

**GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
09 February 2010 at 19:30 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 09 February 2010 at 19:30 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-pednr-20100209.mp3>

On page:

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

Present:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC - Chair
Michele Neylon - RC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Berry Cobb - CBUC
Tatyana Khramtsova - RC
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Helen Laverty – Registries
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Ted Suzuki – IPC
Jeff Eckhaus - RC
Michael Palage - CBUC

Staff:

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

Absent apologies:

Paul Diaz – RC
James Bladel – RC
Alaine Doolan – IPC
Mason Cole - RC
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. I would like to inform all participants that this call is being recorded.

Did you want me to do the roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: No, that's fine (Shana). I'll do it. Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Go ahead, you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's PEDNR call on Tuesday the 9th of February.

We have Alan Greenberg, Shiva Muthusamy...

Coordinator: Excuse me, Mr. Michele Neylon joins.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. Tatyana Khramtsova, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ron Wickersham, Helen Laverty, Mike O'Connor, Jeff Eckhaus, Ted Suzuki, Michael Palage, Berry Cobb, Michele Neylon. From staff we have Glen de Saint Gery, Marika Konings, Margie Milan and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We also have apologies from Paul Diaz, Elaine Doolan, James Bladel, Mason Cole. I hope I haven't left anyone out.

And if I could also please remind everyone to state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Gisella. Today we have a number of things on the agenda.

After the discussion at our last meeting Marika and I drafted a questionnaire trying to identify the various issues that we might may or may not want to try to address, if they are indeed issues related to the various aspects of domain expiration recovery. And Michele and Cheryl reviewed it quickly and both agreed it was basically what we had said we were going to do.

So neither of them vetoed it or tore us apart for doing what we did. So I'd like to go over them right now and look at whether this is what we want to send out, whether it needs any refinement.

Also on the agenda is to discuss who the target audience is for this. We know it's this group to begin with but the question is do we go any farther with that?

And after that there are a number of things that Mikey sent out that have generated a bit of comment on the Web and I think we need to just - on the e-mail list, and I think we need to decide if we're going to do - what we're going to do with these if we're going to do anything as we go forward. Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. Apologies in advance because I just want to be clear of something. Our - the survey that's supposed - the domain - the one that you had sent out that -- thankfully that you did in advance and we've all reviewed -- can you just say who is going to be the recipient of this survey?

Alan Greenberg: That's Item 3 on our agenda.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. And that - so that's what I thought you had said.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly this survey as it stands today is this working group. The question is do we want to try to solicit answers to the - those basic questions from any other groups in the world?

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, so...

Alan Greenberg: And if so, what can we do?

Jeff Eckhaus: ...the reason I'm asking is because sometimes we - I don't want to, you know, just the questions themselves, do they make sense or - to other people outside of this group since we're so deeply involved in what's going on. I was

just - I wasn't sure who the audience was and who the responses would be from.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I think Michele's comment was we would need to dumb down the questions. I think I said we needed to put some explanatory notes on them...

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, that's what - I was saying simplify...

Alan Greenberg: But yes.

Jeff Eckhaus: Same concept. Yes, exactly.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, yeah. As it is worded now it's this group.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And we have Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, (unintelligible) just to give some feedback as well as the thinking behind the survey. And it's something we've been doing in some of the other working groups at a stage where we feel that, you know, we've had a lot of discussion but, you know, it's not really clear what people exactly said or we feel that there is disagreement or maybe there is more room for consent than we think.

Weigh the survey to basically test the water. I think we should avoid trying to see that as a vote and, you know, majority wins and minority loses out, but as a way of trying to see where we're coming together on some of these issues.

Or basically see where we have two opposing views in something that's for example, the registration reviews policies working group has done, it has used the survey as a way to develop consensus recommendations but also identify those areas that are actually two opposing views and use that as a

way of saying, okay, that's what we're going to put in the initial report and put that out for public comment so people can actually weigh in on where we are split through the middle on some of these issues.

Or we - where we have, you know, a majority view or maybe a minority view or an ultimate view as a way of trying to come to some kind of, you know, recommendations or things that we would like to put out to a broader audience. So that was the initial thinking I think behind it, and what has been, you know, it's happened a bit in other working groups as well.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Marika. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thanks, Alan. This is Berry Cobb.

I definitely agree with everything that Marika just said. It's definitely well timed that we start to put a stick in the sand to see where we stand on a lot of these issues.

And I definitely like the form of the survey. And again just to connect with what Marika was saying, it has been very effective in the RAP group.

I guess if anything I wish it was something that we did earlier in our process. The only suggestion that I would have for this survey as we review through them is I would think that we might want to consider the possibility of trying to make this a multiple choice version.

And the main reason that I state that, you know, some of these questions are structured as a yes/no, and that's going to be very helpful. Others, there probably may be four or five probable answers.

The reason why I suggest this is that it'll help with the trying to quantify some of the sub-questions within each of these. And that's all that I'll add.

Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And I think that's essentially why we wanted to go through it in this way, to try to identify the things. Marika and I have done our best to identify what the issues are.

You know, whether it's a yes/no, and if yes then some other question or some other form I think is exactly why we want to look at it right now. If you just give me one second, I am going to try to print out a copy so I can scribble on it as we go along.

And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I've got my hand up so I'll take the mic.

Alan Greenberg: Take it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. Just following on from what Berry said, I also suggested when we were doing our first pass review and I got no argument back from Michele so I'm assuming he agrees with me -- that we could also set this up, you know, what we look at are a set of drill downs, I guess.

So if you answer no then you just skip through to the next part. And if you answer yes then those sub-questions come up.

If you're doing it that way you can also allow for expansion or comment, which shifts the metrics somewhat but does at least mean that people who just have a firm and hard yes/no or not interested in that response can do it at that level. But people who want to get some sort of other information or explanation in can also put some comment into it.

The only other thing, I was going to go back to what Berry said in that his wish that this sort of thing had been done earlier. Just for reference point if

this sort of thing is done earlier in a work group activity it would need to be repeated throughout the process.

Because the whole concept of having an interactive development towards a consensus outcome involves us all listening to each other and hearing and perhaps even modifying our views. So early would be good, but really only as a benchmark to compare any general agreements.

Otherwise we just put things out to a vote and we don't need work groups at all.

