

GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference
15 September 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 15 September 2009. 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-wg-20090915.mp3>

On page:

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

Present:

Alan Greenberg - ALAC
James Bladel - RC
Tatyana Khramtsova - RC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair
Jeff Eckhaus - RC
Michael Palage - CBUC (joined after roll call)
Ted Suzuki - IPC
Alaine Doolan - IPC
Paul Diaz - RC
Sergey Gorbunov
Berry Cobb - CBUC
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large (joined after roll call)
Phil Corwin – CBUC (joined after roll call)
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Mason Cole - RC
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michele Neylon - RC
Michael Young - Registries
Tim Ruiz - RC

Staff:

Marika Konings
Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

William McKelligot – ICANN Staff Compliance
Karim Attoumani - GAC
Davina Meigs - NCUC
Avri Doria – GNSO Chair

Coordinator: This is the operator. At this time this call is being recorded and you may begin.

Alan Greenburg: Thank you, and can we have a roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, I'll do that. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Tatiana Khramtsova, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Michele Neylon, Ron Wickersham, James Bladel, Mike O'Connor, Jeffrey Eckhaus, Berry Cobb, Paul Diaz, Sergey Gorbunov, Ted Suzuki, Alaine Doolan, Mason Cole, Michael Young. From staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings, myself -- (Gisella Gruber-White). And apologies we have Karim Attoumani, Davina Meigs, William McKelligott, and Avri Doria.

And if I could please remind everyone to state their names when they speak for transcription purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenburg: Thank you, Gisella. Okay, we are using the Adobe Chat Room. I will try to keep an eye on peoples' hands up. If you are on the call but not on the Chat Room, then try to get in at any given moment when there's a break in the conversation, and say you'd like to be on the speakers' list, and I'll try to handle things in order. If someone notices I'm ignoring hands up because I'm focusing on something else, please let me know.

All right. The first part of the agenda is to try to finalize the registrar survey. Although we've made a lot of progress on it, it seems to be taking forever. And I'd like to, to the extent possible, get through it today, so we can start working on doing more substantive work as we go ahead. A new version went out yesterday, I suspect, from Marika. And I would like to go over that quickly and see whether there's any outstanding issues that we have to address other than the particular ones that we deferred until a future time.

However, we did start a discussion on email, and with - regarding a comment that Michael Young made regarding the RGP. And before we go forward, I'd like him to clarify what he meant. Because as I read the email, he said - I thought he said we want to make the RGP work as it was originally intended

to, which implies the name has to be deleted because the RGP doesn't kick in until then. And before the recording started, he was trying to elaborate on that and say what he really meant. So...

Michael Young: Sure.

Alan Greenburg: I'd like to understand that.

Michael Young: Basically, Alan, what I'm saying here, and I've just popped back an email as well that lists to support this. I think, you know, my discussion what the RGP was intended to do isn't what it was intended to do as a hard core function, but what it was intended to accomplish. It was intended to accomplish a couple of things, and the discussions back then were how do we get the attention of the registrars when a name's expired. How do we provide them additional error protection? And those were the couple of core intentions. And so RGP was created as an artifact, a functional artifact, to try and address those two issues.

Now what I think you're doing is jumping to the natural assumption that RGP is defined by how it works currently. And I don't see RGP as being defined as how it currently works. How it currently works probably is no longer effective to accomplish what RGP was supposed to do. Does that make sense?

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, okay. So what I think you're saying is you want to revert back to the intent of the RGP which was number one, to make sure you (unintelligible) languages to the extent possible going to get the attention of the registrant.

Michael Young: Right.

Alan Greenburg: In the case of the RGP by making sure it went black.

Michael Young: Right.

Alan Greenburg: And number two, give them a reasonable period of time in which to do something. Now with the RGP, that time was anywhere from 30 days, if the registrar deleted the name immediately, up until a maximum of 75 days, during which the registrant had time to reclaim it. I'm not saying we replicate that exactly, but that was the mechanism that the RGP provided.

Michael Young: Well in combination with the auto-renew grace period, that's what effectively came out of it. But the RGP itself, like exclusive of the auto-renew, was only ever defined as a 30-day period.

Alan Greenburg: Right, but it was three days after deletion, which could have taken place anywhere from zero to 45 days after expiration.

Michael Young: Correct.

Alan Greenburg: I think I understand your email and it was sufficiently different from some of the other things that were being said. I wanted to make sure that was clear before we went on with this conversation.

Okay, if we can go back to the survey, we've made a number of both cosmetic and functional changes. And how would the group like to do this? Do you want to go over them one by one? Or do you simply want me to take - assume people have read it and identified the things they don't like, and take exceptions? Is there any strong feelings?

My preference, I think, is to quickly read them or read a summary of each one, and make sure that we have positive acknowledgment as we go ahead. Does that sound reasonable?

Mason Cole: Silence is acceptance.

Alan Greenburg: Silence is acceptance. Okay, well silence could also be everyone dropped off the call, or I've dropped off the call and didn't know it yet. Okay, there was a

whole slew of questions, each of which could be typically answered by a yes/no or providing a fact, or something that would not be a long narrative description on what happens if the registrant is silent at expiration time.

The first one. Does the registrar allow the domain name to auto-renew in those registries that employ the policy? This is not something the registrant see, but there has been an interest in knowing whether that's the case or not. And I don't presume there's any harm in asking.

When and how are notices of expiration sent to the original, to the registrant at expiration, prior to expiration? If a re-seller is involved, are the notices sent from the re-seller or the registrar?

Mason Cole: Alan, you have a hand up.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, Ron. Thank you.

Ron Wickersham: Actually my question comes to the methodology area above it, which is - as I understand originally, I thought these survey questions were going to be sent to the registrars. Am I now to understand that there's a group going to try to do it from the Web pages and then report back?

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, what we decided a couple of meetings ago was a modest number of registrars, if we pick them reasonably well, will cover a very large number of registrants.

Ron Wickersham: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: And we did not want to have too large a group, because it's going to take too long to do, and take too long to collate. So I think we ended up, Marika can correct me, with a number like 10 or 20 as the first half. And then we could decide at that point whether we needed any more or not.

Ron Wickersham: Okay, but these won't - but these questionnaires won't be sent to the registrars initially. They'll be our own internal group.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah. They will not simply be sent out, because that would add a significant amount of time, and the percentage that would respond would probably be small. We would attempt to gather as much data as we could from Web sites and then fill that out with personal discussions.

Ron Wickersham: Got it.

Alan Greenburg: I believe is what we were talking about. Marika, is that reasonably close to what you felt?

Marika Konings: Yes, I think that's correct. The idea would be you need to try to find what information is publicly available, and then to work hopefully with many of the registrars who are participating in this group to find out additional information that is missing from the public domain.

Alan Greenburg: Yes. I mean from my point of view I think one of the things we're going to get out of it, which is important to know, is that there is a wide variation in practices amongst registrars -- that it's not a very monolithic set of processes that are followed, and I think that's an important issue that we have to wrestle with as we go ahead with this.

