

**Registration Abuse Policies Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 09 November at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group meeting on Monday 09 November 2009, at 15:00 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-rap-20091109.mp3>

On page:

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

All recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO calendar page:

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

Present for the teleconference:

Greg Aaron - Registry stakeholder group - Working Group Chair

James Bladel - Godaddy Registrar stakeholder group

Berry Cobb – CBUC

Martin Sutton - CBUC

Rod Rasmussen – individual

Greg Ogorek - Individual

Roland Perry - Individual

Caleb Queern - Registrar stakeholder group

ICANN Staff

Margie Milam

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Apologies:

Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Faisal Shah – IPC

Alan Greenberg - ALAC

Frederik Felman - IPC

Marika Konings

Coordinator: This call will now be recorded.

Glen DeSaintgery:Hi Greg.

Greg Aaron: Hello Glen. How are you? I think some people are still trying to get in but let's go ahead and take roll call and then we'll see if we have others join us.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay Greg. I'll do that for you. On the call we have James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Roland Perry, Caleb Queern. Have I pronounced your name correctly?
I'm sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Caleb Queern: Yes. Caleb Queern. Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Greg Aaron, Caleb Queern, Greg Aaron, Rod Rasmussen and Greg Ogoreck. For staff we have Margie Milam and Glen DeSaintgery. We have apologies from Alan Greenberg, Fazal Shah and Frederick Feldman and Marika and Gisella are not on the call today either.

Greg Aaron: Thank you Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Has anybody joined the Adobe Connect that is not on the call? Margie, can you perhaps see?

Margie Milan: I think that's everybody.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. Thanks Greg.

Greg Aaron: And Martin sent me a note. He's taking care of some business outside the office and hopes to join us later if he can.

Okay. Today we'll begin by doing a quick recap of the ICANN meeting in Seoul, South Korea two weeks ago. You know, a couple of brave souls tried to dial in remotely including Berry and myself. We could hear the meeting great. It's just that when we talked, it wasn't coming through on the Seoul side.

So didn't quite go as hoped but Marika moderated the meeting -- did a wonderful job of walking us through things. She presented the PowerPoint, which summarizes the charter and where we are so far.

There seemed to be relatively few questions from the audience later in the meeting. But those are captured in a transcript. James gave an update of uniformity in contracts since he was there in person and could be heard.

I thought it went fine. I wondered if anybody had any questions or if they wanted to note anything that they thought was particularly interesting from that meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: Greg, this is Glen. Sorry. Just to add about a technical point, it was the line from Seoul that apparently was the reason why you had the problem that you were not being heard. We did everything we could and they told us that it was the telephone lines in Seoul that were bad.

Greg Aaron: Ah. Okay. Thank you for that. James, would you like to go ahead?

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Greg. Just two thoughts. First on the technical issue that we were having, I should mention that I did some bandwidth tests. We had something like 40 megabits per second streaming from the states via IP. So maybe if we encounter that again if we could have as a backup the audio features of Adobe Connect, might be - might be something to try in those situations where the telephone services are bad but the Internet services are exceptional.

And then the second point I wanted to make was that we did come out of that face to face meeting and Martin and Fazal and I met informally there in the meeting room for about 15, 20 minutes to discuss the cybersquatting subtopic. And then that carried forward into a conversation last week after Seoul. So we should have a little more material update for the group today than usual, so.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

James Bladel: That was the other (tickler).

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great. And I'll tell you what, why -- let's definitely talk about that because it looks like you guys have settled into some good stuff. If it's okay, why don't we circle back to that in a little bit? Is that okay?

James Bladel: Certainly. I'd be at about the middle of the agenda so I'll wait until then.

Greg Aaron: Okay. We'll definitely get there. Okay. Any other questions or comments about the Seoul meeting?

Okay. Hearing none, we should actually talk about the next ICANN meeting, which is in early March in Nairobi, Kenya. That'll mark about a year since this working group go under way. And I would propose to you that we should have our initial report done and presented to the GNSO Council before that meeting.

So I would like to make that a very explicit goal and figure out a way how we can meet that goal. So I think we've had - we've gotten fairly far into some of the thornier issues. But we need to have something spurring us along to get an initial report out and on paper. And I think a year is probably an appropriate time especially given how much discussion we've had.

So what I did was - oh and Margie I see your hand up.

Margie Milam: Yes. Actually it was on the prior topic, a review of Seoul. And I don't know if Berry wants to address this. For those of you that attended the DNS abuse forum on Thursday afternoon, we had a presentation from Adam Palmer of PIR and also Edmund Chung of (Dot Asia). And they both gave a talk about

their contracts' terms and what - specifically what language they use on to deal with abuse.

And I thought it might be helpful for the group to hear it and I don't know Berry if you want to comment on it that, you know, at least it gives you an example of what some registries are doing. It falls more into line with respect to the uniformity of contracts discussion as Adam gave very, you know, he gave actual language and then he gave his experience with enforcing that language over the last six months or so.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Was that an invitation to Berry?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Yes. Hi. This is Berry. I'll bring up more about the topic when we get into discussing uniformity of contracts. But just to echo what Margie had just said. Adam's presentation was practically our outline for the registration abuse policy working group.

They seemed to be tackling the same type of definitions of abuse, the same sub definitions of the types of abuse that we see out there from cybersquatting to botnet to malware. It was a really good presentation and I'll talk more about it when we get into the uniformity of contracts. Thank you.

Greg Aaron: Okay. And I see Roland's hand up.

Roland Perry: Hi there. Just a general question. Are presentations like that available from the ICANN Web site? Because as you probably realized, I was sort of running around from meeting to meeting and missed quite a few things. But I really wanted to show that presentation to some colleagues. Do we have to get it off the (author) or is there some kind of central facility?

Margie Milam: I believe it's actually streamed on the Web site and if the presentations aren't posted, I'll go ahead and make sure they're posted. But you can certainly, you know, look at the materials on the Web site itself.

Greg Aaron: Margie, which day was that on?

Margie Milam: That was Thursday.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thursday.

Margie Milam: Say afternoon from 3:00 to 5:00.

Greg Aaron: Is the DNS abuse forum?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay. And yes, I'm on the site right now. There's a transcript of it available. If you go to the Seoul meeting link on the homepage of the ICANN Web site, you can then click on schedule and find that meeting and there's a transcript already up if that's...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery:And they...

