

**ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 09 December 2013 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 09 December 2013 at 16:00 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-irtp-d-20131209-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Attendees:

James Bladel - RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Graeme Bunton - RrSG
Barbara Knight – RySG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Bob Mountain - RrSG
Rob Golding - RrSG
Kristine Dorrain – NAF

Apologies:

Paul Diaz – RySG
Angie Graves – CBUC

ICANN staff:

Caitlin Tubergen
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings are ready ma'am.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Carol). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening this is the IRTP D Working Group call on 9 December 2013.

On the call today we have Volker Greimann, Mikey O'Connor, Bob Mountain, Avri Doria, Holly Raiche, Graham Norton, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel and Barbara Knight.

We have apologies from Paul Diaz and Angie Graves. And from staff we have Lars Hoffman, and myself Natalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie and thanks (Carol) for the recording help. Welcome all. James has to jump off the call a little early today so since I'm doing the mind mapping thing anyway I'll drive today. And so we'll take a look at the standard agenda.

And I think today we're just going to work on creating scenarios. We'll see how this goes. If it goes great we can pat ourselves on the back and if it doesn't go so great we can blame Mikey but I think that's the agenda.

So take a look at that and then let us know if there are any changes to your statements of interest. We'll take a little pause and look for hands on that.

Okay well so on the screen that all familiar mind map thing. Is it big enough for people? It looks like it's just barely readable.

If people find it hard to read just let me know in the chat and I'll bump it up a notch. But we had a really productive sort of drafting sub team subgroup call on Thursday.

And I summarized the results to the list. But it basically said, you know, look let's take another run at this in a slightly different direction.

I thought the conversation on the list was terrific. I learned a lot. And it gave me a couple of new things to think about.

And where we came out on the Thursday call was that by breaking this into scenarios we may make our work easier for ourselves.

Oh I'm getting - let me just bump the scale. Thanks Avri that's probably going to work better.

And so I took what we came up with on Thursday and then I added just a little bit to it. And then James added one this morning that I think is really good that says look these scenarios have a number of dimensions to them.

One is the policy dimension. And so we, you know, we have some choices there that are just a starter kit if people can think of more choices for any of these that's fine.

But the thought is that what we would do is we would come up with scenarios and say this scenario is clearly in scope for IRTPD or IRTP and the TDRP or it's not.

Maybe it's clearly within scope for the new registrant transfer thing that's sort of lingering from IRTPC or maybe we don't know.

And then the next dimension that we thought of was this scenario is a dispute that's entirely between registrants, or it's entirely between registrars, or maybe it's between registrants but registrars might be a party, or the opposite or it's a puzzler. Again always the choice for something we don't really know.

And then again the same sort of thing with compliance they either it clearly have a role, or they could have a role, or they clearly don't have a role.

And then the one that James added this morning which is some sort of volume dimension that says this scenario happens all the time and this scenario is some sort of it educated it's very low volume.

And I think James raised a really good point which is that, you know, if we have to choose between something it would be nice to favor the high volume ones and maybe leave the edge cases to be solved other ways. So I thought that was a good addition to this.

So I thought that what would be neat is if people came up with these scenarios on the list but I got an echoing silence on that.

So I thought instead what I would do is see if we could come up with these on the call. And my hope is that you will all leap forward with scenarios and I will become the scribe and write them down and we'll sort of see where we get.

So does anybody want to break the ice and go first? Don't all beat the doors down talk at once or anything. Hey way to go Bladel. Go ahead James.

James Bladel: Sorry I couldn't get my mute off very quickly. So I think that the two scenarios that I'm trying to see am I not - am I discouraged from duplicating things that we may have already covered up above there?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh you are discouraged from that because I have control. Hold on.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: So we came up with some. Where were they? Hang on a minute folks. There they are. Examples let me grab those and put them down below.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: It seems like an easy thing to do if I can manage it. Okay there we go. There you go there's the starter kit. I should have put those on the email. I'm sorry.

James Bladel: No that's okay. That makes - I think that helps give us something to push off on there. So I think that we want to very early in the process we want to try to detect and make a distinction between situations where the process was or the scenario was accounted for by the IRTP or the TDRP but the process failed.

For example the admin contact authorized a transfer but the registrant is challenging that. And I think and, you know, in those cases the policy is very clear that the registrant would, you know, be able to override that authorization. So we would say that the policy, you know, covered that scenario.