Ron Wickersham: Right, yes. Some of the questions, though, seem to bore and to dig deeper than what's publicly available, and seem to be addressed to the registrar to reveal stuff that may not be on the public Web page, so...

Alan Greenburg: Well as we go through them, if you could identify those. And we either need to justify why we're doing it, and make sure it's reasonable. Though we do not want to do things which are likely to discourage registrars from participating.

Ron Wickersham: Agreed.

Alan Greenburg: On the other hand, there may well be information that's important for us in trying to follow this process through. Okay. So the first one is what notices do you send before expiration. The second one is what notices are sent following expiration. And are they sent from the re-seller if a re-seller was involved.

The next question is under what does the registrar make changes to Whois data, and we're talking about substantial changes, typically meaning the contact names and addresses -- that is, who is the registrant of record at that point. We know there are some things such as expiration date which will change automatically when the domain is renewed, as it typically will be for an extra year. We are not looking at those changes.

The next question is, is the costs to the registrant to recover the name - how does this relate to the cost that they simply would have paid if they had done it before expiration. And if it varies, under what conditions does it vary. Now one of the things that was inserted at the last meeting, or because of the last meeting, was is one of the variables the cost of recovery for the registrar.

And I don't - I cannot recall, maybe somebody else does, why we added this. There is a cost to the registrar -- an out-of-pocket cost to the registrar -- if it goes into the RGP. But prior to that, I'm not aware of out-of-pocket costs that are associated with that. Anyone who...

James Bladel: Alan, this is James.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah.

James Bladel: Yeah, and I was, I think, behind getting that inserted -- the reason being that while there may not be a direct dollar cost to a registry, there is a cost burden. So maybe that's a better phrase -- cost burden -- to a registrar in recovering any one of the (unintelligible).

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I can live with that if we insert that word. I just wanted to make sure it was inserted intentionally and not mis-inserted in the wrong place. Okay...

Marika Konings: Could you just repeat which word you would like to see inserted?

Alan Greenburg: Cost burden.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: And delete my whole square bracket comment. The next point was at what point after expiration is the DNS changed so the domain name no longer resolves to the original Web site.

Now we're not asking at that point whether it goes black, resolves to a paper click page, or whatever. But it no longer resolves to the RAE site. Now I worded that - well, I have a question for you. If a registrar, and I'm not saying anyone does, but I've had discussions with registrars saying they could do this. If the registrar changes the domain name to point to their own site, which in turn passes control back to the Web site, is that caught by the wording I'm asking here?

So the situation there would be to a visitor to the Web site, it looks no different, but the registrar is, in fact, intercepting the traffic and counting it.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Alan, it's Jeff. I'm unsure - I don't know, maybe I'm not sure of the questions. So you're saying if I have my site out there, you know, about cats or whatever it is saying that - and I'm a registrant. And then I have it registered with whatever, ABC Domains or whatever it is, they're a registrar, that they would - you're saying if the hosting is with that registrar, and can you explain? I'm unclear of the question.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, certainly. James, may I use Go Daddy as an example? Not claiming you do this. If I have a domain, cats.org, registered with Go Daddy, it expires. Go Daddy has the technical ability to point the domain name at a Go Daddy server which then redirects it to my cats Web site. To a visitor it looks like cats is still working if they're not carefully watching the headers. But the traffic is going through Go Daddy.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: It's Jeff here. Just one thing is that, you know, that's a technical issue. Because unless the hosting is with that registrar and if the hosting has not expired, because if not, the hosting - it's hosted on a separate site. It could be hosted, let's call it, at (Rackspace). And so that person - it would go - it would have to go hand in hand, because of you would need the IP addresses and then having to change the host records. I don't even know, you know, it's probably technically possible. But it would have to be - I don't even know if it's technically possible.

Alan Greenburg: I wasn't asking if it's technically possible. I know it's technically possible. I was asking do you believe that the wording of this is, is the DNS changed so the original, so the domain name no longer resolves to the RAE's Web site. In other words, if cats.org used to point to 1.1.1.1, and now points somewhere else, I believe the answer to this question is yes, we have changed it. Even if it still looks to the user as if the Web site is unchanged. I just want agreement that that's what we're talking about. So I'm saying really if the DNS has changed, then the answer to this is yes, we changed it.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yeah, I'd just like to (unintelligible) sake, I'd see what you're driving at with the question, but there's still this distinction between - the DNS is unclear, because you have the DNS records in the root, and where they point to for that domain. And then the other thing that you brought up is the possibility that a hosting company can change the zone records. But these are two completely different things that affect recovery differently. So that technical distinction between the DNS - the DNS to me implies the root zones and a zone change at a registrar...

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I'm going to suggest that we ignore the whole example I gave. The intent of this question is, if you do a DNS query, the A record comes back, (unintelligible) the day before expiration.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay, I understand what your intention is now.

Alan Greenburg: And I just want to make sure the wording is correct for that.

Mason Cole: Alan, it's Mason. You got a couple hands up, and then I'd like to be queued, please.

Alan Greenburg: Problem when I look at the paper. (Mikaly), the only hand I see up right now.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I'm completely confused by your question.

Alan Greenburg: Then forget the whole question. Let's erase the last five minutes.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, because I'm trying to understand actually what the intention is of your question. You're talking about some things that I can't see as being compatible. If you change the name servers of the domain, the likelihood of it pointing to the original Web site is slim to none, as far as I'm concerned. So I don't really understand what you're talking about.

Alan Greenburg: As I said, if you'll forgive me, I can explain off line or when we meet. But it's not really important right now. I just wanted to make sure. The intent of this bullet was that if the A record changes, provides a different answer than it did before expiration, then the answer is yes, we changed it.

Michele Neylon: So in simple terms, you're saying, before expiry it's pointing to whatever the hell it's pointing to. And post-expiry it's pointing somewhere else.

Alan Greenburg: If it's pointing somewhere else, then I'm asking at what point was - we're asking at what point was this changed. The answer might be never, we didn't change it. We don't change it. Okay? The follow-on question is, at this point...

Mason Cole: Sorry, Alan, it's Mason. Can I ask a question on the previous question?

Alan Greenburg: Yes, certainly. Sorry.

Mason Cole: So what would the answer to that question give you in terms of information about helping a registrant get a name that maybe he unintentionally let go?

Alan Greenburg: One of the scenarios that has been discussed is a registrar that does not change DNS during the post-expiration process. That is, there is no visual clue to the user that anything has happened. So that goes back to what Michael Young was saying before, of the 30-day period and during RGP, makes the Web site go black.

Mason Cole: I understand. Okay. All right, all right.

Alan Greenburg: Which is something hard to ignore if you're awake at all.

Mason Cole: All right, I'm with you. Okay. All right, thanks.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yeah, in that regard, I think we have to make the distinction between whether an A record, which appears in a zone - or whether the root zone pointing to the name server changes. That's, I think, that technical issue is at the heart of what you're saying. The registrar doesn't control the - acting as a registrar, they don't act as someone who controls the A record. That's - maybe a registrar acting as a hosting company, but...

