GNSO
Domain Tasting ad hoc group teleconference

August 8, 2007 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Domain Tasting
Ad hoc teleconference on 8 August 2007. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it
is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to
understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The
audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/dnt-ad-hoc-08aug07.mp3

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Attendees:

Mike Rodenbaugh - group co-coordinator CBUC (Council)

Marilyn Cade - CBUC

Greg Ruth - ISPCP

Danny Younger - NCUC

Jothan Frakes - Registrar constituency

Margie Milam - Registrar constituency

Paul Stahura - Registrar constituency

Jeff Eckhaus - Registrar constituency

Sophia Bekele - Nominating Committee appointee to Council

Kristina Rosette - IPC (Council)

Absent apologies:

Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination

Patrick Jones - Registry Liaison Manager

Nick Ashton Hart - Director for At-Large

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Man: The recording has begun.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right thanks.

I will go ahead and the read roll as I see it right now.

Glen from staff, (Nick Ashton Hart) from staff, Olof Nordling and (Patrick Jones) from staff, (Jonathan Fakes) from the registrars, me, Mike Rodenbaugh, and Marilyn Cade from the business constituency, (Kenny Younger) from NCUC, (Jeff Eckhaus) from the registrars, (Greg Ruth) from the ISPs.

Have I missed anybody?

(Margie Nylon): Yeah. (Margie Nylon).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh sorry. (Margie) from the registrars.

(Margie Nylon): Hi.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I didn't see in here. Okay.

So agenda for today, I sent out a couple of days ago. I've really seen so many comments on it. Does anybody have comments on it now or anything you'd like to add or change?

(Jonathan Fakes): This is (Jonathan) and good morning to everybody. I guess the last version of the redline, I embedded it against the registrars constituency, and there was some concerns that Number 12, any kind of price setting might have sort of broader implications beyond what the scope of the working group is.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. So you have some comments on the RFIs, the (substance) to RFI (unintelligible) the first agenda item?

(Jonathan Fakes): Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So we can move right into that unless anyone has any other comments on the agenda for today for time planning purposes?

All right. I'll say we'll go to this then.

And, (Jonathan), nice segue. So your concern is with Number 12 related to redline. Can you keep going? I think I cut you off there.

(Jonathan Fakes): Oh no. I started to jump right into it. I think my hard drive hasn't quite spun up here in the head. I get another cup of coffee in here.

The concern was that there was - you know, to kind of keep any kind of price setting out of this was the feedback that I got from within the registrar constituency on - that they're being kind of priced - minimum price established or entertain as part of this.

That's a challenging one because I think (Jeff Newman) made a really good point that pre-registrations would be somewhat similar to add grace, you know, it would allow the same opportunity. But it's kind of a slippery slope when you get into the price - setting the prices. So if the registry would receive or to offer something at no price, would still be up to the registrars to decide how that they would make that available to the registrants.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I guess right now the question is directed towards - well it's not really - it's open-ended, isn't it?

(Jonathan Fakes): It is a little…

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: …minimum price whether it's registry or registrar price.

(Jonathan Fakes): Yeah.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it was intended to be price set by the registry but for that matter, I guess, it really doesn't matter. If it's from registrant's perspective, it matters. Someone - they have to pay. So, I don't know, (Jonathan). I don't see much harm in asking the question as far as the RFI at this point.

(Jonathan Fakes): Could I have to end of business to - just about that one more time to see if there's some suggested (unintelligible) for that particular item?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's certainly fine.

(Jonathan Fakes): Thank you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Unless anyone has objections to that.

(Jeff Eckhaus): Hey, Mike. It's (Jeff) here and I don't have any objections to (Jonathan). We've been discussing it among the registrars. It's just I have to tell you it's a very sensitive issue when we start - when people start - when it even comes up that ICANN or other groups are going to start discussing - discuss or mandate what a registrar business model should be with regard to how we price and what we do with our business even if it's - this is supposed to be, you know, collection of facts for domain testing and discussions if should there be or should

there not be - you know, should there be any sort of a cost changes or minimum registration fees or anything like that on our business model. It's, you know, it's very sensitive to our group. And we don't see how it's within scope of this.

(Paul Stahura):   (Paul Stahura) has joined.

(Jeff Eckhaus):   Hi, (Paul).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well the reason its relevant is because the issue has been raised that registries - it was raised by (Jeff Newman) that registries could essentially give away domains for free. And therefore, wouldn't that effectively be the (lay intention).

Man: Right. But here's the thing is that if a registry it gives away for free, it doesn't necessarily mean that the registrars are going to give it away for free.

Mike Rodenbaugh: True.

Man: You know, registries give away price promotions all the time. Registrars don't necessarily pass that promotion along at that same (sync), at the same price. We effectively try and make a profit. And if the registries give something away for free, does not necessarily mean we are.

So we'd like to take the registrars out of that question that on anything prohibiting or even discussing limiting our pricing.

