

**GNSO**  
**Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference**  
**13 October 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 13 October 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-20091013.mp3>

On page:

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

**Present:**

Alan Greenberg - ALAC  
James Bladel - RC  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair  
Ted Suzuki – IPC  
Paul Diaz – RC  
Ron Wickersham – NCUC (joined after roll call)  
Michele Neylon - RC  
Alaine Doolan – IPC  
Tatyana Khramtsova - RC  
Sergey Gorbunov  
Jeff Eckhaus - RC  
Michael Young - Registries  
Tim Ruiz – RC  
Phil Corwin – CBUC (joined after roll call)

**Staff:**

Marika Konings  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent apologies:**

Berry Cobb – CBUC  
Mason Cole - RC  
Michael Palage – CBUC  
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Could we have a roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Apologies for the inconvenience with Meeting View.

On today's call we have Michele Neylon, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Serge Gobunov, James Bladel, Tim Ruiz, Paul Diaz, Jeff Eckhaus, , Michael Young, Alaine Doolan, Ted Suzuki , Tatyana Khramtsova. And from staff we have Glen de Saint Gery, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies, is there anyone else from staff, I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I think (Marika) is here.

Gisella Gruber-White: Apologies. We have Barry Cobb and Mason Cole and please remind everyone to say their names when they speak for transcript purposes. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Gisella. I had an echo when you're talking, is it okay for the rest of us now?. Anyone else hear our host? No.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. The first item is a review of the agenda and I did ask (Marika) to flip two items, or to at least move and item, that is to move the status update on the survey up to the first item. Because I believe knowing what the current status of that is, may well help us in deciding what we do in Seoul. Are there any problems with doing that and any other requests for changes in agenda?

Hearing none, could we have a status update on the survey?

(Marika): Yes. This is (Marika). So I've in doing the research, starting off with printing all the information I could possibly find on the Internet on the different registrar websites. So far I've managed to cover the first four registrars on the top 10 lists. And I think I've been on average been able to find like 50% of the information in the information available online. And for the other 50%, I've reached out to the different contacts, some of which are part of this group to help me find the other information.

From two of those, I have already received feedback. I'm still waiting for feedback from the other two. I hope indicated that they're working on it and will get back shortly. And I will continue working down the list leading up to Seoul.

Alan Greenberg: So is it fair to say that within the next few days, we might be able to summarize the answers to the questions for those four top registrars, just to get a feeling for what is happening in the real world?

Marika Konings: And if the two outstanding are able to provide me with feedback in the next couple of days. And that goes to (James) and (Dex).

Jeff Eckhaus: This is (Jeff), I can respond to that. (Marika), I was out of town last week, so I'd responded with (Marika) that I would look at it this week. I should have it done by I'd say tomorrow end of day here, I'm on the Pacific Coast. Most of the responses that you had put in were pretty on point. There were just some of the additional questions that we just needed to respond to. But I would say tomorrow end of day for ours.

James Bladel This is (James). I should have it done relatively shortly. I'm targeting the end of this week. But I want to make sure I give it an opportunity for Tim to review it as well.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So that sounds good. By the way, in terms of - for Go Daddy, is that covered? Are you trying to cover your resellers or are you looking mainly at your direct business? Or did the two map to the same for the questions were looking at?

James Bladel I think it depends on the question somewhat, Alan . I think if you're, you know, if the questioning is targeting a retail environment, then we'll probably find, you know, using our experience with Go Daddy. But if it starts to ask questions about resellers, will probably put on our, you know, a different hat. But I think you can consider it a response on behalf of the family of registrars that we have.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel I'll let Tim of course correct me if I'm off base on that.

Tim Ruiz: No, I think that sounds correct.

Alan Greenberg: I was asking because I know in the case of some of the discussions we've had, you said that it's really the registrar's responsibility to take the action, not the resellers. So in that case, the answers would be uniform. And we're talking about notices and things like that. Other cases clearly, it may not.

All right. So we will have a good image of at least some of the characteristics that registrants see mapping to a large percentage of the total registrants. Maybe a majority, maybe not, but certainly a large number. Which we can use to illustrate some of the patterns that are seen.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is the Seoul meeting.

Marika Konings: Alan ?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: Can I just ask one more question?

Alan Greenberg: Yes certainly.

Marika Konings: So when I've gathered all the information on the four registrars, would you just like me to share it as is in Excel format. You know with all the information there. Would you like me to prepare a kind of summary that stays neutral on names and, you know, who said what and trying to give more the - to see if there is a general trend or not. How would you like me to present that information?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Well, certainly from my point of view, I would like to see the raw data. Because I think with only four to look at, it's not going to be hard to summarize them just optically by looking at them. And will give a better picture regarding how uniform they are. But I'm willing to, you know, hear thoughts from other people. Paul ?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Alan . I just, you know, we first tried to get it in quickly, but I was always operating on the assumption: A) that all these will be anonymized. But you may optically think you can figure out who it is, that's fine. But I don't want to see anything coming out, published papers by this group or whatnot that could clearly link us.

I also think it's dangerous to start taking things in piecemeal and would prefer to see, you know, at least the first four groups responding and then, you know, some form of summary or whatnot. I think, you know, if you start looking at what one says and then what the other one says, more than anything we're probably just going to start, you know, chasing down particular things that may not apply to all. I would counsel to wait until the first four are in and then roll them up again, anonymously though.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I can certainly live with that. Well, (James)?

James Bladel Yes, I just wanted to echo and agree with what Paul was saying. As well as offer a suggestion that we possibly have (Marika) anonymize them before bringing them back to the group. Since our transcripts and Wiki and things like that are public. Just want to make sure that there's not an inadvertent leak of the information that (Paul's) talking about.

Alan Greenberg: No, I'm assuming that our mailing lists and things like that are public, so anything distributed to the group as a whole certainly would be public and we have to honor that.

