

GNSO
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference
September 5, 2007 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Domain Tasting Ad hoc teleconference on 5 September 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/domain-tasting-20070905.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-coordinator CBUC (Council)
Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency
Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency
Jeff Neuman - gTLD Registry constituency
Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)
Danny Younger - NCUC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: Thank you. This call is now being recorded.

Man: Okay.

Coordinator: Let's go through the roll call once for the record.

Man: Thank you Glen.

Coordinator: We've got (Mike Rodenbaugh), Patrick Jones, Kristina Rosette, Jeff Eckhaus, (Jeff Newman), Olof Nordling and myself on the call.

Man: All right. Thanks Glen. So obviously you don't have a very big call today nor a very big agenda. So we'll get through pretty quick.

I'd just like to cover the status updates that I mentioned in the last email and go over what Olaf and I are looking at as a schedule for this group right now. At least get that into the transcript so people can review it. We'll also send out an email summary on that.

Kristina please go ahead...

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: ...and let us know did the IPC Survey get done last night?

Kristina Rosette: It has gone online. I am waiting for the official announcement to go up on the ICANN site. As soon as that happens, I will post a link to it - excuse me - to this list and I also plan to send an email, you know, unless you would rather do so or (Russ) would rather do so to the council list.

You know, letting them know that that's available and current, encouraging, you know, not only the councilors but their constituency members who our trademark owners to feel free to purchase a tape.

Olaf Nordling: Right. Olaf here. I think this is in process - in processing within ICANN I think right now. So I would suggest rather that depending on if we get it up from now onwards until tomorrow morning Eastern - -10:30 European time -- that Patrick if you can send something to councilors, I could do so from tomorrow onward, and depending on when it is actually up on the Web site.

Patrick Jones: Olaf this is Patrick. I don't know if you saw the email exchange with (Kieran) this morning, but we're going to have Paul Levins approve the posting.

Olaf Nordling: Yeah. Right and that means it will probably come up within a few hours from now.

Patrick Jones: Yep.

Olaf Nordling: Okay and if so, since that will be in the middle of sometime by night or late evening, could you take it on to follow it and notify the council and the group that it's up?

Patrick Jones: Sure.

Olaf Nordling: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: And Patrick and Olaf, in the hopefully unlikely event that there are wording changes that need to be made, I'm going to be out of pocket from 2:00 to 4:00 pm Eastern, but otherwise available. So, you know, I'm happy to make any revisions or answer any questions or whatever needs to be dealt with in the event that there are any issues.

Patrick Jones: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Do you anticipate any problems with getting it posted?

Olaf Nordling: I don't.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Olaf Nordling: But, well, I'm not on the supreme level that have posting rights.

Kristina Rosette: Oh, okay. All right.

Olaf Nordling: So...

Kristina Rosette: All right. That's fine.

Coordinator: (Unintelligible) has just joined.

Man: Great.

Man: Hey (Joppin).

(Joppin): Hi.

Man: Good morning or good afternoon.

Man: So then Kristina thanks for all the hard work on the IPC Survey. Hopefully we'll get some good responses out of that. I saw your note also to the list that the EDRP provider questions have gone out. So, and we gave them until September 20 to respond as well.

Kristina Rosette: Right and I actually - we actually already got a response back from - oh and I never get it right, but - the Asian provider, Hong Kong. And the question that I had posed to the folks who were copied on that which was Tim Cole and Olaf and (Joppin) were, you know, I think with the

group probably needs to talk about whether or not we want to make the results -- the individual results -- of those responses public.

And if we do, how we go about getting the permission to do so because, you know, to be quite candid, it didn't occur to me that we would want to identify the individual responses and so I didn't indicate that we would be planning to make those responses public and I also didn't seek permission to do so. So, I think that's probably...

((Crosstalk))

Man: There's just three of them, right? There's just (CPAC), (NAC) and (Lipo)?

Kristina Rosette: Correct.

Man: Okay. Did you think from the response that you got that there's sensitive information there that they might not want published?

Kristina Rosette: You know, honestly, I, you know, I don't know. I don't know how these questions were being received. Some of them are very specific.

Man: Maybe we should send them another question and ask them whether they are okay if we publicize it or whether we like to keep it private...

Kristina Rosette: Right.

Man: ...and we'll just go with their wishes.

Kristina Rosette: Right. I mean the interest, the compromised solution is to, you know, presuming that all three of them sign off is that to make the aggregate results...

Man: Yep.

Kristina Rosette: ...public, but not the individual responses.

Man: I think we can definitely do that. I mean I think that's just implied, but the information they're giving us - do you see that there might be any benefit to using the individual responses and publicizing them?

Kristina Rosette: The only...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can I say...