Greg Aaron: But that's not Adam's PowerPoint.

Margie Milam: Yes. I'll circulate his PowerPoint to this list and I'll also go back and make sure we post everything there because it should be there. So it's probably some technical backup issues. So I'll go ahead and do that. But I know Adam would be - would be interested in talking to us if I could set up some time with him.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Okay. So we'll circle back to that and Berry will talk a little more about it as well.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Greg Aaron : Thank you for muting. Okay. So anyway, let's talk about what happens between now and Nairobi.

I drafted, for the sake of discussion, a schedule that you see in the agenda and it's there on the - on Adobe Connect.

One of issues I think is do we start to meet weekly until we're done. I am kind of doubtful that we'd be able to work our way through text and measured levels of consensus if we only meet every other week between now and Nairobi.

I'd also like to hear your opinions on whether Nairobi is the goal we should be shooting for or not. So I open that up for comment. James.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Greg. Just a quick question. Does staff have any early indications about how well that meeting will be attended? And I don't know if this is particularly dependent on whether or not that is still our goal. I just was curious as to whether or not we feel that that's going to be a lightly attended meeting, then perhaps a draft report published prior to the Kenya meeting would be in order.

Margie Milam: I can answer that. We don't have any indications at this point. So we don't have any information yet.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks.

Greg Aaron: Roland.

Roland Perry: Hi there. Yes. I mean in principal I'd be very happy to have this call every Monday but I do have to say that looking in my diary I've actually got something else in there. It's almost every other Monday between now and Christmas. So that's just an unfortunate coincidence.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thank you. Other thoughts on having February as our deadline? Is it reasonable? Is there - I'm wondering - I'm kind of thinking myself look, we've got to - we've got to put down a stake in the group and shoot for something. So any other thoughts? Berry.

Berry Cobb: Yes. This is Berry. I would have to agree. We definitely need to get something on paper so that the community can see something more formalized on this, the timeframe of the year -- definitely we're due for it. I just - you know, and I'll add from our sub team perspective of - and I'll talk more of this - about this in a little bit.

But we should be able to have our section of that material ready to go by the due dates you've kind of listed out for us on the skeleton you provided. But definitely yes; we need to have something so the community can see something more formal from us and not just, you know, the public list and those kinds of things.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thank you. Of course meeting every week would be posing some problems for some folks and probably for all of us. Maybe not everyone would be able to make every single meeting every week. But that's not a - that's not expected. We always expect some people to be - to be missing.

If we did meet every week though, I think one of the things we would want to do is have a mechanism perhaps online when the time comes for measuring consensus. That allows people to log in at their leisure, look at majority and drafted minority opinions and allow them to vote for those and so forth. It means you wouldn't necessarily have to be present at every meeting and

you'd have a chance to mull some things over as we measure consensus levels.

That's something we tried in the past flux working group. And Rod and James were in that group. Do you guys remember when we went online and we voted basically on different sections?

Man: Yes. That seemed to work all right.

Greg Aaron: I'm thinking maybe a similar mechanism would be good this time around. Like I said, it allows people to log in at their leisure. It also is a way of recording votes in a very formal way. And that would alleviate people's concerns if they do have to miss a meeting here and there.

Let me ask you guys on the call, are you willing to go to weekly meetings. If you are, please raise your hand in Adobe Connect.

Man: Are we assuming they are Monday?

Greg Aaron: Assuming nothing actually at this point. So I'm - what I'd like to do is measure people's commitment to meeting every week for an hour to an hour and a half. Okay. So looks like everybody is good with that. Thank you. Looks like that's unanimous. And we'd have to - we'd have to ask our missing staff members as well, especially Marika.

Now, James sounds like maybe Monday's aren't best. Does anybody have a big roadblock on Mondays? Okay. I'm not hearing any - James, do they - do Mondays represent a big roadblock for you?

James Bladel: No. I was just commenting on what I believe Roland was saying earlier and just trying to think ahead a little bit for some of the potential objections.

Greg Aaron: Yes. What I'll do - and we have some members who are not with us today of course. I'll take it as an action item to get a doodle together to see if an alternate time is necessary. I still see some folks hands raised. Did anybody else want to comment?

Roland Perry: Well it's just Roland here. I'm just repeating what I said earlier which is I've actually got four meetings on four consecutive Mondays in the real world I can't put off which would mean that probably the next meeting I could get to at all would be the 21st of December. So I know that's not terribly useful for you guys but that's just what my diary looks like.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thank you and fair enough. We'll do some online polling and see if we can come up with some possible alternatives.

Okay. But let's take this as a - as a commitment from the group that we are going to try to go to weekly meetings for an hour to an hour and a half and push very hard for a finalized document in February.

Okay. Now I wouldn't necessarily push for a meeting a week from today. Let me - let me doodle that as well because that's not a lot of notice for some folks. So let's not necessarily push for a meeting next week. The week after that is our regularly scheduled meeting for November 23.

And one of the things I'd like to do is we do have a number of items still on our list to discuss and I listed those under November 23. Some of them might be relatively easy to dispense with. But we'll have to see. But I'd like to try to clear the list and get discussion on all of the topics that everyone has raised. Okay. And then we can work our way through text.

So on the next - on the next meeting we have we'll circle back and work on pay per click and 419 scams and traffic diversion and all those other things that have come up.

In the meantime, what I propose we do is get a master document going when possible. We do have some material on some of our Wikis and Marika had offered to start creating a document, which would become our initial report.

For those of you who haven't seen that before, it's basically a Word document. But it starts to take on a more formalized shape. The lines of the document are all numbered so people can reference specific sections of the text easily and that kind of a thing.

Our plan was always to start with the Wikis, develop some stuff there but then start putting it in a master document that Marika would keep and it would become kind of the authoritative piece of text.

So between this meeting and the next, I want to form, you know, get as far on the Wikis as possible because then Marika will be able to basically start picking up that text and pasting it into a formal document. So this is a call to finish up your Wiki work and push forward on that over the next two weeks.

Basically the rest of that schedule says we're going - we're going to basically start working our way through all the topics, read through the text together. And the goal is to come up with a consensus statement wherever possible.

As consensus is not possible, we have to measure levels of consensus and then label those as, you know, levels of consensus. You know, complete consensus, strong, weak, dissenting opinions and so forth. Those definitions are spelled out for us actually by the GNSO.