(Marika), your hand is back up.

Marika Konings: Yes. I just want to ask to make sure, cause I want to, you know, make sure there are no concerns and I'm not printing anything out that we don't want to see there. So would people be happy then if I, you know, take off the name at the top of the registrars identified. Like hustle them up and, you know, and take out - I really have been careful in talking about registrar and not putting in the name of the actual registrar in the language.

I would be happy to share that, I will of course take out, cause now I've included as well all the reference material that I've used for the research. So I would take that information out as well. And are those on the call, you know, (James), Paul are you happy with that information being shared?

Because of course some of the, you know, the language will be - it's not too difficult to trace it back. Some of these texts comes straight out of registration agreements, or some product websites. So if someone puts a little bit of research on it, of course it wouldn't take too much effort to, you know, put two and two together.

Is that sufficient? Are you more comfortable if, you know, I do what I just said and send it to you, so you just check whether, you know, you're happy with it as is going out on the mailing list?

James Bladel Yeah, this is (James), I'll respond. I think that, you know, we want definitely company/registrar names removed, any identifiers such as address, or (unintelligible) number. But also be careful with any footnotes or URLs referenced, you know the web pages of those particular registrars.

I think that going beyond that, I think that, you know, if a person is so inclined and industrious. That they want to start doing text mapped searches against all of our registration agreements, I think, you know, I don't know if we can guard about that and still have something useful or useful bit of data to inform this group.

But I don't think that owing to that extreme is necessary, but I think just wiping out anything that could be directly linked as an identifier to a registrar would probably be good. I see (Jeff)'s hand is up so I drop off. (Jeff)?

Jeff Eckhaus: I'm kind of just thinking here on this, is what's the level of the responses that would be useful to the group? Of course I'd like it to be as anonymous as possible, so I think part of that would be, you know, what's the data that would be - that we could put forward that anonymous that would be relevant and useful to this group.

Because we would want to make it - I wouldn't want to go through this survey and then we come back and we say, "Hey, it's too much out." You know the data is too cleansed, or we can't figure anything out, versus it's too detailed. But, so maybe if I can turn it that way, maybe that will help respond to how anonymous it needs to be.

Alan Greenberg: (Marika), did you want to comment? I have a thought, but you go ahead first.

Marika Konings: No. I'm sorry I just had my hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. What I was thinking and I'm not sure how much it will dirty the data and make it less useful, is (Marika) was talking about a sort of a

spreadsheet with the four sets of answers. In the extreme, we could randomize the order for each question. And, you know, the first one question (1A) may be Go Daddy, the first one question; (1B) may be, you know, eNom. That may make it rather difficult to understand, however, because some of the questions are in fact sequences of things that happen one after the other.

Jeff Eckhaus: Alan , hey, sorry it's (Jeff). Yeah, so I guess, sorry, maybe I misstated my question sort of. What if not the physical output, but what's the data that you would use, that you would need to, you know, to help to get the answers that were looking for and to move on? Not the actual physical layout, because that can always be played around with.

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm assuming that in some questions we're going to find uniformity, that is all the answers are similar, in which case we have a description of whatever the question was asking about. In other cases, we're going to have a range of answers which will vary from registrar to registrar.

You know, certainly the questions about what kind of notices do you send? And do you send notices post expiration? And, you know, some of those we know there's a variation between registrars and seeing just what the range of them is may help us in deciding whether we need to formulate policy there, or best practices or just leave it alone.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. So, I mean, I think that - I think (James) and the others and everyone else made good valid points about the level of the data. I don't think we need to mix up the questions. And I think maybe - I don't know about the other registrars, but I sort of trust (Marika) on this,

saying hey, here's like the basic stuff, like remove our names and links and other things like that.

And then to try and, you know, make it as anonymous as possible without, you know - without deteriorating the actual responses. I don't know - I kind of - I think I can trust (Marika) and staff to put that together.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, (Marika) do you have marching orders that you're happy with?

Marika Konings: Yes, and I would just like to encourage those about providing feedback, you know, in the answers you provide me with, you know, please indicate if there's something that you would like to see included. Or, you know, just make sure you make reference to the things that I've already filled in then you say, "Well, this is not public information or is not correct or whatever."

But as well, you know, I have the feedback from you guys to make sure that I put the information in there. Because I've tried already to do my best to make it, you know, as anonymous as possible, not use the name of the registrar, just refer to registrar, or not any, you know, other identifiable information. But if I've missed anything, you know, just please let me know.

And I think, you know, otherwise, I think I know what I'm supposed to do. So I'm happy to pre-send out to those on the call that provide it input just as a last check before it goes out to the mailing list, if people would like that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, if we can get a quick turnaround.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and just to confirm in principle, you know, I'm not going to put anything else in there, what I've already sent you and what you send me back. So in that sense, you know, I'm not expecting to make any huge changes, cause I already did my research and I'm waiting for your input. So in between that, there shouldn't be any drastic changes from what you've seen.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I guess from my side, I'd prefer to have the data in hand before I leave for Seoul and that's a week from tomorrow.

Okay, the next item on the agenda is discussion of what we're going to do in the Seoul workshop and update. And a little bit of information on timing. We had at the last meeting said we would schedule it for an hour, because there was a half-hour overlap with the AXO meeting. The AXO meeting has since been canceled.

Woman: I was going to say that is not a problem.

Alan Greenberg: Well, my immediate reaction was to ask (Marika) if we can extend a half-hour, which she said we could, because of the lack of AXO meeting. Could we extend farther than that? And in fact have both a public workshop and perhaps a one hour meeting of the committee.

The answer unfortunately is a half-hour after the end of our scheduled meeting is the registrar/registry separation meeting, which has been scheduled in place of the AXO. And I suspect a large number of the people on this call are going to be interested in that meeting. So it pretty well says we have an hour, either the hour we have currently

scheduled, or an extra half-hour and that that our limitation, going all the way to 15:00. And that our limitation.

