

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
21 September 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 21 September 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-20100921.mp3>

On page:

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

Present:

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

Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

James Bladel – RrSG
Karim Attoumani – GAC
Margie Milam

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: My apologies, everyone, my voice again. Just a good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's PEDNR call on Tuesday, the 21st of September. We have Alan Greenberg, Michele Neylon, Shiva

Muthusamy, Jeff Eckhaus, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Paul Diaz, Berry Cobb, Ron Wickersham, Oliver Hope.

From staff, we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from James Bladel and Margie Milam. Sorry. Margie is not on the call, my apologies. And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you.

Over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I think we have to mark this date on our calendar. Does everyone realize what the event is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's the Solstice.

Alan Greenberg: Well it is that. But Gisella made a very minor mistake. It's never been known to happen before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think I'll remember the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: And that is only said with all due awe. Thank you, Gisella.

All right, the first event which isn't on our agenda but I was reminded on an earlier call today is we are supposed to request and - if there were any updates on statements of interest. And not seeing any hands, I'll assume there are none and disclosures of interest.

Now, I'm going to make an assumption that anyone on the call who is a registrar has an interest which is implicitly declared. So other than that, is there anything else that needs to be declared as such?

Not seeing anything, we'll go on with the real work.

The first item to - that we're going to look at is the analysis that Berry has done on the survey data. And giving everyone a moment or so to make sure you have the spreadsheet up on your computer. It's far too complex and compact to try to do on Adobe.

And I will turn the floor over to Berry to try to explain to us what he's done and to give us a little bit of a - education on how we can use this to try to figure out how to go forward.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, Alan.

This is Berry. So, you know, for everybody that has the spreadsheet open, I haven't really prepared anything formally. I was just going to walk through kind of the thought process behind what we tried to do here with analyzing the survey results and the comments that are assigned to each one of those survey questions.

There are several tabs along the bottom row. And I guess I should ask this, does anybody have an issue with opening up the spreadsheet or any technical issues before I get started?

Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Not hearing any sounds or seeing any hands, you can go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Okay, cool. So there is a series of tabs along the bottom section of the spreadsheet.

Man: Hello?

Berry Cobb: The first being, the title. Then it has a key. And then for those that are on the Windows platform, you'll see color coordinations of the tabs. For those on Mac, you'll just have to refer back to the key and/or the specific tab that we're working on.

So basically, on Tab Number 2 is the key. And that's basically just a list of all of the survey questions divided up by kind of the relative section or the topic for that section. So for example, Questions 4 through 9 dealt with registrar after expiration, and the color coordinated of red, and then the corresponding tabs. There's two of them -- RAE that has the description after the RAE which stands for Renewal After Expiration. And then you'll see the question numbers that correspond to that particular tab or the questions that were used. And I should probably step back here in a second or step up, I should say.

The intent of this analysis is basically to use pivot tables within Excel. And it allows you to compare columns of data and/or rows of data and analyze - and compare them together. Jeff Eckhaus is familiar pivot tables and stuff, so I don't need to preach into the choir to him.

But the idea here is to be able to sort through large amounts of data and try to derive meaningful analysis from that data so that we can hopefully try to find the areas where there is much more agreement on a particular question and/or analyze it in a way that we can make some of this actionable towards our exercise here and the PEDNR group.

So with that said, I guess let's just kind of go ahead and start with the third tab which is RAE Q4, Q5, Q8 and Q9. And this is hopefully kind of running through. This first tab will give you an idea of what we try to accomplish here.

So we're starting up at the top left and the first eight rows or so by the first three or six columns is the actual pivot table. And I don't want to go into a true pivot table lesson here, but the idea is basically if you look at Cell A3, what that is a tabulation or account of one of the columns in our raw data which is the far right tab listed as Raw Data. And there also is a tab about remove data, and we'll get into that a little bit later.

But the idea is you're creating a simple query that says count - give me a count of all the records that I have in the Raw Data. And so what you'll see consistently across all of these tabs is a count of session ID which was a unique number for every survey respondent. And we're just wanting to get a count so that we can begin to tabulate these in various ways.

And so if you were to look in Cell F -- Foxtrot -- 8, Row 8, it totals to 412. And that corresponds to, if you were to go to the Raw Data tab, there are - anyway, that there are a total of 412 - oh, my apologies.

So before I go any further, I'm going to go ahead and quickly talk about the data. And we need to go to the far right of the tabs. There's Raw Data tab and a Remove Data tab.

When - there was discussion on the list as to, you know, should we filter out some of the more obvious responses that were very generic or didn't match up to somebody that we specifically knew. And Mikey went through an exercise of kind of denoting - if you looked at the Remove Data tab, there are 51 entries that were suspect as to whether, you know, they were bad data and/or - I don't know how we want to classify these, but they were suspect or questionable as to whether these are valid entries or not.

So what I did was removed those that were tagged and separated them from the raw data. So when I mentioned that there was a total of 412 total responses, that is the entire population. And these two tabs, the RAE tabs,

the red ones, I have not gone back and reconfigured these pivot tables on the separation of data. I'm hoping that that makes sense.

And the reason why I haven't gone back to these is because we as a working group need to make an upfront decision as to how we want to handle this data. Do we use them all, do we filter out the bad ones and use the remainder, et cetera.

So when I first started building the pivot tables, I was using all of the data. Then to hit on the list that we should maybe pull these out, so I went ahead and went down that road and started to build all of the remainder pivot tables. And so you'll start to see totals that vary which is 361 versus the 412 for the total population.

