

**GNSO**  
**Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference**  
**10 November 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 10 November 2009 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-20091110.mp3>

On page:

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

**Present:**

Michele Neylon - RC / Acting as Chair  
James Bladel - RC  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC Chair  
Ted Suzuki – IPC  
Paul Diaz – RC  
Ron Wickersham – NCUC  
Alaine Doolan – IPC  
Tatyana Khramtsova - RC  
Sergey Gorbunov  
Jeff Eckhaus - RC  
Tim Ruiz – RC  
Mason Cole - RC  
Helen Laverty - Registries  
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large  
Mike O'Connor – CBUC  
Berry Cobb - CBUC  
Graham Chynoweth

**Staff:**

Marika Konings  
Margie Milam  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent apologies:**

Alan Greenberg - ALAC  
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Coordinator: We have now started the recording. All parties, this call is now being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may now begin.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Could somebody do a role call for me please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely, Michele. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's call. We have Michele Neylon, Tatyana Khramtsova, Siva Muthuswamy, Sergey Gorbunov, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Helen Laverty, Ted Suzuki, Paul Diaz, Mike O'Connor, Elaine Doolan, Graham Chynoweth, Tim Ruiz, Ron Wickersham, Mason Cole, James Bladel, Berry Cobb. From Staff we have Marika Konings and Gisella Gruber-White, myself.

We have apologies from James. Sorry, apologies, James has joined the call, from Alan Greenberg and from Karim Attoumani. J.Scott Evans will be joining late as well Jeff Eckhaus. And we have quite a few people on the call this evening. If I could ask you all to state your names when speaking.

Thank you, over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right, thank you. In case you haven't gathered as Alan couldn't make the call this evening I put my head on the block to chair us in his stead. So if you all will behave and be nice I would appreciate it.

Have you all got a copy of the agenda for today? And if not its up on Adobe Connect. So we had a roll call and was there any update on the constituency statements?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to note that so far we've received constituency statements or stakeholder statements from the business constituency, the registry stakeholder group, the IPC and the registrar stakeholder group. And this is just a question whether any other statements are forthcoming or whether I can go ahead and summarize these and create a table as we did as well for the public comments.

Ron Wickershan: Hello this is Ron Wickershan.

Michele Neylon: Hi Ron.

Ron Wickershan: Yes. Yes we're not preceding good with NCUC statement given that - so probably it's not wise to hold out waiting for that.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you, noted. So Marika could you do what your funky thing with that little summary thing that you've done if nobody has any objections?

Marika Konings: I will do.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Marika.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've got a hand up.

Michele Neylon: I'm sorry Berry Cobb, I beg your pardon. Hi Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Hi thank you this is Berry Cobb. I'd just like to point out for those that do through the BC constituency when I submitted that, the very last sentence of that statement was an error.

I had mistakenly classified this as a pre PDP when its not. I corrected that and submitted it. And just to make it clear, the BC did not vote on this position statement because there were no formal recommendations made and we're reserving that for the outcomes towards the end of this working group.

So if you have any questions, you can direct them towards me. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Anything else on the constituency statements? Okay. The registrar survey, I believe staff was looking after those. Was there any updates on those?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika again. Just an update that I haven't had a chance to do any further work on that. I have been out of the office last week. And its more

a note here, are there any sort of questions on that further following the discussion in Seoul and ask that people have a chance to maybe review in more detail the outcomes. But I hope to have some further details on that for next week's call.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Marika, you sent through the some bits of Numinous reports. What was this in relation to - this is to do with renewal rates for this?

Marika Konings: This was following a code by Berry Cobb where noted was this spoken about in an article on news sites in which someone pointed out as well, that this is data that this group might want to review in the context of their discussion on exploration. And the data that is here is some data in relation to (WK) on renewals. And it has some information on the renewal rates and reasons for not renewing and (remaining) and got a question for this group to review this data and see if there's any relevance in relation to the discussions the group is having.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Berry did you have any further insights into this?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I personally I haven't study ever number of the report myself. I did come across it and just thought it would be good for the group at the very least, just to communicate out to the group that we're being watched sort of speak, because they definitely the posting had called out that, you know there was effort being taken by this group etcetera.