My feeling is with only an hour and a half, there's no point in trying to schedule a committee meeting. So the question is, do we leave the public meeting at one hour, or let it go to the full time zone, the time that is available of an hour and a half tops.

I suspect we have enough to fill the hour and a half, assuming there are people in the room that want to speak. If it's just us speaking, an hour is going to be more than enough I think. (James)?

James Bladel: Yes, I'm just looking at the schedule quickly here. It looks like that there is subsequent to that, there are a couple of other meetings relative to the new details eProgram, if I'm reading that correctly.

Alan Greenberg: I think there's one at 15:00, at three o'clock. I don't know if there's anything for the half-hour before. I haven't looked at the final schedule itself.

James Bladel: Okay. I would just lobby for keeping to an hour, just so that I don't have to go through the cascading schedule change (unintelligible). But that's a personal and selfish reason to want that, but I'll just put that out there as well.

Alan Greenberg: (Marika) you were going to say something?

Marika Konings: No (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay, it's all right, I thought I heard your voice. Tim you're next then.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I was just going to echo what (James) had said. And I know that sometimes, you know, however it runs, it's going to run probably over a little bit and things just happen that way. So I would be a little nervous about going to the full hour and a half. I know for myself and I'm sure the other registrars on the call are not going to want to miss any of the registry/registrar separation...

Alan Greenberg: Nor are some of us...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, right, I'm sure, thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes, we may just get up and all move I think.

Alan Greenberg: (Mecally)?, (Mecally)?

Michele Neylon: Pretty much what the other two guys said. Though I would add, I think we should set up a little stand selling pop corn for the Registry/Registrar Separation Meeting.

Alan Greenberg: What do we use the proceeds for?

((Crosstalk))

Man: Tranquilizers.

Man: Set up a series of funds that will be used for community projects.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I could make a comment at this point, but I think I'll be nice and not make any.

Okay, I think we have unanimity that we stay at one hour. Now what do we do for that hour? I've had some thoughts. Anyone want to go first? Or do you want to listen to me and then shoot me down?

Man: I like the idea of shooting you down Alan , boom.

Marika Konings: I was going to say that's always good sport Alan ...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay (Marika), you dare to want to speak first?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: No...

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, sorry, it's been a long day for me already.

Marika Konings: ...but actually if we're going to keep with one hour, then my question would be if we could maybe then do the meeting from 2 to 3, instead of 1:30 to 2:30, as there is a (GNSO) (CCNSO) lunch meeting that's taking place. Although, I know that the (CCTLA) Fast Track Meeting starts as well at 1:30, so I don't know if that means that the (GNSO) (CCSO) meeting will be cut short as well. Otherwise...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: If there's a (CCTLD) Fast Track Meeting starting at 1:30, the lunch will stop by then.

Marika Konings: ...okay, so then we don't have an issue.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, if we move it till - from 2 to 3, then we start hitting the barrier that Tim was worried about. That is we overflow a little bit and...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...overlap with the registry registrar separation one.

Marika Konings: Okay, then we just leave as is.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. (Jeff)?

Jeff Eckhaus: So here is my - I guess it's more of a question. Is the idea of the meeting in Seoul, is it to provide an update to the larger community at hand, of where the status of where we are? Or is it for the people on this call, to have like a face to face and move forward? Because if we only have one hour, we need to choose one or the other. And I guess once we choose that path, then we could sort of set the agenda. But I'm not sure what's the specific goal. Maybe we can clarify that.

Alan Greenberg: Well I think the die is cast, in that it is the latter, because we have announced it as a public meeting. That's the question I was asking at the beginning of this little discussion, of do we want to try to set aside some time for a face to face meeting of this working group? And it sounds like there is not enough time in that time slot. And, you know, unless we want to do something for a half hour, but to be quite honest,

by the time we get to the room and start, people are going to want to leave for the Registry/Registrar Meeting, I would think.

Jeff Eckhaus: So we'll be more the state public update then to the community?

Alan Greenberg: Public update, and to the extent we can, solicitation of information, or input.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Someone had a hand up, but then dropped it. I don't recall who it was, but it's gone.

Man: It was (James) and I think (Jeff) covered it, so...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Man: ...(Jeffrey) did.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think once we've announced it as a public meeting, it's too late now to go back and make it into a private working group meeting.

All right, in the absence of hands, what I was thinking of trying to do was on the assumption that at least some of the people at that meeting are not going to be well aware of the intricacies of the end of life timeline. And by then, based on what (Marika) has said regarding the survey, we should have some hard data points as to what's really happening for at least a percentage of registrants.

And I would suggest that we start off with a review of the end of life timeline. Not just with the picture, but trying to summarize what the RAA and other contractual requirements are on these various issues. The various specific issues that we identified in the survey. And then adding to that, what is being experienced in real life based on the survey questions. And other moderately hard data points that we have.

Does that sound like something realistic to do? (Marika)?

Marika Konings: I was wondering whether something that we could mention or share with the group as well is the public comments received. I mean of course I'm going through them, but just to mention that, you know. Some public comments I've received touching upon these different issues, as a way, as well maybe get the audience to provide input or share their yes's or no's on some of those comments.

Alan Greenberg: I was going to do that as a separate item, but it may well fit into the same thing.

Marika Konings: Okay, fine.

Alan Greenberg: One way or another, I think the answer is yes. We want to get some feedback on what we received and how we understood it.

Any other thoughts on trying to present essentially a status report of where we are right now. It's something we don't have at this moment, but we will have by the time we have the survey - the first part of the survey done. And I think it would be useful to understand how the real life experiences correspond to the various requirements that are within the RAA and the contractual requirements.

Input? How we get that done of course in the timeframe we have is a different question. But if we can get it done, does that sound like a reasonable way to proceed?