And I'm not watching for any hands, but let me - if anybody has any questions, please type up at any time.

Okay.

Jeff Eckhaus: Hey, Berry. It's Jeff here. I just had one quick question. Can you repeat the last thing you just said about - because I've been just sorting through the formulas and looking through the pivot, you know, tables and how it's been compiled like on the field list and the other stuff and I just - I missed the last thing you said and I was trying to find that list. The 412 was with everybody included, not filtering anybody, is that what you had said?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So let me repeat it, hopefully more clearer this time.

Jeff Eckhaus: If you can please.

Berry Cobb: So the first two tabs, the RAE tabs...

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...when I started building these, I was using the entire population of 412 entries.

Jeff Eckhaus: Got it.

Berry Cobb: And then we met as a sub-team to kind of review through some of this to see if that was even going down the right path. And at the same time or in parallel, there was the effort that Mikey and others were talking about filtering some of the bad responses out.

Once - I went ahead and moved forward and filtered out those bad responses. And then I continued building all of the other pivot tables. What I haven't done yet is gone back to the first two that I created and refreshed them with the new data.

And the reason why I haven't done this and as you will probably know, Jeff is once you change your raw data, then it's a fair amount of effort to go refresh a pivot table and format it in a way that's reading because the way we have our questions worded, it's the entire text stream, so it will - Excel will automatically expand out all the columns and it really freaks out.

So before I go back and try to clean this up with the exact numbers on these older pivot tables, like I had mentioned, we as a group need to make a decision on how we want to handle this, the data. Once we make that decision, then I'll go back and clean this up with the exact numbers.

So just to reiterate, the first two tabs or the first two red tabs, RAE, are using the entire population. The remainder of the tabs are using the filtered population.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just to be clear -- it's Alan -- when we looked at the initial cut of the data, it wasn't clear that removing them was going to make a substantial

change in the overall results - in the direction of the results. And it similarly wasn't clear that we're going to use these in some heavy statistical way where the actual numbers matter.

So at that point, we decided that it wasn't worth having Berry go back and redo the work unless we actually have a good strong rationale for him doing that. And that will decide when we finish going over the whole process here today.

Berry Cobb: Well thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Thank you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay. So now to get back on track before I got sidetracked there, so back to first RAE tab, Q4, Q5, Q8 and Q9. Questions 4 and 8 are the two primary questions and then Questions 5 and 9 are allowing the respondent to enter in pretext comments. And so, obviously, it's the name of the game in ICANN that we review it through each of these comments. But when you look at it in the raw state, you know, it's just a bunch of comments that are kind of taken out of context.

So what I tried to create here was first of all create the pivot table of the questions that we want to compare to each other. And then once we created that, then I'll go back to the raw data and filter based on that criteria and then cut the corresponding comments. So that's what you see from Row 12 all the way down. And those are the comments that are with respect to the highlighted numbers that you see here.

So, let me try to put this in layman's terms. What I'm really trying to do is ask a simple query of the data. And it would go something along like this -- of those respondents that answered favorably in Question 4, did those same respondents also answer Question 8 with - stating that yes, that question should be ICANN policy?

So as a result you will see that in Cell -- Charlie -- 7 that out of 337 respondents out of the 412 agreed that registrars should offer a period of renewals after expiration and they also think that it should be ICAAN policy. And then further, of those respondents, of those 337 in rows 12 through 33, of those that decided to list a comment in Question 5 or Question 9, they're listed there and then it breaks out below.

So we can ask - it's kind of asking the same kind of query. There were 41 respondents that did agree that, you know, there should be a period after expiration to recover the domain name. But 41 of them said, well, it should be at the registrar's discretion as a best practice or however they choose to implement that policy. And then those are the corresponding comments from Questions either 5 or 9 listed there in rows 36 through 40.

So, just so that everybody understands up to this point at least, and I can only speak for myself, when you look at the entire spreadsheet or the entire realm of data and how we analyze this, I myself haven't even gone through and read every individual comment to see if they make sense with respect to the 337 respondents. And I think that's what we're all going to have to do as the entire team by evaluating any of these.

So that's the general gist of trying to parse these out and create a compare - a meaningful comparison of a large chunk of data. And then as kind of the same repeat exercise on the second RAE tab, and this one gets a little bit more complex because we're dealing with multiple entries.

But in general, you know, we're trying to query the data that, okay, of the respondents that answered Question 4, should registrars offer renewal period of time following expiration? And those respondents that said yes and they specified for how long, in Column Foxtrot or Cell Foxtrot 9, 80 of those respondents, which was the most, said 30 days should be that time period.

And then I sorted this from a descending order and tried color coordinating to add them up. And what you'll see is kind of a manual total of the entries.

So in general, all of the respondents, 63 of them said it should be 30 days or less; 151 of them said it should be 30 days; 50 of them said it should be on or around 45 days; 54 at 60 days and 56, greater than 90 days. And so it's just kind of trying to assign all of the different responses into buckets so that we could again try to derive meaning from that. And then over to the right is the corresponding comment for Question 7 which allowed the respondents to just enter in pretext comment.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Ron, you have your hand up?

Ron Wickersham: Yes. Yes. I'm getting slightly confused because I'm using a different spreadsheet to view it which is - but I don't get those totals. So I wasn't following where the data for the number of days. Do you have...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Wickersham: ...there should be a box that's F...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Did you move to the Q4, Q6, Q7 tab? Because I'm also using Open Office and it's the second tab. There's no colors in our tab if you're using that.

Ron Wickersham: Oh okay. So it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But there is colors in the...