And similarly any case where someone says this registrar is claiming that they had my authorization to do this transfer but in fact they did not so challenging the veracity or authenticity of an authorization.

I think where things get sticky is when we have two separate parties claiming with competing claims over the control of the domain name and by control I think here meaning the ability to disposition and transfer it.

But I think that's where this gets very, very sticky where its party A and party B are both claiming that they have exclusive rights to transfer the domain name, and only they can authorize it, and that the authorization from either party is harming them.

And I think that was one of the things we touched on -- this is a little bit of a non-secular -- but one of the things we touched on in our discussion was right now when there is a - when there is a transfer and then someone disputes

the transfer the status quo is to leave the transfer in place while that dispute is worked out either between the registrars or TDRP or whatever.

But there may - we may one simple thing we may be able to do is that if any transfer is disputed we would immediately reverse it until and then lock it in that pre-transfer state until that dispute is worked out.

And I think the thinking here is that the bulk of the harm comes from allowing the transfer to stand more often than not then from preventing the transfer from going forward.

And I'm sure that there are folks who implement UDRPs that may see that, you know, the other way. But I'm looking at it from the perspective of someone who's had a name hijacked.

So I don't know if that's helpful Mikey or if that takes us down a rabbit hole but that's my thoughts on the scenarios.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's great. You know, it gets us going really nicely. I think I'm going to take that one out. It goofs up my little outline.

So what we came up with last on the Thursday call is this starter kit list. And then James added this one on the top. So we have an admin contact authorizing a transfer but the registrant is challenging it. And that one's covered.

We had another one where we had a registrar who was simply not participating. So maybe a losing registrar is not answering queries from people and again I think that one's covered by the, you know, by existing policy. That's why we put in the emergency action contact kind of thing.

We have a pure registrant to registrant dispute, you know, I have acquired a domain. And now the person from whom I got it my son let's say is saying no

you coerced me to me into giving it to you because you're bigger than me and I want it back that's clearly between the two registrants the registrars did everything right.

And I think that one of the things that cause's a fair amount of confusion is that right now it's not really clear whether the IRTP pertains to that. Oh James you've got your hand up. Sorry.

James Bladel: Yes. I just wanted to jump in on that last bit. I think there is a there are two different flavors or let's say at least two different flavors of the registrant to registrant dispute.

I think one is where both parties were acknowledged at some point as being registrants maybe not simultaneously or maybe at separate registrars so one registrar has registrant X and one registrar is registrar Y.

I think the other one the other scenario is where one party is completely unknown and has always been unknown to a registrant a registrar.

So for example, you know, we occasionally get calls like this which is hey I want to transfer my domain name because I hired this guy to create a Web site for my business and now, you know, he, you know, kicked my dog or something terrible and unforgivable and I don't want to do business with them anymore.

So I'd like to transfer my domain name. And when we look it up we're like we're sorry, you know, the person who designed your Web site for you put all of that in his own name.

And then this person will of course bring, you know, contracts, and bills of sale, and all this other stuff but really we're not in the position as registrars to say that that person has a legitimate claim over that domain name.

So I think there's two scenarios. One is where there are two competing records for registrars and one is where - there's only one but there's this sort of invisible undocumented third party claiming control.

And I think it's that last scenario where really TDRP registries and registrars ICANN really kind of have to throw up their hands and say we really shouldn't be wading into these waters in my opinion.

Mikey O'Connor: Now let me do my version of that one and see if it fits in the same jar or if it's a new scenario because I had a good friend and then Holly I'll get to you but I'm on a roll here so hang on a minute.

I had a good friend who had his - this is the guy that writes the Imponderables books things like why Do Penguins Have Knees and other books that answer questions like that.

And his name is Dave Feldman. He's a friend of mine from long, long, long ago. And he had his Web site built by a Web site designer that went out of business. And so his name expired.

The Web site designer was gone so the expiration notices went nowhere. And the first time my pal found out about it was when the name imponderables.com showed up at auction. Is that a different one James or is that a subset of the one that you're describing?

James Bladel: It could be a subset of the latter one or really of either scenario depending upon whether your friend was ever listed in any of the contact records contact objects of the Whois record.

One of the things that maybe could come out of this group would be best practices that, you know, is something that said look, you know, make sure that if you're hiring someone and, you know, to do a Web site that your name

appears as a registrant even if they are the administrative or technical contact or something.

