the exact implementation for the Web. It might mean we go to a parked page for other things it might mean tie notes or something like that because there is no listener on those appropriate ports. But again, we see on the Web quite a solid belief Web and email that the

services should be stopped and I'm not quite sure why there is a slightly different answer on other and perhaps I'll take that up with Glen and try to understand that and a strong belief among registrars that we not take any action to force things to be done.

On the next sections on transfer, now transfer was the vague one, which we have still never gotten a formal answer out of compliance. And whether we will now or not with the staff changes I don't have a clue. I will be trying to pursue that one and that was the question of does compliance treat post-expiration the same as pre-expiration to address situations where a registrant is trying to transfer and cannot get the registrar of record to release the domain or to provide the off cord or whatever.

The next item is again, I merged a number of things together, should there be some requirement that there be clarity in the registration agreements or the Web? So should a registrant be reasonably able to understand what is going to happen to their domain after expiration? And again we have the same split as we have seen before.

And on the last column on this one we have should there be a clear indication of the fees? You'll remember that ADDP put a requirement that the RGP fee be documented. But there was no such requirement on the renewal fee post-expiration and this one asks should we fill that gap. A strong feeling among users and a few registrars who feel it's reasonable to tell people ahead of time what the cost will be.

And RGP, which is the last page, the first one is should there be a consensus policy for registries? Unanimity among the users and a few registrars and the one registry to answer. Very similar answers among should there be a consensus policy requiring it for registrars. And the RGP transfer one was the question of should RGP transfer be allowed? The symbolism here is if it says CP, which is the green one, there should be a consensus policy saying it's allowed.

Consensus policy if were a number of other answers where it said I swear if I can summarize - there should be a consensus policy if there is no other reasonable way of the registrant recovering the name or there should be a consensus policy that transfer is allowed if the registrar does not offer it. The ifs pretty well disappear if the RGP is made a consensus policy for all.

And that last column effectively would disappear if we come to closure that there be a consensus policy on RGP. So although the last column looks like a jumble, it may well disappear if we can come to closure on the first two. And that's where we stand. These charts tell us what we all knew ahead of time that there was a split between registrars and users.

But I think it makes it a little bit clearer. It would have been nice if we had had more responses but we have what we have. And I have not much more to say on this. I hope once we get the results in from any comments if there are any and the survey that the commenters have also completed we'll be in a better position of deciding how to go forward.

My voice is now pretty well gone. Anyone else have any other comments? Is there anything else we need to do at this point prior to adjourning and waiting to see what the results of the doodle are? Marika, when you send out the note on the doodle, will you put enough background in it for people who weren't on this call to know what it is they're doodling on?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes I will. I'll take care (of it in other words).

Alan Greenberg: (If it starts becoming an obscene comment) then I think we'll stop going in that direction. Any other comments before I wish you all a good vacation and see you somewhere between one, two, three or four weeks? Ron.

Ron Wickersham: Yes. You mentioned this might be displayed on the work you did, which I've got to thank you for because there is a whole lot that just glancing at it makes

a lot more sense than my muddled mind had before you kind of organized it this way.

But will this be on the wiki or something? Because sometimes thinking about it later and these things disappear from the Adobe thing off your screen as soon as (you sign off).

Alan Greenberg: I will make sure it's on the wiki and I'll also put the spreadsheet in case you want to play with it yourself (and make some changes).

Ron Wickersham: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Alan, before you (do that) I did already circulate the PDF to the meeting list as some people were asking in the Adobe Connect to have that access.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: But I can also post it on the wiki and if you allow the Excel sheets that can be added too.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I think I actually have edit rights on that wiki but if not I'll send it to you.

Marika Konings: Yeah. You should actually. So I'm happy to post it but you can go ahead and post it as well.

Alan Greenberg: Between us we'll figure out how to do that. Anything else before I wish Marika a marvelous vacation? I hope you won't be checking your email.

Marika Konings: I'll try not to.

Alan Greenberg: I hope you have personal email so you can actually turn off the ICANN one for two weeks.

Marika Konings: Sounds like a good plan.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Marika, have a marvelous vacation. Anyone else who is vacationing enjoy yourself and we'll see you in a couple of weeks hopefully all invigorated and able to close up this PDP on hopefully short order because I'm getting tired. I don't know about the rest of you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Today is not the day to ask me that though Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Well as far as I can tell you have been up for 97 straight hours or close to it.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks everybody. Bye.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, if you have any say in this, you might suggest that they move Australia to a different time zone. I wouldn't want to...

Cheryl Landon-Orr: (Unintelligible) - what happens when I've got to change the time zone?

Alan Greenberg: I wouldn't want to ask you to leave Australia but just moving it might be a lot easier. Take care all. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

END