Ron Wickersham: So it's second tab. Got it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...indigo, 5 to 9 lines.

Ron Wickersham: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No problem.

Ron Wickersham: Got it. Yes.

Man: Thanks, Cheryl.

Man: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay. So I don't know if, Alan, if you want to go through every one of these tabs. I think really we ought to just let everybody kind of read through these themselves, digest it and then we can maybe come back together on another session. And I don't know how you want to approach this or do you want me to...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think it's worthwhile going through each of them and, you know, try - summarize what your perception is or our perception is of the overall results.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: In other words, try to put some words around it to say what the consensus is. So in other words, if we go back to the very first one, there's a very large majority -- I don't know exactly what the percentage is -- who say yes...

Berry Cobb: 84.46.

Alan Greenberg: ...yes, I wasn't sure if that was of the 399 or the - no, that's the 337. Okay. So roughly 85% of the people who answered this said yes, it should be required, it should be - redemption should be possible and it should be policy.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: So I think the numbers are important because the question is, do we ask you to go back and redo all of this work omitting the 50 or 60 entries? And even if they all fall in that - in the bucket of 337 category, it's still going to be an overwhelming majority. So my perception is unless we are going to use these numbers in some sort of a quantitative exercise, it may not be worth going back and getting them. And certainly not doing it - even if when we want to get the numbers, the numbers are easy to get (around) any data; it's organizing all of the comments and things to look pretty.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So my gut feeling at this point is it's probably not (worth) going and reproducing the spreadsheet, although it may be worth redoing the pivot table. But we can reserve that and - but that's certainly my perception at this point.

Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. I tend to agree with you, Alan, especially since I can see the amount of manual work that Berry would have to do because of the way it's structured. I don't think that it would be worth his time and effort. And the output we would receive would be miniscule compared to the amount of effort that would require to make the changes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I mean, certainly, we could redo the pivot tables if we want to publish those in a, you know, in an appendix or something like that. But...

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. I would just add one caveat to that is this is - it's easy here because that 337 number is so big or - whereas - or I shouldn't say big, but it's an easy takeaway message...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...that's, you know, there's agreement there. On some of the other questions down the road in the survey where there's not so much - where it's a lot closer call, then perhaps, maybe we might need to look at evaluating what those other 51 entries that we filtered out. So just kind of keep that in mind. This is barely...

Alan Greenberg: I agree. And I was passing judgment on this particular question. But yes.

Berry Cobb: Right, cool.

Okay. So RAE tabs, Q4, Q5, Q8, Q9, the takeaway is pretty obvious. The second RAE tab which is the number of days for that period, for the most part, I think it falls around 30 days. Certainly we could adjust that as a group when we go to talk about this in deeper detail.

Alan Greenberg: Ron - not Ron. Berry, a question; this one adds up to 381. Does that mean there were 20 or 30 or so who didn't answer that question?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Yes, there's a number of blanks. Where did it go?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Charlie and Beta have blanks...

Man: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Got it.

Berry Cobb: F18.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Yes. And again, this is one that's using the entire population as opposed to the filtered one.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Berry Cobb: And certainly this is the one that would take a lot of time. All of the color coordinations are manual. But I think it's pretty clear that on or around 30 days is where most of the people - most of the respondents have data that that should be the duration.

Alan Greenberg: Right. With the - I have a roughly similar number, less than 30 days and rough - and greater than 30 but within the 45 which is currently the redemption - the auto-renew grace period.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: From a decision node -- sorry, Cheryl here -- I wasn't in the room. Well I am. I'm just busy getting excited over the spreadsheet, Berry. It takes a lot to get me excited at this hour of the day and you've managed to do it. Congratulations.

I mean if you - I'm mentally putting this into a distribution curve. And your decision markers are clearly skewed in one direction. You got a strong right-hand tail, you know, 63 to a 104. Maybe when you (cut) 51 doubtfuls out it might, you know, bring you back to normal distribution. But it's not going to make a difference to your probability of putting yourself in the 30-day slot. So this is fantastic. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: No. And remember that the ones greater than 45 -- and there's a total of, what is that, 110 or so of them -- are longer than the 45 days allowed in EDDP.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (I figured, yes).

Alan Greenberg: So we would be extending that period which potentially affects where registrar's business models significantly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But even without going to the nuances of why, just on raw - just on stats, you know, and I know you're doing...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No, no, I'm...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...violently agreeing with you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Berry, let's go onto the first blue one for those who have colors.

Berry Cobb: Okay, cool. So that's Tab Number 5 titled EN Q10, Q11 and Q12.

Let me scroll back up to the top here.

Okay. So this one is - and you'll have to forgive me for a second. I - it's been a couple of days since I've looked at this.

So basically what we tried to do was to compare if you did answer yes to the previous question of Question 10, which if you look at the key is, should the

policy specify the minimum number of notices that are required prior to expiration?

And looking at those response - I was only pulling in the yes questions of Question 10. That's why you don't see them actually as a part of the pivot table because we're only trying to derive meaning from the Question 11. But it does key off of Question 10 of those that did answer yes.

And again this is kind of the same story. What I tried to do was I sorted them in descending order and 103 of the total population had picked three, what is the most appropriate number of reminder questions; 70 responses left it blank, 251 said two, et cetera. And you don't see the pretty color coordination here because again I wanted to make sure we were kind of heading down the right road before I tried to pretty it up.

But it's pretty obvious takeaway here is it should be either two or three messages. And so, you know, now as a group, we just decide how we handle that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yes. And there's - an awful lot of them say two in various different forms of the word as we go down.