Alan Greenburg: The gist of what I was saying is trying to not have to have different questions based on whether the registrar hosts the DNS that is in use or not.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Right, but if...

Alan Greenburg: It doesn't matter who's the authority for that domain name. The question is what comes back.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: I get what your goal is, but I think we really need to ask whether or not the root servers are changed to point to a different name server or not, because that's the real clue that's been traditionally used.

Alan Greenburg: But that does not catch the case where the DNS that the registrant is using is hosted by the registrar, who can then change the A record without changing the root zone.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Right, if they choose not to change the root zone. So the important thing is did they change the root zone or not.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Who's speaking? (Mikaly)?

Michele Neylon: (Mikaly), yeah. I think part of the problem is the way the question is worded.

Alan Greenburg: Well that's why I was trying to make sure it's worded reasonably.

Michele Neylon: Well no, I think if you just made it a little bit more explicit as in explain, i.e. it no longer resolves to the original Web page.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Is it the term DNS that's causing all this problem with the root zone?

Ron Wickersham: Yeah, that's the problem. This is Ron Wickersham again. That's the problem to me, that without - as far as looking down the road to formulating a policy suggestion, it makes a difference whether the root zones were ever changed or not. So collecting information to that regard makes it clearer what we can make a policy recommendation.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Maybe I'm missing something. If my Web site is pointing to 1.1.1.1, you change the root zone to point to a different...

Ron Wickersham: Yes, when it's deleted from the root zone, then there's no name server associated with that, the main (unintelligible) goes dark.

Alan Greenburg: But if you now pointed to your name server as the authority, and put an A record in your...

Jeffrey Eckhaus: But I have no way, if it's been hosted somewhere else, I have no way other than if I'm busy spending time looking at who's hosting my customers' domains, I have no way of recreating that zone. They may have additional things that's necessary for their Web page. It may not be just an A record for www-dot. It may be another one for images-dot, or forum-dot, or wiki-dot. And I have no way of knowing if all of those are recreated or not in this distant zone that I'm...

Alan Greenburg: The gist of why this question was added, if we go back to the start of this, is asking does someone who is coming in and trying to use the Web site -- whether it's the registrant or someone else -- see a difference. So what the root zone says, and who is the authority on this domain, doesn't really matter for the purpose of the question.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay, as long as we cover that somewhere else, if changes are made in the root zone. I think we need to be aware of whether changes are made in the root zone or not.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I have no problem asking that as a second question. But one can make changes in the root zone and still end up with the same end result from a user's perspective.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: And at that point, to some extent, it can be completely moot. I mean if you revamp all of your domain servers, you may make a change in the root zone. But it doesn't change the end result.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Right, but if it's deleted in the root zone, then it goes bad.

Alan Greenburg: And that's certainly a change. All right, if anyone is not happy with the wording there, then let's propose something else on the list. The next question says at this point, which says: Something has changed, where does it point?

And we've gone through a number of words. I think that what is there right now is what was proposed during the last meeting.

James Bladel: Alan, this is James.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, please James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah and, all right. Maybe my memory is faulty, but I thought we were going to not necessarily get into the construction of a new page. Just essentially say it was going to post as something else. I think that was the...

Alan Greenburg: I think what we said last time is we didn't want to offer suggestions, but we wanted to ask a more open-ended question and the paper clip was an example.

James Bladel: I think I recall Jeff and I were discussing some alternative language to not necessarily get into what was or was not on the new page, just what, you know, where does it (unintelligible), as you were saying. Not offering the...

Alan Greenburg: I did have one specific comment that the wording that Marika captured was, does it point to the original page or a different page. And I think since this question is prefixed saying we're only talking, but when it's pointing somewhere else, we don't need the original page or a different page there on the first line.

James Bladel: Because we've already established it's pointing somewhere.

Alan Greenburg: That's right. So I think we're saying does it point, or where - I think the wording then would have to be, instead of (unintelligible), where does it point. Example, a paper clip page. Is that acceptable to all?

Man: Yeah.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. The next question goes back to the issue of does the registrant or someone else looking at the page understand what's happening, and saying does the new page explicitly say that the registration has expired and how it should be reclaimed. I think that's a very important issue from the point of view of the registrant, and someone else going to the page who may want to alert the registrant.

Man: Yeah, good question. (Unintelligible) for that.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. Then we go into the - go away from the Web, remembering that domain names can be used for a whole multitude of things, but the primary ones that we can ask targeted questions are on the Web, which we've just done, and email.

And the next set of questions have to do with what happens to the email, essentially. One can imagine a number of different scenarios that it can get redirected somewhere else; it can continue going to the original registrant through use of an MX record, even if the Web site is redirected. It can go into a black hole, it can bounce. All right, James?

James Bladel: I'm sorry. Mason, did you want to go? Or...

Mason Cole: Nope, I was pointing to your hand up.

James Bladel: Oh, okay, thanks. Yeah, I just - the wording of this particular question then, and I think we've touched on this issue before, is because, you know, just the nature of email, a registrar cannot insure delivery. So I think, you know, we should probably necessarily, you know, does the name stop being delivered? I think that we can say at what point, you know, things are sent, and what actions a registrar may or may not do to, you know, to increase the likelihood of delivery.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, just for the record, the first question, the one starting at what point, I am proposing - or we are proposing, it's being replaced by the next two bullets.

James Bladel: The entire first question will be stricken and replaced by the next two bullets?

Mason Cole: If the RAE, and if the RAE.

Alan Greenburg: There's a parenthetical in the middle which says that.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: We still have the problem you're talking about, but nevertheless...

James Bladel: Yeah, I see. Okay, go ahead. I saw someone else with their hand up, so I'll just drop out of the queue.

Alan Greenburg: Everyone is down now? Paul had his hand up, but it's gone.

Paul Diaz: I guess I'll just weigh in because I was fine with what James was saying. This is Paul - what James was saying, and then I got a little confused by what you just added. Alan, if you can redirect, you're suggesting what?

Alan Greenburg: Okay. The bullet that is at the top of a page, the top of my page, which says at the point, at what point does email, is struck. And in its place there are two new bullets, both of which start with the RAE. Sorry, if the RAE.

Paul Diaz: Okay, then I do have a question if I may. I think we need to clarify here is the registrar is not hosting the DNS. I don't know how we would determine that, other than the fact that we would get a bounce if we send an email. But...

Alan Greenburg: Okay, just for the record, DNA should be DNS, of course.

Paul Diaz: Can we clarify that question a little bit?

Alan Greenburg: Well the question came up last time of how can an MX record be left in place if the Web site points somewhere differently. And after a little bit of to and fro, we realized that there are two different scenarios. One is where the DNS managed by perhaps the reseller or Web hoster is being used. And the other case is when the DNS is not associated with the registrar, in which case you must move all or nothing. Does that make any more sense?