So there's another issue, which always comes up which is once we look at something and vote on it, do we - do we offer people the opportunity to change minds? If we do the online kind of polling that we did in the past flux working group, that becomes I think a little less of an issue.

But my note of caution is once we start working on something, please be ready. I think we owe that to each other. And we will eventually run out of time at some point. So I think we're getting down to the crunch time. So if somebody has something they need to say, you have to be ready to say it.

There may come a time when it's frankly too late to keep inserting changes into a document. So over the next couple of months, it's very important for people to step forward with their opinions and to product text.

If you don't put your opinions out there, if you don't write down your positions, we will eventually run out of time. And it would be unfortunate if someone's opinion was not reflected but you do need to put your material out there for consideration by the group.

Roland, I still see your hand up. Do you have any other notes?

Roland Perry: No, sorry.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great. All right. So that's the schedule. We'll doodle and I will put a note out to everybody to really push to finish your work on the Wikis. Those Wikis contain different sections that need to be filled in.

As a reminder, you've got basically a problem statement, which is a short statement of the issue. You've got a background section that you can fill in with all the background material, references and more explanation. And eventually then we have to come up with recommendations, draft recommendations.

Okay. So that being said, why don't we - why don't we move on from that - from that administrative stuff and go back to cybersquatting, which is Number 4a on our agenda? And I'd like to turn the floor over to James.

James Bladel: Thanks Greg and Margie did you have those points that we...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Yes. Let me get...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay.

Margie Milam: Yes.

James Bladel: Just a moment while we get the materials ready group. I'm sorry for the delay.

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

So what we have here Greg is we've arrived at some basic definitions and we're providing some - at least a skeleton of a recommendation outline for what the group as a whole should include in its report with respect to this type of abuse.

So this is from Fazal and Martin and myself. And I think this would be second or third iteration of this particular subgroup. I think that that - we'll get to that in a moment. But that speaks to the - there's a hidden complexity here that I think that it gets pretty intractable.

So what we tried to do is essentially start off with what we had unanimous consensus on and then indicate where the consensus starts to break down.
Okay.

So the first item we have under the definition is that we're drawing a distinction between a competing but legitimate claims for (a stain) versus cybersquatting. I think that that's important. We need to recognize that there's

a - there's a line there between a dispute versus an infringement. And, you know, one designates bad faith infringement on another party's (intellectual) property.

But that's - you know, setting that aside for a moment, we do agree fairly unanimously that the provision in 4a and 4b of the UDRP are a very robust working definition or test for cybersquatting. Okay. Those are the sections that detail the three items that must be demonstrated in a UDRP. And the 4b describes bad faith.

And then we have attempted on multiple occasions to expand beyond 4a and 4b of the UDRP by borrowing from some other documents, most notably the Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act. And that's where we start to see the consensus break down. And I'll get into that here just in a moment.

But we have a few recommendations. The first one is that for some reason the discussion of cybersquatting prompts a lively and extended debate about whether or not the UDRP is continuing to serve its purpose. And I think that this is something that is - it's interesting and probably should come out of the overall working group as a - as a recommendation or a recommendation for future study or for future work.

But it does take away from the core purpose of the cybersquatting issue. So what we've said here is that, you know, if the UDRP requires revision to make it more appropriate specifically through anti-cybersquatting and make it more useful in those cases as opposed to just dispute of name, then that could be recommended for future PDP or future study as possibly one way to alter that tool to make it more useful.

There are numerous RPM efforts going on elsewhere like with a draft (unintelligible) guidebook and we should monitor those for their applicability to cybersquatting and existing or incumbency TLDs.

And the final thing and I - we mentioned here was that, you know, that I think a lot of folks enter into this issue with maybe a slight of a perspective and look there, you know, knee deep into the subject matter, realize that this is a little - lot more complex than it - than it might appear on the surface.

And so it does not lend itself well to quick or straightforward solutions and the group and any future or subsequent groups should probably be notified that, you know, if a solution seems very simple or very tempting that it probably deserves further study and we should put a sign out there that says, you know, beware; beware of these illusions or mirage solutions.

So that's kind of where we're at at this point. And I think that, you know, between Martin and Fazal and I believe we kind of have a fairly comprehensive and objective approach to all of the different interests that are involved in this issue.

We do have some minority reports coming in and those will be sub bullet points. For example, I think that there's a desire to include - to include some aspects of the ACPA in the definition and then that a minority of the minority report that believe that if those definitions were - are included that there are some other carve outs from the ACPA that should also be included.

So I think that that's kind of where we're headed at this point. But I think that we are at - we are at the stages in game where we're ready to say that we have a definition. The definition is very robust and contained in 4a and 4b of the UDRP. We can build upon that. It's going to be much more controversial than what we're currently working on. And then we have some recommendations from there. So that's the update.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I've raised my hand.

James Bladel: Well I'm turning to back over to you so you don't raise your hand.

Greg Aaron: Thank you for that update James and thanks to you guys for working on this. You crafted something, which is coming together. That's much appreciated. I had a couple of questions.

So you had - you had mentioned that there were going to be some recommendations and you had to work out some - perhaps some minority statements. When do you think a draft of that will be able to come to the larger group?

James Bladel: In fact Fazal sent those around last night and Margie and I were just discussing it. We just didn't have time to prepare them for review by the group this morning.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Okay.

James Bladel: So they are actually submitted and circulating amongst the group that's working on this.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Are those not only recommendations but also some background?

James Bladel: Not sure what you mean by background but I'll say that we don't have any, how's that?

Greg Aaron: I meant background that could be inserted into the Wiki and eventually into a report. Basically a little bit about how - what the issues are and how the group kind of made its reasoning to arrive at the recommendations. Do we have that yet or do we need to work on it?

James Bladel: It is not written but I think that has been a narrative that we've discussed verbally and it's just a matter of, you know, putting together a few sentences that everyone is happy and comfortable with.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great.

James Bladel: I don't think there's any - I should say I don't think there's any obstacles in our path to getting that.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Would it be okay to put in the action items that the group will basically fill in those Wiki sections between now and the next meeting?

James Bladel: Yes. Absolutely.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great.

James Bladel: The next meeting, yes. Yes. That's...

Greg Aaron: Yes. Within the - yes, next - yes, within the next ten days let's say.

James Bladel: Yes. Absolutely. Yes.

Greg Aaron: (Awesome).

James Bladel: I think that's reasonable.