Alan Greenberg: There may be some merit in that. He said facetiously.

All right, seeing no hands up then I would suggest we go through it. And since there are five basic sections in line with the charter questions, I would suggest we look at each of them to the extent it'll fit on one screen -- each of them one at a time and get input from the group as to whether as it stands right now is fine, how we should change it to end up with the results which are likely to be more meaningful or more useful to us.

The first one is questions whether opportunity - adequate opportunity exists for registrants to redeem their domain - their expired domain. My understanding of these issues is not do we believe the registrant is being informed, but if the registrant decides they want to renew after expiration, is there adequate opportunity?

The first question was should there be a right to recover? Currently although most registrars allow recovery under varying conditions, there is no right to it and there is no requirement that a registrar provide anything past the date of expiration.

Is it reasonable to ask the question? I would say I don't think we can proceed without asking that question. What the outcome is of course is different.

Not seeing any hands.

The follow on question is if there is a right should there be a timeframe under which this is allowed? If you look at the current situation, most registrars again allow something in the order of 30 plus days under which it can be redeemed under some circumstances or other.

Cheryl, you had your hand up then changed your mind?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, just briefly what I was just going to point out at that first decision node is depending on what happens with what this work group says, we need to make sure that information and outcome gets back to the RAA work groups, both A and B as well as the (ALAC) aspirational registrant rights charter group.

Alan Greenberg: Can you explain further why...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because...

Alan Greenberg: I mean, we're not going to keep it a secret but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Within the wish list of, I think it's RAA Group B is a specific request for such a right to exist. So if this work group in its wisdom decides that the right is affirmed, that - and would be all looking at some form of change or process to review how that right can be established, then - i.e. what we're doing in the PDP process, then that's important information for those other work groups to know about.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, certainly. I, you know, have no reason to believe that we will not keep them up to date and they will not continue to watch that.

But you're - are you saying that if we decide that such a require - such a need is there that they have to implement it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. But it would perhaps be important that they know who is going to implement it.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I'm working on the assumption...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Otherwise it will end up in an aspirational document or it'll end up being worked on in multiple places. And that's not...

Alan Greenberg: I'm working on the assumption that if we decide something is needed and it is within our scope to recommend it then we will indeed do that. But...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And they're making the assumption that...

Alan Greenberg: ...maybe I'm wrong.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that's the case. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Michele?

Michele Neylon: I can't really understand why we're discussing this. I mean the thing is that there's plenty of crossover between this working group and the RAA working groups.

So I mean, if I'm on an RAA working group call and something in relation to something that we're already discussing within this work group comes up, I'm going to say something along the lines of, "Oh, yeah, we're already looking at this in the other working group."

So, you know, I can't see why this is a problem.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine with me. Cheryl, anything else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Just for our information, Marika, in terms of the kind of interactive survey that Cheryl was talking about earlier, that you only see question B if you answer yes to question A -- is that something within the scope of the survey tool we normally use?

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible). We need to look into it, but I would imagine so.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: That that's possible. And otherwise it's right easier for people to click through. I mean and there's certainly a difference between, so, you know, people don't need to fill it in even if, you know, they've answered no.

They can just otherwise click through. So - but I'll look into that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I mean, the other side of that is I sort of like to see, here's a fifth of the questionnaire, and I know I'm through it. As opposed to something that there's no real indication of how long it's going to go on.

But Ron, you had your hand up.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah, on a couple of items. This asks should there be a right, and I'm wondering if it's not more a case of saying is there already an implied right?

Otherwise...

Alan Greenberg: There is not right now.

Ron Wickersham: So - right.

Alan Greenberg: There's...

Ron Wickersham: Okay. And then secondly I agree with your concept of not hiding what the questions would be. And in some cases you - it might be even useful to say yes, no or I don't have a strong opinion one way or the other.

Because someone with a weak opinion or almost no opinion would sway over on the other side.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, noted. Okay. So assuming if you answer yes, then the question is what should the minimum timeframe - next question is what should the minimum timeframe be that the registrant is guaranteed that they can recover a domain name?

Now that is one I think that we -- for this group we may not need anything additional. If we were to go into a further group, there certainly needs to be some constraint.

The issue of if a registrar has paid for the renewal and chooses to simply let it go and not continue the process, is there, you know, how do we make sure that we're not putting a financial burden on registrars by adding this?

And I can think of a number of ways that we could do this. Of course, we could put the financial burden on registrars. That's within our right.

But the - but I think we need to consider that as we go along.

The next question I believe is not dependent on an a - on an answer to a, but the question is should the cost of recovery after expiration be clearly defined? That is, not set by ICANN but something which the registrant has an expectation of understanding what it is.

Comments? No?

Should the RAA be able to recover his or her domain name for the same cost that a normal renew - as a normal renewal prior to expiration during this minimum timeframe? In other words, should a registrar be allowed to add a premium to this price?

Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, I think I'd like to ask if we can - I understand the question. I'd like to ask if we could just reword it taking out the words like normal versus - I mean, I think you could say as, you know, the standard renewal price.

Or what you had said as your definition or your explanation was actually clearer than the actual question.

Alan Greenberg: I hoped someone caught it.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, so I would just ask if we could sort of reword that so it's just...

Alan Greenberg: Can we ask you to put...

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, sure. Let me...

Alan Greenberg: ...some words in?

Jeff Eckhaus: Let me think about that right - I had it in my head. I'll think about that right now.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Eckhaus: And I'll put it onto the chat.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I mean, I think the intent of the question is should a registrar be allowed to change the price post-expiration and versus pre-expiration?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, there you go. That's it. Should they be able to charge a premium for a renewal post-expiration.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Jeff Eckhaus: Does that...

Alan Greenberg: Now we may want to have some subtlety in that given that if you look at the registrar survey we have some registrars who charge the same price for the first 10 days but then increase the price after that.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. And then you know what, I'm actually...

Alan Greenberg: How we get that granularity in the survey and make it understandable, I'm not sure.

Jeff Eckhaus: You know now - hold on, before I even go further I'm just thinking back on this. And I'm just - let me just step back and are we allowed to dictate on what prices people would charge?

I don't know if we're, you know, how that rolls into that. So that's just another consideration before we even send this question on that.

I don't know if maybe someone on staff can respond to that.