Michele Neylon: I'll just take a quick look at this. Oh I see what you're saying. It's stated, it should be useful to the ICANN working group examining the issue of expiring domains.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes, work away.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. The particular parts that Marika pulled out where you're looking at the reasons, the research they did as to why people chose to renew or not to renew their domain name. I think that's probably something that we could shamelessly steal and put somewhere in a preamble because it is a piece that's statistically interesting information. And I think particularly the reasons for the non renewal when we look at some of the beliefs that people have about automation and reminders, I think it's not an exact fit with the metrics we're looking at but I think its foundation to some of the assumptions we might make based on the metrics we're going to have.

Michele Neylon: That's a very valid point. I think this also, just as a kind of a side note, I think AFNIC did have some information as well. I'll see if I can dig that for the group. They do, they've done a few reports on the state of the dot FR name space which I think probably contains some similar enough data.

So based n what we've seen there, I'm just trying to pin this...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, remembering surely the (decodes) in case if you became (nominate) also send out reminders. Say you've got a (jewel) response or coming in. And I think we may need to if we're looking at other studies which I think would be well worthwhile if there is enough to find. We'd probably need to look at these in two data sets, those where it is only the registrar that has contact and those where it's not the (case).

Michele Neylon: Very true.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry there was (unintelligible) moment, I'll go back to being simple now Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay, fair enough, fair enough. I was just looking up the stats here. I mean the, you don't see a huge number of people kind of going. Oh I didn't renew the domain because my registrar is a scumbag. Or I didn't renew the domain

name because the registrar never told me they are literally saying, you know they forgot. I can't read. Mr. Chynoweth.

Graham Chynoweth: Yes I thought this was actually interesting, this is a point that I was thinking about in Seoul, which you see that 98% recall receiving a reminder about renewal. So to me it seems like part of the question here about the post expiring, I mean the frame is post expiring but I'm not totally convince based on this data and based on kind of anecdotal experience with other people that that's really where the root of the problem is.

I mean sometimes it seems like people, you know the confusion and concern over the expiration of a domain name results from just a failure to act or failure of being aware of what's going on prior to the expiration. And no one pays attention about it until their Web site goes down.

So it's just an interesting, I mean it may be out of scope, but to me it's an underlying issue that probably deserves at least some consideration. Maybe it's already been considered thoroughly and disregarded. But one which I think is a relevant conversation to have.

Michele Neylon: Well you mean the reminder - reminding people or them not being aware of the consequences if they don't renew us?

Graham Chynoweth: Both I'd say. Reminding people and how those people get reminders whether or not, you know the email they get is effective and also whether or not they act on them. I mean some of it is people just not, people thinking that it's the process that they, it's the posted expiry process that's broken and confusing.

But it's only that way because you freak out because your domain name is down and that's, even though you had probably could have gotten or did get previous notice that there was something about to happen. You don't really seem to get concerned about it until your domain goes down.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Michele. I think from the registrants' point of view here the vital importance when talking about the emails or perhaps other uses not necessarily just Web sites that you're making of your domain name. It is an important piece of one's business but it is not exactly up front and central to your day to day try to make ends meet in all cases.

If your running a meat export business for example, you probably are thinking even if you have a Web site, your Web site being rather more as a catalog and may in fact overlooked the fact that your next order or email is going to be compromise as well.

So it comes back to something that we've said a number of times before and that's the need for the registrants to have a better understanding of the fore consequences and indeed of the value of what they're licensing. But I also think that we should take a moment when we look at these statistics and any other metrics that we collect from other sources.

I'd love to see more information from other sources that Numinous has put together for the sub set of reasons for not renewing a domain name. If you look at those there's actually a change between 2007 and 2009 in the way that registrants are approaching these assets and we may need to look at how that's going to change both behavior and expectations from the registrant point of view.