(Marika) your hand is up again or still?

Marika Konings: Sorry (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: All right. In the absence of any negative comments, I'll assume that that's a good way to start. I'm not sure to what extent the comments that came in with the public comment period can be integrated into another column in that table. But to the extent it could, they should be. I would think though that they're probably going to be something that we should deal in a different section and then follow by soliciting comments from the public, particularly on the charter questions. But hold it relatively open.

Dead silence, no hands. Okay, the next question is how do we actually get that work done? That is try to put together a list of some of the questions we asked in the survey, what is mandated by the contractual requirements and add to that the summary of what we have seen. Not broken out in the four registrars, as we were talking earlier in this meeting, but, you know, trying to represent the overall picture using a range or, you know, a list of the various options that people see depending on the registrar.

(Marika) This is (Marika). I'm happy to have a first go at putting together some slides touching on these different topics.

Alan Greenberg: Okay and I'm certainly willing to work with you on a.

(Marika): It might require some working in Seoul, I'm afraid but...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I, I...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): ...it could be a problem.

Alan Greenberg: When do you arrive there (Marika)?

(Marika): I'll arrive on Thursday.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I arrive late Thursday night, so Friday is available if we need to do that. I would like to also make sure that if possible, all of the registrars, or at least a few of the registrars who have answered have seen the data before we walk into the Monday meeting. To make sure that were not mischaracterizing the situation. Are we going to have people from the larger registrars there on Saturday?

Jeff Eckhaus: This is (Jeff). I'll be there, I arrive I think Friday afternoon.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. (James) says tick mark and Paul says a symbol that I've never understood.

(Marika): Mainly just sector way.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay, okay so...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...so that's not confirmation.

(Marika): I think Paul is not attending as far as I know. But I don't know if anyone else from that work solution might be able to step in.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sure someone will be attending, whether they will be there or not.

Okay, (Serge) had his hand up for a moment, but it's gone.

Sergey Gorbunov: (Unintelligible) sorry it was a mistake.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And Tim had a check mark saying he'll be around...

Man: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...or support the process. All right, so (Marika) and I...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): I'm sorry, I'm sorry (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Woman: I will come to Seoul on Friday night, so I can help on Saturday or Sunday (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I think we're going to have to try to get this done on Friday and then just make sure there are any big major mistakes in it over the weekend. Because both (Marika) and I are likely to be, if not double booked...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...fully booked on Saturday, Sunday.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And we'll see you on Saturday, so there to be an opportunity for you to take a look at it at that point also.

Woman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay (Marika), we've just volunteered for more work. Neither of us is very bright I think. Okay.

(Marika): No comment there.

Alan Greenberg: No comment, hey, you can make negative comments about the people who do that.

All right, next item on our agenda is continuing on the review on the public comments. And my recollection is we got down to somewhere near the end, but not quite. (Marika) am I correct in saying that if you have to be discussed in the last column, then to be further discussed, then we did do the overall review in our last meeting, is that correct?

(Marika): Yes, correct. I actually had to look back at the transcript for those two, cause I don't think we specifically identified for those two issues, to which charter question specifically belonged. But I think we did indicate that, you know, those two could be discussed in further detail later on.

Alan Greenberg: Do we want to try to do that, to identify where they are? See if we can without too much effort. Just trying to find...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): May I presume then the vital question or comment is to a certain extent related to some of the other comments that indicated that it's difficult from data to assess a domain in its life cycle. Whether it has expired, or whether it has been renewed by the registry or the registrar. And I guess this as well, but, you know, it's not - you know they can't see whether the legend has actually requested (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: I'm trying to find the charter questions, and I haven't found them yet.

(Marika): I mean it might relate to question four, whether additional measures need to be implemented, to indicate that once a domain enters a new grace period, it has expired.

Alan Greenberg: And it also is related to, is there adequate notice? In that if you're using who as the messenger, to tell you whether you have to do something or not, then it also relates to that.

Is that satisfactory to all? Okay, let's go on to the next one then.

(Marika): The next one was a suggestion to explore linking duration of other new grace periods to duration of the dominion registration.

Alan Greenberg: I guess that, if it falls into a question at all, it falls into is there adequate opportunity? Assuming we're talking about lengthening the period for older domains and not shortening it for newer ones. I think that comes down to the adequate opportunity.

Okay, let's go onto the next one then.

(Marika): The next comment basically states that the cost of recovery during RGP seems excessive.

Alan Greenberg: Is that within the scope of our PDP, in that our policies cannot limit costs? (James)?

(James): Yeah, I think it's not clear and I apologize to (Marika) of not having the full comment in front of me. But it's not clear whether they're talking about the costs of the RGPs that the registrar charges for the registry, versus the price that is paid that the registrar charges. Which I think the latter, it's certainly not within our arena to discuss. And then of course, any pricing during ARGP is a separate issue and I would submit that's also outside of our scope. Tim it's not clear from this comment, which the commentator is talking about.

Alan Greenberg: I believe it was with regard to registrant, registrar. But I don't have the original comment in front of me either.

(Marika): This is (Marika). I have the comment in front of me and I think the person talks about that. Because he basically says another big issue is

the cost of retrieving domain if it's still available, it's often well over \$100 per domain, which seems excessive.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so it's definitely the cost to the registrant.

(Marika): Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Tim ?

Tim Ruiz: Just for whatever it's worth, the RAA actually explicitly says that nothing in the agreement should indicate that ICANN is prescribing anything in regards to the prices that registrars charge, or something to that effect. So specifically, carved out as a, you know, not a topic for the rest being addressed in the RAA. So certainly outside of the so called picket fence, I would imagine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, that's something which could be addressed in RAA amendments. But is not subject to consensus policy and it's probably outside of the scope of this PDP.

Tim Ruiz: I think that's a fair analysis.