Greg Aaron: All right. I had a - I had another question. You said that the team draws the distinction between UDRP and cybersquatting because UDRP arbitrates competing but potentially legitimate claims than cybersquatting, which is just plain old bad faith.

James Bladel: Right. I think - here's one way to look at it. If you're working with, you know, folks who, you know, who are involved in UDRPs as a significant portion of their let's call it their day jobs. You know, if you talk with some of the folks who are filing their complaints or filing their responses, I think that what comes to light fairly quickly is that a large section, I'm not ready to say a majority or a minority, but a large slice of UDRPs are very straightforward.

They're - I'm trying to choose my words carefully here. They're very clear cases where an individual has registered a name that contains not a derivative, not a typo but a - you know, someone else's trademark and it's not - has no possibility of being a generic. It is simply, you know, a protected name.

There's a certain subset of that or a certain slice of all UDRPs that are - fall into that category and usually the involve no response. It's the UDRPs that, you know, involve a response and where someone says now I know that, you know, it kind of resembles a particular string or a mark but in fact I'm using it in a different way or it's a parody or it's a criticism site or something of that nature.

So I think that what we're trying to say was this here is that those are actually the UDRP is being used in two ways. One it's being used to arbitrate competing claims to the same string of characters. And then two, it's being used as an anti-cybersquatting tool which maybe wasn't part of its original intention.

Greg Aaron: My impression actually was that was one of its intentions, which is why it had the sections in it about what bad faith is.

James Bladel: Okay.

Greg Aaron: I thought it - my impression, and I don't know all the history because that was a number of years ago when it was first written. But my impression was it was actually designed to handle both of these kinds of problems.

James Bladel: Okay. Well let's say it's being used for both types of issues or both types of situations and it's being - it's fairly effective for both of them. However, for one the amount of time, dollars and the harm that can result is (to) somewhat disproportionate. So I'm trying to think of careful ways to say this I suppose.

James Bladel: I'm trying to think of careful ways to say this.

Greg Aaron: Right. Okay.

James Bladel: Anyway, if that needs to be looked at, if that needs to be studied, you know, it's a question at this point. It's not, you know, we're not offering definitive declarations. But if there's further interested in possibly making that bad faith cybersquatting elements of the UDRP more effective, you know, then that's something we can look at.

And there are models out there in other areas of the community. Not saying that those are positive or negative; just that they're out there.

Greg Aaron: Okay. And I had one observation. This is Greg again. It's interesting. I guess the UDRP's what, about ten years old - nine, ten years old at this point. One of the criteria was that one of the I guess the definitions of bad faith is that -- or one of the things that a challenger has to prove is that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith.

But I think what we've seen over time is that the case law has actually been a little different because a lot of cases are decided without the domain ever being used. In other words, people are making decisions about bad faith based upon just the registration.

And that's - and that's probably just a case where people have used UDRP and it's one of these - it's one of these situations that probably occurs on a regular basis that perhaps the letter of UDRP is not being followed anymore but it - maybe it makes sense to do things the way they've been happening over the years according to this case law so to speak.

So it seems like UDRP has been around for a while but maybe there are some tweaks that need to be looked at that might make sense. And that...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: ...an example.

James Bladel: Yes. And that is essentially, you know, that is certainly encapsulated I think in our first recommendation which is that, you know, what can we - what are the lessons learned after ten years of UDRP? What is it being used for? Is it being used as originally intended? And can it be more effective in that role?

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great. Does anyone else have any questions or comments for James?

James Bladel: If I can add just one before we throw open the floor there. Just one other part. You know, where the consensus breaks down on the definition is that I think that we have some interest in adding from the ACPA there are two components I think that we're looking at adding.

One is this notion of recidivism of the idea that, you know, there should be some sort of - you know, UDRPs are I guess can be treated in isolation if I'm stating that correctly or they're a case by case basis where it's, you know, possible that, you know, cybersquatting is more of a bulk or a pattern type of behavior.

The second one is the - whether or not cybersquatting is driven by inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS information. And so those are kind of things that we're having trouble coming to - coming to a full agreement on. So we'll probably put those into separate minority reports and attached it to this list.

Greg Aaron: Okay. I see Margie's hand up.

Margie Milam: Yes. I wanted to comment about the proposal to monitor the efforts at establishing the right detection mechanisms in the community because I'm involved on the STI group, the special trademark issues group. And one of the things that they are evaluating is whether their recommendations for the

new gTLD program should be sunsetted or temporary with the idea that if it's to be something more permanent, it should be looked at by the GNSO.

So they haven't decided yet whether that's the tact their going to take but it is possible that, you know, the recommendations coming out of that group will say we're going to adopt this - whatever this, you know, URS or trademark clearinghouse is. But it's on a temporary basis because the GNSO should look at it from a more global perspective.

So I just wanted to give some background to that comment because, you know, it may very well be that the recommendations that come out of the new gTLD program are - could be temporary in nature.

James Bladel: And Margie that's a great point and that's exactly why we were a little deliberately vague in that - in that recommendation. I mean we were discussion URS and the clearinghouse and the global (unintelligible) checklists and all the other things relative to the IRT, excuse me, and the SIT or STI - I don't know these acronyms, special trademark initiative, is that it?

Margie Milam: Yes.

James Bladel: And essentially we were just saying, you know, that all of these things are works in progress and, you know, the - their recommendations and models are likely to change between now and their adoption if they're adopted and if they are whether they'll be adopted on a temporary basis or permanent basis.

And so that's why we're just kind of bundling that up into this recommendation that we should, you know, monitor and look at the things that are going on in other areas of the community and see if they have any applicability to this issue as opposed to calling them out individually or by name.

Greg Aaron: Right. They certainly are an evolving thing. And recommendations that the RAP comes out with might dovetail with some of them might be very different

than some of them. We should definitely keep abreast of them. In the end I think - I mean this group will recommend whatever it feels is appropriate, so. And we'll have to see how they jive with each other if necessary or applicable.

Okay. Any other - any other discussion of cybersquatting on what James has said? Okay. Hearing none, James thanks for that update. And the takeaway action item will be that that subgroup finishes up its draft. It's pretty far along it sounds like. If you guys could put the draft recommendations and background up on the Wiki in the next ten days, that'll give us a chance to maybe read it before the next meeting and...

James Bladel: Will do. Will do.