Alan Greenberg: Well, we certainly can't dictate the price. Can we dictate the price doesn't change or end up at a certain period of time, I'm not sure.

Margie Milan: Hey Alan, it's Margie. Can I respond?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Margie Milan: Sure, yeah, I actually had my hand up raised for the same concern. I have a concern about making a suggestion that would dictate price.

And price is one of those areas of antitrust that we typically want to stay away from. So I don't know how else you could rephrase this -- perhaps, you know, I can check with the legal counsel on what they'd be comfortable with.

But...

Alan Greenberg: Well, I guess - let - before you do that let - Michele has his hand up and then I have a thought that I - or a question I want to ask.

Michele Neylon: I mean the only thing I would say -- this is Michele -- is I'd agree with Jeff. I mean be careful about what they haven't really noticed, what Jeff raised and it's a very valid point.

Word like normal are quite loaded. And, you know, it's - if you word things using certain terms you're -- how to word this -- you're kind of - you're starting from a particular standpoint as opposed to simply soliciting an objective opinion.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, just for the record I don't know whether I worded that question or Marika did. But looking at it now, removing the word normal I think it loses nothing.

Michele Neylon: Well no, that's what I'm saying. I'm not saying that you did...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: ...this or (unintelligible) did...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no, I'm just saying I don't know if I did it or Marika did it. But looking at it right now on the screen, removing the word normal I don't think loses anything in its meaning.

So I don't think you need - we don't need to debate it very - how much for very long.

Michele Neylon: Well no, it's just - it was just a - it's just a general thing though with regards to...

Alan Greenberg: Understood.

Michele Neylon: ...some of these things. I mean the thing is that from our perspective as registrars, you know, if you ask me - if you circled things normal and premium and things like that, it's got a certain kind of emotive underlying semantic which, you know, I understand what the (unintelligible) of your question is, but I think, you know, that's - you...

Alan Greenberg: Point made and keep on calling us on it.

Michele Neylon: Don't worry, I will.

Alan Greenberg: I was going to ask a more general question. Is this really important?

If the answer to C is yes, that is it should be clearly defined and visible and everyone knows what the game is, does it matter if it's different from pre-registration? From pre-expiration?

Jeff Eckhaus: Alan, can I - it's Jeff. Can I respond to it, I think...

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Jeff Eckhaus: That's an excellent point. And I think you're right.

I agree with that. If it's clear...

Alan Greenberg: Well, I didn't answer the question, I just asked it.

Jeff Eckhaus: No, no, (unintelligible) but I'm saying that saying that, you know, if that were - because the idea is saying that if it's there or if it's not that, as long - I'm trying to repeat what you had just said stating that, I don't think this question is necessary because if it's clearly defined then I think the goal, you know, what we're sort of leading into is that people want it to be clearly defined as it is required in the RGP pricing now, that it might not be necessary for d.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. It...

Jeff Eckhaus: I hope that makes sense. I was agreeing with you on your point that...

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It strikes me that in - like with what I think Berry said, but it may have been someone else earlier, that this is the kind of question where the possible options might be yes, no, I don't really care. Or it doesn't really matter.

Michele Neylon: I will - if...

Alan Greenberg: Michele?

Michele Neylon: I mean, like with - you know, look, if C answers D in many respects. If it's clearly defined then the answer to D is largely - is irrelevant.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. My inclination is to leave questions like this in, certainly at the phase where we're answering them. But make sure that the options include things like don't care.

If everyone in this group, regardless of what side you're on, basically says it's not all that important if c-if the answer to C is yes, then if we do this survey in any further group it probably won't show up at all. I don't think anything's lost by keeping it in here as long as the answers give a reasonable range.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The only, sort of, this is a hypothetical case that it would go down a road that we say there should be, you know, certain period of time during which the RE should be able to recover their name.

I mean of course wait, if some, you know, if a registrar would say well, you know, I really think that's a ridiculous requirement so I'm going to put, you know, I'm just going to put a ridiculous price on it so that the name won't be recovered by the RE because they find it too expensive. And, you know, I can monetize it or whatever my other plan is for it.

So the link with that question would be if you indeed give a right to recovery, would it be reasonable as well then to allow that renewal to take place for a certain amount of time for the same amount as can be done prior to expiration. That I guess would be the, you know, reason why you might want to include that question or why it's linked maybe to that initial question of should there be a right for the RE to recover his or her domain name...

Alan Greenberg: Of course if - when you express it like that, my inclination would be and if the registrar wants to charge 50% more or 70% more, fine, as long as it's well documented. But they shouldn't be able to charge 400% more or 4000% more or whatever it is.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: So this is the problem, Alan. If you start prescribing how much is reasonable and everything else, you're going down a very nasty rabbit hole.

I mean, it's - is it - should a - the RE have a right to recover the domain name after it has expired? You'll probably find a certain degree of consensus on that.

Should the cost of recovery be clearly defined? Again I don't see a huge issue with that.

If you start getting into, you know, reasonable costs and, you know, 200%, 300% - well, 200%'s okay but 210% isn't? You know, where are you going to draw the line?

It's something I'd be very wary of.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I would suggest that we go ahead with a question like this but we reword it regarding - to rephrase it in terms of should there be any constraints on what that clearly defined fee is in relation to the regular annual fee.

And I'm not using the word regular as a code word, I just can't think of the better one right now. And again, you know, if the answers that come out of this, there is good uniformity across this board then we have the answer we're looking for.

And if not then it's clearly something we need to further discuss.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Alan can you ask...

Alan Greenberg: Ron?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, can you also ask Shiva to type more explanation on his points there? Because I'm getting confused.

Alan Greenberg: I haven't actually read them. Sorry, I'm trying to focus on what people are saying.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry to interrupt.

Alan Greenberg: You've just said it. I presume he's heard it, so Shiva if you can elaborate more on what you're saying because there are at least some people who are not following you completely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I specifically was asking it for typing, because it's often very difficult to...

Shiva Muthusamy: Yeah...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Audio clarity from Shiva's lines, that's all.

Alan Greenberg: I understand.

Shiva Muthusamy: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Shiva Muthusamy: Can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, but Ron is on first.