Alan Greenberg: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Let me look at the figures. If it is within the scope to cover the entire transparency issue, in terms of costs and everything else. Then if that is addressed, in other words, the registrants are given their information at the time of registration, so the costs are all transparent and clear, then I can't remember what that Latin expression is.

Then it's, you know, up to them whoever they choose to go with. If they haven't read all the details, aren't aware of how much they're going to be charged. If they're negligent in their renewal, that's hardly our fault.

Alan Greenberg: You're of course assuming that those details don't change from the time that they registered the domain, till the time it expires. But...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: If your being transparent that moot.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think issues regarding the visibility and the ability to predict what that cost is going to be is an issue within this PDP, setting the price...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Is outside.

Alan Greenberg: ...it's definitely outside of this PDP. So I don't think we need to consider this from the point of view of price setting. And I think we are already on the path to responding to the issue of transparency and predictability.

Michele Neylon: Well I think, Alan with all due respect, all I'd say is because people will raise the cost issue time and again, the thing is just basically to reply to the comment and say simply, we felt this was addressed elsewhere, in other words in terms of the transparency.

Alan :                   Yeah, I don't disagree. I'm not trying to wordsmith a response to this comment, I'm just trying to outline what our position is, and our position is the cost is outside the domain of this PDP and the RA probably. The issues relating to transparency and predictability are within.

Next question, next comment.

(Marika):               The next comment I propose is a number of complete solutions for the good to consider. First of all making the AGP and RGP a mandatory register service with maximized fee, and secondly set prohibitions against standard registration agreements that sign away these rights. Thirdly, describe who is. Fourth, registrar show all actual registry form data. Another suggestion is to explore the merger of the AGP and RGP into one expired renewable period.

Alan :                   Making the AGP and RGP a mandatory registrar service with maximized fees. I think the maximized fees aspect comes into what we were describing in the previous comment and the same answer applies.

Making the AGP and RGP - I'm not quite sure what the AGP means for registrar service. Does the actual comment go into any specifics.

Woman:                 I'm presuming (unintelligible) auto-renewal grace period.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, but that's a defined term only between registry-registrar right now. So the implication is that there should be a similar defined period between the registrar-registry. Is that the tone?

Woman: I think it is if I recall (unintelligible) and will actually provide more details. But in his previous comments he'd just say registrars are under no obligation to grant auto-renew grace or redemption grace to registrants. So, I presume the comment relates to that, I think we'd like to see that as a mandatory grace period.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so he's looking for a grace period after expiration prior to RGP of some form. Set prohibitions against standard registration agreement to sign away right the registrar rights. That really comes into the same general area.

James Bladel: Alan , this is (James), I stepped away from my keyboard, but can I get in the queue real quickly.

Alan Greenberg: Sure, right now.

James Bladel: Oh, okay. I just wanted to comment that making auto-renew grace period mandatory is in effect, it is declaring how registrars will spend their registry balances, and making that part of the ICANN, you know, prescribed method for handling (unintelligible). I just wanted to point out that I'm not entirely comfortable that is on that grounds, that is within the scope of the group. But I would yield to somebody else if they can maybe shed a little light on that or tell me how I got that wrong.

Alan Well, I wasn't -ignoring what happens between the registry/registrar, I was taking what, I think, (Marika) is saying about this comment. The comment is saying there should be some period of time where the registrant has a grace period with the registrar, without looking at the mechanics of it.

James Bladel:: Okay, but I mean the only reason that period of time exists is because the registrar has paid for it essentially, so I think that by saying you must offer this period of time is the way of saying, you know, you must make this expenditure, which to date, if I'm understanding correctly, a registrar could handle it in such a way that it would be optional.

Alan Greenberg: That may be true, but that also is within the bounds of the (PEP) is we want to recommend something, which is radically different from what is being done right now.

So all this comment is saying that suggestion that there be a grace period in which the registrant is guaranteed they can redeem the name, and I think that is within the mandate of this group, if they do something we don't do. But if something within the mandate (unintelligible).

Is (Mecally) there, your hand is up. You're not muted.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, sorry. I muted on my end. I beg your pardon.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Too many mute buttons.

Michele Neylon: I think the problem is that from (James) perspective of these, under the current system, the only way that any of these grace periods can be offered would be with the registrar bearing the brunt of the cost. That has a direct economic impact on the registrar, which would be a problem.

If the registry operator were to automatically do something without there being any financial burden on the registrar, then that might be more palatable. But from my understanding of what people are saying, I think the problem at the moment is that because the way the tax system is set up, it would be very awkward to see that make a huge change in the way the registries operate.

Alan Greenberg: Well I don't think that is outside of the bounds of possibility number one. Number two, we've already been told that for registries that do not immediately charge the domain back to the registrar, they still typically follow the same process where the domain is retrievable.

(James) This is (James), but that could be a difference of scale or a couple of orders of magnitude if we're talking about a smaller registry versus the ones that do. Just putting that out there for consideration. If we're talking about, you know, possibly tens of thousands per day as opposed to here and there. It could be a much different level of financial burden, like (Mecally) was saying.

Man: I'd like to ask a question, because I'm a little bit...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can I get in the queue too, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Tim , go ahead first.

Tim Ruiz: I was just going to ask kind of a clarifying question maybe as to what we're doing right now. Are you expecting to get into the merits of the comments that were made, or if proposals or suggestions were made.

Are we discussing the merits of those or trying to just look at whether, regardless of the merits, whether or not what their commenting on, is actually related to a question that this group is addressing.

Alan Greenberg: I thought we were doing the latter, not debating whether we should implement it or not. And in that light, I'm a little confused, because in the most general sense I think that that part of the comment is saying there should be a period under which registrants can reclaim a name post-expiration. And if it's the belief of this group that that can't happen, then why are we having this PDP at all. I thought that is essentially the substance of this whole PDP, so I'm not quite sure why all the negative comments.