Greg Aaron: ...field any questions. That would be wonderful. Thank you. Okay. So that's it for cybersquatting today and we'll move on to uniformity of contracts. And Berry, the floor is yours.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you Greg. Definitely been a while since we've talked on the call. So I kind of like how we started off this call a couple of housekeeping items and we'll jump into the meat of the topic.

First and foremost, I apologize for the 10-12 (part AT) meeting. I was away on vacation. I swore to myself that I'd send a statement of apology. I did for the other working groups and I didn't for this one. When I was listening to the recording, I felt like I was the kid in the room raising his hand and wasn't being called on.

So I know we didn't get very far in that call. Again, I apologize that either I didn't arm James with more material and the like. And then also...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I heard some background. Are you guys hearing me okay?

Greg Aaron: Yes. Yes. Just no more vacations for you ever my friend.

Berry Cobb: Yes. And well that's (sure) indeed for the rest of the year. So I'd also like to again extend my thanks to Marika and James for backing us up in Seoul. It was unfortunate with the technical issue.

Again I kind of felt like the kid raising his head because there was so much to - that I've been kind of wanting to say and where we're at with the subgroup. So thanks again and hopefully we will be able to get through the rest of this.

Second housekeeping item. I just wanted to say that since our last meeting of the UofC subgroup that was on October 5. It was the last time that we've met. So since then it was vacation then it was Seoul and scheduling around Seoul that we really haven't met since then. So I wanted to try to brief the group a little bit about what we talked about in that last session.

But I would like to note that there is some material that is posted on the Wiki for the UofC stuff. There's a little bit of it that's new from the 10-5 meeting and here very shortly we'll definitely get our issue, background and recommendation stuff, the template posted onto there.

One other comment about UofC Wiki; and Greg you had sent the email back shortly after our 10-5 meeting about the, excuse me, the generic comment at the bottom of the page between myself, you and Marika. And I was just wondering what we can do about that.

So we've got that guest comment on there that really has zero to do with UofC. Is it possible to remove that out of there or is that against the law or how should we handle that because it does act as an element of confusion to the topic of uniformity of contracts?

Greg Aaron: Hi Berry. It's Greg. Actually I did delete it from the Wiki at the end of the week.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Greg Aaron: I had sent a note to Marika and what we discovered about that a few weeks before and what I'd discovered from Marika was that there's basically a public comment feature on those pages that I don't think any of us really knew about. But it's kind of a common feature across all these GNSO working group areas.

And what I - what I told her was that - and my personal opinion was that that was confusing. And since we were going to have a public comment period, that's - and we have these open meetings at the ICANN meetings that that's the - those are the appropriate spots to take public comment.

So I did tape that text; it's recorded. We can consider it alter. But otherwise I think we need to take those down because they're confusing and that not the input format.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Very good. All right. Thank you. Okay. So that concludes the housekeeping stuff. Let's get on with the good stuff.

Okay. The last time the UofC team met was October 5 as I mentioned and that was pretty much the meeting following a working group meeting where we quickly presented our findings about seeing dispersion in the marketplace across registrar registrant agreements and the like in terms of relative to abuse language and stuff like that.

So we think we've got general consensus and agreement that yes there is dispersion out there and that our To Do item was well what are we going to do about it from there.

So when we met on the 5th, I would say that that was probably one of the least productive meetings that we had because we - I kind of felt that we were in a quagmire about talking about trying to answer some of the questions that we had proposed to the overall working group.

And I think one of the big kind of stumblers, if you will, is about the data that we've acquired to measure the dispersion. So we see that there is the dispersion; but it's not, the data that we have now is not necessarily specific enough to develop specific recommendations about what uniform language would be in contracts.

And Rod Rasmussen did put together a very good example of, you know, what it would take to get to more detailed information or detailed data to make a better informed recommendation about uniformity as well as a very daunting task of trying to marry that data with actual processes or policies that registrars or registries are using to combat abuse.

Basically, you know, we would - we would want to have the data tell us well this should result in Recommendation X. Recommendation X needs to be evaluated against actual current practices out there and does that equal to a success in combating the abuse? And I definitely agree that in the grander scheme of things that that's probably the best road to march down or the best hill to climb however it's a very, very steep hill and probably kind of goes beyond the scope of our sub team.

So to kind of sum this up is basically the sub team was wrestling around, well we've got this data. Do we go - do we go to the next level of detail or do we just really try to kind of step over it and still accomplish what the sub team needed to do?

Before I move on to the next topic, I'd like to point out that I think since Seoul and specifically Adam's presentation about what they've done at the dot org and the like, I think - I think we can probably come up with a very good

solution to help us get around this data quagmire that we got stuck at on the October 5 meeting.

So all in all we probably won't need to go down the detailed data acquisition that we were batting around and hopefully a solution to that and I'll talk about that in just a second.

The next little recap from our 10-5 meeting was basically what is the framework for some of the recommendations that we started to formulate is, and just to recap, is basically the EOC team, you know, recognizes that consistency is probably necessary but to what degree. How much is it going to cost, what does it buy us, you know, and what does it mean for the market participants? So some of those questions still need to be answered.

A secondary component to that framework is, you know, there's probably a very good chance that we still need to have some sort of minimum baseline to combat abuses out there relative to provisions and agreements, those kinds of things. And then that there was going to be this big balance between, you know, what would that minimum baseline look like, you know, is it going to be very generalized language? I'm getting a lot of background noise.

Greg Aaron: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Cool. Thank you. Could everybody hear me to the last 30 seconds or so?

Greg Aaron: Can you repeat the last few seconds Berry?

Berry Cobb: Okay. So in talking about what the minimum baseline for abuse provisions would look like, you know, the spectrum is very generalized language that gives broad (powers) to kind of act against abuse versus very specific in detailed language that, you know, is much more precise at combating the abuse but may not be expansive enough to combat future abuses.

So we've got to try to find what that balance would be. And I'm not saying that the UofC group will exactly define details of what the provisions languages should be but I think we will be able to develop some good guidance.

And then in the last component of this abuse framework, if you will, is, you know, whatever this baseline looks like, it needs to try to have one size fits all. But we also recognize at the same time that there are different types of industry participants. And while some general language may accommodate one group, it may not work for a secondary group.

And that's what prompted the team to try to start to understand what these various groups might be and within the registrar community as an example and understanding the difference between such as just the normal retail registrar versus a retail club or reseller or large portfolio holders and the like.