But when you look at, you know, what would be, you know, project or business not starting and the short term opportunity (numbers) there, I would think that previously you'd have expected a much closer set of figures where right now in 2009 there's seems to be a different mindset or different set of uses and therefore a different set of its no longer use for me that's coming out.

So one of those (past) things that we might need to also recommend some longer term studies might be interesting and perhaps collect from a number of the cc operators and some of the globals as well.

Michele Neylon: Just as a point of information as well, bear in mind the co.uk registrations for a two year period only. You can't register one for one year, you can't register for ten years. Anybody else want to jump in there? No? Helen go ahead.

Helen Laverty: I was just wondering when I look at the chart, the 2007 bars are a lot less than the 2009 bar and I don't know if that means there were a lot of people that didn't know how to answer the question or what it is. But it makes it very difficult to tell whether it's increased or decreased when the overall results from 2007 seem to be less than 2009.

Michele Neylon: Thoughts anybody? No?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl here. We could always ask Numinous whether or not they had a particular outreach in 2007 which meant there was a whole lot of additional registration that were coming up for renewal in 2009.

Michele Neylon: The co.uk name space is still growing. So the 2009 expirees and renewals for domain registered in 2007 or before then. Paul Diaz?

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Michele. I just want to ask the group in general, you know this data from Numinous is definitely interesting and but it seems to me it pulls more the (neat) to know than the need to know for the purposes of this working group. I'm just kind of at a loss, why would we go back to a ccTLD operator when, you know, the way they run their operations, the rules that they operate under are very, very different than the ICANN registry operators. I'm just really kind of at a loss as to how this informs this particular working group?



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. My immediate response to the differences between the way the operations are in the cc and the ICANN registry well its of course more (sabitty) in many cases because there is perhaps an amount of registrants confusing or registrants miss information or change of expectations between what the registrants who are using both ccTLD operators and gTLD operators have and some of the small proportions but significant to those people effected of complaints may in fact come from the difference between what one is expecting with one regular interactions with your ccTLD world and that they get in the gTLD world.

And the other thing is I think we could start by saying that this preambing background information, it's not information that is asking us to turn over the work that we're currently doing or take it in different directions. What it is doing however is giving us, I think a very interesting illumination on some of the behavior and some of the reasons of behavior on renewal non renewals from the registrant's point of view.

Michele Neylon: I think I'd kind of echo, I'd agree with Cheryl's say come up to a certain point. I mean Paul with all due respect, I mean (Numinous have a lot of data on this. I think some of the other ccTLD have asked questions of registrants where as I'm sure the operation of gTLD maybe different but we haven't actually asked them. We haven't actually gone out and conducted these surveys.

Paul Diaz: Can I follow up?

Michele Neylon: Paul, then Jeff.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele and I'm sorry if the question sounded -- I'm not trying to be argumentative or confrontational in anyway -- I'm just genuinely asking a question from a sense if this is a policy to (to our) process, it's expected that the group is ultimately going to come up with either a recommendations policy change or at a minimum best practice or something.

And so I guess I'm asking if we take what you folks said, with what Cheryl and Michele have said to (natural) conclusion then that means we need as a group to look into what particular things ccTLD operators are doing differently then the gTLD operators to try and perhaps (tease) out a best practice or identify things that work better there, cause less confusion etcetera, okay to a point but I'm still left wondering and then what's the end result?

We're going to go back and tell the ICANN gTLD operators this is what we found and we recommend you guys do it this way? But that was my question. I'm just looking for the - this is all very interesting but where does it take us? What will the group get out of this sort of research?

Michele Neylon: Jeff?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Well actually I had a similar question. I'm sorry that I was a little late for the call. But I think this is interesting information. I won't say lets throw it out, I think its interesting. I looked through it, I didn't see, you know before we even go I need to if the, you know the statistical information and finding out some of the points on this is I guess, yes what is it?

You know the whole idea is, is there, you know I'm looking at the proposed agenda and to look at the notes and say, hey is there adequate opportunity? And whether expert for, I'm sorry, for registrants about expired names and the two main questions here.