Tim Ruiz: That's why I brought it up now. And me, I certainly have views about the merits of what's being suggested, but I think it is a response to a question the group has been chartered to respond to, so I think it should be categorized that way. And it's a time when we're at that point discussing the merits that we don't get too far off track here today. Just my suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: I support that. But I guess I'd like to understand the comments that we've had, because they really, if that is the formal position, then it really obvious - it says we're not clear what we're going to do here at all, if we're starting on the basis that there is no way we can provide a grace period, lower case G to registrants.

Cheryl, did I hear you try to get in?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no. I think you could hear perhaps my thoughts going along with what you said, which in my - I almost said was - happy to

say, now which of course as we know will save us a hell of a lot of time.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly. All right. I think this commenter was really just putting a name, perhaps an inappropriate name, it was a three letter acronym that already had a different meaning, but was trying to put a name on the concept that registrants have an opportunity prior to RGP of getting a domain back. My understanding is that's basically restating why we're here. So I don't see any great objection to that, and I think that comes down under opportunity.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I tend to agree with you. I think the problem is the terminology being used is causing the barrier, not the concept behind the terminology.

Alan Greenberg: And we can't change what the commenter wrote, but I would suggest that we take it as, so to speak, with a grain of salt.

Michele Neylon: Exactly.

Alan Greenberg: And if it's a different period, we should have the decency of getting a different set of three letters.

Woman: Oh, goodie.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim .

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Tim Ruiz: I think that we have to accept the fact that some of us on this call didn't support the PDP, so that's going to be out there and so clearly, you know, there are going to be certain views on that. If we didn't start a PDP unless everyone felt that it should progress, we'd never have a PDP. So I don't think that necessarily means that, you know, we should try to figure this out right now and, you know, end it if that's the feeling.

There's clearly others on the call that feel completely different. So I think, you know, this is what this is all about. Coming to being able to negotiate with other, coming to some consensus on something that is palpable and work for everybody, and that's all a part of this process. So I don't think we necessarily need to take the views that have been expressed as saying, you know, "Let's just stop this today and throw it out the window."

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Tim .

We'll try to go on to the next half of this comment, which was rather long to begin with. Set prohibition against standard registration agreements. That allows people to sign away their rights again. I think that is within the scope that we are talking about, and in due time we will discuss that. Prescribe (unintelligible) who is, think I would dare to adventure into that market to be honest.

Can anyone comment on why they think this person may have said this and who is going to address this particular problem?

And (Mecally) had his hand up before the question, so I'll let you go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I'd just be very wary about going down the rabbit hole of who it is. I personally think that who it is does need to be addressed. But if we start getting to those, we won't be able - we'll miss what we're meant to be dealing with.

Alan Greenberg: I tend to agree. And in this particular case, I'm not convinced that where the data resides would stop a registrar from changing it. So.

A registrar who is to show all registrant data, explore the merger of ATP and (unintelligible). Okay, so again, we're talking acronyms in the rest of this.

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

Alan Greenberg: Yes, (Marika), go ahead.

(Marika): You know generally to clarify, I think maybe the (unintelligible) is a bit out of context there, because I think with the exact what the exact sentence says is, "Prescribe at registrar who is and registrar who is, show all exregistrant data up to the depth of the domain when it drops. Okay. I should have explained the comment talks more about the all the data the registry or the registrar show the exregistrant data.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so it's really a comma after, saying who is, not a semicolon?

(Marika): Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And I think that goes into the discussion we already had on should there be new fields in who is or something of that to make it clear exactly what the states mean. I think that's something that we will in due time get to.

So I think this one pretty well maps to opportunity, and in terms of showing data and who is notification.

Do I hear any objections. (Marika), I see you hand is up from last time.

(Marika): Oh, yes. Taking it down now.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Well you can put it back up now, because let's go on to the last point.

(Marika): There's still three to go.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. It's the end of my screen.

(Marika): Well the next two are both questions or comments from (Wyco) and they're saying consideration should be given to the implication, if any, for the UDRP. The different interpretations by a registrar of the (EDP) that relate to UDRP proceedings, namely 3.7.5.7.

Alan Greenberg: And I won't pretend to know exactly what that is, but I would think that as we go ahead in this process, we will need to make sure that what we do is supportive of the UDRP or identify changes that are needed there.

(Marika): I just pulled up the article, so just for consistency, I can just read it. And it says that, "In the event that a domain, which is the subject of a UDRP dispute, is deleted or expired during the course of the dispute, the complainant in the UDRP dispute will have the option to renew or restore the name under the same commercial terms of the registrant.

Alan Greenberg: Both a...

Jeff Eckhaus: Alan, it's (Jeff), you mind if I just jump in.

Alan Yes, please.

Jeff Eckhaus: We're actually involved in something. This actually occurred. What happens is if somebody files a UDRP and the domain - you file a UDRP and the domain is going to expire in one month, it's up to use as the complainant to renew the domain name, or else, you know, so that while the UDRP is in process. So what they're saying and what this law is saying is that the complainant, you, has the same right as the original registrant or anyone else to renew that domain.

So that's what the RAA states. And I think this is more about, you know, I don't see, I don't know of any registrars or issues that, you know, how this effects this piece, because it's something that's in the RAA, so it's more about enforcement. So I'm not sure what this comment is stating. Because right now it's a provision that we are contractually obligated to comply with.

Alan Greenberg: So if I under this, this provision says that post-expiration, even the original registrant or the complainant has the right to renew. Is that correct? Did I do this properly?

(Jeff Eckhouse): Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And presumably, if the complainant reviews and the complaint is settled on behalf of the original registrant, they take it back or something like that.

(Jeff Eckhouse): That's correct, exactly. To put it in simple terms, yes, that's correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so we need to make sure that we don't do anything to harm this provision. But that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...comes up towards the end of our process, not the beginning.