Berry Cobb: Exactly. And so if we do need to, then I can go through and try to put all the other responses into buckets like I did with the previous tab. Okay?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So let's move on to Tab Number 6 which is titled EN...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, let's come to closure on that. I think the answer is yes, we need to. And exactly how you do that, I guess there's various different ways. But I think we do need the tally of 0, 1, 2, 3 and greater than 3 or something like that.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Let me create...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...a note for myself.

Alan Greenberg: Does that - do those numbers sound reasonable to everyone based on what we see here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mm-hm.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Shall I move on?

Alan Greenberg: All right. Yes, please.

Berry Cobb: All right. So the next tab I think is Tab 6 EN Q10, Q13, 14 and 15. This is where it kind of starts to get a little complicated I suppose.

So in general, it is where...

Alan Greenberg: But I'll note that this one is done filtering out the, I won't say the bad entries but the suspect entries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Three-sixty-one.

Berry Cobb: That is correct. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So from this point forward, we're using the filtered data of 361 respondents.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Berry Cobb: So the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And a lot less blanks.

Berry Cobb: So - I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just said and it's seemed at least in this set to be a lot less blanks.

Berry Cobb: Right, yes.

So in general, the query that we're trying to ask here is of the respondents that, you know, should the policy specify a member - a minimum number of notices prior to expiration? They would - you know, it's a simple yes or no. And then comparing that with Question 13 which is, should the policy specify when such notices should be sent - sorry, sent?

And so the kind of the clear takeaway here is of those respondents, 251 of them said yes, we should be - the policy should specify the minimum number of notices and they should specify how they should be sent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: When.

Berry Cobb: So I guess the takeaway here - or I'm sorry, when. Thank you. Yes, when. And then it breaks out from there.

So Column A, which is comments to Question 14, is all of the respondents that said yes and yes to both of those questions. And so there's over 150

comments here that will need to kind of, again, probably assigned into buckets. But I don't even know that the bucket theory will work very well because a lot of these comments are kind of all over the place. So if we feel that we need to spend some time on that, then I can try to do that as well.

And then just like all the previous other tabs around Column C, around C13 is the 34 respondents that said yes to Question 10, but no strong view either way to Question 13, and then it just kind of trickles down from there.

And so the reason why the comments are in this column format is I was running out of room to try to make this somewhat readable. And that - so it probably looks confusing, but again I tried to segment these out based on the highlighted responses that we got from the pivot table.

Any questions with regard this tab?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, it's Jeff here. Just a quick point; I think this tab in this information here really shows that what - something that I've been saying for a while, is that the answer to this question it seems to me from a lot of the people is just absolute guesswork, you know? And people are all over the map because I don't think - and this is something that I've said from the beginning that is very concerning to me, is that people might have an attitude of hey, more is better or let's mandate this number at this specified time frame where we have no evidence or no background, no precedent, that this is the best method to do it and is the most effective.

And just, you know, if there was one specific time frame that everyone - you know, that was accepted that said hey, if we send it six weeks, three weeks, whatever, you know, I'm just throwing those numbers out there, that is standard as the best method then - I'm not saying everyone would be writing it, but this sort of shows all over the map that this is all absolute guesswork. And I just caution everyone on when we go forward with this on the law of

unintended consequences that a lot of people are just making guesses and we have no idea what the repercussions might be.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks, Jeff.

I guess my comment in response to that is that's correct. But the original numbers we're using right now and the policies we're going to have now are equally or even more guess of guesswork. And the lack of provision should not freeze us in fear of making a change if indeed there seems to be some reasonable - valid reason for doing it.

On the other hand, we need to be flexible to make sure that we're not breaking things that are working.

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl here.

Jeff, just - I think, you know, at another call, we - when we do a little bit more drill-down onto those bits, particularly in the comments, we'll revisit this again.

I certainly agree with you, the law of unintended consequences and it should be looked at extremely carefully. And that's the whole art of this sort of thing, trying to create policy out of -- I mean if I can use an analogy, a whole bunch of people might feel at one point in time when we were moving from a horse pulls to horseless carriages, that having some sort of stopping mechanism would be a really, really good idea. But very few of them were confident to design it and make it then become standard that we call breaks on cars today.

There's a huge amount of stuff that happens between a perception of a need or an inkling of a desire. And in this case, what we're seeing is don't just tell

us once, tell us twice, if not three times and space it out in some way and making that into policy.

So yes, that's - it's certainly something that needs to be looked at very, very carefully. But this type of analytical tool, particularly why Berry has managed to get the comments that I think is extraordinarily readable, I find trawling through comments and trying to remember what, you know, Person Number 7 said versus Number 77 said on line. I've got a pretty good damn memory. This is - it's a huge assistance to making those sorts of discussions and decisions effective and probably less wrist slittingly scary.

Jeff Eckhaus: If I can just respond, I have no problem understanding - I'm with you. I understand all the analysis of what people have written. What I'm saying is there is nothing even close to a consensus saying this is what is the best method to do it and why should they be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Jeff Eckhaus: I mean I'm reading one month before two weeks, one week, 30 days, plus 14 days...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which is why I used the metaphor, you know?

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. And - but the thing is, is that, you know, I'll just - to revamp that and say, you know, you said we ask the people and they said this is what they want, you know, and that's what we're going forward on there, (it was used)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Right).