Man: No.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, unfortunately I don't think so. I think we'll need to insert that in your new bullet point beginning if the RAEs, etcetera. And we're going to have to make that clear, because if the registrar is looking to try and respond to this,

we're going to be left scratching our heads saying we don't have control over the DNS. We can't answer it. Maybe that's the, you know, response you're looking for.

Alan Greenburg: Well and the first bullet, the first new one, says if the RAE has been using the registrar's or reseller's own DNS. If they haven't, then they don't answer that question at all.

Paul Diaz: All right, so that's a formatting - since it starts further up, I thought it was all from the previous.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Now you say there are two questions that come out of it instead of one.

Alan Greenburg: Sorry, that was just a formatting. I'm trying to show the logic of how we got to the revisions.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I'm just reading all this stuff here about the email and I'm just - my head's going to explode. I mean, okay, you're going to have to get rid of any reference to the term deliver, with anything involving email. Sending is one thing. That's already been stated. There's no way for anybody to know if it's being delivered or not. Asking any registrar to keep track of bounces and everything else is completely unreasonable.

Alan Greenburg: No, no I - that certainly wasn't the intent. The intent was if I send email to "x" at the domain that is now in question, the one that is expired, one of several things can happen. It can still be targeted at the original place. Now whether it works or not, you know, depends on the idiosyncrasies of the Internet. That wasn't what the issue was. The issue was is there still and A or an MX record which says try to deliver it to the original place.

In the absence of that happening, is it going somewhere where the answer will be, sorry that user doesn't exist here any more? Or will it just go into a black hole?

Michele Neylon: But I don't understand what the use of the answer to that question is.

Alan Greenburg: Well it has exactly the same use as the questions related to the Web site. If you have a domain name which is not being used for a Web site, but is being purely used for email, as an example, what happens? What visual, what message do you get back that it has expired?

Michele Neylon: Okay, but is this in reference to a third party trying to send email to the domain name? Or is this in reference to the registrar sending email to the domain name?

Alan Greenburg: No, the first bullet is in reference to a third party.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: Or are you sending email to yourself? But the question is if mail is directed at an email address using the domain name that has expired, what happens based on the changes, if any, that the registrar has made. I'm not talking about the reliability of the Internet. We're talking about what is the intent of the changes. I welcome better wording.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, I think you just said it.

Mason Cole: Did anyone capture it? It's in the transcript. All right. God bless MP3.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Okay, if you go back to the transcript and try to capture that, is everyone happy?

Man: Yeah.

Man: May I ask if, could we possibly make one little change, which is this email directed. Directed says a whole bunch of intermediate steps. I think what you really mean to say is email address to the domain name. And that would, because directed implies...

Alan Greenburg: I consider that a friendly amendment. Anyone else want to have a go at this before we go onto the next one?

(Tim): Yeah, this is (Tim), Alan.

Alan Greenburg: Welcome, (Tim).

(Tim): You might - yeah, sorry I joined late. You might even want to use that term third party so that it's clear that this question's not about emails that the registrar's sending, but, you know, that others are sending. And then, you know, there's just a note when we get back, when we actually do this survey and we get back responses, we'll...

Alan Greenburg: We may have to tweak the questions.

(Tim): Yeah, because I think we might find there's other things that aren't quite as clear as we think they could be. Or we may have to look at other sources, too, for some of the information. I have a feeling that there's probably a good number of registrars who may not even know the answer to that question, simply because they don't necessarily process their own email, whether it's hosted elsewhere or not. You know, in other words they advertise being the hoster and etcetera, but actually using third party tools or services to provide it.

Alan Greenburg: Sure. All right, Marika, I note we were having this conversation when the wording was talked about, it was about 38 minutes into the call. One of us should be able to find the exact wording at that point.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: Sorry. Marika?

Marika Konings: I just wanted to know where (Tim) wanted to use a third-party reference. If you could maybe clarify that.

(Tim): You know, I would say, you know, third-party email address to the domain, or something like that.

Marika Konings: Okay, okay.

Alan Greenburg: Or mail sent by a third party.

Ron Wickersham: Right. This is Ron Wickersham again. In these questions, while we keep referring in the conversation to saying they're addressed to a registrar, I believe at this time these questions are addressed to our internal panel who tries to gather this information from the Web site. And this is a tough one to gather from a Web site.

Alan Greenburg: This one is not likely to be gathered from a Web site. Marika has a whole roomful of people back there that will gleefully be asking these questions for us.

Marika Konings: I wish.

Man: Gleeful is a term of art I hadn't heard in this context.

Alan Greenburg: I don't know. Some of us seem pretty gleeful at the moment, but it may be just exhaustion. All right, if we can go on, the next one is if the RAE's contact email uses the domain name in question, does the registrar factor this in, in sending out post-expiration reminders?

This is something that was brought up in the last call of if I have a.org registered, and my contact information is a.org, does anyone notice that? Or do we still gleefully try to send the mail out, which we know won't get there? That doesn't, of course, address what should be done in such a case. But that's not at the level of information gathering.

Okay. The next question seems to be a follow-on to the previous one, and I'm not sure if they need to be merged into the same question. The first question as we had it now, said at what point is mail addressed at a specific domain name stop being delivered - well, we didn't use the word delivered. I don't remember what I said. I think the wording that we came up to that we're going to go back to the transcript with now includes the question of what happens to the mail.

Mason Cole: I think you said directed to, or something like that.

Alan Greenburg: Yeah, but the question of does it bounce or discarded, or redirected to another recipient factors in. If you give Marika and I the latitude, we'll either do this in two questions or one question, whichever we can phrase best.

Mason Cole: Alan, it's Mason. I think the answer to some of this is going to be, we have no idea. I mean if it gets redirected to - like if, I don't know, if it's to a company or something like that, and a person who's responsible for the domain name and Whois record leaves the employ of the company but his or her email is forwarded to someone else in the company, we may not know that.

Alan Greenburg: No, the question is not whether it goes to user x or user y at the domain name. The question is if you are now intercepting the traffic to go to, for

instance, a paper clip page, what happens to the email that was going to that same domain name. That's the substance of the question.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: I mean there are a number of issues. Number one it's a matter of what kind of awareness is there that the email is no longer working, if it is no longer working? It could still be working.

And there's a privacy issue of what are you doing with this email that was directed at someone else that you now have been able to take over?

One presumes you're not sitting there at your desk reading it with glee but that's the substance of the question.

Mason Cole: All right.

Alan Greenburg: The next question had to do with spam filters and what's the likelihood that someone will get a message? And the question was are the reminders sent to the same address that the registrar normally uses for communication?

Don't remember who added that. It may have been (Mike Pali) or maybe somebody else.

Marika Konings: This is Marika . I recall that someone to forward a question with in mind that I think it's or in case of an email address might be filtered through the spam filter if it's not the usual address.

Alan Greenburg: Yes.

Marika Konings: And is that the question?

Alan Greenburg: No, it was spam filter related.

Mike O'Connor : This is Mikey. You might want to add that for the question just to clarify the spam business.

Alan Greenburg: Add a clarification that if a different address that used it might be caught by spam filter or something like that just to explain why we're asking the question?