I'm just trying to echo what Paul is saying, this is great, this is useful information but I don't see how it helps us get to our goals. Maybe it does and someone can point it out to me because I'd love to know why we're going over this survey.

Michele Neylon: Well from my perspective -- and I'll then let Helen jump in -- from my perspective it gives one of the problems that we seem to be coming around and around is a lot of anecdotal he said she said type of stuff (rating to this).

And from what I'm seeing personally is that a lot of the problems people seem to have with the post expiree is actually to do with the expiree not what happens after the fact.

So I mean what I think is interesting looking at the Numinous report is, you know people actually saying well they didn't want to renew the domain names but I (mostly) remember actually receiving renewal reminders from people. So, you know, that's quite a valid thing. Helen you want to say something?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Michele may I just finish on that point there?

Michele Neylon: Yes, sure go ahead.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: So then, just to put that around is to say I'm looking at it and then we say 98.2% recall receiving reminders about renewal, correct?

So do we want to say, okay if 98% remember then there is adequate, I mean how do you, you know besides just using it as a data point in saying, hey on Numinous to me it looks like that 98% of the people recall seeing something about a reminder.

And that's great but I don't know, do we say okay it looks like that's a large amount so we take it and put it in the rest of the group? Into our information and say 98% of the people (.counk) know about this? I just really want to - before we spend a lot of time going over it, I just want to try and figure out how we use this data as effectively as possible if at all.

Michele Neylon: Helen.

Helen Laverty: Well first of we don't have anything like this for the gTLD. Yes, I wouldn't take al of it of accurate reflection of what happened to the gTLD but I think it's important that we take advantage of information like this and from this it

appears that informing people that their domain is expiring is not the worst problem.

It seems that a lot of people are still aware of it and not that many forget. There are some possibilities that we have found in the past that actually making sure that a domain goes down is a good way to get people to just putting it off and putting it off until their Web site goes down and then its, oh I guess I better do something. So I think that is definitely part of the problem.

And on the other hand I think it's actually very good to see ccLT what's going on because they have flexibility then what ICANN says they can do different things. And we can look at what different things, the different ccLTs are doing. (Cera) for examples for (.ca) domains also sending renewal notices to the registrants.

May that's something we want to look at. I honestly don't agree but perhaps it is something that people might think would be a good idea. The registries actually did send reminders to their people on the domain.

There are different things that we can look at form this information. So borrowing a more detailed chart like this directly for the gTLD. I think we should look at this quite seriously.

Michele Neylon: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. And Helen I couldn't support what you were saying more. In fact I think one of the things Michele and I both mentioned earlier was that wouldn't it be interesting to see if there was different statistics from ccTLD where there is those where the registry does and those where the registry doesn't contact registrants themselves.

That simple piece of information could lead us towards giving some very significantly different outcomes and advice as part of this PDP process.

Michele Neylon: Silence. Lots of chatter on the Adobe Connect. Great, okay. Okay, well okay we have some data here which may or may not be useful. So we'll agree for the moment that it may or may not be useful and whether we can do anything with it or not is subject to some debate. Okay, then.

The question of Helen's hand is up again. Hello Helen, go ahead.

Helen Laverty: Sorry, I just wondered is it worth asking some of the other ccLDs whether they can contribute some similar kind of data so we have more data to compare and see whether there's consistency across ccLTs?

I mean I could probably ask (Cera) whether they got some information that they would like to contribute. And the other ccLTs may help at on the amount of data.

Michele Neylon: That might do. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just that I am happy to request from my colleague who supporting the CTNSO to see if he has any (prior) data or that he would be willing to send out a note to the cc community to see if they have any similar kind of data that they're willing to share.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Marika. Right. The (charter) question is always going to be the core question. What adequate opportunities exists for registrants to redeem their current domain names?

So, where have we left things with that at the moment? Marika do you still have your hand up?

Marika Konings: Yes, just taking it down, sorry.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That's fine. Ted?