Ron Wickersham: Okay. Yeah, this is Ron. My only point would be that if registrate - if the agreements are to change by just simply posting a change on the Web of the registrar, then it doesn't seem that you're informed at the time you do it.

So I think that you almost have to go into that area of what's reasonable. Because it could be changed by a registrar who says, "Well, I'm low on money this month so I'm just going to make it 4000%."

Alan Greenberg: But are you suggesting that the fee - if the fee is controlled it's based on what you originally spent on it, not what the market is today?

Ron Wickersham: No. What - no, what it was at the time that you signed up for the domain name. If you renewed it...

Alan Greenberg: Which could be 10 years ago.

Ron Wickersham: Yeah. If the registrar has a right to have his agreement respected when ICANN wishes to change it and ICANN has to wait until that expires, shouldn't the registrant have a similar position?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I want to go down that road. But I guess the best we can do is when we word the question in the final survey, Marika and I will try to give an opportunity for open ended answers in this particular one.

Margie?

Margie Milan: Yeah, I just wanted to comment on the choice of words. I think you suggested the word constraint, and that in the context of price seems problematic.

Is there, you know, perhaps a different way to phrase the concern for that question?

Alan Greenberg: It's problematic in the sense that it may be construed as setting absolute values? Or...

Margie Milan: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Well...

Margie Milan: And so, I mean the way it was originally worded didn't seem to quite say that. But when you use the word constraint to me it starts getting in that gray area, and it's hard to tell...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Margie Milan: What they're...

Alan Greenberg: I mean the original one said same cost or not. And I think we've gone into an area where we may need more granularity.

But your concern is noted. And I presume you'll see the final version before we send it out. If we do anything naughty, tell us.

Margie Milan: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. My point is actually in relation to question, because I'm just realizing that we might want to rephrase it a little bit as well and say - instead of saying that the cost of recovery should be defined in the registration agreements, it should - it could be as well a link to that information.

Because otherwise we might be in a situation where a registrar has to update its registration agreement every time they change the costs. So if you make it in such a way that information is easily found on links through, I don't know if that's - you know, because I understood as well from some of the comments on the registration agreement that, you know, sometimes general language is used because it's complicated and...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, you're point is well taken. We'll - we need to word it to make sure we're not saying it has to be in the agreement as opposed to findable, identifiable whatever.

Shiva?

Shiva Muthusamy: Hello?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, let's see if we can hear you.

Shiva Muthusamy: Can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: We can.

Shiva Muthusamy: Hello?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, we can hear you. Let's see - try to...

Shiva Muthusamy: Someone said that if there is a - if we agree on the new station agreement, there is no need to define a minimum time payment, no need to go beyond that. But my point was that this needs to be discussed.

And the agreement - the registration agreement should include a definition of a minimum timeframe for normal renewal at the same cost, and this is one point.

The other point that relates to the consensus policy. So if by consensus policy you have an agreement across registrars or a guiding structure for renewal, then I would present that that's a consensus to be - there, they're going to (unintelligible) but not across all business, just across already registered.

That is because there are different types of domain names. For example if (unintelligible) there could be an agreement that all .com names will be a renewed at no more value than \$50,000 premium during this period and no more than \$100,000 premium during this period.

But when it comes to new (unintelligible), there are some of the new (unintelligible) are premium names. And (unintelligible) could be told (unintelligible) \$100 or more their name.

And if there is one such premium domain name, then it is not required to pay that - the renewal spot should be limited. It can be much more. It can be \$200,000, \$300,000 or higher (unintelligible) for such renewal names.

That's what I meant when I said that (unintelligible) policy across the domains but not within a...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, let me answer some of what you said. The first part, you were giving your answers to the survey.

Right now we're just trying to decide on what the questions are. Once the survey is finalized you will have an opportunity to give your opinions on the questions.

In terms of consensus policy across registries, we're looking at the possibility of recommending a consensus policy which would cover all GTLD registries. We do not have the option of picking and choosing which registry it applies to.

In any given registration a registry agreement with ICANN, there is the opportunity to negotiate exemptions based on the specific needs of that registry. That's not our business.

And in terms of renewal fees, no one is talking here about what the fee is for renewing a domain name. We are simply looking at whether the fee should be different after expiration than before expiration.

Shiva Muthusamy: Are you giving answers for the last questions? Or is it...

Alan Greenberg: We're not looking at answers at all right now. We're looking at the questions.

Shiva Muthusamy: Okay. Okay. I was giving the answers. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Any other thoughts on questions A through D before we go onto e?
Helen.

Helen Lavery: I had understood that ICANN did not get involved in the pricing that registrars charge. And there could be a problem with D in that since the prices charged to the registrar by the registry are going up every year, we could get into some problems where just at that time the price goes up again, therefore the registrar may have to take a loss because of this policy.

I would actually recommend that the question D just be removed.

Alan Greenberg: Noted. I think we have ICANN staff who will tell us if we're going into a territory that we shouldn't go into. But we're - I don't believe we're, you know, there was a suggestion from Ron that the fee that the - any addition fee charge post-expiration be related to the original fee charged.

That is certainly something which can be suggested. I would not suspect it's going to be a universally accepted concept.

Helen Lavery: But would this mean that the registrar may have to take a loss if the registry is now charging more?

Alan Greenberg: I don't - no one is discuss - no one's saying -- I'm not saying, anyway -- that the registration fee shouldn't go up in a world where prices go up. All we're talking about is if it expires on March 10 how does the price differ from March 9 to March 11.

Helen Laverty: If the registrar is charged more because there's been an update in the fees that the registrar pays to the registry, then it may go up anyway. And they - the registrar has no say in that because they have to recover costs.

So by saying that it'd have to be the same as before you are limiting the registrars in the ability to increase these type of...

Alan Greenberg: You're suggesting this is a case where the registry raises their price on March 10.

Helen Laverty: That's an example. In some cases this may happen.

There may be other reasons why it costs more. It may be expensive for other reasons.

Alan Greenberg: I think we've decided that we will have a very open ended answer of - answer possible for d. And I would suggest you express it at that time.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yeah, actually Helen does raise an interesting point. I mean VeriSign for example are upping the price that they're charging registrars, I think it's 1st of July.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Michele Neylon: For both com and for net. So I mean, the point she raises is a very valid one.