Mike O'Connor : Yes.

Alan Greenburg: I think that's reasonable.

Ron Wickersham: Yes, this is (Ron). Yes I was the one who raised that before because of an incident where post expiration the originating email address changed on a - and so the registrant didn't understand that these were from his registrar. They seemed to be phishing attacks.

Alan Greenburg: Well yes indeed. I've personally seen ones where they come from a generic name, you know, domain name services or something like that.

Ron Wickersham: Right.

Alan Greenburg: It sounds like someone phishing but it in that particular case it happens to be a legitimate domain name owned by the registrar.

Ron Wickersham: But all previous communications from the registrar have not had that appearance.

Alan Greenburg: Yes. And the other issue of course is if the original contact was made by a reseller and the reminders are now coming from the registrar, that may be a name no one has ever seen before also.

Ron Wickersham: Agreed.

Alan Greenburg: All right.

Mike O'Connor : This is Mikey. I don't get any of that last paragraph of conversation is captured by the question the way it's worded now. You know, I think it's really important but it needs to be stuck in there somehow.

Alan Greenburg: So you're talking about the issue that if it comes from either an unfamiliar source or a suspect looking source it may be either just ignored or treated as spam, something capturing that intent?

Mike O'Connor : Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, okay noted. I say that lightly and I'm hoping Marika is noting. Good old Marika .

At what point if any is the expired domain name made available to others, others than the RAE sale auction -- whatever? Any problems with that?

Marika Konings: I'll note it.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, if the reseller is involved in the original transaction how does the RAE determine whether they are dealing with a reseller or a registrar?

If the RAE is dealing with a registrar how can the RAE identify the affiliated registrar? And to recover the domain name can they RAE work with the registrar directly or must work with the reseller?

Now some of these, the early questions are to some extent addressed by the new RAA in that there is a requirement to make available, not always clearly, but make available who the reseller, who the register is if it's a reseller.

James Bladel: Alan , this is James .

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

James Bladel: Yes, I just wanted to...

((Crosstalk)).

James Bladel: Hello?

Alan Greenburg: Go ahead.

James Bladel: Oh okay. I just wanted to point out that I was behind this kind of clumsy compound question last week and for the folks that missed the last call, really attempting to boil down I think a number of questions and topics related to how resellers fit into this transaction if they do - if they do indeed at all.

So I thought perhaps structuring it in this series of (pending) conditionals might be the most straightforward way to do that.

Alan Greenburg: Okay thank you.

James Bladel: But I'm open to (edit).

Alan Greenburg: I think they're relatively clear and useful. I've always personally been interested in how many times does a registrant try to transfer a domain from one reseller of registrar X to another reseller of registrar X. I'd be curious in seeing the statistics of that.

But nevertheless, okay next, what options are available for - are available and should (be for) contacting reseller or registrar post expiration?

The question was asked because it is being noted that particularly in the case of summary sellers but possibly registrars also they don't even provide a telephone number. And they only provide email or Web form.

And if you're trying to do something urgently that's not necessarily the way to get quick action.

And perhaps lastly under what conditions is their domain name actually deleted and enters the RGP?

Are we happy now that these are, once we do the edits that we're talking about today that these are reasonably complete and we can go ahead with it? We may of course learn something during the process of doing the original survey that requires us to or want - makes us want to change something. But are we moderately comfortable that this is a good start?

Man: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon: Yes, Cheryl (yes).

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. The second question is essentially the same scenario but what happens if the registrant explicitly says they are not interested in renewing? And the answer could be we do exactly the same things or maybe there was something that's done differently.

Mason Cole: Alan a question. It's Mason .

Alan Greenburg: Yes go ahead.

Mason Cole: What - when you say explicit instructions of an intention not to renew, what is that - what's an example of that in your mind?

Alan Greenburg: You send out a reminder to someone and they come back return it and say I don't want this domain name anymore. I have no intention of renewing.

Mason Cole: Okay so the question is, if we get that do we still follow any of the procedures that you outlined under number one?

Alan Greenburg: Any of the procedures that you outlined. Yes.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Yes.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: Can we get the attention of the operator to try to get the dead line away?

Does anyone hear or is it just me?

((Crosstalk)).

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. I thought for a moment it was just me, okay.

Paul Diaz: I've got a question for you Alan .

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

Paul Diaz: This is Paul . The - this particular question I guess I'm just - help me think through the logic here for the question before the working group, the charter questions.

You're talking about, you know, means to recover a name post expiration. This question is asking somebody says I don't want the name anymore and yet you're still asking what happens?

I'm missing a step in the logic here. Why are we asking this question?

Alan Greenburg: The reason is a number of registrars have said if someone tells us that we really - that they really want to delete a name we don't believe them.

We know sometimes they're going to be coming back shortly thereafter and say oops I made a mistake. I really want it again.

James Bladel: Alan this is James .

Alan Greenburg: Yes James ?

James Bladel: And that was me and I don't think that that's precisely what I was trying to say. It was...

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

James Bladel: ...well I was trying to say something like a certain percentage will want to come back...

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

James Bladel: ...and have that reversed. And so to guard against that percentage we would if a registrant explicitly asks to cancel a name, we do hold on to it for a brief period of time. So as long as we don't cross over any grace period boundaries to ensure that we have that, that is a reversible...

Alan Greenburg: I was being flippant, inappropriate for the chair. But I was trying to say what you just said.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mike O'Connor : Hello. This is Mikey. I've got a question.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, go ahead.

Mike O'Connor : What about fraud? What about a person who intercepts the email and fraudulently says no. There...

Alan Greenburg: That perhaps is a good reason for the registrar also to not take immediate action. But we're just asking what registrars do at this point.

Michael Palage And again Alan this is Mike Palage. Just as someone who originally asked the question, we were trying - part of this question also was to look at the general practices of registrars where they auto renew all the names from their account.

So this was kind of trying to get a spectrum of how they treat different domains or if they even in fact do treat them differently. As we heard from some of the registrars in some previous calls, notwithstanding that some registries have different billing practices regarding auto renew, most registrars appear to follow the same practice regarding the impact on the end user whether they do or do not get charged the renewal fee at the time of expiration.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, is there any strong objection to keeping this question here? We do need to move on. We have only a half hour more and I really want to finish this whole questionnaire.

If not we'll move on but (Mikaly) had his hand up still or not?

Michele Neylon: Yes. I mean I'm just - I'm a bit concerned about some of these questions about what registrars do or don't do with domains that's largely irrelevant.

I mean the question is whether a registrant is given the opportunity to recover the domain name? What registrars are doing or not doing with domains is irrelevant.

Alan Greenburg: Are you talking about a specific question at this point?

Michele Neylon: Yes I mean this entire side conversation about people being interested in what registrars do with domains I feel it's completely off topic.

Alan Greenburg: Okay I'd...

Michele Neylon: I mean the question that's being asked and this working group is meant to answer is whether or not a registrant has ample opportunity to recover their domain, to renew their domain, or whatever.

What business practices registrars may or may not use and why they do so is irrelevant.