Jeff Eckhaus: ...you know, the Henry Ford example when he said if I ask my customers what they wanted, they would have said a faster horse, you know?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And you know how long that was successful until two other companies gave colors and choices. Anyway, and that's a business decision; not a policy one.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. But what I'm saying is we're not sure on what the policy - what's the most effective policy here. And I think it's something...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not arguing against that. I'm saying this is something that needs to be looked at and this is a good way of helping us do exactly that.

Jeff Eckhaus: Well, sorry. I just want - let me just - what I'm saying is I agree that it should be looked at and we should study it. But by studying a lot of people's responses and their guesses, I don't think that's what I consider studying. And I think we should look to - if we want, we could say hey, this is what has been most effective, and look at that and not look at and say what's been the most common response to the question because we don't necessarily mean that's going to be the most effective method for stopping unintended loss of a domain name.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks, Jeff.

I guess there's no disagreeing with you that we don't have full control of what's going to happen if we make a change. But I would welcome suggestions on how we could move forward and have that kind of information other than some large registrar implementing five different models and then reporting to us the gory details of what's happened in each of the subgroups after the fact. I don't see how we're ever going to be more - get much more instrumented than we have right now.

And so we're in the position of like one is in almost every business decision of making decisions with all of the facts. But I'm not sure we can get a lot...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...better than that unless we actually try to instrument real registrars and try different models.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. But, Alan, just you made a perfect point right there on what you said is when contemplating any business decision. As Cheryl pointed out, you guys are not letting people make this business decision; you're making this a policy decision. And those are two separate animals.

So I just want to be clear on that. Because if it's a business decision, I don't know - I know you guys don't believe this, but I would say if you pulled every registrar, every registrar would want to have their domain names renew from their customers. It is - we spend a lot of time to acquire each customer. It is an expensive proposition and we would love to have every customer renew every domain.

So one of the things is that it's - you have to think that as a business decision, every registrar wants renewal. So that is one thing we're afraid of that a policy decision could come out and trump - take away what you have said is when it's a business decision because...

Alan Greenberg: No, I - just for the record, I was giving an example that one makes business decisions without all the information; one makes political decisions without the information; one makes marriage decisions without all the information. That's life.

Ron?

Ron Wickersham: Yes. Yes, Ron Wickersham talking.

It seems to me that whether there is a consensus expressed that our goal is to have registrants renew - at least registrants renew. There may be some disagreement if you would require registrants renew that don't list a renew,

but don't list a renew and they're confused or something. From every side, I'm hearing a consensus on that. So I'm confused by why there's - why we would choose to make - to allow something to be random in the - in what the registrant would expect their registrar to - how their behavior for renewal notices, et cetera, that - you know, the subject of our group.

So I think that we have a consensus. We just have to find a way to work together to make real policy changes and not resist making policy changes but put the best ideas forward so that we get good policy changes that will improve for everyone the expectations of - and all to work the way people expect.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Ron.

Any other comments before we move ahead to the next one?

Berry, back to you.

Berry Cobb: Okay, thank you. This is Berry.

Let's move over to Tab EN Q10, 16 and 17. That's the correct one? Yes. And so basically we're continuing down the notice or the road of, you know, should a minimum number of notices be required prior to expiration, yes or no. And then asking the question, should the policy specify how the notices should be spent again - gees, I want to spend the money today - is sent.

And that basically the takeaway here is yes or no, but the registration agreement or Web site should tell registrants how the registrar will contact them with reminders. And then again, basically just column out the comments on the yes and yes, yes and no about our registration agreement, and then all the other additional comments that showed up there.

Alan Greenberg: So...

Berry Cobb: So, this is - I'm sorry. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. So if I'm reading this correctly, the vast majority of people said yes...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...said there should be some level of specification. And it tended to be divided almost evenly between those who said it should be set...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the registration agreement.

Alan Greenberg: ...specified...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...by a policy or it should be - or the registrar should specify it ahead of time.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Again, it's - Cheryl here. Again, I just typed into the chat space, so while Ron was making his previous points which to me it goes back to what the ILAC had called for which was, you know, a predictability at least for the minimum standards of what's going to happen during a registrar relation.

Here, we're getting to the points of, you know, yes, it needs to be specified be it policy or within the agreement list of things; just make sure it's specified. And I think that's a good metric to have in our hands and know. That's a pretty damn close 50/50 split from those who have said yes and yes to yes and no in the registration agreement. That's meaningful.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's useful.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's actually - this is one where it's quite interesting to look at the answers specifically in the yes and yes. Because if one follows their advice, the policy would specify you must use e-mail, fax and Twitter or whatever the, you know, whatever the words are going in there.

And that's one of the issues I think that we need to look at from Jeff's point of view of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, because - yes, Alan, just jumping in there...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...(Marika) is I think really keen to sort of get through (to other tabs as well).

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because of the closeness of these metrics, the argument equally strong to say yes and no is still a good way forward.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because of the metrics. And I think that falls back into what Jeff was being concerned about of making everything so policy driven where it doesn't necessarily need to be.

Alan Greenberg: No, indeed. But what I was saying is for the people who are saying yes and yes, that is the policy should specify the exact mechanism, that's one where

we'd have to look at, if we follow their advice, what are the implications on the business models and things like that. And I think we need t look at...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...we certainly in that kind of case must very carefully look at the impact on registrars and, you know, not only the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...the unintended consequences but the intended consequences.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But a registrant is not necessarily quick to understand either of the consequences...

Alan Greenberg: No.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...or the risks and limitations of making a particular choice.

Alan Greenberg: Hopefully...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And certainly, in this workgroup, we've gone down discussing this e-mail pathway far enough to know that it's not as simple as it first seemed to, you know? The immediate rush of blood to the head says, "Oh yes, just send me an e-mail, but hang on there." So yes.