(Marika): And this is (Marika). For those of you that are interested to know more about this issue, they do provide specific case, and they say basically, "The policies offer the usual tool, although its application to circumstance of expire (unintelligible) in UDRP proceeding is not always clear. As of one example of (unintelligible) UDRP decision, which illustrates some of the potential difficulties that can arise in this respect." And they give their link to a specific case.

Alan Greenberg: I'm assuming this is in the UDRP, because the complainant wants to make sure that someone else doesn't pick up the domain while the complaint is going on. That if the RAA chooses to let it go, they don't want it to go back into the open market, they're still dispute process. I assume that's the original thought behind it. But perhaps what the original thought behind it doesn't matter.

Does this - I think this is something we need to think about when we're in the stage of formulating new policy, if we are, but I don't think it specifically comes under any of the five questions.

(Marika): This is (Marika). I mean one question I have, but it relates as well, because (Wyco) has also submitted some question in one of the other (EDP)'s that is ongoing on (ISAP). It seems that they have some issues or questions that they would like to see addressed or discussed, so maybe another discussion would need to be had, you know, how they can raise those issues that they see with sort of consensus policy at the (unintelligible) level. I guess it's a different kind of discussion, I'm not necessarily sure.

Alan Greenberg: It is, and I think it's one that comes later in our process.

(Marika): Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Next one, another (Wyco).

(Marika): So the next question is related to adequate notice and also relates to whether adequate notice on the current policies timely alert, parties in the UDRP proceedings of upcoming expirations and pending deletions. And they are requesting if - should the (unintelligible) clarify what - if any reasonable notice obligations should be.

Alan Greenberg: Well we are certainly talking about reasonable noticed. I guess this is a head up that maybe we need to consider if there are UDP issues there. And let me ask a question of the registrars. If you're in a UDRP dispute, if a UDRP dispute has been raised regarding a registration

that is about to expire, do you provide notice to the complainant as well or to the people abbertrating in addition to the original registrant.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...current practices.

Jeff Eckhaus:: This is (Jeff), if I can respond on that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeff Eckhaus: Is one yes that we do, but also, in almost every case where this is, I won't say it's an issue, where this is the case, whichever the UDRP filing body, whoever it is, if it's (Wyco) or somebody else. They actually send an email as well, stating the fact that the domain is close to expiration and what their obligations are to the complainant to renew the domain.

But that's what they do. But as far as us as the registrar, yes, we do send out a notice to them stating what the rules are and what they would need to do in that the domain is close to expiring.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so should we choose, we could formalize that and make it a requirement or just leave it, under the assumption that due process already handles that issue. Because clearly, when a UDRP is filed, one knows what the expiration date is.

Jeff Eckhaus: Of course, that's part of the filing. And also the other part is - I don't know if it worth part of this is worth digging into, I think I would say an edge-edge case. I think out of 10 million plus domains, there are -

we've seen this happen maybe once every 18 months or so or two years, I think, where a domain has expired and the complainant did not renew or say they didn't know about. I think actually maybe this is second time in about eight years this has happened. So, just to give you an idea of the scope of how often this occurs.

Alan Greenberg: So it's something if we are good we will remember when we are talking about notification and we may well discard it at that point, but other than that, it comes under notification and we don't need to do anything further at this point. (James)?

James Bladel: Hi Alan . Just a quick question, procedural question, since I don't know any better. But it seems like people who ask you questions really delve into the mechanics of how UDRP operates. And is one of the possible outcomes of this group, besides any type of standalone policy, a recommendation to modify what up until this point has been an unrelated policy.

I'm just trying to figure out how this would work if we decided that, yes, we need to include additional notifications, or something like that, as part of the UDRP sequence. How does that happen?

Alan Greenberg: I'd go to Tim as the wise old man on this. My gut feeling is I don't think there is any restriction as to what we can make policy on, if indeed we believe policy must be made. So, I would not think that there is any prescription against making a recommendation of change in UDRP, if that comes out of this. I don't think it's going to, but. Tim , any thoughts?

Tim Ruiz: I did until you claimed me as a wise old man. The old is in terms of GNSO experience. I think I win the award in any chronological issue. At least ten years old.

Yeah, I don't think that would be unusual for a working group to come back, and even though it's not something we can necessarily recommend as a policy based on what we're working on, we could certainly say here's an issue that we think needs to be looked at further or something of that nature.

Alan Greenberg: I mean I can certainly imagine that some change we make invalidates the wording in a UDRP or in some other policy, and there needs to be corresponding changes there just to keep it in sink with what we're recommending. And I would hope that would be within our domain. Again, I don't see it happening in this case, but I would think that is all within the scope of recommending policy, that there may be peripheral changes that are necessary, just to make everything work together.

Not hearing any violent objection, let's go on to the last item.

(Marika): The last item is related to specific complaints related to the policies over specific registrar and basically stating that the change of renewal date caused confusion, the patient was not able to transfer domain during RAGP. The domain name was auctioned before payments to a registrar was confirmed, and then the registrar refused reversal of the third party transfer.

The person claimed that he did not receive notices of change to the auto-renewal policy and also had issues with the fact that there was no (unintelligible) mechanism but auction process.

Alan Greenberg: I think we can treat this as at least one example of someone who said they had problems. It falls pretty much all of the issues we're looking at, I think. With no check, taking them off, certainly falls under notification opportunity.

Not having five issues in front of me, my mind has gone blank. Does anyone who has the five issues in front of them, the five questions, does it fall into more categories than opportunities and notice.

Opportunity. Information is clear and conspicuous. Additional measures need to be implemented. I think it address that question. I do not believe it addresses whether anything regarding the RGP, so it comes into questions numbers 1, 3, 4 and maybe 2.

Okay, the next item on the agenda is discussion of question number 1. I would suggest that first we should look at additional, what we're going to be doing for additional meetings, because we need to do that before we leave this meeting.