Kristina Rosette: ...to this marriage, it seems to me that the one circumstance in which it may be useful is, you know, if for example there's one provider that is seen, you know, that one provider's numbers and one provider's responses are...

Man: Yeah.

Kristina Rosette: ...kind of, you know, qualitatively different from the others or if, for example, you know, I have frankly no idea what market share for lack of a better word each of the providers has in terms of what percentage of (Aot) files complaints each is getting.

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: I don't have a very good sense about that.

Man: How about as the three responses come in, you just send them with a reply saying thank you very much. We have one follow up question which is whether you have any sensitivity about publicizing any of this information or whether you'd prefer that we only use it in aggregate form.

Kristina Rosette: Right. Okay. Yeah, no, I'm happy to do that. I mean I think there may be...

Man: Sound reasonable to everybody else?

Man: Yep.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Man: And then, okay, that sounds good. We'll just see what they say and take it and do essentially what they want or if they say they don't want it public and we feel like there's a need to have it public, then we'll go back to them and try to make that case. Since there's only three of them, it shouldn't be that difficult.

Kristina Rosette: All right.

Man: The only comment there is I think any transparency that we can send through - this is (Joppin) - I'm sorry for, but the only - I think that the transparency that we can illustrate, you know, through these findings is

going to help add weight to what, you know, what the relevancy is to this.

Man: True.

Man: I'd suggested that we do but, of course, with permission.

Man: I think that would be the preference. On the other hand if we do have aggregate data from the three providers and publicize that, I'm not sure why it would really matter the breakdowns, especially since we would have them. ICANN staff would have them anyway.

Why don't we just cross that bridge when we come to it (Jonathan). Let's see what we get and let's see if anybody tells us no. And, if so, we'll see what kind of case we want to make to persuade them to let us publish the data.

Kristina Rosette: All rightie.

Man: Okay. And then I guess that's it for you Kristina. Right?

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Kristina Rosette: Well then I will jump off and I will be back in touch once the - I guess Patrick or Olaf, you all will send the announcement around. In the meantime, you know, I have the link to the actual poll, so that hasn't been distributed to anyone yet.

Man: I just talked to Danny Younger; he should be on in a minute.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. All right. Thanks everyone. Have a good week.

Man: Thanks Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Bye.

Man: We'll talk to you later.

Man: Bye.

Man: All right (Jonathan) welcome. I'm glad you could make it. Do you have any update for us on what you've been doing with polling the registrars on use of the AGP?

(Jonathan): Regrettably I don't have that much to report. I've gotten three responses each of them kind of illustrating a proprietary nature to their uses where they didn't want to distribute what it was necessarily, but they were going to be impacted should there be an elimination entirely of the AGP. I'd request -- humbly request -- if I could get another week to try...

Man: Oh yeah, of course.

(Jonathan): ...to get something substantive.

Man: And basically you've got till September 15 at least but ideally we'll have all of our data by then. I think some of the deadlines we set are actually

September 20. We'll talk about schedule a little bit more at the end.
But, bottom line, you have at least another couple weeks.

(Jonathan): Okay. I've been somewhat underwhelmed with the response, but I also want to, you know, note that there has been a holiday and sort of a tail end of summer, so there's...

Man: Sure.

(Jonathan): ...probably folks who are not, you know, necessarily as active as they typically are.

Man: Understood and have you sent it to all of the registrars?

(Jonathan): What I've done is poll the question to the registrar constituency.

Man: Okay.

(Jonathan): The individual members who had participated in this group as a straw poll and then...

Man: Okay.

(Jonathan): ...I think in the absence of a lot of response from that, I figured that would be the interested parties. I'm going to...

Man: So there's what, seven or eight registrars subscribed to the list. Is that right?

(Jonathan): I want to say it's more like 12 or 13.

Man: Okay.

(Jonathan): Whatever the number is, the -- because there's multiples from individual registrars, but the - I think it might be wise to send the actual poll to the - I'll send it to John Nevitt requesting that the poll, you know, that people in the group respond to the poll.

Man: Okay. Good. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And maybe send it to the entire constituency and ask for responses back in the next couple weeks. What do you think about that?

(Jonathan): I think that's a good idea.

Man: Okay.

(Jonathan): Thank you for the suggestion.

Coordinator: (Unintelligible) (Younger) has just joined the call.

Man: Great. Welcome Danny.

Danny Younger: Thanks.

Man: You're actually up next. (Jonathan) is that it on that point...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): Yeah. Yeah. That's it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You think you can make that request to (John) like today?

(Jonathan): Absolutely.

Man: All right. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Yeah.

Man: All right. So (Paul's) not on the phone - on the line. Danny have you received the zone information from him yet?