Okay. I'm almost done and just trying to trying to kind of recap where we were at 10-5. So there were a number of action items that the UofC team had. We've accomplished most of those. First and foremost was a generic registrar classification list, James completed that for us. And I do like where we've started with that template.

And that is posted up on the Wiki so I recommend that people take a look at the document real quick. And if you have feedback or other classifications that should be added to the list, we definitely welcome that expansion or refinement either way but thank you very much James.

Another action item was talking about within the team itself the recommendations that we create, you know, they could - the recommendation could be as far right as it - we should update agreements or it could be as far left as that we maybe just provide some best practices for the community to follow.

We don't know exactly where that is at, but what we do start to bat around is the fact that if we venture down the road of best practices the fast flux working group, one of their outputs or recommendations of that was to look at this world of best practices which is a new concept for ICANN.

So that certainly led to some other discussions about how could best practices still be pushed out into the marketplace without necessarily being a PDP or refinements to the RAA et cetera, et cetera. So those are - that was another component that we were batting around. I kind of feel like I'm rambling here so let me get to the meat of where we are with the team.

This weekend I guess before - I guess before Friday I was struggling myself at really what is the UofC's next steps other than just answering this pool of questions that we have about the topic. And having re-listened to the DNS abuse forum and kind of digging a little bit deeper into what some of the other registries have been doing, dot org, dot info, dot biz, dot jobs, I think I kind of had a revelation or an epiphany this weekend about where we need to move the UofC stuff forward.

And this basically it is really just kind of filling in the blanks for the template for the report, documenting, you know, what the problem statement is, the background material, which is part of the revelation that I got.

I had a hard time viewing the overall picture of what it is that we're dealing with. All the way from viewing the dispersion across contracts and that entire space because right now we are mostly focusing on registrar registrant contracts within some of our data acquisition but there's other areas that were covered in the issues report that I went back and re-read that helps bring together the entire marketplace of dispersion and contracts.

And so I started jotting down a picture to help us frame this much better and help us identify where there are gaps in that diversion. And I think once I put this picture together and key in on what those gaps are, those gaps will easily

translate into what the recommendations I think will flow out of the UofC team.

And so just like kind of from a very high level perspective and I hope this doesn't ruffle feathers or anything, but from a high level, it basically (this) - these recommendations will form the premise for what the minimum baseline of abuse should look like.

And so what I'm going to recommend for the team. We have a meeting scheduled for this Thursday. There are a couple of conflicts with schedules. So I'm going to propose that I try to reschedule it for next week and what - that we'll have completed for next week is a draft of our report.

And then within the sub team, I'd like - I want to share the report with our sub team. Make sure that we gain consensus on what this report looks like especially around the area of the background material and the recommendations that will flow out of that.

So I think by early next week I'll be able to have that draft complete for the sub team by next Wednesday or Thursday. Have the sub team meet, review this draft, revise it and then so two weeks from today roughly we'd have a very good draft to share with the overall working group. And so just bring closure to this.

The recommendations themselves out of the sub team at a very high level is okay we believed that there should be some sort of minimum baseline. Yes, and we agreed to that. Then if we do then this is what that minimum baseline should look like or basically a picture of what that framework should look like as the recommendation. Put that picture, that framework together.

Then the second component is well what is the scope of the recommendations that we're talking about? Who all is affected? What parties are affected? Maybe try to at least address the question of, you know, what

impact does this mean to the industry if we did roll this out? And then the third kind of high arching recommendation is just executing the package and what that may look like.

So I probably babbled quite a bit and confused a lot of people. There's been a lot on my mind that I've been trying to get out and I can't get it all done until I start drawing pictures to have you guys see some of it.

But all in all let me just reiterate that I think what I've been missing up to this point was an idea of what a best practice should be and I - my gut is telling me that what PIR and dot org has done over the past year perfectly aligns to what this working group has been talking about even beyond just uniformity of contracts.

But specifically going out and execute - defining what your policy should be internally whether you're a registry, a registrar or ICANN is, you know, really understanding what that policy is and then just going out and executing against it.

And PIR demonstrated how they moved the needle and then turned things off and how the abuses seemed to jump again. And so I think the biggest thing is really just going out and really trying to combat it.

The last thing that I'd like to say relative to uniformity of contracts is it sounds like there are other people that are already doing some of the work for us. There was an ALAC session at Seoul where David Giza had presented about some of the compliance things that they were doing within that team and some of their successes. Then also specifically some of the things that they plan to do in the future.

As it turns out, for those that may or may not know, David Giza is on the RAA working group and he specifically denoted four or five areas that the - that the 2009 RAA, as an example, is lacking in abuse provisions.

So one of the things that he said that they were going to start looking at was specifically targeting language and provisions in RAA that surround cybersquatting, that surround malicious conduct, privacy proxy, services and a couple of other various topics that seem to be missing today.

And the RAA is just one area out of six that we should be looking to understand what that minimum baseline for abuse provisions should be. But it was encouraging to hear that ICANN staff do recognize that there is that gap missing in the RAA and that they were going to be starting to do stuff about it.

Okay. I'll shut up for a little bit. Are there questions or clarifications?

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thank you for that update Berry. James had raised his hand first and then we'll take Margie after that.

James Bladel: I'll defer to Margie and she may answer my question.

Margie Milam: Oh. Yes. I just wanted to address the last thing that Berry talked about with regard to David Giza's presentation. We have this RAA working group that's working on evaluating whether there should be additional amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement and that's part of that ICANN staff has put together a document. We're going to post it today to the working group.

Basically outlining different areas of where the RAA could be improved and in one of those topics is how to deal with malicious abuse. The way we looked at it from the staff perspective is in connection with the new gTLD program we've made some recommendations on how to deal with malicious abuse. And we felt that there's probably areas to improve the RAA with respect to that topic.

So once that document gets issued, and it should be issued today, I'll also circulate it here and for this group although, you know, a lot of it won't be

relevant to our discussion but certainly the stuff that deals with malicious abuse and cybersquatting I think is another area that we've touched upon, you know, can be useful for this group to evaluate.

Greg Aaron: Thanks in advance for posting that Margie. Thank you. Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Greg and thanks Berry that was a good update. And I am pleased that you're having a lot of the same types of, I don't know, I think best when I'm on the lawnmower for some reason. I think it's the white noise but it's like over the weekend I've been thinking about his as well in this uniformity of contracts.