Man: And I've gotten some other feedback on that. So I'd like to (vet) it inside the registrar list. So…

Marilyn Cade: Mike, this is Marilyn. Can I ask a question?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: It seems to me though that the questionnaire is speaking views from a widely distributed group of stakeholders on the range of various options. Isn't that what you were saying?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yup.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. And I understand that in individual constituency or individual might have a view that that's the whole point of the questionnaire.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's my view on it.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Do you have a question?

Marilyn Cade: Well, I just was just verifying that because I, you know, I think as I understood following the work of the group is this group is not debating the solution that's trying together views on a range on both data gathering about the facts and then views on ideas of potential approaches, and I just not call them solutions but call them approaches which I think is a more neutral term.

And then to be able later there would be some work authorized by the GNSO council potentially to examine further that right now it's just to gather data and opinions.

So I just was verifying that, you know, that the question should stay in because it is a data gathering question.

(Paul Stahura):   It certainly like it's not - it's (Paul) talking. Certainly like it's not fair because I don't think registrars are able to really talk about pricing especially when it comes to like making minimum thresholds and so on for pricing.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. But it's not registrars what they're talking about it here, it's ICANN essentially asking the question of the community and then we can take every one's concerns into account, every one's responses into account when deciding on a policy later if the council decided they want to go down that road.

Marilyn Cade: And, Mike, I'm just going to say to (Paul) if I might. You know, A, I'm not an antitrust attorney and I'm not…

(Paul Stahura):   Correct. Me either. That's why I know - I'm hesitating in talking about it in this call.

Marilyn Cade: However, as I've said before in public, I hung around with a lot of them for a number of years. You know, I think, (Paul), you're right that as a group in industry setting so we're not talking about - you know, we could be talking about ISPs or telecom providers and software providers or hardware providers. As a group, they cannot get together

and talk about pricing. But individually, companies can talk about their views.

(Paul Stahura):   I have to talk to my attorney.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. But I don't think we should debate that here.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's right. And, you know, I'm conscious of time here. We do have a bunch of other items on the agenda. The purpose today was to see whether there are any additional concerns on the RFI and how they've been raised on the list yet. (Jonathan) has raised one. I think the group is willing to give Jonathan a little more time to get that to the registrars. But the bottom line is we want to get this thing done as of today and out to staff so it can be distributed.

You know, frankly, (Jonathan), you guys have had time to kick around this issue now for several weeks, and this is the first you've raised it.

(Jonathan Fakes):   Well this one is a challenge.

Mike Rodenbaugh: These questions have been in there since the first draft.

(Jonathan Fakes):   You're absolutely right.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, you know, I'm really not willing to allow any further delay after today on this. But I think I would love to hear from others in the group where they stand on this particular question and on the notion of getting this thing out today.

(Jonathan Fakes):   I mean, as it stands, we'd be fine with the term registrar removed. But, you know, again I'm not an antitrust attorney. And, you know, the fact that this may or may not touch into antitrust is something that, you know…

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: It has nothing to do with antitrust right now because it's not registrars acting in concert to do anything.

(Jonathan Fakes):   Of course.

Mike Rodenbaugh: This is ICANN doing something to get information so, you know, antitrust is a complete (Red Herring) at this point.

(Jonathan Fakes):   Oh no, that's very true. The concern would be that somebody come back through and question the integrity of the data because of my touch on this area.

Man: Well, let's just..

(Jonathan Fakes):   But if we've agreed to close…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: This is the answer to that, just asking the legal council to scrap the language and the questionnaire.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't know if that is a step that you can contemplate right now. Olof, (Patrick)? We haven't thought about that before as far as I know.

Olof Nordling: I think - well it maybe wise. I don't think there are extra concerns in the question. Of course, it maybe from the registrars' perspective when they distribute it internally for their own responses, but that's a very particular aspect to it.

But we can certainly - I mean in part of internal clearing process. (Patrick), have we gotten legal staff available in (unintelligible)?

(Patrick Jones): Legal staff is available but I don't think that they envision they would have to, do a clearance check on this on the RFI questions.

Olof Nordling: No, perhaps not. Should we - well…

(Patrick Jones): It can be done but I wouldn't suspect that that's going to cost some delay.

Man: That's certainly nobody's call.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, let's - (Patrick), maybe you can ask today and see what that delay would be. I mean, obviously, it's a pretty short questionnaire. So…

(Patrick Jones): Yeah. I can tell you it's probably going to at least a week because there is a board meeting coming up and a retreat to the board and they're actually quite a bit of obligations on the legal team this week, not to mention Dan Halloran just had a baby and so they're short staff.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Well, a board meeting and a baby. Maybe we can at least ask (John) whether - you know, take a quick glance at it and whether he thinks a more thorough review is needed that would cause some delay.

(Patrick Jones): I will ask the question.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. I think that's about the best we can do and then come back to the list. But, you know, obviously, we all would like to get this done so we can start talking about other things, statistics and such.