Tim Ruiz: Yes. What I guess I'm a little confused on that because of Alan's last note to the list. It sounds as though at least two proposals or suggestion, whatever where we're coming and that that could effect that question I guess depending how the group views those proposals.

So I don't know if we're looking, if we're talking about what just in general what the group thinks or what the consensus of the comments from those of the public and the constituencies said if had that analyzed. But I guess I'm not sure where we throw out that question right now until we understand what Alan was talking about as far as the proposals he was referring to.

Michele Neylon: Yes, Marika have you seen anything on these proposals he mentioned?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No I haven't. Aside from Alan mentioning it and then the notes he added to the list, I don't know more then that. So I have no idea either whether that is something that will come before the next call or it will take a lot more time, I'm not sure.

But just to follow up on Tim's question. The reason why it's up here is basically to continue the discussions that we had at an initial stage. I think the desire were to have some more data and now that we have some initial results from the survey, I think the question is put back here in combination as well with some of the comments that were made to see if a more substantial discussion on this issue within the group or whether there is any kind of consensus around the potential answer. I agree that a discussion might change in light of what ever proposals are forthcoming.

Michele Neylon: Okay. The email from Alan for those of you who may or may not have read it, I mean he's talking about two initiatives that will be coming soon. One is a complete redesign of the end-of-life process and the other one is a more modest proposal but we don't have any real details on this. So we're flying a bit blind I think.

Okay. So is there any point of us discussing that at the moment while we're waiting for these proposals to materialize?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we can't fly blind. Sorry, Cheryl here.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I do note also that the matter of post expiree has been brought up in a number of people's lists for the RAA work groups to look at. So it may be that there is some overlap that he's aware of.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Are you referring to (Danny)'s list?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was referring to (Danny)'s list, yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to make sure that the assumptions out, that it's being done in the other work group. We actually have to talk to the other work groups to make sure that people aren't letting it drop through the cracks.

Michele Neylon: Right. Okay. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele want don't want to do is A, duplicate it and B, we certainly don't want to have a situation where there is different directions being taken by two charter work groups.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Are any of you on the other, on the RAA working group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that would be a yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay apart from Cheryl is anybody else involved with us?

Marika Konings: Michele this is Marika. Margie is the staff lead on that group and I'm also backing that one up. So we'll make sure as well that we caught it from a staff perspective. That we get those lists and see as well which items or topics are also covered or might be more appropriately covered in any of the ongoing PDPs make sure to avoid two different directions or that kind of stuff.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That would be helpful. Okay. Look then considering what Alan sent to the list and maybe it might be better if we looked at the charter question two at the moment which is to do with the registry agreements.

Does anybody have any issues moving onto (last)?

Woman: Nope.

Michele Neylon: So does anybody have any thoughts on this? Marika has her hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes. I think its common from my experience doing research (you know for now) on the first or the top four and having (pretty unique) person information that others that company have similar - a similar way -- there are great discrepancies in how information is presented and how easy it is to find relevant provisions. I mean some contracts are literally over 50 pages long. Some are really written in legal language, some are (unintelligible) (dupified) very clear FAQs or information sheets on the Web site that detail it, so.

From the research so far, I can just say that there's a great level of difference in how clear and conspicuous information is and of course one of the questions of course is going to be to look at what is - how do you define what is clear and conspicuous and might be good for one and might not be clear enough for another.

So I just wanted to share that on the basis of the research done so far.



Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any thoughts or comments? Jeff?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes actually that's a good question that I actually, I don't know if we discussed it in the past that Marika had like what is clear and conspicuous enough and who is the intended person to find out of it is, you know if it is because something I could in, I'm not a lawyer, but I could be a lawyer and say, okay that's clear to me versus somebody who has no idea about what it is. Maybe it's not clear to them. I'm just trying, what's our standard if there is one? And is there really, I'm just trying to think is there a way to really answer this question?

Michele Neylon: Fair question. Anybody have any thoughts? Cheryl?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Who was that? Someone was there.