Alan Greenburg: Okay but I'm not sure in respect to what - which of the questions on this questionnaire you're talking about?

Michele Neylon: Well is just its some of the questions Mr. (Pali) brought up in both on the list and just now as well. It just seems to me the questions being asked and the reasons they're being asked does not actually address what this working group's scope was meant to be.

But I think that it - by asking too many questions about sidelined topics you're not actually going to help anybody. Because you're not going to get honest answers and it should be - the eyes should remain firmly on the ball.

In other words does the registrant have the opportunity to renew the domain, are they given ample notification, whether registrars are being billed, not billed, taking hits or not taking hits is irrelevant. It's not - it's got nothing to do with this.

Michael Palage: This is (Mike Pali). So who was just speaking?

Michele Neylon: Michele

Michael Palage: Hi Michele As far as the relevance I do think it is relevant regarding the some of the operational practices. Because as was documented by (Christina Roseetta from the IPC, when registrars as part of the expiration practice begin to make changes to who is information, that does have an impact on their ability to potentially timely recover a domain name.

So the reason I had that question regarding what happens if someone chooses to expire a name, are they making changes to the who is? So I do think that there is some relevance so I do take issue to your claim. It's totally irrelevant.

Alan Greenburg: I'm going to intercede in this debate. We have two hands up, James and then Jeff.

James Bladel: Yes just real quickly (Mike). (Christina), for a point of clarification, (Christina Rosette) scenario described a different situation. It was not an expired name. It was a deleted name that a registrant was attempting to avoid legal action so they deleted the name. Not truly the case...

((Crosstalk)).

Alan Greenburg: I would really like to have the debate about the questions we're looking at and not the side comments that people are making.

Jeff did you have something specific?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Oh yes I just - you know, I'll let that go. I just wanted to know if somebody could send that email to the list so we could read it to ourselves. And then I'll just leave it at that because I do - I agree with you, I want to move on.

Alan Greenburg: This is the (Christina) email?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: It was sent to the list but...

Jeffrey Eckhaus: I must have missed it. I'll look through my...

((Crosstalk)).

Marika Konings: It wasn't sent to the list but it's in the public comments forum.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Oh okay. All right, thank you.

Alan Greenburg: All right. There's a parenthetical after to which relates to that question. And it is a question for this group is do we want to ask the question of if someone terminates an agreement prior to expiration does the registrar treated as a delete or not which if they do, then it - or rather do they treat it as an expiration or do they not treated as an expiration?

Because that - we're asking about registrar practice on whether it falls into our working group of scope or not. Did I confuse everyone with question?

Man: Yes I'm sorry, I'm afraid you did.

Man: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Let me try again. In this scenario of a registrant deleting, requesting that a name be canceled, deleted regardless of the exact terminology, the question is what process does a registrar follow at that point?

And the specific question is do you treat this as an expiration happening early or do you treat it as some other or by some other process?

Mason Cole: I'm sorry, Alan it's Mason . Are you in Question 5 now?

Alan Greenburg: No. I'm on the square brackets are on Question 2.

Mason Cole: Oh, sorry.

Alan Greenburg: (Christina)'s question that she posted to the comments list talked about a registrant who had requested the name be canceled early.

There was a debate on this - within this working group as to whether that is deemed to be an expiration and therefore falls within our scope or is an early cancellation and it has nothing to do with expiration whatsoever.

And there seemed to be some division of opinion on whether an early cancellation is by definition - or rather cancellation is by definition an early expiration and expiration rules apply or if it is treated some other way.

And I'm suggesting that we ask the question of registrars when someone cancels a name in the middle of the process do you consider this an early expiration or not?

Mason Cole: Alan it's Mason . I just have a question about that if I may. So when you say an early - you're talking about before the original expiration date of the name?

Alan Greenburg: Six months into the year.

Mason Cole: Yes so okay, yes. So somebody calls you and says I don't want that name anymore, cancel it. That's what you're talking about.

Alan Greenburg: Now whether that means I don't want to own anymore or it means I expect you to delete it so that it never existed in the world, everyone has different opinions on that.

The only questions that I am suggesting we ask is ask the registrar do they consider this an expiration which therefore does fall under our domain or not. I'm not saying they're right or wrong, just asking the question.

Mike O'Connor : This is Mikey. I think you've done a pretty good job of rewording the question again in your comments. This would be another one for the...

((Crosstalk)).

Alan Greenburg: I've got to stop doing that. Okay we are an hour and two minutes into the call. Is everyone okay with putting that question in?

Hearing no knows we go on.

((Crosstalk)).

(Tim): Alan , this is (Tim).

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

(Tim): So, you know, I'm not so sure. I mean does that - doesn't that imply sort of an expansion of the - of what this group is chartered to cover which is basically post-expiration? So if someone - I guess I'm not convinced completely that a

request to cancel it prior to expiration is necessarily the same issue that we're dealing with here.

Alan Greenburg: Well...

(Tim): This is...

Alan Greenburg: I think I heard Cheryl .

Cheryl Langdon: Yes, thank you. I was just going (respond to team) that I thought was the purpose of asking, should we ask the question to establish is it or is it not (continued) on in the registry world, the registrar world? But it would be in any way shape or form considered an expiration?

If it is, then it is in thier purview. If it isn't well no it's not.

Mason Cole: I have a question. It's Mason .

Alan Greenburg: Yes I - my assumption's we're going to get some answers one way and some the other and we'll - we're going to have to discuss it again. On the other hand if no registrar in the world says they consider it an expiration then I think we have to take that at its face value.

We can debate whether we want to - need to expand the scope of it if we deemed it not to be an expiration but we want to talk about it anyway.

But I was just trying to ascertain is there - who thinks of this as an expiration, who does not?

Mason Cole: I have a question Alan .

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

Mason Cole: Well actually I have two comments. One is it seems like - I'm not an attorney but it seems like that could be opened up for some manner of legal interpretation.

My suspicion is that if you get a reply to this from registrars that you query, the reply might be A, we get that so seldom that the questions are relevant. Or B, you know, it depends on how you define expiration.

You know, I think registrars generally consider expiration to be on the anniversary of a given anniversary of the beginning of that registration.

Alan Greenburg: In which case their answer is no we don't treat it like an expiration.

(Tim): And I guess...

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

(Tim): This is (Tim), Alan . I guess my concern is...

Alan Greenburg: Yes no hold it (Tim).

(Tim): ...and whether this is open to, you know, registrars defining what this isn't not. I mean either, you know, we're talking about a post-expiry in this group or we're not. If we're going to expand beyond that then I think you need - you should go back to the council for some interpretation or decision as to whether, you know, the charter should include it or not.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, so you believe we should not. James had a comment?

James Bladel: Yes I mean I think it's similar to what (Tim) was saying but maybe not. I mean this is something to the effect of if 994 registrars say they do it one way and two say they do it the other way are we - what are we going to do with this information?

Are we going to try to bring everybody inline one way or the other or if we prescribe any sort of practices or policies based on this process then are the registrars still able to opt out by just not treating it as an expiration? I'm just trying to figure out where we're going with this.