Okay. Any other issues with the RFI other than Question 12 affecting the Questions 11 and 12, (Patrick), specifically like (John's) quick read on, and about - and other than about the legal issues. Do you have any other issues you want to bring up about the RFI?

Okay. Good.

So, (Patrick), I guess we'll ask you to come to the list as soon as you have talked with (John) on that (unintelligible). And you're going to go back to the registrars and see if you have any better suggestions that we can clean up.

But I'm hearing from that group that we like the question the way it is. Outside of (Jonathan), is there anybody else who - (Jonathan) and (Jeff) and (Paul) probably, anyone else that has an issue with Questions 11 and 12 as they are now?

Okay. All right. Then let's move on to the next agenda item.

I would love to hear from Olof and (Patrick) or (Nick), anybody about the possibility of getting an economist to help us with our work as suggested by (Kirk Putt) some time ago.

Olof Nordling: I hear that. All right. If there's no problem and we get wording from (Jonathan) or - we go ahead for - and prepare for posting, that's A; and B, we have considered internally within staff whether we should link the posting on the GNO - on the ICANN Web site to a big posting as well.

And actually, in fact, it's giving the respondents the opportunity to see a lot of the form on that fund or responding as they please by email to the ICANN Web site and are there any views on that.

Well perhaps first do we consider this that, well, provided that we have it all settled then we go ahead reposting it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct. I think that's everybody's understanding. So now you're asking the further question what about the mechanics of the posting, do we want to leave it - do we want to provide essentially an online survey tool functionality, correct, rather than simply free form responses?

Olof Nordling: Free form responses would be an option. I mean, because we have considered posting it on the ICANN Web site and well - before seeing that procedure. But to have an extra option for filling out a form on this big (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Mike, its Marilyn. I have another question about the use of the term free form. And I posted - you know, I'm merely just sharing the

experience that we've had once before in asking others from the ICANN staff maybe.

Some of your questions seem to lend themselves to yes, no which is easier to tabulate. If you go for free form and I'm not suggesting - I think you do have to go for some free form. We also have to figure out how that gets analyzed.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. Well, we have talked about that earlier.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And the intention of this is certainly not to be a statistical survey in anyway but to be a request for information and ideas.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly. Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: The group will look out and analyze. I'm not sure exactly what we're going to do with the data. I think that will depend in large part on how much and what quality of data we get.

Man: Well I think we've done a lot of effort to our credit in the group so far to sort of narrow and make sure that the responses can be related to what something is so the answer to that question is somewhat narrow but still an opportunity to be subjective.

Man: Right.

Man: So hopefully that does address it for you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: And all I meant was by making sure it's under heading so that, you know, it's like even though you use the free form, you - people break their answers into the kinds of information that can go in to sort of like gathering information into certain categories.

And I'm not going talk about questionnaire development anymore but leave that up to others who are also experts and have experience on it.

Olof Nordling: I think we meant by free form not - well, rather contrast to a multiple choice forum.

Man: Yeah. And that's my concern with the survey tool, Olof, is that it - in other words, I'm fine with it in general because it should make it easier for people to respond and that's good so long as it doesn't cut off their ability to respond, you know, as completely as they want.

Olof Nordling: I understood it and here, (Nick) is on the call, and as I've understood this from (Nick) was used it, used it regularly within (ILEC). It lends itself very well to, well, some degree of epic verbosity.

Man: Well I think we should basically allow it, otherwise, what's the - otherwise it would be put out as a series of questions and we'd expect people to basically retype the questions and then type in their answers and send as a document. Or this way, you go type it in and then it'll all get nicely correlated mechanically; would be a big help to us I think actually.

((Crosstalk))

Man: The other thing I would say is that Olof is correct. Any format of answer can be accommodated including combination where certain - you know, one could say yes or no to something and depending on which you chose, you might then be asked other questions. Or off to, you know, simply typing the narrative response whether you (unintelligible).

And likewise, you can also do things like, you know, people indicated there with a particular constituency they might receive a standard set of questions everyone receives but they might also be able to then answer additional questions specific to that community.

Olof Nordling: Which is not what we foresee because we need to get this up and running fairly quickly.

Man: Right.

Olof Nordling: So the thought was rather to copy this straight down to have this as an alternative avenue. But - well, there are plenty of options, yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yup. You know, does anybody have any concerns with using the online questionnaire tool?

Okay. So I think we all agreed that that's a good idea in general, Olof and (Nick). So let's go for it.

(Nick) as you mentioned constituency-specific questions, I think we resolved last week that the constituencies would come up with those questions themselves when sending out the RFI or notice about the RFI to their members. And then they would be responsible for collating those responses and presenting them back to this group.

(Nick Ashton Hart): No worries. I'm speaking - you can do it any way that you wish. If they ultimately do come back, I want us to add another questionnaire which answer that question, we can do that too.