Michele Neylon: Anybody want to jump in?

Graham Chynoweth: Yes this is (Graham). I stepped away from my computer. I'd just like to say that maybe a first step in that direction is consistency, you know as to Marika's point in having reviewed through several registration agreements it is certainly all over the board. You know depending on what those provisions should look like, you know, that's a different way, a different story and to how easily understandable they are as one party versus another. But at the very least we can start with consistency as a suggestion. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Consistency with respect to what exactly?

Graham Chynoweth: With the language that is written within the registration agreements themselves. Having done some other research across several different types of registrar agreements, some registrars don't have language or very little language in their expiration of domains and post expiration. Others like

Marika has mentioned, you know, they have, you know, the cross every T, dotted every I in their language as it relates to post expiration or expiration of domain name.

So at the every least there is a high degree of inconsistency across the marketplace and I think the more we can promote consistency where feasible and possible that will help needs and the understanding of the policy itself.

Michele Neylon: So what you mean just to clarify is a consistency meaning covering certain topics within the agreements. Is that what you mean?

Graham Chynoweth: Yes sir.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Cheryl and then Mikey. (I think was) a long list. Cheryl go first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I won't be long for once, thank you very much. Cheryl here. Look that's exactly what I was typing up. It's a matter of getting a baseline level and a minimum practice, a set of expectations that a registrant can know and understand in other areas I wont go into our cc code of practice development here in Australia or I'll bore the other RAA groups on that, not this one. But in the telco world here in Australia we found because of the way things had grown that we ended up having to develop a plain language policy and a set of guidelines to industry which goes right down to the size of the typeface and exactly how information is to be presented to the in this case consumer that we can replace that with word with the word registrant in any form of that purchase and contractual agreement between the registrant in this case and the licensor of the domain name. It's all about predictability, ease of use, knowledge, expectations being met.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I wholeheartedly agree with Cheryl's comment and then I'm going to tackle the other word which is the conspicuous word. And it seems to me that there are some fairly simple metrics that we could apply. For example we could say how many clicks does it take from the home page of a registrar to get to the clearly worded stuff, one, two, three, five, ten? You know most of the information that registrants are going to be collecting is going to be over the Web and it seems to me fairly easy to put a metric or two around that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. (Graham)?

Graham Chynoweth: Yes I guess great, this is (Graham Sinowitz). And if I posted this to the chat. To me the important point is the distinction between required process and required disclosure or clarity of what you do.

And I think that I'd be cautious about getting into Web site design for registrars or figuring out what, how large the typeface is in any document you have to produce because those things are just difficult to enforce and I think what we're after here is, and I heard someone make a suggestion about this, I forget what meeting it was but I don't know in the US we have a description on the back on the side of every piece of food carton which has some basic information and disclosure about what the information is with related to that particular food product.

And I really like that analogy here, so that you have quick easy form of where to get the information about how things work without getting in too far into the details of prescribing a practice. And then the second thing that I would note is that the, well I'll leave at that.

Michele Neylon: Great, thank you. Helen?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I was not quite certain from what Cheryl was saying is there an implication that maybe there should be some consistent language with all registrars put on their sites to explain about how the expiration process

works? And if so, most of the documentation that ICANN puts out would have to necessarily require a lot of legal input on it and therefore it would be not something that most registrants would ever want to plow through and I would say most of them wouldn't understand it.

So getting back to what Mikey said about the clear language or something that you can put on a milk carton, maybe there should be something clear but having a consistent document that's prescribed by somebody like ICANN would probably not be of any benefit other than for legal requirements.

Michele Neylon: Tim? Tim I think you're muted.

Tim Ruiz: Sorry about that, I was muted. Yes, I guess, what I was going to bring up was pretty much been covered just now. So just a question about what different group members (who man) as far as consistency goes, but I think that's been clarified not necessarily consistency of practice as much as consistency of transparency or making that information available. So I just wanted to clarify what was intended there but I think it's pretty much been answered for me.

Michele Neylon: Okay. (Graham).