Danny Younger: No and I also sent through an email to him a few days ago asking for an update. I didn't get a response yet so there is nothing to report on my end.

Man: Yeah. Likewise, we have sent - I've sent a request to him and so has Olaf yesterday and we haven't had any responses either. So I will...

Danny Younger: I think he has been holiday...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...try to call him.

Danny Younger: I think he has been on holiday. Not entirely sure, but I do want to give that note. And I'm trying to raise him now to join the call as well.

Man: Okay. I mean it's pretty important that he gets that information at least to Danny because he's been holding up Danny now for several weeks after promising to give that information to him so we're getting to the point where doing the studies, you know, we're running out of time essentially and I'm not sure why it's taking so long to just basically give the information over to Danny.

So I'll try to call him personally as well. I'm not sure what else we can really do. Danny, I know there's other sources you could possibly tap to get the information.

Danny Younger: Well, why don't we just wait till we hear from (Paul) and we'll see where we're at.

Man: Do you have an estimate of how long it'll take you to do the study you're contemplating doing? It would be nice to have the extra three weeks, I'm sure.

Danny Younger: Yeah, well. We'll just have to do the best we can under the circumstances. That's all.

Man: All right. Okay. I guess we'll just leave that one at that for now.

(Jeff): Hey (Mike) it's (Jeff) here. I just have a question. What is the study that we're waiting on for the zone information on - can you just remind me of that or remind the group...

((Crosstalk))

Man: In fact I've asked for sort of descriptions of those from (Paul) and Danny as well as to what generally they're intending to do with the data. Danny do you want to comment on that at all?

Danny Younger: Sure. This is pretty much in response to (Bruce Thompkin's) request. He suggested that we take a look at data from any given period of time and try to determine to what degree we might have potential infringement activities happening.

Sort of an open-ended question, but clearly what we're looking for is in a given batch, what percentage of names are potentially (unintelligible) squatting established brands.

(Jeff): And this is, I mean, because pulling out a zone (unintelligible) is not something proprietary that, you know, that (Paul) or ENom is doing when there's a million...

Man: Right.

Man: You know there's a lot of other sources out there and I think that - I mean I know that we don't personally do that, but it is not I would say rocket science and I'm sure any of the registries or other people can have access to it. And if, and I'm not even sure if that's actually going to be able to help.

By doing that, we'll be able to help answer that open ended question on, you know, and how long that analysis could take (unintelligible) is enormous. So, I'm not sure how you'd be able to do that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well the idea was to do a statistically significant sample of it. Of course we were trying to start this about a month ago. I agree with you though. That information is available and obviously in many other places, so...

Man: True and we all have to keep in mind that infringement is often a function of the use of the domain name.

Man: Right.

Man: So, while we may look at a particular name that appears to be a typo-squat, or we can't definitively say that infringement has occurred. We can just point to the possibility.

Man: Right. So that's what I'm saying. I don't know if this is - just my personal opinion on this - I mean everyone can go through with it.

It might not be a, you know, might not be worth waiting for it for to use this to see if it's even going to be worth it and - but then again, if we do decide to make sure that we do use like actual statistically significant information on zone, not - I don't want to, you know, throw an arrow, but, you know, some people put forth some information about typo-squatting and other things that I think are - might be more on the marketing side than on, you know, just pure data.

Man: Understood.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Danny is sensitive to that too. I think the goal is to do a purely statistical - well as purely statistical as possible. There's always going to be some subjectivity, but...

Man: Of course. Of course. Now that's all I ask.

Man: Okay.

Man: All right. So let's - several of us will try to follow up with (Paul) directly. Otherwise, I think we ought to look at maybe another way to get you that information Danny.

Danny Younger: All right.

Man: Talking to some other people. Okay. Olaf, can you give us a brief update of the responses we've received so far?

Olaf Nordling: Yes. There is a trickle - this is Olaf - there is a trickle of increase of the email responses to the RFI on the ICANN Web sites. I think we're up to 13 now. So it's not advancing by leaps and bounds, but we still have almost another fortnight to go.

The responses to the big pulse one line form well is perhaps a little more impressive. We've got 35 so far there. Still the tendency from two weeks ago notably that we get text -- free-form text -- that goes by email to the ICANN Web site, while the big pulse results well they show that people that log onto that site, they primarily take boxes and (unintelligible) even though the possibility is there, do not provide free-form text.

So, well, it seems to divide the respondents into categories. Those who like to take boxes and those who like to - those who like to come up with free-form text replies.

Man: All right.

Olaf Nordling: But that's where we stand right now.

Man: I think it would bear maybe putting into our meeting upstate Olaf a request that constituencies send out a reminder to their constituencies about the RFI that it's open and it'll only be open for until September 15.