Marilyn Cade: Mike, I'm sorry, it's Marilyn. You're suggesting that the constituencies would collate answers and send them back?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Only at those specific - any additional specific questions they wanted to ask for their constituency members.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Man: I'm curious on the online survey. I kind of agree with what Marilyn said. You know, we need the free form thing. I got lost in the conversation. Is there going to be some free form or no free form?

Man: They'll still be completely unrestricted in the tool.

Man: Yeah.

Man: I asked the same question.

Man: I agree that it opens us up to a lot of, you know, verbosity or whatever.

((Crosstalk))

Man: We know. We know.

Man: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's okay.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. So, Olof, anything else on the distribution?

Olof Nordling: No, I think…

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. Great. Then can we move on and talk about the economist
                  and the do staff have any sort of update for the group on that issue?

Man: Haven't have a response from (Curt). But (Patrick), you're in the
                    corridors of power over in (unintelligible) and may have seen (Curt).
                    Have you got anything from him?

(Patrick Jones): I have seen (Curt). And I do not have anything further on this right now.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

(Patrick Jones): He knows about it. We're working on it and I don't have an update yet.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. No problem. So let's just table that until hopefully next week
                  and have an update then.

                  Next item was the UDRP. Questions to UDRP providers. (Jonathan)
                  and (Kristina) were essentially going to come back to the group with

revisions to the list of circulated before the last call. And I've seen a couple of posts by those two.

I know (Kristina) is on vacation. She won't be making the call today.

(Jeff), did you want to tell us kind of where you think we're at on that, are we pretty close to final?

(Jeff Eckhaus): I think we're pretty close to final. I'd like to allow (Kristina) the opportunity to get - you know, to make sure that we've added appropriately and I wasn't aware that she's going to be on vacation.

In essence, I'd requested - just to summarize it, I requested that we narrow down the responses to those that, you know, had some sort of add/delete activity, so we could focus in on the actual universe of what we're talking about here to what these working groups basically looking for as opposed to the general universe of UDRP complaints.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Uh-huh.

(Jeff Eckhaus): And it seems to me - I don't want to put words in (Kristina's) mouth but it seems like she was okay with that. But I'm still sort of digesting her comments.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I know, I just saw it from this morning too.

Okay. I think - you know, I would love to get that done and out but given that (Kristina) is on holiday, it seems like you still have a little bit of work to finalize that.

Did anybody else in the group have questions or concerns with the list of questions the UDRP providers are extending now?

(Kristina):   This is (Kristina). I just want to let you know I just got in.

(Jeff Eckhaus):   Oh, good.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hey, (Kristina). Well, (Kristina), I think it's kind of still - and you are in (unintelligible) court to finalize those questions and submit it back to the list but it seems like we're pretty close from the email traffic between you two, do you agree?

(Kristina):   Yeah, I think so, I mean, I have a feeling that it just might be a function of, you know, email frankly that I could be might actually be talking about the same thing but if we're not actually communicating verbally, we don't know that.

But what I think probably, you know, would be helpful is, you know, given that I am on vacation and this is my ICANN call for the week that I've been committed by my family, that, you know, (Jonathan), maybe if you could let me know whether some of the comments that I had post in terms of, you know, do we want to get to what exactly are the administrative deficiencies and then focus just on those that are really well - maybe you and I could email back and forth at least until Monday when I can actually communicate regularly by phone and try and get this mail down.

(Jonathan Fakes):   Perfect, it works for me and enjoy your holiday.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. So, we'll - hopefully have that wrapped up by next call if possible.

All right, moving on, (Danny) and (Paul), do you guys have any sort of update at this point? I guess, obviously, I'm not expecting you've done too much but I want to make sure you got the tools that you need. I think, (Patrick) has sent around some of the information.

(Paul Stahura):   Are you talking about my volunteering to (unintelligible) information on the last call?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Paul Stahura):   So, we have a brief email exchange and I have my guys working on it but it's not going to be exactly as easy as I originally thought because we only get the zone files once per day. We have not signed up for verifying service, I guess, that you can get it every ten minutes or whatever.

Therefore, it's hard for us to tell when we look at the zone whether a name has been deleted or whether it's changed registrars if there's no time in between those events.

So if a name gets deleted and it's not re-registered for a day, we will notice that. But if a name gets deleted and it's re-registered immediately, it looks to us like it just changed registrar like it was a transfer by just examining the zone files.

((Crosstalk))

(Paul Stahura):   That's what just makes it a little bit more difficult. So, part of.

For new names that get deleted, that's easy. Names that weren't in the zone before but basically names that weren't in the zone immediately prior to them being registered, those are easy to track and so on but other names that were in the zone immediately prior to being registered, those are part of the track.

(Danny):   And this is (Danny). At my end, I took a look at what would constitute a statistically valid sample. Basically came up with a value of 1,850 entries would be statistically valid given a 3% margin of error.

Man: I think we came up with a large number than that.

Man: Yeah. I would think - obviously, I'm not a statistician but I would certainly like to see larger numbers than that as well.