Graham Chynoweth: Yes, just the second part that I was going to bring up was as a lawyer I guess my (kind) would be that its difficult to, lawyers are going to want to write things into very specific way and I think that has its place and so I don't know if its necessarily fruitful to talk about trying to force a contract language to be in plain language because I think that's, its those are too difficult things to meet.

And I think what your really talking about is making sure that you contractual language, the essence of the contractual language gets pulled out and boiled down to a little bit more accessible form and (then) locked away in some contract but rather its kind of is more to the front so that people can access it quickly.

But I think there's a useful to not try and change the contract but rather try and get it out of the contract into something that can be, that's designed to be more usable than the typical contract language.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just wanted to echo what was (Graham) was saying because in doing some of the research and (going through) some of the contracts and some of them are very tedious, talking about being a lawyer is required as well as some kind of interpretation or trying to read in some what some sentences might mean lawyer languages that may or may not. But so much (are) provided and by clear FAQ in which (unintelligible) would be spelled out like this is what happens on day one, this is what happens on day five which I think from a registrant's point of view, we may come up clear.

And I do understand as well why you need certain language in a contract, you know from a legal perspective but on the other side at least from the registrant's perspective, I mean documents like FAQs would be very helpful.

And there another (moment) might be, I have no idea how something like that could work in practice where you could have like a central place or maybe a requirement where registrars provide a link to that information so its easily accessible so for some as so much (unintelligible) of course provide a lot of different services. It's not always easy or you know with one click you're not able to find the information and it requires some digging.

So I was wondering as well as part of this discussion if there could be consideration of trying to find some kind of way to have this information centralized so we can say well here you'll find all the links to all the expiration related provisions or practices of the different (accredited) registrars. Just something to, you know, put on the table.

Michele Neylon: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'd like Tim's use of the work transparency because I think it gives us something to hang our recommendations on. It sounds like we're pretty agreed that we would like to have some clear language that's extracted from a undoubtedly more complicated contract available easily to registrants both on registrars sites, preferably not too many clicks from the top and perhaps also in a repository where they're all collected.

And what I'm sort of reminded of is some recent documentation that came to the (RIT) working group where the respective practices of several registrars were sort of laid out side by side and was very helpful to be able to see in very plain language and very short form the difference between the practices without having to wade through the multi page contract to do it. So it sounds like we're headed in a pretty positive direction.

Michele Neylon: Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes. The, I'm going to put my hand down here first, so I don't forget. A couple of things, you know, in regards to conspicuous one of the problems that I know registrars get concerned with is because this as a conspicuous notice comes up, you know now a number of different time and different PDP or whatever that we talked about. Or in discussion about the RAA, so we get concerned about, you know how, and when you start having all these things that need to be conspicuous then pretty soon nothing is conspicuous again.

Just one suggestion might be that working on this registrant rights and responsibilities charter, I believe that's what we're calling it, that, you know, we'll be maintained on ICANN site and registrars would be required to link to.

Perhaps, you know that there can be a complimentary document or charter or whatever you want to call it that registrars would maintain that might apply to things that are unique to the registrar and then we want to have some

consistency in that the topic would be a aspect of the registration as covered which is easily accessible or conspicuous so that there could be just one repository or one document where those things have been placed.

Because the registrants rights and responsibilities charter at ICANN isn't going to cover all of this because there are differences in business models and the way that registrars approach things. So how can we be consistent in making sure that those differences are clear and conspicuous or transparent? And so that might be a way of looking at that to try to have this complimentary relationship between their charter and what is something that the registrars is not maintaining on their site.

Instead of looking at these and all these kind of worn fashion as to what we want to have clear and conspicuous, we would just have this single repository for those kinds of things. Just throwing out a suggestion, something maybe we can refine in this work.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Tim. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Cheryl here. I just wrote a term into the chat, sorry about that but it cuts across a number of things that were being said and goes back to some of the telco industry examples that were successfully worked through in the last six or eight years here in Australia and the end point of much of what we've done and seem to make our consumers relatively happy with as well as our industry look good is echoing some of what has been said. So I'll just put it in the chat for reference.