And I know that's pushing water uphill. But it feels like there's a lack of awareness, you know, and just and it leaves registrants vulnerable to the situation you described.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay type a minute and then Holly your next. Okay take it away Holly.

Holly Raiche: Yes it's just I don't know if these situations are different but could you distinguish between say a person who is down as a contact possibly wrongly in the same organization and somebody in the organization a different person thinks they are the registrant and they have the ability to transfer or not?

That's one scenario versus registrant versus registrant where they're different organizations. So one is a kind of a - for some reason a mixup within an organization and another is a dispute between organizations or individuals. Does that make a difference?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I think the - I think that well I don't know if this is - I was going to put this in as a subset of that one. I think maybe I'll leave it where it was.

I like lots of scenarios because then we can we get more granular conversations. So I'll leave it for now and we can sort it out later. It's easier to make things clumpier than it is to invent stuff. Barbara?

Barbara Knight: Hi. This is Barbara for the transcript.

Mikey O'Connor: Barbara get a little closer to the microphone. It's really hard to hear you.

Barbara Knight: (Unintelligible) is this better?

Mikey O'Connor: It's a little better. Now it's silent. You yelled at the microphone so loud that it broke and we can't hear you.

Barbara Knight: I'm sorry. Can you...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh there we go. That's much better.

Barbara Knight: Is it too loud?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it's good enough.

Barbara Knight: Okay. So the scenario that I'm thinking of perhaps is with the privacy services. Do you have to address anything in regards to those because I think that the gaining registrar may very well if the registrant does not remove the privacy service that occurs with a transfer may not have any (ability) into who the registrant is and how would you go about validating that?

Mikey O'Connor: It's an interesting type head problem and who does not look at the screen. I'm used to being able to see what I type and this new version of this software shields it from me.

So the losing registrar doesn't remove the privacy service and the gaining registrar can't validate who they the registrant is right? That's a good one.

James back to you.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. Going back to Holly's scenario which I think is - and I think you've captured here something distinctly different.

I think it is making clear that different contacts or different departments within the same organization would have to would also be something that maybe this policy is not very effective at sorting out.

I think the other situation is when someone - and also very common almost as common as the Web developer scenario is when someone registers a domain name as part of their work or their job but puts it in their own personal name or as part of their personal account.

And then for whatever reason that person and the company are separated either through, you know, resignation or termination what, you know, who has control of the domain name?

And we have had to provide some build some I think that's common enough that we've actually built some procedures where someone where the organization name will trump the registrant name.

So someone says they are with, you know, Acme Incorporated and the registrant remains Acme Incorporated but, you know, the CEO or the General Council or somebody from Acme Incorporated produces their business license their articles of incorporation and says change this, you know, we have usually devised some mechanisms where they can demonstrate that they are speaking with the authority of Acme Incorporated and remove that other person from, you know, from the mixed registrant field. So I just wanted to put that one out there as maybe a wrinkle into this scenario that Holly described.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good wrinkle. I am coping with a computer that just decided to get really hot probably due to Adobe Connect.

Oh but by bringing up the activity monitor I scared it into submission. That's much better now. That's weird. I don't get that. But hey anything that works.

Okay. So I'm looking at the chat and we're getting a pretty good conversation going there so let me go back.

So (Rob) is I'm going way back in time (Rob) was probably I don't know which one (Rob) was agreeing with but if I captured it right (Rob) that's good.

Let's see so then we have a little dialogue about registrant and admin context have the authority to transfer and then the ownership argument.

And I think what we're getting to okay and then (Rob) is an answering a question from (Kevin) who is saying really you can transfer these with privacy on?

I guess (Rob) was asking that question. And then okay and then (Rob) is giving me a thumbs up. So we're okay. Good.

I'm liking this. Let's - I'm sort of leaning on the registrar's a bit since you are the folks and also Barbara is this the total pile?

If we went to your department that deals with goofy disputes is this list good enough or have we missed a big one that we need or even an edge case or two wouldn't be a bad thing.

I don't want to beat this to death but at the same time I think this is a pretty good start for us to start kind of making clumps out of them.

And so if we're sort of out of - oh Volker go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I can hear you now. I couldn't at first.

Volker Greimann: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Working...

Volker Greimann: Just one subset of the privacy services thing when you say losing register doesn't not remove privacy service this may also be any other entity that's providing a privacy services for example, our reseller or another business that just use our registration services.