Alan Greenburg: I think if nothing else we'll have some information to feed back to the person who made this particular comment and to the other people who have gone on that bandwagon that have said an early cancellation is an expiration.

James Bladel: Okay. I have two quick comments.

Alan Greenburg: I just don't - I guess I don't see the harm in asking the question.

James Bladel: Okay so I just have two quick comments on that. And one is that whether we ask it here or not it, you know, I don't really have strong feelings. But, you know, this possibly might be more appropriately directed at some of the folks who are looking at how folks would avoid a UDRP or other types of action. So, you know, that might be a better venue to raise this issue.

Alan Greenburg: All right, I don't have any strong feelings about it. May I suggest people who feel strongly one way or the other make comments to the list and we'll try to come to closure on this and the next day or so?

Man: Good idea.

(Tim): Okay Alan this is (Tim).

Alan Greenburg: Yes (Tim)?

(Tim): I probably won't comment it on it on the list. I'll just make my comment now that again, I'll just reiterate that I think it's an expansion of scope and that that question appropriately belongs with the council and not in the list.

Michael Palage: This is (Mike Palage. And my - I guess if I could respond to that (Tim), maybe this questionnaire will find some other issues that may actually require an expansion of the original charter.

So perhaps let's ask the questions. Let's look at the issues. And then if there is a potential expansion of the charter we should go back to the council and ask for it.

But precluding questions from being answered at this time I don't think is constructive.

Alan Greenburg: Further discussion on the list.

(Tim): I just predict the answer you're going to get but, you know, that's I guess your choice.

Alan Greenburg: Okay we have 15 minutes left. Next question is are the terms of the treatment of a domain name registration at the time of expiration contained in the registration agreement or in another document?

Please specify if you have not already done so in Question 1 or 2 essentially where is the domain registrant supposed to find out this information?

If the registrar make substantial changes to who is at the time of expiration, is the practice dependent on the TLD? I would actually change that to the time at or after expiration.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay Alan it's Jeff. Can I ask a question please?

Alan Greenburg: Yes please.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Just on the one you just said maybe you're saying if the registrar makes substantial changes to the who is at the time of expiration, is that process dependent upon the TLD? Are you saying like, just to be simple like com versus net? Because then you give an example auto renew versus non-auto renew. So I'm not sure of the question. Hopefully you can clarify this.

Alan Greenburg: The question is is what you do dependent on rather the registry charges you for that domain at expiration date or not?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Oh I see, I see. Okay. Can you just add that in just so it's crystal clear because I have a feeling I just, know another registrars - people will be confused by that question?

Alan Greenburg: We will try to clarify.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. And I would like to change it to at or after expiration. If they do it three days later we're still asking the question I think.

Man: Well what happens if the registrar decides to - what happens with a registrar who may want to change it, you know, one hour before expiration even though the term of the registrant is up?

The reason I like that at expiration was that you kind of had a - you are - I think you - the question was originally thrown a substantial net.

Alan Greenburg: I don't - if you like it the way it is it was asked at your request. I'm not sure we need the information but it's not going to hurt us.

If you're happy with the way it is will leave it to be.

Man: Thanks.

Alan Greenburg: Next question is, it's still there, is does the registrar or affiliate provides the registrant prior to expiration the rights to remove the name from auction processes, auction sale processes?

No comments, no hands.

Michele Neylon: This is (Mikaly), one question.

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

Michele Neylon: Affiliates meaning what exactly?

Alan Greenburg: I think it is loosely meant as a subsidiary or parent or sister company.

Michele Neylon: It might be a good idea to explain that because within this market a lot of companies would have affiliates are in affiliate marketing which would confuse things even further.

Alan Greenburg: Ah good point. I'll ask (Michael) off-line who came up with the question originally if you can come up with a better word that will satisfy (Mikaly) and your own legal definition of this. James ?

James Bladel: You know what? I'm going to lower my hand because I just answered my own question by reading it a little more carefully. I was wondering why we weren't using RAE but it looks like we've changed it to be registrar prior to expiration. So there is only one and RAE is irrelevant, so I'm lowering my hand.

Alan Greenburg: Ah yes, okay. There may actually be a better term than registrant. I think the RAE uses some other expression. So there may be a question but I think we all understand at this point.

Does the registrar or affiliate we're using -- we need to define affiliate similarly here -- provide the registrant the ability to renew, reregister the domain name once it has entered the auction process or after completion of the auction process? If so are the costs the same during the auto renew? If the cost is not - so on and so forth.

Essentially we're asking is there a drop-dead point at which the - an auction begins or is there still opportunities to reclaim? And if so what are the general financial terms?

All hands, no questions.

Mike O'Connor : This is Mikey. You know, every time you do that little description that summarizes the question I always like it better than the question itself.

Alan Greenburg: But I ended that. I took the last three lines and said and so forth.

Mike O'Connor : Yes I know I like that.

Mason Cole: Alan , it's Mason .

Alan Greenburg: You - Mikey I - why don't you volunteer to transcribe this call?

Mike O'Connor : Oh it's the beauty of MP3.

Alan Greenburg: Yes Mason Cole?

Mason Cole: So just a word of caution. And I know this issue's been raised before and there are different opinions on it. But I don't think you can anticipate a lot of discussion from registrars on any kind of issue on pricing. So if you ask the question I just think you need to be compared for a polite decline on that question.

Alan Greenburg: I would say that if registrars all politely decline to give us the parameters, not the absolute actual pricing, then that is producing - then if they won't tell us they also won't tell the registrant which is not providing a rather predictable and clear environment for that registrant past the point when the auction begins.

Mason Cole: Well I've appreciate that point of view. I just want to say that I know registrars are extremely gun shy to talk about their business practices in the presence of other competitors whether it relates to pricing or not.

And specifically when it does relate to pricing I think you're especially going to get people who are just disinclined to say anything to stay completely on the safe side.

Alan Greenburg: Any other comments? Do we have general agreement from all the registrars that we shouldn't be asking what happens if - as soon as the name enters an auction process which as I understand it can start pretty soon after expiration in some cases?

(Tim): This is (Tim), Alan .

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

(Tim): Asking what happens is one thing. You know, getting into details about, you know, usual costs and then it even goes further into are the costs of same for all names? If not, what does it depend on, time of renewal, estimated value, et cetera, et cetera. And I think it's where you're going to start running into probably not getting a whole lot of information.

Alan Greenburg: But indeed that's also the area that we have had large numbers of complaints on, that is someone who wants to reclaim the name which has particular value based on whether it's semantic analysis of the name, paper clicks or how the auction is proceeding may have to pay an arm and a leg compared

to me renewing my no-name domain they'll charge me \$9. And that comes down to issues of predictability.

Mason Cole: So Jeff has his hand up but it's Mason again. I'd like to go after Jeff.

Alan Greenburg: Okay Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: You can go Mason . Go ahead. I'll go after you. Go ahead.