Michele Neylon: Could you post of the list as well please Cheryl when you get a chance?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh God, you mean I've got to cut and paste.

Michele Neylon: It's pretty hard, I don't know about other people, but I'm finding it very hard to decipher things chucked into the chats. And then as soon as somebody says

something else, it disappears off of the page, so it's always easier to read from an email.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh we should all be on Google Wave.

Man: Who (unintelligible) on Google Wave?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey I got 30 more invitations, just ping me if you want me to invite you.

Michele Neylon: I wish somebody would invite me because I got it set up on the wrong account.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Michele just send me your account you want it set up on and I'll fix it.

Michele Neylon: Here I'll put it in the chat for you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you.

Michele Neylon: And I will thank you. And James is looking for one as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just put the emails in there boys and I'll get you done.

Michele Neylon: Look at this.

Mikey O'Connor: Cheryl you've been getting all technical there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well. Hey I only got 30, just remember I've only got 30 more.

Michele Neylon: You need to give your Google account, not your private one as well.  
(Unintelligible).



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can guarantee you if you got a Gmail account its going to be far more seamless then a lot of the bells and whistles that they're developing work very, very nicely with the Gmail account. I will (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible) pasting (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Geesh, is he tough.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes he is tough especially when we got a shiny new toy to play with. Exactly.

Michele Neylon: Oh God help. I can see it now.

James Bladel: Michele you're losing it, you better rein us in.

Michele Neylon: I was on my best behavior, but I'm losing it now. Okay. Right. Okay, so the question was whether expiration (unintelligible) a typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough? And I would tend to agree with Tim since everybody wants everything to be conspicuous how that's going to work is beyond a -- I love Tim's address.

Okay. Yes there's a lot of stuff coming through which requires us as registrars to provide all sorts of wonderful bits of information spaciosly and transparently the how anybody is going to deal with all that is beyond me. That's just my personal take.

I also pasted into the chats a link to plain English Web sites.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that's good.

Michele Neylon: Of course the other thing which I'm just being naughty but might as well throw it in there is if I can't expect the registrars to adopt plain English could ICANN adopt plain English as well please.

James Bladel: Oh you're no fun at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. In all seriousness here that is exactly what the public participation committee is saying needs to done and is working towards. So I don't see that it's unreasonable. I think it should be a high level expectation and something that should get back to them.

Michele Neylon: Oh, totally, totally. But they can't expect the contracted parties to use plain English if they're not going to use it themselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly right.

Man: Or plain Chinese, or plain whatever.

Michele Neylon: Plain -- exactly, exactly, exactly. Is this call 60 or 90 minutes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It could be a 60.

Marika Konings: This is Marika it definitely could be 60. I don't really mind that but we are consensus open. There's nothing restricting you from keeping it shorter.

Michele Neylon: I think since everybody is now distracted by shiny objects that Cheryl has thrown in there. And based on the fact that we're waiting for the document/proposals/God knows what, which is coming from Alan, I don't think we're going to achieve much more by continuing this call this evening. So unless anybody has any major problems can we call this an evening or a day or a morning depending on your time zone?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Can we then just confirm that the next meeting is next Tuesday, same time, same place?

Michele Neylon: Anybody have any issue with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My only issue -- next Tuesday, yes that's fine. I was trying to remember where I was in the world. All right.

Tim Ruiz: Will Alan be, there's nothing going on next that will affect Alan's ability to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He only indicated this one I thought.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, okay.

Marika Konings: That's what I thought as well. But I'll double check.

Michele Neylon: You're trying to get rid of me already.

Mike O'Connor: Yes, we don't like you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Duly noted and I shall remember that for the next conference call that I'm chairing, thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Paul.

Michele Neylon: Okay, then boys and girls then in that case, can we officially finish this call and we'll all talk again next week.

Man: Thanks (you did) a great job.

Man: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Speak to you next week.

END