The situation is the next scheduled meeting would be Tuesday, 3 November, where some people might still be in transit, I don't know. And the meeting after that is the 10 of November where I will not be available, and (Marika) says she will not be available. And (Marika) can be covered by (Margie). No one has volunteered to cover me yet, although I'd be grateful.

What is the situation regarding travel and availability for the rest of you for the 3 and the 10 of November. (Mecally)?

(Marika): I can't get the calendar to load actually, (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: I won't be able to make the 3rd. I think I'm stuck somewhere without internet access. If you need somebody to cover you for the 10th, sure I can do it, if you need.

Alan Greenberg: The alternative is for both those meetings to try to reschedule them later in the week. Do people want to try to do that, or do we stick with those meetings, and perhaps that limited participation? One date that strikes me as being possible is I never have any ICANN conference calls on Fridays. Now maybe that's because nobody wants conference calls on Fridays, or maybe that's a suitable time we could drop in with our conflict. Any thoughts? Want us to send out a doodle on this.

(Marika): What, proposing Friday?

Alan Greenberg: Well, or just a thought. (Marika), are you gone for the full two weeks, or those Tuesdays just happen to be bad.

(Marika): I'm back on the 11th. But just so you know on Fridays, they typically are challenging, because of course if we do hold our early in the morning from U.S., they are already at the end of the day Friday afternoon for European reach. The only ideal time to have conference calls are Friday's evenings. But...

((Crosstalk))

(Marika): ...I'm not complaining back there, but the experience, and I think one of the reasons there are very few calls taking place on Fridays.

Alan Greenberg: Understand. Cheryl, with regard to your chat comment, you've already damaged your credibility significant by willing to have meetings on Saturdays and Sundays, and in the middle of the night.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I didn't say I'd do it.\

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I'm siding with (Marika) and Friday evening is probably not the best. If I want to go visit my beloved family, I'll be in a car somewhere, so not exactly ideal.

(Marika): (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: I'm going to suggest we do a doodle on the 3rd and the 10th to see what peoples available is, and if there are significant number of people for either of those meetings, we will hold the meeting. (Mecally) has volunteered to chair the one on the 10th, if there is one held, but we will not try to change days and times at this point. Everyone agreeable on that. If you are, I then have one minor caveat.

By the 3rd, on both sides of the Atlantic in any case, we'll back on standard time instead of daylight saving time, and I would suggest that we keep the local time of this meeting the same, and thus increase the UTC time by one hour. Is that reasonable for everyone, or is there anyone who thinks that is not a good idea. The only people it affects is Cheryl, I'm guessing, because you don't change times at the same time we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh but we have and we do.

Alan Greenberg: On the same dates?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I'm already in daylight savings since last week.

Alan Greenberg: This would make it one hour later for you, which I presume is better not worse.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Without changing the UTC time, it has become a nice time for me. With changing the UTC time, it's certainly doable, but it is also a time when I tend to have a lot of other local meetings. But that's okay, we can work with that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And I think for everyone else it keeps the time the same and that has worked until now, and I suspect by changing it for an hour it will impact some people, and I think it will, (Marika), it makes it right in the middle of dinner time in New York. Is that correct?

(Marika): Yes, right in the middle of getting kids to bed and things like that.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I guess dinner time depends on your personal standards, but at an inconvenient time between afternoon and evening.

(Marika): Correct.

Alan Greenberg: All right then, unless I hear any objection on the mailing list, I would suggest that we keep the local time the same for Europe and North America in any case, and increase the UTC by one hour.

Michele Neylon: You're confusing me Alan . I'm completely confused. Because I'm basically on UTC most of the time, so I'm trying to understand what you're actually changing.

Alan Greenberg: Have you had daylight savings for the last couple of months.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And that will - so your time and relation to UTC time changes at the end of October.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm saying that we change the UTC time, and therefore keep your local time the same.

Michele Neylon: If you change the UTC time you're going to change my local time.

Alan Greenberg: No, you said you were on daylight savings and you will not be by then.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I'll be on UTC again.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Michele Neylon Okay. (James) says UTC is not equal to (GMC), oh, God, I had this argument with somebody before. Look, I'll wait until you send something around and then I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Whatever time you started this meeting today, and I've lost track, it would have been 2:30, 8:30 in the evening?

Michele Neylon: 7:30 in the evening.

Alan Greenberg: 7:30 in the evening. We're suggesting that it still be 7:30 in the evening for you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so alright, okay.

Alan Greenberg: Which I think means we have to change the (UTC) time to do that.

Michele Neylon: If you say so.

(Marika): I think we'll ask Gisella to (unintelligible) there and get back to us.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Can I wave my "I'm an Arts Graduate" flag here please?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, you were muffled, I could hear what you said.

Michele Neylon: I think I need to wave my "I'm an artist graduate flag here over my head."

Alan Greenberg: Touché.

Woman: Excuse me.

Alan Greenberg: All right. So we will send out - we will tentatively hold meetings on the 3rd and the 10th, pending a lot of people canceling. I will not be here

on the 10th, but Michele will chair. We will definitely hold a meeting on the 17th, and to the extent possible we will talk to each other in the hallways in Seoul. I think that's all we need to talk about of future meetings.

And we have nine minutes left, and I don't know, but the rest of your state of mind, mine is that I suggest we terminate early today, because I don't think we're going to accomplish an awful lot, going back to question number 1 at this point. I don't think the time will be very productively used, so I recommend we give it back to ourselves.

Cheryl says she agrees. The rest of you are silent, and no outcry means you all agree. Tim says he agrees. We've taken enough time. I thank you all. I will see those of you who are in Seoul. There is no meeting next week. And thank you all for your hard work. And Cheryl, I'll call you in about five minutes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I won't even take my headset off, just dial away.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I'll call you right away then.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, bye.

Alan Greenberg: Bye-bye all.

Man: Thank you, Alan .

END