I mean, the other one which people tend to forget about is that, you know, registrars have tree fees to pay beyond - before they pay their staff or anything else. There's a fee to the registry which as I already said, it can go up and I've get to see them actually go down.

There's a per transaction fee to ICANN plus the variable fee to ICANN. And the variable fee to ICANN, that's based on the ICANN budget divided by the number of registrars, the yadda, yadda, yadda.

So I mean, that's the fees there could take a massive jump from one year to the next. So it is something just to bear in mind.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Alan. Just while that conversation was going on I wondered whether or not restructuring the specifics of Question D, 1D, 2A multiple choice, which I think Berry raised earlier. So we could propose a couple of scenarios -- no change in cost, cost - and use the terms cost plus, cost plus premium, cost plus -- you know what I mean?

Just sort of - so it bundles in the fact that costs do change.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I - maybe I'm reading too much into what we've already said. But if the costs - if Registrar X is selling a domain for \$10 right now, and as of tomorrow it's \$11 then it's certainly not unreasonable for the renewal fee to be \$11 -- even if it's post-expiration.

You know, I'm talking about, you know, the worst possible case, the fee goes up just over the boundary of expiration. I don't think anyone would consider it unreasonable for the registrar to charge that extra dollar.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Alan, to me it seems - part of the sticking point is the way that question is written in terms of renewal prior to expiration during this minimum

timeframe. What we need to do is structure a question which recognizes that that is considered when that question is being asked.

Alan Greenberg: And I - yeah, I thought we had already decided to do that one open ended. And, you know, we'll do our best to cover these options. Ron?

Ron Wickersham: Yeah, just a small point. But the - if the registry charges a higher fee post - after the domain has gone into auto renew, it's already been renewed at the original price.

So I don't think it can happen in post-recovery, post-expiration recovery. Because it's been auto renewed.

Alan Greenberg: I get the feeling we're talking about a very minor thing and spending a lot of time on it. And we've gone through half the meeting.

Can we accept that there'll be another iteration of this question, and if it's really broken then people will say so on e-mail?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, Alan, this is Jeff. That was my exact suggestion, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you. Shiva, do you still have your hand up or is this a new one? Down.

Okay question e, 1e, should the redemption grace policy be adopted as a consensus policy? If you remember correctly it - the consensus - the RGP was introduced round about 2002.

It was never put in as a consensus policy for either registries to implement it or for registrars to offer it. I believe pretty much all of the GTLD registries have implemented it, the ones that - where it made any sense.

There may - I think .museum may be an exception to that. And many registrars offer it.

Many say they do not offer it and in fact do offer it. And presumably some actually do not offer it.

The question is should this be a requirement that is all new registries do offer it? And we're talking about potentially a lot of new registries with new GTLDs.

And should a registrar be required to offer it? And remember this only kicks in if the domain is actually deleted.

Is there any reason not to ask the question do we need more granularity? Or should it just be a simple yes/no?

Okay. Question 2, whether expiration related provisions in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough.

Part a is are you of the opinion that expiration related provisions in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough, which essentially asks the full question. Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: I'm sorry, this question I had a real - this was - a real issue with this. Because I wasn't sure what we were driving at here.

And let me just explain why. That's why I was asking who the audience was, because we're asking whether, you know, in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous.

And so first, I don't know what a typical registration agreement is. And two, are people in the group going to review registration or whatever typical registration or any registration agreements to make sure they're clear and conspicuous?

I'm really at a loss for this question why - who's going to answer it and how and why and what typical is. So I don't know how this question makes sense to me.

Alan Greenberg: Well, the word typical is in the charter question. I believe anyway since it's in bold I think Marika just copied it right out of the charter.

So to some extent we are stuck with it because it was approved by counsel, assuming my assumption is correct. Marika, is that indeed correct, that this is the wording of the charter question?

Marika Konings: Yes, (unintelligible) is correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I don't see how we can avoid asking the question.

Jeff Eckhaus: I don't know how we could answer the question. Who's going to answer it?

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Jeff Eckhaus: I mean, is everyone here going to read - do we have a standard set of typical registration agreements for the people to review before they can respond to it?

Alan Greenberg: Well, we do have comments - we do have Marika's analysis of the nine, 10 registrars who compose a - comprise a large percentage of the registries - registrations that are done. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is one of the pivotal questions which led me to suggest that - and agree with Michele that, you know, a little bit of dumbing down and some of these questions will be really useful to when to ask beyond this group. I'm at a little bit of an impasse.

My response here, we're definitely going to have comments because yeah, some of these responses would to all honesty, from my point of view come back with, "I have no bloody idea. I haven't read them all nor do I intend to."

You know, that's the sort of thing you'll get from me on an a. But if I want to find the temperature of part of the ICANN community by asking (unintelligible) constituencies or some of our at large structures what their view is on that, I find it much easier to answer.

Alan Greenberg: Well, certainly if you have any better wording to - for us to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think the question...

Alan Greenberg: And the one that's going to ask ourselves...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just not sure that for this group what we have as a reference point is the reviews that staffers provided us with. And we're asking ourselves for an opinion - it's very subjective, anyway.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it is certainly subjective. Jeff, your hand is still up.

Jeff Eckhaus: Sorry, I just muted myself. So, you know, I think - here's the point, what I was saying is that if people here say, "Okay, I'm going to read, you know, a - whatever Marika went through, you know, the registration agreement and saying am I an opinion - is it clear or conspicuous? No, this agreement was not."

And then point to it and then yes, I agree, you know, we can't just say based upon anecdotal evidence we think - I think it's now clear. You know, it just - unless we have the specific ones or a group to look at and somebody pulls a cross section that I'm not going to argue what's typical, but people have to read it before they can answer.

They can't go by someone else's synthesis of what they think.

Alan Greenberg: All right.

Jeff Eckhaus: Or then what...

Alan Greenberg: I...

Jeff Eckhaus: Surveying us.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I have a suggestion, but let's go through the speaker list first. Michele?

Michele Neylon: I echo Jeff and Cheryl. I mean, if you ask me this question, I can't answer it at all.

Jeff, can you answer it? I think he already answered that anyway.

I mean it's - we can't really answer it because we don't - we're not going to read every single registration agreement. We can only go on anecdotal evidence.

We can only go on maybe things that we've come across ourselves. But even that, it's very, very - it's beyond subjective.