Man: The higher the number it gets, the more accurate it becomes in terms of marginal error. If you want pure 100%, then you're looking at about 16,000 records.

Man: What we're going to do is going to be - the whole zone but only for like a
two-week period or something like that. It won't be for a whole year, whatever, we're going to just take, you know, the most recent two weeks that we have and do it for that.

Man: And, (Danny), are you using the (biz zone) or the (comp zone)?

(Danny):   We're looking at the (comp zone).

Man: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, are you both comfortable that you have the data you need to do the studying that you want to do or is there anything that you might need from ICANN staff or VeriSign or anybody else that would help?

(Paul Stahura): I'm 90% comfortable.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right.

(Paul Stahura): Since we're not done, I can't give 100% answer to that question.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure. Okay.

And, (Danny), you're good to go as well.

(Danny):   That's really hard to say. Obviously, when you're going to have a lot of data on your plate to try to analyze, it just depends on the sheer number of entries that we have to look at and how much time can be involved in working the way through the project.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right.

(Danny):   It may require more hands on approach; I may have to bring in some other bodies.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Well, you certainly might be able to find other volunteers through the list if you'd like including possibly me.

(Danny): No, I'm told that we have a very large community out there and perhaps through next to systems we could (enchant) some participation.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Man: (Danny), I would say, also what you're looking for.

((Crosstalk))

Man: …we'll happily help you.

(Danny): Very good, once we get the data, we'll figure out a way of tackling it properly.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. Any other issues, questions, or concerns about that sort of statistical analysis that (Danny) and (Paul) have graciously volunteered to spearhead?

Okay. And we shall move on.

I think the next staff was VeriSign; just as - there was a note in the staff issues report of that VeriSign was talking to ICANN's staff so we've kind of get that as an item for stuff (unintelligible) if there is anything.

(Patrick), you've got anything?

(Patrick Jones): I've talked to (Pat) and there's nothing to update at this time.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

(Patrick Jones): I talked with (unintelligible) from VeriSign, I talked to (Tim) as well the other day and, you know, he certainly seems willing to help the group if we have any sort of specific questions. He does tend to believe that the data that we need is out there in public but if we had any sort of specific request that he would look into them.

So we'll leave it at that and if anybody does think of anything, then let's post it to a list and have a discussion. (Pat Kane) is now on the email list as well.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

And then the last agenda item unless anyone has other business and is the country code, ccTLDs and thanks, (Patrick), we saw the - your post from DENIC and from Nominet in the UK, looks like good stuff. I know you're also going to go after the ccNSO. Has that happened yet?

(Patrick Jones): Well, it - that have not happened yet because at the last call we said we would contact them once we are a pilot process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Cool.

Man: That's true.

(Patrick Jones): Now, what I did is we went ahead and looked up the ten largest ccTLDs and I've already made contact to some of them. (Yurid) has contacted me or written back, responded back to my request, they do not have an add grace period in (Data U). So, I don't think that they have any statistics that they can provide.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Good. No, I think it would actually might be useful just to document however many of the Top 10 or Top 20 ccTLDs have an (AGP) or not, I think that alone could be useful information, so…

Man: And one of the members of the registrar constituency, I want to ask (Francesco) from (ASCU) mentioned that NASK -- N-A-S-K -- is doing something in the (dot PL).

Olof Nordling: Yeah, they're introducing an add grace period and that's - well, that's what they do. So I guess, they wouldn't have much experience of it yet but they really introduced it to country member exactly which state - this is Olof.

And what I did as well was to check out the Web site of six of the remaining biggest ten ccTLDs; Italy, Argentina, Brazil, Switzerland, China and the Netherlands. Doesn't seem from what I can deduct from that is that any of them has gotten an add grace period…

Man: It depends what the definition of add grace period is because I know like that name, for example, you know, you could get a six-month free (dot name), you know, is that add grace period or is that a promotional giveaway or whatever?

Olof Nordling: Well, for add grace period, put it like this, when you checkout the financial conditions, well, they have to pay up before there is an update.

Man: Yeah, but I mean, you said - I think you just said that's the end, for example, did not have an add grace period, did you just say that?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, well, as much as I can - could deduct but I was very…

Man: Yeah, well, their registrations are like 12 cents a year.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: So, well, you know…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …so you define it.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And, you know, and Olof, it's Marilyn. My understanding is (dot PL) is going to charge 20 Euros per take. And I think that information is out there.

Man: Marilyn, 20 cents.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, 20 Euros.

Man: Twenty Euro cents.

Olof Nordling: Twenty Euros, it's - well, $25, okay.

Man: Well, it's 0.2 Euros basically.

Man: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Right, but it's per take and it's got to pretty well define I believe, so it maybe, you know, you just mentioned you just add that into your document.

Man: Yeah, if you're making a survey, you got to be - you know, you got to really know, I would guess. I mean, look at the pricing on (CN), its 12 cents US, you do the conversion for a year.