Mason Cole: So I don't want to get too far into an answer here. But as a company that provides registration services and auction services and aftermarket services, it - I guess I question where the large number of companies come from, where they go and how we quantify them.

Because we operate one of these services. In the scale of complaint against what I think is being alleged it just doesn't exist.

Now maybe that I don't have the information that you do. But if you do have it I'd like to see it because it just simply does not exist operationally in our experience.

Alan Greenburg: Jeff?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: I was just going to go back to - sorry about that question and just agree with (Tim)'s response to that. I think that the earlier questions about having the ability to get it back once it goes into auction. Otherwise it's sort of answers - it does answer the questions that we're looking for, what I thought we were looking for in the working group.

And this question goes - I don't know if it's getting to the answers that we're looking for. And I think it'll just have some problems with the responses on this.

And what I'm trying to do is, you know, for somebody who has to deal with the registrars a lot as part of the (xcom), I know the back and forth that goes on and the responses we'll get. And I'm just trying to help on this group to get clarification so that people will respond.

And I think by - I'll agree with the others by putting that in you'll probably have very limited response on this. And I won't say hostility, but I just think you'll have no response on it. And I want to try and get some responses to this survey so we can move on and, you know, and try and come to some sort of resolution on this.

Alan Greenburg: On reconsideration I believe we have already asked for this salient information about this in the bullet, the earlier bullet on Question 1 about how cost varies prior to the redemption grace period.

So I would say that's the large bullet on the first page.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Right that's - thank you - that's the one I was referring to.

Alan Greenburg: On re-inspection I think it in fact is covering those issues. (Michael), did you have a comment?

(Michael): Yes just with this whole discussion of price, you know, as a Go Daddy customer I am proud that Go Daddy tells me that if a name goes into auction I'm going to pay an \$80 redemption fee. That's in the terms of service. It's on their Web site that provides openness, transparency and predictability.

Now if somehow registrars feel that under the auspices of an antitrust they need to deny engaging in discussions of what should be public information to their registrants, so be it. I don't buy it and, you know...

Alan Greenburg: Okay but (Michael) the point I made is I think we have already asked this question in a different form. And the bullet on question one starting is the cost to the registrant.

(Michael): Yes.

(Tim): And this is (Tim), (Mike). My concern was more about the last couple of questions in 6 where it's talking about, you know, is there a variance? And then it starts asking, you know, what does that depend on?

And I don't know if that gets in how it related that is to antitrust but I know it's certainly related to - could be related to, you know, competitive decisions that are made or, you know, business model aspects that may not - a registrant may not want to reveal. And they just don't - regardless of what our goal is or right or wrong or (any of that), I just don't think you're going to get a lot of information on that with that question. I'm not sure what...

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I would suggest we delete the one currently numbered 6 because I believe it is a replication of what we have talked about before.

Marika Konings: This is Marika , just a clarification. Do we delete everything or just keep the first sentence?

Alan Greenburg: Everything under 6, does the registrar or affiliate.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: Because the auction process has already been covered since we said anything prior to that entering the RGP.

We are now asking, the next question is for registrars that have auction services, what percentage of registrants have exercised the right to reclaim it after the auction has started?

Does anyone have a problem with that?

Mason Cole: It's Mason again. I don't necessarily have a problem.

Alan Greenburg: Micahel Palage was your hand still...

Mason Cole: Oh sorry. Go ahead (Mike).

Michael Palage I'll take it down, my apologies.

Alan Greenburg: Okay sorry Mason .

Mason Cole: I just - I don't think registrars who operate these kinds of services are going to give you that information. I think they'll view it as proprietary.

Alan Greenburg: That's fine.

Mason Cole: Yes. I mean I don't necessarily object to the question itself I just - I seriously doubt you're going to get the answer.

Alan Greenburg: You may have the same comment with the next one.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Alan Greenburg: Oh I'm sorry. The next one I don't think we were asking the actual registrars. I think this would be gathered ourselves. And the intent was not to publicize this in any list of answers that might come out but simply to use it in a global sense to understand what percentage of overall registrations have we covered.

And the last question -- and the last two should probably be inverted -- is the registrar responding on behalf of a family of registrars or on behalf of themselves only?

Ron Wickersham: Yes this is (Ron) again.

Alan Greenburg: Yes?

Ron Wickersham: And this comes back to the thing, we're not asking the registrars under this. This is our internal group. So there isn't any registrar responding. This is a collection of data from their public Web site or retrieved.

Alan Greenburg: On a one-on-one discussion.

Ron Wickersham: Oh it does include one on one discussions? Okay.

Alan Greenburg: To the extent that we cannot glean the information ICANN will try to get it...

Ron Wickersham: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: ...based on discussion.

Ron Wickersham: Thank you for that clarification.

Alan Greenburg: And maybe responding may be the wrong word but does - do the questions correspond to a family or to an individual?

I think we've come to closure. There's a couple of things we're going to reword from the list or rather from the recording. There are one or two things that we said we would have - may have further conversation on the list.

At that point we will send around in relatively short order a revised version of this. And next meeting we may actually start beginning to talk about some substantive issues.

The next meeting is - why are you laughing?

Cheryl Langdon: I'm sorry. This is. We all know (unintelligible).

Alan Greenburg: All right, our next call is scheduled for...

((Crosstalk)).

Alan Greenburg: Our next call is scheduled for next week at this time.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika . If I can just add for the next call I hope to have a summary of the public comments that have been received. The public forum has been closed but we did receive I think ten or 11 comments.

Alan Greenburg: Excellent.

Marika Konings: And another point that hasn't been on the agenda for I think already two calls that we haven't been able to get to is the plans for the PDNR workshop our meeting in Seoul. You know, it would be nice to put something on the Web site of what this, you know, the meeting is going to be about and what will be interesting for the broader audience. So maybe people can think about that for next week.

Alan Greenburg: Well since we don't have a questionnaire to go over again hopefully we can move it closer to the top of the agenda and make sure we cover it.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: It's Jeff. Can I ask one quick question?

Alan Greenburg: Go ahead. You have 30 seconds left before the call expires. Yes sir?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay, can somebody send around this - if we have it, the proposed date and time for the Seoul meeting? I don't know if that was made available.

Alan Greenburg: I don't know when it is either. Marika , do you know? Last I heard it was Monday.

Marika Konings: Yes I think it's on Monday if I'm not mistaking 2:30 or 3:00. But I'll confirm and send it to the list.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Okay great. Thank you.

Alan Greenburg: I thank you all for your participation and for your good humor and Cheryl , I wish you luck in whatever is happening in your life right now.

Cheryl Langdon: Thank you.

Man: This meeting is better than coffee isn't it Cheryl ?

Alan Greenburg: For those who didn't hear the beginning part, she's sitting in a hospital emergency waiting room waiting for the results of some tests from her son I believe.

Thank you Cheryl . Thank you all.

Cheryl Langdon: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Cheryl Langdon: Even more exciting than (unintelligible). What can I say?

Man: Bye.

Man: Thanks Alan .

Alan Greenburg: Bye.

END