I mean it's in kind of crazy territory.

Alan Greenberg: I assume MDP is Michael?

Michael Palage: That would be I. Perhaps a rewording of this question to address the concerns by Jeff, Michele and others is are you aware of the right and obligations regarding renewal or domain name renewals in agreement that you've entered into?

So instead of asking them to opine on 1000 agreements, we're just asking people that perhaps are domain name registrants, are you aware of the rights and obligations regarding renewal terms? And, you know, are you aware of them and then have they been clear and conspicuous?

So we're asking the person who perhaps has a domain name that has entered into a contract, have they been clear, conspicuous, are you aware of them? And we're only asking them that knowledge with regard to domain names and, if you will, agreements that they've entered into.

We're not asking them to opine on 1000 contracts.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I have another variant. Do people want me to give it now before the rest of the speaker list or go through?

Man: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. When you - if you look at the next question is what measures could be taken to facilitate understanding of the related provisions by registrants? That one I believe is the correct tone that we're looking for.

So the question isn't are registration agreements clear, it's do we believe registrants understand the terms and conditions related to renewal post-expiration? Because that's really - that's the question that we're trying to fix in the next question, in the following questions.

And I think the wording there is not are the agreements clear, which a number of you have pointed out is a rather difficult thing to answer, but do we believe there's a problem that we have to solve? And that's somewhat different than what Michael just suggested, because he was suggesting from your personal experience, and I'm - for better or worse we're here to solve the ills of the world if they are there regarding expiration, not just on our own personal behalf.

Okay, let's go back to the speaker list. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yeah, this is Berry. Thanks, Alan.

Yeah, I think definitely here what we're talking about is the audience. You know, we need to go - continually remind ourselves to ask that question.

You know, the question of, you know, a, as an example I agree it does need to be removed. Me as a member of this working group, I can honestly say that, you know, registration agreements are probably not clear and conspicuous -- more to the case that they're definitely lack a zero consistency.

And why I know this is I have taken a cross section of about 20-some odd different registrars and analyzed sections of those agreements where they contained expiration provisions and renewal provisions. And certainly none of them are the same.

And certainly you can pick out some that are best of breed versus kind of just meeting maybe what could be considered an average baseline. So perhaps, you know, that's something to look at in terms of how we structure this question.

Because to me, I mean I honestly could answer that and say no, they aren't clear and conspicuous. But I do agree with Jeff and everybody else, it's not the right question to be asking.

And then where you were starting to go, Alan I believe - and when we start getting into the B and part of it, those are certainly more the questions that again when we consider the audience, we should be asking. If we're asking this amongst us to gain consensus, to start forming consensus about a direction we want to head, that's great.

But, you know, do we also - if we do want this external audience again to review this, then the - kind of how the question that Mr. Palage was talking about, is framed for those...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...kind of outside of the group.

Alan Greenberg: Just to be clear, what we are talking about today is for us. It is clear that if we were to go out to an outside audience -- and that's still an if -- it - these questions would have to be reworded and clarified, whatever. Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay. So then yes, just to reiterate then question a, you know, we can't answer it specifically within the group. But it doesn't help us really gain consensus on anything anyway.

So I say strike - say we strike it. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, so just two parts of this. One, I wanted to respond to Mike Palage's suggestion which actually, I think that's an okay question relating to you, you

know, the person individually when you went to sign up, you know, did, you know, are you aware of it when you did it?

And then I think just an add on - if we were going to do that an add on question is, honestly did you look for that information when you were registering it? Or did you care at that time?

Because, you know, just because it's not flashing in your face, you might not have looked for it or you might not have cared. Because that's a difference - that's a big dividing line.

Because you have to know if the person looked for it. And so I'm okay with the first part if we add in that second part, I'm okay with that, saying if they look for it.

And then the second thing, Alan I think your point here and then for part b, I'm just thinking if you answered no, what measures could or should be taken to facilitate understanding? That question, the wording on that is very leading, because what we're saying is you're saying that there's a difference between clear and conspicuous versus understanding what it is.

If it's clear and it's out there the person might - that's the difference between clear language. So I just want to be clear on that.

And then the other part is that we still can't say what we think registrants, we can only - if we're taking the survey, it's what we see and what we believe for ourselves, not what we think of registrants, what they know.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I guess I differ on that last question. But I was suggesting that whatever wording we use, that if the answer to a is yes or no, that there need - if the answer to a is there needs to be something fixed, then the questions following it should be the same thing.

Right now we're talking apples and oranges and that clearly is not reasonable. Cheryl? Or Michael, your hand back up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I just wanted to...

Alan Greenberg: Mike Palage, are you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Cheryl go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I just wanted to establish very clearly exactly who we think the target audience is. Because to be honest if we've established now as you just indicated Alan, that for this survey and these questions the target audience is us, then that's - a lot of what we've discussed is irrelevant. Inside maybe.

Alan Greenberg: I thought that was a premise that we started with.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because a lot of what we discussed is how worthy having the answers of these - to these questions would be from beyond this group. And we need to maybe reverse three and two in our agenda if that's the case.

Alan Greenberg: My understanding from when we started off was we are looking at a questionnaire, at a survey for this group. It would need - with the de facto statement that it would need to be changed if we grow to anywhere else.

I thought that was the premise, but maybe we've drifted on somewhere else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, what is everyone's view on that?

Alan Greenberg: You're suggesting that we put a pause on agenda Item 2 and go onto three.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I can give my opinion and then hands up afterwards for others. Marika, you want to speak first? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) I'm happy for you to go first, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. My belief is number one we need this work group to address the issues. The other audiences that I could see addressing it and set the issues, not necessarily a verbatim these questions, is there's a number of other working groups right now that are looking at very similar things.

I suspect many of us would be on those working groups and many of the people on those working groups would be on this one if there wasn't a finite amount of effort one could put into ICANN related things. And I think the people on the RAA groups and the IRTB groups for instance are moderately knowledgeable on these issues.

We might need to reword the questions and put some clarity and some enhancement to them. But I think those people are in a position to address the questions.

I would like to see it going to a wider audience than that. And clearly if we did that there would need to be some rewording and additional clarification, additional enhancement, additional dumbing down.