Man: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, I think that - you know what, well, I think what Olof has agreed to do at least with me was look at the Top 10 ccTLDs and try to figure out what policies they had around these issues essentially.

Man: It is a good idea.

Marilyn Cade: Mike, its Marilyn. I think it's a good idea. But you have to also look at the restrictions to registration. There are ccTLDs that do restrict who can register and so, let's just use hypothetically a ccTLD that requires a (nexus) with national presence and they may have been be charging close enough 12 cents US but you can't register in a TLD unless you have a local - a country specific presence. I'm just saying important…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. None of those are going to be in the Top 10, of course. I would love to do the survey of all of the ccTLDs.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm sorry.

Man: (Dot CN) is in the Top 10.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Talking about (unintelligible) registrations?

Mike Rodenbaugh: But they don't have any sort of restrictions on registration either.

Man: I agree with that. And if you're going to look at restrictions over registrations, you've got to look at when that - you know, like, I guess, (dot org) the lowest price is if you register from certain geographical regions like Africa, so you could nearly get a free (dot org) if you're, you know, in the Caribbean, that's right.

So, it's just more complicated survey than just saying, "Oh, this is, you know, ccTLD have RGP period - not RGP, an add grace period, you know, checkbox, it's more (unintelligible) than that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I appreciate that. I think, I know Olof is really just doing the initial cut through the Top 10 and then we'll all have a chance to comment and now that sort of color around it, (Paul).

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, well, this was very quick; just have to look through yesterday afternoon and…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, right, right. I think it may actually be that we want to send a note out to each of those CC managers and ask them the sorts of questions that - the type of questions that (Patrick) asked of .ee and .uk.

Olof Nordling: And that's foreseen. I just wanted to make a very quick check…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure.

Olof Nordling: …before the call.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I appreciate it. I know, we just really discussed it Monday morning, so thanks, Olof.

Okay, any other…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …easy job.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, I know, that's why we sort of just decided to look at the Top 10 first and see how difficult that was and what we found and then we can decide if more work is warranted.

(Patrick Jones): This is (Patrick) again. At this point, we've heard some three in the Top 10.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Who's the third?

Man: .eu.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh, yeah, (unintelligible). Good.

All right, does anybody else have questions, comments?

(Kristina): Yeah. This is (Kristina). I have a question and I think Olof and (Patrick), you all circulated that really helpful PowerPoint and I was just poking around and I think, the VeriSign report for April…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Uh-huh.

(Kristina): …looks like it's actually remain specific add grace numbers on a per registrar basis.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Kristina): Are those - I wasn't clear how those grace numbers were reflected. I mean, they're not sent out separately from what you all have provided in the sense that it's my understanding that what the PowerPoint decided to put a data that can be distinguished add grace

(unintelligible) because that distinction was not previously available. Is that right?

Olof Nordling: Exactly, exactly, that's correct. So, the time periods we have for deletes within the add grace period is very, very short.

(Kristina): Okay.

Do you anticipate and if you're not would you update the PowerPoint to reflect that add grace information or at least maybe starting a new one?

Olof Nordling: That's - it's rather starting a new one but then now, I think, it's around from the beginning of the year, isn't it so, (Patrick)?

(Patrick Jones): Yes, the PowerPoint would be of January to April.

(Kristina): Okay.

(Patrick Jones): That's the data that's hopefully available.

(Kristina): All right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

(Kristina): I personally think that would be helpful. I don't know what others on the call think.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it would be helpful and I know we can keep tracking it over the next several months as well. Of course, it would be great if we had data prior to that and we need to think about whether we can get that.

Olof Nordling: But - all right, we're talking here about deletes within the add grace period and there was just top the curve on those.

(Kristina):   Correct.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

                  Well, we still have 15 more minutes approximately if we need them. Does anybody have any other business questions, concerns about any of the topics or feel that there are some - any other specific topics that we ought to look into?

(Kristina):   I apologize since I came in late. Well, is there someone - if the (ICC) were interested in perhaps having ICANN make available its constituency-specific questions, is there a point person that I should get in touch with about that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Are you saying make available the questions that you want to send out to your constituency?

(Kristina):   Correct.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And by make available, you mean, publicize those more broadly than to your constituency.

(Kristina):   Or even, you know, make them - my understanding is we're going to look an online form, is that right?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah.

(Kristina):   Yeah. I mean, if we wanted to have (RFP) available as well online because I can't…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh, yeah, (Nick) actually - (Nick) did mention that there was a possibility, so…

(Kristina):   Okay…

(Nick Ashton Hart):   Yeah, you could if you wish. Actually, if it's a question thing in what constituency or agency do you come from and they said they come from yours, you can actually ensure that there were enough sets of questions specifically to them.

(Kristina):   Okay. All right. Well, I don't want to take up everybody's time. (Nick), can I just - I'll just reach out to you directly offline.