Alan Greenberg: Again, a violent agreement.

All right, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Okay. Next tab, EN Q10, Q19, and basically 19 is asking what in your opinion would be the most effective means to remind a registrant that their domain name is about to expire. I sorted this in descending order from the grand total or from the yeses I think. And that's what we have as a result.

So basically, 101 people left it blank; 34 said - while 34 and 27 said e-mail. So again, I'll put this as an action item to kind of create some buckets of e-mail, phone, or both or something along those lines to derive more meaning from these responses

Alan Greenberg: Yes, that sounds good.

Berry Cobb: Let me take a quick note for an action...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...the blanks are significant, right? That's one of those chance when we're not making a comment is as meaningful as making one. I like it.

Alan Greenberg: And we have an executive decision that we treat e-mail with a hyphen the same as e-mail without a hyphen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh God. Just adding some levity here.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Berry, (it's you're on nest to get her back here) again.

Berry Cobb: All right. So that takes us out of the Expiration Notices section. And now we'll move into the Whois portion of the survey, which is titled, Whois Q20 and Q21. And basically, 20 being the primary question and 21 being the additional comment, that's pretty significant that of all the 206 of the 361 respondents

said that Whois should be changed to make it obvious that a domain has expired and not get renewed by the registrant.

And then the gaggle of - actually not so many comments as I would have imagined.

Alan Greenberg: You didn't break these comments down based on the answer though at 220.

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Is that - would that be possible without too much effort?

Berry Cobb: I - yes. I'll play around with it more. I think what I found is that these are just all of the comments. And I think that they're mostly yes. But I'll - let me - I'll dive into it a little bit deeper.

Alan Greenberg: Now the only interesting sidelight on this one is this is the one item that within this working group, we're pretty well unanimous that this should be done. So it's interesting that the people who answered who are largely, I'm presuming, registrants were not quite as convinced as we were.

Any other comments on this one before we go on?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I guess what would be interesting if we were to do this survey over again is, you know, how much do you actually use Whois. And to your comment, Alan, if, you know, if a significant numbers said that, you know, we shouldn't make any changes here, you know, how often do they even use Whois to look at that?

Alan Greenberg: Right. No, I think all of us on this call for one reason or another have a vested interest in having Whois correct or more meaningful.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely.

Alan Greenberg: All right, let's keep going.

Berry Cobb: Okay. That takes us to the next section which is for information and education. And that is titled Info_EdQ22 and the following tab Q23.

I don't think there was much of a way to break these out. And I just sorted the responses in descending order.

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Berry Cobb: And so...

Alan Greenberg: So I guess, again, buckets are - if we can do, impose upon you again on this one and try to do some general buckets.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: It's interesting that just quickly scanning the comments -- and there are several pages of them. So I won't protect who have done it.

One doesn't get the impression that there were an awful lot of them that said shut it down. And yet within this group, that's being - the general consensus, that's the most effective way to ultimately get some abstention. Not unanimous but general.

Yes, Paul?

Paul Diaz: Hey, Alan. I was just going to say that maybe because people aren't even thinking like that. They're thinking for a more proactive type of solution as opposed to it goes dark and then you kind of wake up and call your registrar.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Paul Diaz: We didn't include that option in our survey. So it probably didn't occur to a lot of people even to consider it.

Alan Greenberg: I think you're right.

And by the way, with respect to Berry's comment, if we do this again - I don't think we plan to do this again. The pain threshold is just too high.

Any other comments on 22?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. I'm laughing at Paul's plea.

Alan Greenberg: All right, 23.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Question 23 is, what in your opinion should be done to educate registrants to ensure the domain names are renewed without incident? Again, sorted them in descending order. And I'll have to assign buckets to these to make anything meaningful out of it. In fact, just reading through some of them, I don't know, it may just require just to kind of read through each one. But I'll try to do a bucket exercise on this.

Alan Greenberg: It dawns on me that we actually could delegate the bucketing to other people and not put all the load on you. I'm not sure it requires superb Excel skills to do this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm going to have to go back and see who suggested electrocution if they fail because it wasn't me and I'm the stress physiologist, okay?

Alan Greenberg: Where is that one?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: First, electrocution if they fail; second, they should have (locate and) domain name policy -- blah, blah, blah, blah.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Line 15. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I don't know. I just wanted to, you know, whoever that is, we need to talk. Because I had no (unintelligible) only person who had much experience in electrocution uses of training exercises, but anyway.

Berry Cobb: And, you know, I guess I would make just one comment about this particular tab. You know, again, we'll do the bucket exercise. But it seemed to me that there was pretty much pure consensus on the working group that at the very least that we create, you know, perhaps like ICANN-sponsored education with respect to expiration of domain names and that kind of stuff.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes.

Berry Cobb: As opposed to, you know, I think a lot of the responses that we get here are something more process oriented about sending another reminder or some of that. I don't know that - and I haven't read through every one of them. But I think that, you know, one of the smaller buckets, if any, that were created out of this isn't what I just said about the ICANN-sponsored education. So, that's two different things.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Okay.

Berry Cobb: All right, let's proceed.

Alan Greenberg: That takes care of that section. And now we are on the services after expiration which is Questions 24 and 25. And this one was a pretty simple pivot table. Question 24 being, you know, what should happen post expiration when the domain is accessed via the Web, when e-mail is sent to an address at the domain or other IP services are used.