I'm not trying to define the exact words to make sure that people understood the questions we were asking, and that the answers had some meaning to them. That is my perception.

But I thought we were talking in this particular meeting about the first version of the questionnaire where we're dealing with knowledgeable people who did not - would not need a hell of a lot of explana - an awful lot of explanation, excuse the language. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. You know, I think that there's definitely a user purpose for this group to go through the survey to try to determine where the group stands and see if we can come to consensus or agreement on certain recommendations. Or at least a clear view where people stand.

I do have some concerns about sending this out to other working groups at this stage of the process, because to me it wouldn't be really clear what value that would add. I mean it's for this working group to come to recommendation and come to agreement, not for other working groups to decide on that.

They might not have had the benefit of all the discussions that this group has had, the registered survey, all the discussions. However I would see a value if this group at the end of the day comes to initial report where it does have certain options that it doesn't have a clear consensus around yet, but would like to get, you know, the public at large's input.

Then a tool like a survey where you really want to have yes/no questions or people choosing for one option over the other, that might be an efficient way of getting public input. And that way you could also target then those working groups specifically that you think have, you know, further knowledge about these issues.

But I'm maybe concerned if you open this up to certain working groups, I'm not really sure what you're going to do with that information at this stage of the process with not having a clear idea yet which direction the group wants to go or what recommendations we would like to put on the table for all the considerations. But that's, you know, just my two cents.

Alan Greenberg: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Alan, just humor me a small bit. Aren't these questions in many respects the charter questions for this working group?

Alan Greenberg: They are basically - they are driven off the charter questions with adding some level of granularity to try to determine what we think we need to do, yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, based on the fact that these are in many respects the questions that we as a group have been asked, I mean surely the fact that we can't actually answer them is - would actually resolve this working group's work.

I mean, if the question, you know, whether expiration related provisions in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough. If we as a group can't actually answer that question, well then in that respect maybe that's - the working group's work is done.

Because we can't actually say because we don't know. Now, the thing that we can take away from the entire thing is saying well, you know, based on the discussions that we've had, we realized that certain provisions may need to be clearer or that people may need to pay more attention to those things.

Plus, you know, what's the point of sending it out on URLs if we as people who have been asked to actually look at this -- as Marika rightly points to -- if we can't answer the questions. And the fact that we can't answer the question is an answer in itself.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I think that particular question we can't answer because I think that question was indeed not worded very well.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, but you see what I'm driving at though.

Alan Greenberg: I - if the questions are truly unanswerable then we have been given charter - a charter which we cannot address and we need to fold up shop and go home.

Michele Neylon: There you go.

Alan Greenberg: On the other hand I'm not convinced that's the case.

Michele Neylon: Why?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think this group should walk away from the overall task because the charter questions may not have been worded as well refined as they could have been. The amount of effort that was put into writing the charter was not at that level.

I mean, the charter questions came right out of the issues report. And Marika can speak to that.

I think there's an intent in the charter questions and in the issues - in the questions raised by the issues report which may or may not have been expressed well in the wording of the questions that doesn't alter the intent.
Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it's only fair to say that we can't answer this question. Because I think it's all based on the research that we've looked at on the registrar survey.

And, you know, I think we've all looked at the issues before where we looked at as well different provisions that are contained in typical registration agreements. I think, you know, you're asking here for an opinion.

And I think people can say that they feel that those - I mean, you might, you know, argue what is clear, what is conspicuous. But I think if we go here on peoples' opinion that you think that that's clear and understandable, I mean I think we've already spoken many times as well saying look, these registration agreements are legal agreements.

Maybe in the, you know, digging deeper into these and saying look, it's not, you know, it shouldn't need to be clear and conspicuous as long as that information is maybe contained somewhere else in a clear and conspicuous way and it's easy to find for people. I mean, you might take the questions as well in a different direction if you feel indeed that that's not answering the question.

But I think on the base of discussions we had, you know, I at least have the opinion that there is some kind of consensus that there should be more education or more information available on, you know, what it actually means.

And, you know, we're talking as well for example on, you know, having an easy guide to the RAA. You know, we have those provisions as well on - that related to expiration for example, pulled out and, you know, have those posted somewhere on registrar Web sites or things like that.

I think we need to be able to think a little bit out of the box for these questions as well and (unintelligible) well, just because that's your own definition of clear and conspicuous, I cannot answer the question.

Alan Greenberg: I guess the question that I was trying to word on the fly, and that's always a bad thing to do in my mind, is the question is - I think the question was really asking, are registrants provided with reasonable information in which to make informed decisions? And I don't know whether - I can't read Marika's mind in whether that was the intent of the question, but that's the way I read it.

So it's not an issue of whether it's in the registration agreement or somewhere else. And it's not in trying to define clear in a purely quantitative way.

But it's saying are registrants reasonably in a position to understand what the rules are, or do we need to try to take action to make it clearer? And that was certainly how I read the question, not focusing on the words.

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. If we've established that we are the target audience, are we going to then establish that we are going to answer these questions individually? And if that's the case we don't need to design very much more, because we can do a couple of carriage returns between each of these and just type away or say yes, no or maybe depending on what our personal opinions is.

That done, and that can be done between now and the next meeting, how are we going to analyze this information and what are we going to do with it?

Alan Greenberg: Well, I think first of all we do need to refine things. We've already heard that with the question as worded most of the people including yourself would say, "I don't have a clue" and walk away.

And that's not a particularly useful outcome of this, I don't believe. And we also have to address the fact that we're not just talking about the people on this call, we're talking about the working group which is a wider group than just the people who are here today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand, I've used the terms working group all the time.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I think we do with it what we do with other surveys -- we enumerate the results and we try to understand is there a feeling among a significant enough of the working group that we want to go forward in these things? Or do we believe it's a non-issue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Will this first run of metrics result in a paper report, something that - something happens with?

Alan Greenberg: Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What we've done in some of the other working groups and did produce the results of the survey, clearly identify where people stand and gives an idea that leads into sort of discussion to see indeed if a consensus view comes from those discussions, try to put those down. Then in another survey, our people then have an opportunity to basically say, "Yes, I agree with the recommendation," "No, I don't."

I sort of agree but I have some suggestions for changes, or I want to propose an alternative view. And work in that way trying to come at the end of the day with some kind of, you know, maybe some unanimous consensus recommendations, maybe some, you know, alternative views, some support.