(Nick Ashton Hart):   Yeah, yeah, sure.

(Kristina):   All right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Anybody else?

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan Fakes):   …still free form - this is (Jonathan). There's a domain conference this coming week in Seattle. The domain roundtable conference…

Mike Rodenbaugh: Uh-huh.

(Jonathan Fakes):   …where there is, you know, probably going to be some domainers who may want to offer some feedback to the RFI if we have it completed.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh, that's certainly is the goal to have it completed actually after this call. I think, we've given to the end of today to finalize it. I believe that, you know, everyone in the group considers and essentially done except for the registrar reps to have one open issue.

But bottom line, (Jonathan), it should be ready at least in a very close to final draft form to circulate and take on this on next week.

Man: And so, when would this be available online for people to comment would be the question. Is that a reasonably accomplishable timeframe?

Olof Nordling: It is hopefully so unless we have added complications here. But - well, what do you say, (Patrick), if we get it approved today, I mean with all the comments and things and it seems like we're up and running, we should be able to have it posted by at least Friday…

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: …I guess.

So, well, now, I got a question, is (Nick) still on board here?

(Nick Ashton Hart): I am.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. Time - I have no experience myself with this big (unintelligible) but what would you foresee in order to get something out on their Web site?

Man: I'm sure that that can be done; I'll work with (Ralph). Once I get the final, final questions, I'll work with (Ralph) to get us a setup.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: And you and I can work together to provide the working group the ability to run through it and, you know, try it out, test it out and make sure that it works for them and we just (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: Yeah. I mean, does it call…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …with us.

Man: Whatever page you're working with is okay. You know, I'd hate to introduce confusion or delay to the process. What I'd hope to do is, you know, even if they're just the URL that might reference where people can go to do comment that can be distributed there or discussed, I think it would benefit the efforts to the group to, you know, get feedback from that community.

Olof Nordling: You mentioned this was taking place next week.

Man: It starts - I think its Monday through Wednesday.

Man: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: I mean, that's certainly - I mean, we foresee if everything goes to plan to have it up and running by the end of the week.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And now, it's more question of how do we sensibly approach them but maybe you've got all the leads in that department.

(Patrick Jones): This is (Patrick). I just have a question and it's aimed at (Kristina). When you posted the pro survey…

(Kristina): Uh-huh.

(Patrick Jones): …that you speak of.

(Kristina): Yeah.

(Patrick Jones): You need to get ICANN general council approval to do that, correct? You guys just want to have…

(Kristina): I don't know the answer to that because I was not involved in the actual mechanics of it. So, if there was any approval, it would have been handled through it. I mean I think he was aware of it but I don't know - I

know that I was not involved in getting approval from him or anything like that.

(Patrick Jones): Okay.

Marilyn Cade: And, (Patrick), it's Marilyn. You might ask Glen but I've been under the impression for some times that public postings have - do have an internal review process.

(Patrick Jones): Oh, you know, that's true but that survey was not on the ICANN Web site and it was posted via a link but just trying to reduce delays and if we are relying on someone - potential advice from general counsel it may not come as fast as you guys want.

(Kristina): I mean and I would say that based on the prior experience that we definitely should have it available for testing by members of this group just to make sure that there's nothing that kind of no one really thought about while we were working on it but comes - becomes clear while you're completing it.

For example in the pro working group and I don't think we're doing anything like that is you have to identify what county you work on and the country menu that was used was not complete and there were some issues and concerns about what were we trying to exclude respondents from particular countries, et cetera, which was not the case.

Olof Nordling: At the same time I mean it calls for testing and we don't want to delay the positing of it. I mean there's still the option that we do post on the ICANN Web site for about responses in the traditional way let's say

and then add this link later I hope that would be noble rather than delaying the posting because of the need of testing of the big (pop).

(Paul Stahura): Sorry to interrupt; I have to leave the call now.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

(Paul Stahura): Bye-bye.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks, (Paul).

(Kristina): And you just kind of put it out for, you know, one day; everybody - just an email saying it's up for testing if you want to test it, you have 24 hours. We don't - you know, if you do it afterwards, come back.

Olof Nordling: Well, we (unintelligible) as quickly as we can and hopefully it gets it up from (Rally) by Friday like (Roberts) and (Kirsten).

(Kristina): And can I - I actually have something that wasn't clear from my note. Are we asking people to provide specific identifying information for verification purposes even if that information is not released?

Olof Nordling: Not according to - well, we don't ask any more questions on our - in the RFI.

(Kristina): All right. So is there any mechanism to (track the gaming)?

Olof Nordling Well…

Man: That's a good point.

Olof Nordling: Well…

(Danny):   This is (Danny); maybe I could chime in here.

(Kristina):   Oh, absolutely.

(Danny):   Over the course in the last couple of days I actually took a look at ICANN's public comment period; trying to evaluate how many comments were actually sent through on anything generally.

By and large we aren't getting anymore than three or four comments any open public comment period with the exception of blockbusters like Triple X. I don't think you're going to have gaming just based on experience.