Again, sorted in descending order and pretty significant numbers say that it should stop working to alert the registrant. But there's definitely significant numbers in terms of that it should stay working as a courtesy to the registrants and no stronger view either way.

And again, you know, I guess we can try to do a bucket exercise on these comments. But...

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure we need a bucket on this one. But it would be useful to break them down by the answer.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: That is separate the comments for those who said it should shut down versus those who said it shouldn't shut down because that may tell us. That may - we may learn something about their - what they're trying to achieve or why they're saying it.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Berry Cobb: And then moving on to the last section of the survey, these Questions 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 that are broken apart in two tabs. So RGP Questions 26, 27, 28 and 29, Question 26 being, should an offering to the RGP be mandatory for all gTLD registries? As compared to Question Number 28 is, should it also

be mandatory for all registrars? The significant number is yes and yes of 286 out of 361 that state yes and yes and then the breakout from there.

Alan Greenberg: That is as close to unanimity as we're going to get in this world. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Berry, this is Mikey. Just (a net), in Row A14 and 15, there is 286 yes and yes and then in Row A43 and 44.

Berry Cobb: Okay, yes. So Row 11 through 37 is the comments to Question 27. And rows 40 through 50 are for comments for Question 29. And I'll draw a line to separate those out.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no. I don't think you need to. That was pretty stupid. Sorry about that.

Berry Cobb: Well, no. I mean I actually agree because it took me a minute to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To...

Berry Cobb: ...(just thinking, so)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To draw a line is not that complex. So I think that would be handy.

Berry Cobb: Done. Okay. So that's pretty significant takeaway there. And then closing out on Questions 30 and 31. Question 30 being, should the registration agreement be required to provide predictable statements about what will happen after expiration? Again, sorting by descending order with the pretty - very significant number of 307 stating that yes, the agreement should specify what will happen, and then the corresponding comments.

And I think what I did for these - I think these were all the comments and not necessarily broken out by answer.

Alan Greenberg: This is small enough number that I don't think it really matters.

Berry Cobb: And that's the analysis by paralysis.

Alan Greenberg: So I think we owe you a huge debt of gratitude. I think many of us are capable of doing - of having done half of this work but not producing it in a way that's so clear and so usable. So I do thank you for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's brilliant.

Berry Cobb: My pleasure. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I'm willing to take on the - putting things in bucket so you can focus on the stuff that requires your skills. If anyone else wants to join me with it that we can roll it out. But I'm quite happy to do the first cut at that.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Yes, let me take a pass over the rest of today and I'll send out the next version tomorrow around noon some time?

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So I won't work on it until then.

Berry Cobb: And - yes. And so basically my to-do lists are - well, the overall to-do list is there's four tabs where we need to create buckets and two tabs where we need to sort the comments by answer.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Yes, the sorting comments by answer I'll leave to you because I think...

Berry Cobb: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...you can do that in the semi-automated way or at least, but easier than I can. And - but the bucketizing, either I'll do or we'll get some other willing person to help.

Anything else we need to do?

Now, okay, at this point let's - oh we have Mikey's - has his hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just wanted to point people to the last tab which is the Remove Data....

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And the reason I want to point people at that is I went through the data really, really fast to decide which ones were the ones to pull out. So if anybody wanted to go through that list of mine and reinstate any, this would probably be a good idea to do that really soon because I - my criterion was that if I actually knew the person, like Avri was in there and she didn't put an e-mail address or an organization or anything but I knew it was Avri. So I left her in. If there's anybody in this pile that you see on the last tab that you actually know, we should rescue their entries.

You know, a lot of them are pretty, you know, (John, Joan Doe), I decided was pretty safe bet. But that wasn't a good one. But, you know, a lot of these folks...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I've got - just in the first screen I can see (Bart Wan), (Dave Cassidull), you know, a whole bunch of - (Garret Sherman). I mean these are ILAC members, operational leaders.

Alan Greenberg: Not in Raw Data, but in the next one, Removed Data...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, no I mean Removed.

Alan Greenberg: Where do you see (Garrett)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Question E - Column E. Not Question E; Column E.

Alan Greenberg: What row?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: E.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No, what row?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, E23. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: E23.

Alan Greenberg: I see (Verner) user.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's what I see too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well...

Man: Are you sure...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: E23...

Alan Greenberg: You're looking at Raw Data, not Remove Data.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...Remove Data.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Cheryl, you're on the wrong - you're on a different tab.

Alan Greenberg: You're on the Raw Data tab.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: DP - I'm in (DPCache_Remove_Data) tab. That's the tab I'm in.

Alan Greenberg: And how many lines of data do you have in it?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, how many rows?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Going down.

Alan Greenberg: There should be 52 if we're on the same tab.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you're in Removed Data.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not (DPCache_Remove). Yes, okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That's the one that I would like people to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: ...run their eye down...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...because I was...

Berry Cobb: Okay, you have the...

Alan Greenberg: ...sort of lenient. You know, certainly if it was a name, that was all spelled out, first name, surname. I generally didn't remove it unless it was...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Within...

Alan Greenberg: ...(Nuck Chorris) who I happen to know on this. Not a person that's an ICANN constituent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understood.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...some people's privacy is different too.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Well I don't think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Whether they put their names.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. A lot of people put in their first name like on Row 32, on 30 - this says Foreign Private Domain Holder. And I just start to arbitrarily apply the standard that said there'd really be no way they ever figure out who that person was. But that could - the main thing is that this is pretty subjective. And before we just launch Berry on an exhaustive rework, we probably need to kind of - somebody else needs to look at this page and make some choices because I did it really fast. It's pretty informal.