Specifically because after the DNS abuse forum on Thursday in Seoul I had some discussions down in the lounge where I think that ICANN veterans will tell you a lot of the really interesting stuff happens at these meetings. And I'm not going to indicate which individuals were down there but - because I don't want to speak for them.

But they were definitely some that you mentioned in your update and that were present for that DNS forum. And one of the topics we were discussing and it's something I'm still kind of wrestling with is this idea of whether or not contracts and contractual compliance are an effective anti-abuse mechanism.

Just because of their speed and their implementation, their enforcement and also the fact that, you know, criminals or bad actors or folks who are set on the malicious activities don't typically sign contracts and they don't uphold them when they do.

So it's this idea that contracts and contractual compliance will make individuals and organizations accountable for abuse that occurs but it doesn't necessarily attack the problem directly. It's more of a end around on the problem. So that's just one thought, you know, some of the topics we were

discussing. But one of the ideas that we were having was you mentioned that the (unintelligible). Hello?

Greg Aaron: We're here.

James Bladel: Okay. So one of the things that we were also discussing, you mentioned, that there's the RAA work that's going on and I think that, you know, that's something that a lot of folks are interested in and participating in. But there's another initiative as well which is the, help me with this one Greg, the expedited registry service request process, the ERSRP.

Greg Aaron: The - are you referring to the ERSR, which is...

James Bladel: Yes sir.

Greg Aaron: ...okay, which is a basically an emergency or expedited security request.

James Bladel: Okay.

Greg Aaron: If there - if a problem crops up and a registry needs to deal with it, if it's a serious thing that could affect the registry or the DNS, the DNS, they can - they want to be able to deal with it and ICANN wants to facilitate that but it may require a contractual exemption. So that's a process to obtain that.

Conficker is an example where a registry is either needed to grant some fee relief or register names themselves. So there are two things that are not allowed normally under contracts.

James Bladel: Right. So what I was thinking about would be an equivalent or an analog to that to the RAA and I'm just brainstorming here and I'm sharing some of my lawnmower, you know, thinking here.

The idea that what would be an equivalent or model for that in an RAA where a registrar would say, for example, I feel like there's an abuse activity going on that I've detected and either I'm not clear or I'm fairly confident that my registration agreement for - or my - or the RAA does not give me sufficient latitude to address this issue.

Can there be some sort of a public, you know, dialogue with ICANN to address the issue first and then, you know, kind of work out what the contractual RAA implications would be later? And this is just something I'm thinking about and haven't put a whole lot of research into it at this point.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

James Bladel: But it kind of hints at the crux of what we're doing with the UofC group. I mean, which is, you know, are registrars -do they have the latitude to act when presented with these issues? If so, are they doing so and, you know, you know, when we talk about uniformity how specific do we want to go with the uniformity and developing that baseline?

Do we want to tell registrar's, you know, here's a paint by numbers; you must do A when you encounter, you know, when you encounter B or do we want to just give them more of a broad latitude and say, you know, if you encounter something that you feel is malicious, you know, and trust upon them to act accordingly?

Greg Aaron: I see Rod's hand. I think he was next.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. I just wanted to respond to something that got brought up a little while ago and that's on the usefulness of contracts to and contracts with compliance in the arena of malicious abuse.

And I think in the - kind of the day to day operations it may not be as, you know, today at least not that useful other than perhaps for being able to point

out to a particular registrar or registry an issue where their not complying and help them get past whatever the hurdle it is.

But there is at least one good example of where contractual compliance eliminated a bad actor and that was the (S Domain) issue. And so in the regard or - we're assuming of course, that all registrars and registries are good actors and that is not always the case. So contractual compliance is extremely important in the regard of bad actors getting into the space and removing them permanently hopefully.

James Bladel: Yes, that's a good point Rod (S Domains) and there are others I think right now that are on the radar for compliance. And but I think while a lot of folks are encouraged to see that there's some action taking place on those, I think a lot of folks are also pointing to, you know, just how long it took to, you know, to really go after some of these folks that I think have had some notoriety in the community for some of their actions for quite awhile.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. And I think that might be something to take a look at to - you know, I've talked to compliance quite a bit and there's some, you know, as to a lot of us in this group and I think there are some tools that they would like to have in order to shorten that lifespan as it were or, you know, allow them to take certain actions that might mitigate things more quickly. So that might be something we want to look at out of this.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

Greg Aaron: Berry.

James Bladel: And would you say -- I'm sorry but I just wanted to question there. Would you say that's an example or that's a case where a registrar was actually a little more than just a bystander in the abuse that was going on?

Rod Rasmussen: Well I would say that we have - certainly have cases where registrars appear to be, I (don't want to look back), where they are - they do have knowledge of bad actions going on and are either dragging their feet or looking the other way or whatever kind of euphemism you want to use, but not taking direct action even presented with evidence.

Greg Aaron: All right. I see Berry and then Margie.

Berry Cobb: Yes. Thanks Greg. Yes, James I definitely agree with your white noise moments and I appreciated your sharpening your lawnmower blades and letting the grass let you do that that was...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...comments. So yes, up to this weekend, I personally was struggling with, you know, what does a minimum baseline of abuse provisions and agreements really buy us six months from now. If we could flip the light switch tomorrow, what would we get other than a paragraph of language and agreements out there? Does it help curtail abuse? And up until I reheard the DNS abuse forum, I was really of the opinion that I didn't think that it was going to buy us much.

And ultimately it may or may not. But I really targeted in on about Adam's presentation is - towards the end of the presentation I specifically asked the question, you know, did you guys modify any of your agreements that allowed you to go out and combat the abuses that you've identified? He said quick and easily, no they didn't.

And so that prompted me, I'm like all right well Greg or Adam had pointed out in his (unintelligible) two or one component of language out of the RRA that they (use), which is (specifically) Section 3.5.2. And it was very high level - it was basically the provision in the contract that allowed them - that gave them the, not the freedom, but the right to really kind of combat abuses and it was

the language that says, you know, we're here to protect this TLD and this registry. I can't remember the exact language.

But it seemed that it was - the language in the paragraph itself is simplistic enough that it allowed the registry to combat all forms of abuse. And that's what they were using as their motive and then dot info even has as different section within their RRA 3.6.5 that specifically starts calling out abuse types. And so it's these types of - really these two paragraph provisions that I think are a primary component of what a minimum baseline should look like.