That's much more common because in that case as a registrar we don't even know who the registrant is. We only see the privacy service as registrants.

Mikey O'Connor: Now is there a difference between the privacy and the proxy? The proxy is where the person is actually I think - I'm treading on thin ice in my knowledge here, so I'm not sure I'm going to get this (unintelligible) quite yet.

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: Well no, this services and proxy services there is a differentiation between the two, but not everybody makes that differentiation.

Basically the privacy service just hides the address but leaves the name and provides the owner with a certain degree of privacy whereas the proxy service actually acts as new registrant and also puts his name in there besides the address and the email address.

So a privacy service is usually, there's always a reference to who owns the domain name. And in the proxy service there isn't. That's my understanding of the main differentiation.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's - and the thing there is that in the - that was sort of my understanding of the proxy service as well is that this is basically either a law firm or someone else.

Woman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...who's acting as the registrant. So that might be a different thing. But we'll capture it for now and catch up to it later. James go ahead.

James Bladel: Oh, just wanted to echo Volker's statements about the differences between the privacy service and the proxy service and to point out that there is a PDP on this issue that is underway.

And perhaps rather than reaching out and absorbing that edge case maybe this is one of those scenarios where we direct that other group that is working on these issues to come up with a definition and then, you know, adopt some sort of consistent behavior like what we were discussing in the chat about not getting a transfer request so that - until it's - until the service is canceled or removed.

So just one thought of maybe this is something like you said Mikey we're treading in some dangerous waters here. Maybe we just highlight this issue as work for another team that is focusing on this as its core, you know, the core topic.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that our situation may be simpler in a way because from my vantage point a proxy service is essentially the registrant. And, you know, the person that they are at the forefront, you know, doesn't really matter.

I mean, so I would think that if a proxy service transferred a domain that that would fall into normal transfer, you know?

(Joe)'s pretty good proxy services transferring from Go Daddy...

James Bladel: I think...

Mikey O'Connor: ...(unintelligible) all end of story.

James Bladel: I think. If we could say that - I think that if our - it's our agreement to determine what happens when someone is listed as a person or an entity or a privacy or proxy service is listed as the registrant.

It's the work of another group I think to determine what registrants should and should not be able to do in that role on behalf of their registrant customers.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, absolutely right. But I would think that that would be the scenario you're describing would fall right into registrant to registrant dispute.

Woman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: One being...

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...the proxy service, the other being a registrant, you know, off you go to court, have a great time. I don't know...

James Bladel: Agreed.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and so unlike privacy service thing where unlatching that privacy service might be something that does fall into IRTP so that the gaining registrar can understand who's the losing registrant.

Anyway, that's a nice murky pile. We'll put that in the nicely murky.

I like at least one or two good murky ones in our search here.

Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Yes just so I think it's a slight wrinkle but remembering the Whois final report and the way they defined the proxy service as really an agent, so the lawyer or whoever is an agent of and they're acting on behalf of.

So I think that's a wrinkle of two people within the same organization in a sense that technically your agent is acting on behalf of you. And then the issue there is as a possible legitimacy of your agency and what was meant when you gave somebody the agent to act or not.

I think it's in that category, but it's a little bit difficult because technically it would be probably a lawyer who see agents but they're taking instructions from their clients.

James Bladel: Mikey this is James. Can I jump in on that?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

James Bladel: Holly that's an excellent point. And I think that it should be covered in the terms of service of the privacy service...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: ...or it shouldn't. You know, so I just wanted to throw that out there. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Well I'm just - the only thing I wanted to make sure you really meant proxy and not privacy.

James Bladel: Yes I did...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Sorry, either. Proxy (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So I'm going to put this one up in the organizational one at least tentatively.

Now as you can see it's easy to move these back around. Barbara go ahead.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So the one that I'm thinking of that was actually brought to my attention by another registry operator, the (unintelligible) relates to that one that yes they're highlighting just now which (unintelligible) somebody registers the domain name as part of their job (unintelligible).

It probably is that it in this particular scenario somebody who works at the company, registers a domain name it may be in a corporate account but, you know, they have themselves listed as the admin contact or the registrant and they've left the company and there's nobody there, you know, who has that email or those are access to that email (unintelligible) longer.

I guess kind of relate to that or, you know, that individual may not have passed along information relative to the, I'll call it corporate (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I think that I'm going to put that in a different category, at least for now because in this one there's a dispute perhaps.