Alan Greenberg: I'm certainly comfortable with what you've done. The - given the heavy skewing of the results that we saw with the date removed, I find it hard to believe that it's going - it would be substantively changed if we added back in.

But certainly on the few questions where there's a balance, it would not be very much work to look at the Remove Data and do a, you know, just a very quick tally -- even I can do that -- of how many would be in one column versus the other and, you know, just sorting them. We'll coalesce that.

So in the few areas - again, assuming we're not going to use the quantitative data in any substantive way, we can do a sanity check to make sure that removing this data has not skewed the answer significantly. But I don't see a need for instance to have Berry go and do the whole set with the data and without the data, the questionable data. I think that's far more work than we're likely to benefit from, unless someone else is seeing something that I'm not.

No comments? Then I would say we go with the data as it stands with the data removed.

Is there a strong feeling that Berry should go back within the first two questions and redo it with - so that we have a consistent set of data for all of them?

I don't feel strongly that needs to be done, but Paul says no. I just don't want to be in a position afterwards where someone says, hey, but your data isn't consistent. Certainly, we haven't heard any positive reasons that we should go back and do that now. We have several Xs saying don't do it.

So, Berry, I think you have your marching orders that the first two questions do - the first two summaries do not need to be redone using the same data.

Ron? No. Ron is gone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think he was agreeing that he shouldn't do it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. All right. In that case, I thank you again for the huge amount of work. And we'll wait for your revised spreadsheet before going back and trying to bucketize the one that needs to be done. So, I thank you.

We have 15 minutes left to go. We need to do a little bit of talking about what our next meeting's plans are. And my inclination is to say that there's not enough time to one, starting to go into the comments right now. So that we'll

leave a few minutes early unless there's some desire strongly to go back to the comment period - to the comment responses.

Okay, seeing no objection there, I would request strongly however that people look at the revised structure that Marika sent out a week or so ago - a week and a half ago to look at how she has filled in those various sections and make sure that everyone feels comfortable that she has accurately reflected the discussion that was held because I don't really want to go over that again, you know, with the whole group. But we really do need to make sure that all the - especially the - both the registrars and the user groups here feel comfortable that the answer is what we want to - the face we want to put forward.

Paul?

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Alan. I may be getting ahead for the final bullet point on the agenda. But I was just going to ask for next, next Tuesday, if I can request to the group that we postpone an extra. A number of us are going to be in a meeting and won't be available for this call.

Alan Greenberg: That's semi-problematic because the following week is ICANN Policy Staff retreat.

When you say a number of us, you're talking about registrars or is it some other group?

Paul Diaz: At least that I'm aware, registrars.

Jeff Eckhaus: And registries. It's Jeff here. A few...

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Jeff Eckhaus: ...participating. They would not be on the call. We'll be meeting with - in Washington DC with various members of law enforcement.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've got to say my schedule with a daily trip for radiation therapy that doesn't end until the 30th by the 29th, I'll be delighted not to get up at 4:30 in the morning.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Marika, how much trouble is it going to be if we say we want to hold the meeting on the 4th? Is that doable or really it'll be a great inconvenience?

Marika Konings: You mean the 5th?

Alan Greenberg: The 5th, whatever the Tuesday is.

Marika Konings: It will depend a little bit on our program. I mean, you know, primary of course, you can go ahead and have the call. It might just mean that, you know, there will be less staff reports. So, you know, maybe we'll require someone else to take notes for example. But, you know, we can definitely...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...set up a call and organize a roll call. It depends a little bit how our program looks - how much time as we have a quite tight schedule and it's sort of falls in the middle of the day - of the morning there.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: It might be complicated. But, you know, we can schedule the call and set it up. That's no problem.

Alan Greenberg: It would certainly be hard for someone else to take notes because then you or Margie, but I presume you are going to have to try to integrate it into the matrix.

Marika Konings: Yes. And I'm also otherwise happy to, you know, listen to the recording. If, you know, it really becomes an issue, I can also listen to the recording and take notes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Let's tentatively say, since I don't think we can proceed on reviewing the comments without the registrars on the line, let's tentatively say that we'll reschedule for two weeks from now on the 5th of October. And, Marika, you and I will talk in between and make sure that we're comfortable that we can do that without losing the full benefit of the call.

Marika Konings: That's good.

Alan Greenberg: And I'm sure we can. We just need to make sure that I or someone else is on the same wavelength. I need to make sure I'm going to be on that call. There's a slight chance I may not be.

But we will cancel next week's meeting then to accommodate the people who are meeting in Washington.

Okay. Anything else we need to do before we have officially 15 minutes left?

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, related to the meetings, I won't be able to make next meeting either.

Alan Greenberg: Next meeting being...

Michele Neylon: The 5th?

Alan Greenberg: ...a week from now or two weeks from now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The 5th.

Michele Neylon: Both.

Alan Greenberg: The 5th?

Michele Neylon: Fifth.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Just so you know.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, noted. If you have any strong feelings ahead of time, assuming we go ahead with it, which I think we will, if you have any strong feelings on any of the particular questions, feel free to let us know ahead of time.

Michele Neylon: Well I'm sure my fellow registrars will be voicing similar (unintelligible) of my own.

Alan Greenberg: And noted then.

Anything else? And so now I'll give you 15 minutes of free time back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Woohoo.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you for your participation and again, Berry, thank you for the work.

Man: Yes, great job, Berry.

Berry Cobb: My pleasure, take care.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Bye bye.

Woman: Bye.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much, (Tanya).

END