So when I - when I read through those, I immediately went back into my gap analysis or what does dispersion look like out there. So I quickly reread the issues report and staff did a great job of outlining, you know, which registries do have abuse provisions in their agreements and which ones don't.

So immediately as an example, and I'm not calling anybody out here, but the dot com agreements with ICANN, you know, when you go to look at that particular version versus the dot org TLD agreement they're night and day in terms of how they're structured and specifically the dot org agreement has a template on what the RAA should look like whereas the dot com doesn't.

And specifically there's the gap is this 3.5.2 that empowers the dot org registry to protect their TLD against abuses and to fight malicious conduct and those kinds of things that's completely missing in dot com. So anyway, I referred back to this picture earlier and I was able to get an entire market space picture of where abuse provisions do pop up, where they don't and where the gaps are at.

So I think that that's kind of where I was - the road that I was heading down is, you know, dot org had that minimum language in there but regardless they didn't - they didn't seek to get other types of language added into their contracts or their agreements.

And I think Adam even had pointed out briefly that, you know, it was really was the time thing versus executing against it and what they did is they went ahead and, you know, how are we going to combat these and then they just went out and did it.

And that's where the last part of one of the recommendations are is regardless of what we do from a uniformity of contracts and those kinds of provisions, it's really about just internal policy development and how you're going to respond to these types of abuses.

But the other component that was missing in a dot org and James has touched on quite a bit which is another part of our UofC recommendation is the indemnification aspects of it. And so when we talked about ERSR, the emergency or basically the emergency take down stuff for the Conficker, that was an action item within UofC to review as to how that was set up.

And I think one of the, I wouldn't call it a founding principle, but one of the key aspects to that ERSR is the fact that the registry has this high degree of indemnification in taking those actions. And that's certainly another component in the world to dispersion as it relates to abuse provisions is that there's not probably the adequate indemnification that needs to be there as well. So I am - I picture some sort of indemnification language as being attached to that minimum baseline for abuse. And I'm rambling again.

Greg Aaron: Okay. We're coming at the end of the meeting. Margie, why don't you go ahead?

Margie Milam: Sure. I guess I wanted to touch base on some of the comments that James had raised about the (unintelligible) in Seoul. David Giza in our RAA meeting talked about various areas that ICANN staff proposed or had suggestions for evaluating how to deal with some of the issues that were talked about.

So when you see the paper, you'll see we have recommendations related to cybersquatting, recommendations related to malicious conduct. And in the malicious conduct area, we tried to take an approach of not requiring specific action because it doesn't - you know, we're very aware of the fact that, you know, that phishing and other scams evolve over time and that there's no point in, you know, in being very specific as to what type of action is required.

But try to take it from the approach of right now the RAA has no requirements at all. And where we thought there may be room for discussion would be, you know, clauses that say something like a registrar shall investigate, you know, and take appropriate action and report back to ICANN. I mean in other words, we don't tell them what the action should be but we're asking them to look into it.

Another example with respect to some of the bad actors; sometimes it happens in the reseller world. And so we ask the registrars to, if requested, to investigate, you know, if one of the resellers appears to be involved in, you know, some sort of illegal or malicious conduct.

So we've tried to suggest things that are broad yet give, you know, frameworks for the registrars to at least do something if notified and that's kind of the approach we took because of the fact that you can't be specific.

And the other - the other thing is - in specifically with regards to the registry, the expedited registry, I don't know what it's called; the thing you were mentioning earlier, you know, there may be situations where it's appropriate for registrars to get a similar, you know, expedited request from ICANN.

You know, we didn't include that in our proposal but I know we discussed it whether it was, you know, necessary or appropriate and so that might be something that (fed) into the RAA working group as well.

So when you see this document, it'll be very detailed; it'll have background, it'll have issues and it'll have multiple ways of addressing it. And I think it'll be, you know, useful for us and like I said, I'll circulate it as soon as I have it.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thanks Margie. That'll be really interesting to see. Okay. We've come up at the end of our meeting. Berry, I think you had mentioned that your group will have a draft early next week. Then you're going to meet and it sounded like you were targeting having a draft ready within ten days and to put up on the Wiki is that correct?

Berry Cobb: Kind of -- almost. Basically I will have a draft ready for next week to be socialized within just our sub team. And my intent is to gain as much consensus as possible after next week and as soon as we complete that meeting and make any adjustments and I'll post to the Wiki to share out. So by Friday of next week we should - I hope to have a good chunk of our report draft up on the Wiki.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Great. All right. So that's targeted and we should see that up on the Wiki by the next meeting.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Greg Aaron: What I'll do Berry is I'm going to also send you over the language that we need for our template just with the heading...

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Greg Aaron: ...so forth. So you guys can fill that in. Okay. So we're looking forward to that draft. We've run out of time. I was going to add a few things. Maybe as we continue these discussions, I can give you some background into what happens at the registry level. And info actually went first and then org patterned their procedures and policies on what we did using similar

contractual language. So I might be able to answer some questions about that if you have them.

I had a topic actually about uniformity of contracts kind of but I won't bring it up today. What I'll do maybe is I'll write a note up to the list because it might actually be a separate project but kind of fits with uniformity of contracts among several other things. So I'll write a note. I think we should always continue to use the mailing list as a forum for discussion between the meetings.

So unfortunately we're out of time. But this was a very fruitful meeting and we're seeing accelerating work in a number of areas. It's good to have really substantial stuff that we're sinking our teeth into here.

I'd ask you to please push as hard as possible to get that Wiki material up. If you're also working on another topic that we didn't discuss today, please push to get stuff up on the Wiki. At some point we will stop using the Wikis because Marika will take that material and start integrating it into a draft initial report. So push as hard as you can on those.

I'll post up the actions items from today's meeting. And we will definitely have a meeting two weeks from today, maybe not next week, but definitely two weeks from today, same time, and then we'll have some discussion on doodles and so forth about weekly meetings.

Any parting thoughts before we go? Please let the minutes reflect that Martin Sutton did join us part way through. And if nothing else, we'll adjourn for today. And thanks very much for your hard work.

James Bladel: Thanks Greg.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Have a good...

Man: Thank you Greg.

Greg Aaron: ...have a good week everybody.

Woman: Thanks.

Greg Aaron: Take care.

Man: Thank you. Take care.

Greg Aaron: Bye.

END