Olaf Nordling: Okay.

Man: I guess with everyone coming back from holiday, it just seems like it's a good idea to me to send a reminder around and try to bolster the results.

Olaf Nordling: Yeah. This is indeed what we call (unintelligible) in Europe when people get back and the schools begin and all of that. Though back from holidays and people may not necessarily have noticed that this is up and running.

Man: Right. Certainly a reminder can't hurt. All right. Thanks.

Okay, the questions to VeriSign - I apologize, I've been sitting on that for a week for no real good reason. But I've finished them up taking the comments that were posted to the list.

They're very minor comments on the draft that (Jeff) and I had sent around I think a couple of weeks ago now. So those are actually in my outbox out to (Chuck) and (Pat). As soon as I get back online, they will go.

Patrick, have any further word from (CCs)? I know you've been really good about sort of reporting that stuff as it's come in, but any comments on that right now?

Patrick Jones: I think we're going to have some new information from (dot PL) on results of their - they've launched a domain tasting in the (Polish CC) so I expect to get some information from them. I don't have anything else from anyone - the other (CCs).

Man: Olaf and I were discussing the (dot PL) yesterday and it sounds very interesting. It sounds like they may well have some pretty good data for us in a few weeks, so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...following up on that.

Man: On the whole, quite a bit of information from the (CC) community. So I'm working on a summary that I'll send to the (main tasting) list.

Man: All right. Thanks so much. Okay. The other thing that I wanted to cover was the schedule and then, of course, if anybody has anything else, we can do that. But Olaf and I sort of drafted out a schedule.

It makes it seem like - basically we want everyone's - all the factual inputs that we can have by ideally September 15. I think we told at least the EDRP provider September 20. And I think because the IPC RFI is just going out now after some strange delay, but we're probably going to give those people until September 25 to respond.

The goal is to have a draft report, which will still have probably a lot of factual holes in it, ready for the group around September 25. We'll then compile the RFI information and the other factual information to try to get a final draft report to the group by October 4 and that will give us a week to finalize it until it's due date to the council on October 11.

Olaf Nordling: Right. Reading - this is Olaf again - reading the council verdict on this, I think they expect it to be shipped on the fourth for the October 11 council meeting. So I think we're running a week short here.

Man: Oops. So, okay. That, well let's see. That right, September 25, we only have three days. Well that still gives us from September 25 to October 4; 9, 10 days...

Olaf: Yeah.

Man: ...to finalize the report. So given that I will be unemployed at that time, I should anticipate that I will be able to do that.

Danny Younger: This is Danny. A quick question for Olaf.

Olaf Nordling: Yeah.

Danny Younger: I'm looking at the big poll results and I am not seeing the free form responses. Is that simply because of the way that the poll results display themselves or is it actually that there have been no free form responses.

Olaf Nordling: Exactly. That's what I mentioned. I mean, people that respond to big polls, they pick the boxes. They don't fill out the free form text fields.

Danny Younger: Okay.

Olaf Nordling: Those who like to supply free form text, they reply by email to ICANN. Rather interesting.

Danny Younger: Okay. Thank you Olaf.

Man: Okay, so any questions on the schedule, you know, understand it's still a little bit loose, but the goal is to finish up the report by October 4. So the sooner that we can get factual inputs, the better. And I think Olaf is working on sort of a straw man report that you will have ready - that he and I can have ready Olaf you think by the next call?

(Crosstalk)

Olaf Nordling: Yes. Well call it ready. That will be like you say it's rather a backbone with which we can put something - we need to put a little more flesh and (unintelligible).

Man: Right. Okay. One other issue that's sort of been hanging out there that we never closed the loop on was the notion of an economist doing

some sort of economic survey as was originally suggested by (Curt Pritts). We ever hear anything back from (Curt) Patrick or Olaf?

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick. There is now a ICANN economist under contract. That economist has quite a bit on their schedule, so it might be worth throwing this back to (Curt) for him to comment on that - on the availability of the economist.

Man: Okay. Well I think we're, since we haven't really heard from (Curt) in a long time, I guess we're assuming that that's not really going to happen as a part of this group's work, but something that we should think about how we want to deal with in the report.

Olaf Nordling: Maybe so that I'm also realizing that time is flying but maybe something we would like to envisage as a second stage of the rocket if you'd like.

Man: Right. Well I think that that is likely to be a section of the report. It's, you know, basically ideas for further information that might be useful. We asked for that specifically in the RFI from people and it's something that the people on the list, on the call, should think about as well.

Okay. I don't really have anything else for today unless anybody else has any other business or comments or questions.

All right. Then I'll thank everybody once more and we'll plan to meet again next week.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Man: Thank you

Man: Thank you.

Man: Great. Bye

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END