I mean, that's at least for example how we worked in the registration reviews policies working group where people were standing very far apart from each other at the start of that meeting group as well. And taking a lot of discussions to come closer.

And I think the survey has helped to actually crystallize where people stand on issues. And there's not, in the end of the day, if there are indeed opposing camps, well why don't we put that into the initial report and say look, this is where we - how far we've come. You know, tell us what you think.

You think it's view A or view B that has it at the right end. Provide us with some further information why we should switch over to - from one side to the other.

Then at least have a way forward of presenting those results and hopefully come, you know, at the end of the day if there's no consensus on the recommendations that, you know, should go back to the counsel as well. I mean, I don't think it's the objective for this group to, you know, discuss into eternity trying to come to a consensus.

At the end of the day, you know, we might come back to the counsel and say, look, we couldn't come to an agreement. We have two opposing views. Here you are, you know, view the site when you want to deal with it.

This is what the public said, this is what we think and now it's for you to take it further.

Alan Greenberg: I guess from my point of view whether it's my ability as a Chair or this subject, but we decided to come up with this kind of survey as a way to go forward and now we can't decide how to go forward on the survey. And I'm not sure what that says.

I'm not sure - I don't think - I suspect it's nothing very good. Can we see - have a show of hands, do we continue on looking at the questions we've - we have 15 minutes left on the talk - on the meeting and we haven't looked at Mikey's things at all.

What do the people - what do people - what do you people want to do?
Marika?

Marika Konings: A suggestion I would have is to give people a couple of more days to look at the questions, you know, red line, provide suggestions to the main idea. Then maybe we just have a test run.

I mean, I don't think there's any harm...

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, then maybe we just have a...

Marika Konings: A test run. Just run the survey amongst the group and see where it leads us. I mean, people can put in if they have to answer a question, well this question doesn't make sense or I don't think we should be asking this question or.

But maybe, you know, by just doing it we'll see where we get. And maybe we see that we're actually, you know, closer on some of the issues that we currently think.

Should we be making the updates that we had decided to date first before we do that? Or do we go ahead with the wording as we have right now?

I mean a number of issues we've decided need to be fixed.

Marika Konings: Yeah, we can send out an updated version and give people...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...another week to, you know, red line and, you know, we can have a kind of final version maybe for the next meeting. And, you know, people can really think out the very crucial issues.

But maybe we should try to see this as well as a bit of an experiment, see if it gets us further instead of, you know, trying to solve every dot and com in (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Agreement? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would like to see us, if we've established that we're the target audience and these are at least at the macro level if not the minutiae, the types of questions we would like to seek our opinion on. That is the whole of the work group, that we get to the running of the survey much faster than the dotting of the I's, crossing the T's and wordsmithing of the survey.

But that we make it clear for all those responding to the survey from the work group that comments on the understandability or otherwise of the question asked - of each question is also thought after. Because it may be that some or all of these questions may be reworked for future use.

Therefore, we're not spending another joint reading exercise couple of hours to get where, you know, my understanding of typical and your understanding of typical are debated.

Alan Greenberg: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, this is Berry. And I'd just like to add onto that for sure I support that - what Marika has stated that, you know, we go ahead and kind of move forward with what we have.

I ask in the next iteration that you send out to the list, let's go ahead and structure the questions so the ones that we do have a yes/no type of answer, that that format is already there. And then per just the comments there that we, you know, for each question we allow a line item for free form text of explaining exactly how that question, you know, should it be tossed, didn't understand it, needs to be reworded this way or, you know, nothing if they a support yes/no answer.

At least that way on this first take we can quantify where we stand on the yes/no side and basically start to - again the goal here is to - for view A versus view B to start to materialize here. And that gives us our gauge. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just building on what Berry just said, the opportunity to have for each question or sub-question is this clearly understood. You know, something like that.

Alan Greenberg: All right. It sounds like our marching orders are to clean up whatever it's obvious that we needed to clean up that we've looked at so far, add, make sure the - what options we're allowing are reasonably open ended including

an opportunity to say I didn't understand the question. And go ahead with it without spending additional meetings discussing it.

Is that the general direction or did I misunderstand? Berry?

Berry Cobb: That - I think to Marika's point that we would just give a couple of days for anybody to red line any - some of the major stuff that they wanted to before we kind of turn on the switch to - for everyone in most of the working group to submit their answers.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, so what I said, allowing for a few days of comment in between.

Berry Cobb: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: And refinement if necessary because of those comments.

Berry Cobb: Yes. And I would like to add to this, because the exercise that we're going down -- and I'll reiterate it from what I typed in the chat -- again has been a very useful exercise in the registration of use policy group. It's really allowed us to see both sides and give clear direction of where we're heading.

And to kind of add to that, I know we've kind of run out of time for Mikey's wish list and flow chart. Because I think it's very important and compelling information, and I hope that we dedicate all of next call - or most of it for reviewing that.

Because while I do support that we go through this survey, I believe that there's going to be several things that come out of the discussions around the flow chart wish list that will be attendant to this survey, where we will need to again, you know, kind of measure where the working group stands with these issues/solutions that we start to develop. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: All right. If there is no objection then we have our marching orders.

Questions, are we meeting - or have we moved to meetings every two weeks? Or are we trying to meet a week from now?

No one cares?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we all care, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, I know. I'm asking for opinions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The weekly was where we were heading. And the skipping of a week was for other very good reasons, I thought.

Alan Greenberg: Ron?

Ron Wickersham: Yeah, I would like to meet next week in order to take up Mikey's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Ron Wickersham: ...wish list and flow chart.

Alan Greenberg: All I wanted to hear were some opinions. If no one disagrees, we will meet in a week.

Marika and I will try to have something out well before that to - for anyone to comment on. And we can launch the survey round about the time of the next meeting or sometime very soon afterwards.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It may be a good idea, Cheryl here, to do it soon afterwards, I would propose.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. As long as we don't spend a whole meeting talking about it next week.

Marika, does your calendar allow that? I know you're starting to get rather busy with things in prep for Nairobi.

Marika Konings: That should be fine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Anything else on today's meeting, or do we adjourn a few minutes early? Seeing nothing else, I thank you all.

Man: All right.

Woman: Thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

END