Marilyn Cade: (Danny), its Marilyn. That's the current experience that you will recall that during the responses to the green paper, 121 of the 100 responses came from one person at the suggestion of a particular entity.

Olof Nordling: But at the same time I mean we're looking here for qualitative input rather than quantitative. I mean it's not a poling exercise in the sense that 90% thinks that this is a bloody good idea and 10% are indifferent to it. It's more like we want to have the ideas on the table.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. Olof, the difference might be that what the other party did was submit a standard document with just different names and maybe the way you're addressing this would rule that out because every question - every response is going to be read and so you of course would see

that 10 responses or 20 are just copies with a different submitters name on them.

Olof Nordling: It has…

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: …yes but - and then since they're looking for positive input, I mean if they're very repetitive, okay, you can make a note of that but it's not like the validity of the view is not necessarily connected to the number of respondents that have said exactly the same.

Man: There are also some tools built-in to the poling system itself which help you see some of the obvious things why responses from the same IP address will (unintelligible) to look now.

Man: But again, I think we should all just remember that this is not, again, not really intended to be statistically significant in any way so if we simply see a lot of very similar responses we'll realize that as we're looking through the data.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, you know, that's why I just wasn't like I said I wasn't sure where we had ended up on this and I want to make sure that I was clear when I report it back to my constituents.

Man: Well, I have a question that goes straight through the heart of this, is, you know, what personally identifiable information is collected as part of this like, does a person identify who they are and…

Man: I never asked that. We've only asked for the category that they put themselves or categories that they'd put themselves in.

(Kristina):   The (IPC) question will ask for specific identifying information.

Man: And another constituencies of course are free to do that as well.

(Kristina):   Yeah, but don't you have to ask people to identify themselves but then maybe ask the staff to strip-off the - you know, what we did in the previous (who is) questionnaire was, you had to identify who you were but that data was stripped off by the ICANN staff.

Marilyn Cade: That's what we did on the Pro Working Group…

(Kristina):   Yeah.

Man: We can certainly do that in (tools).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. I would be completely in favor of that, sorry that we hadn't raised that issue until now but…

Man: I thought it's being covered but I went back through other…

Mike Rodenbaugh: I actually thought it had been, I thought we had covered it in one of the first calls too but I can't remember how we came out on it. So no matter.

                Does any body have any objections to including that question at the head of the RFI? Of course we would never see that information later but ICANN staff will have it.

Okay.

Olof Nordling: Well, wasn't this map out in two different ways if we have those other traditional posting where we would get sort of an email answer and that would be to a certain degree one identify action.

But it pertains very much to the big (pulse) where, all right, you respond otherwise anonymously.

Man: Well, there's going to be those that that's actually better for and there's going to be those that might want to stand up and say, "Hey, this is who I am and this…"

Mike Rodenbaugh: One of the fact is it's not going to be a - it's not going to be available to us and it's not going to be mandatory so if you'll going to essentially skip through the question if they don't want to answer it.

Man: Okay.

Man: Oh, my final last question, how long will be common period be open for?

Olof Nordling: I think our suggestion in the asset - right now was most 15th of September, nobody else objected to it, I guess that's it.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Excellent, we're right on the hour, does anybody have anything else they'd like to bring up, otherwise, we will, we convene next week.

(Jeff Eckhaus): Mike, it's (Jeff). Just one question just to make sure, are you going to send - can you send out an updated timeline sometime during this week?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Jeff Eckhaus): What the schedule is; that would be great.

Mike Rodenbaugh: In fact I'll ask Olof to include that in the draft in the meeting notes from today.

Olof Nordling: Timeline for what?

Man: An updated timeline of, you know, release - you know, what were - what schedule is like X date release RFI close by this date, you know, so there's something - so we can pass to out constituencies what we believe the timeline is going to be.

Olof Nordling: So, that's fine for - and I definitely - if you wanted the timelines on a number of other things which we haven't decided upon like the distribution of the UDRP provider questionnaire and responses to that, so - but this is throughout the timeline for the RFI.

Man: Yeah, exactly to the RFI, we don't have the information we could always write (TBD) on it, you know, it's just to get a general sense and

nobody is going to hold anyone to any page; just a general guideline of where - what we're aiming for.

Olof Nordling: And we're still coming to that of course we have to - we have now set this at the 15th of September, counting on the GNSO Counsel agreeing to it, haven't we? Because there's a GNSO Counsel meeting tomorrow and Mike you promise to bring it up.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct.

Olof Nordling: That's the planning we - so unless we have any hiccups and they - (unintelligible) protest against it from the counsel, well, 15 of September is the foreseen deadline for comment.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

I think we agreed was really reasonable getting to summer holidays in Europe and elsewhere.

Man: That sounds reasonable, that sounds great actually.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

All right, well, thank you everybody and we will talk again next week.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Man: Okay, thanks.

END