I mean, I think that's an area that James was describing when he put this one out there is that the company and employee disagreed about the disposition of the domain whereas this one is more mechanical in a way and might be treated a little bit differently. And we might even be able to treat it differently in policy although I'm not sure about that.

So anyway I decided that one warranted its own separate case for now.

(Christine) you're next.

(Christine): Hi. Thanks everybody. This is (Christine) from NAF. My apologies for jumping in late and so maybe you've already discussed this.

But I want to just jump back one topic to where we were talking about the privacy and proxy services. And that is that we - I think we can probably spend a fair amount of time delving into who the registrant is for the purposes of registrars.

But specifically since we're talking about dispute resolution for the purposes of the ICANN dispute resolution policies that are in existence now like the UDRP and the URS, et cetera the registrant is the entity listed in the WHOIS record.

So, you know, whether or not- I just want to throw that out there for discussion or maybe not for discussion, but just to capture that information.

And that is, you know, when you have a discrepancy between who the registrar thinks the registrant is and who the policy thinks the registrant is there could be an issue there.

And maybe it's not related right now, but I just wanted to throw it out there so we document that in this particular topic.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not sure that's really where it belongs. Let me just think about that for a minute, get this down to a place where I can - sorry to mumble. If Cheryl were on the call she would be saying Mikey you're mumbling again.

All right okay. So I want to put that somewhere else. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Thanks Mikey, Chris Chaplow. I kept thinking about the case that we've also mentioned before, where two business partners split and then they start claiming, both claiming rights on the domain name.

But I think that's probably in the rather nicely phrase registrant says I'm the owner but I'm not in control of domain name. So I think that probably goes in that unless anybody's to disagree.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll put it in there for now.

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I mean I think that one of the things that we can do with these is give ourselves lots of examples. And by doing that we may learn something.

Chris Chaplow: Good.

Mikey O'Connor: So I think it's good to have lots of examples.

Chris Chaplow: Okay Chris, so I'll just follow-up then.

What - the case about one registrant is completely unknown to the registrars. Now is that redundant now? Does that come into the one - you know, I wonder?

Mikey O'Connor: I would say that they are a little bit different because I think in that case, you know our subset cases are the nefarious Web site designer Chris Chaplow who either claims the name for themselves or goes away.

And now the registrant shows up like my friend Penguin Dave and says, but I've read all these books. I've used this name for a decade and a half. Help me. And I think that's a different case than where there's a dispute.

Now the treatment of that may be the same but I'm okay leaving those as separate kind of things for now just to...

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...tweak our discussion.

I think that, you know, if we go back to sort of why are we doing all this, and I think the reason we're doing all this is because what I'm imagining is that we'll sort of make a little matrix out of all these dimensions.

So we'll have like four columns and we'll take all these edge, you know, all these cases and we'll put little tick marks or something in the columns that say well this is the way they work.

And where we have question marks is probably where we're going to have to work harder. And if we find that there the same when we do that analysis well that's fine.

You know, we'll just have more examples of that particular situation for the documentation that we undoubtedly will publish as a result of this. So I think it's fine.

That's a long-winded answer. Sorry about that.

Any others? Chris you've got lots of experience. Any - have we missed any other ones that you've run into over the years?

Chris Chaplow: The ones - Chris here again. Yes, the ones that I keep coming against are the Web site designer case and the business partners, small business partners specific case.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I can imagine. Yes, okay, good. (Christine) you're next.

(Christine): Thanks. Yes I just wanted to add to the business dispute one because we see that one kind of a lot.

And the other thing to keep in mind is that there may be - the policy may - I mean I know we talked about whether or not the TDRP will apply and we're going to go through those buckets next.

But the thing to also keep in mind is that oftentimes there's contract issues outside there like that there's some sort of agreement whether it's oral or written.

And then there's other issues there as far as when we see that's a variation on a couple of these is where somebody starts a company, is the sole proprietor, maybe the domain name's registered to them, they sell off the company or part of it or maybe they go public, whether or not there's a board.

And the company that - the larger company now wants to wrestle control away from this owner who has sort of an interest in the underlying business.

So it's similar to the business partner thing and similar to the like the person registering on behalf of the company.

So there are issues there I think that will - would not be relevant for policies. In fact, these cases that come to UDRP oftentimes because there is some sort of trademark at play like if the large company bought the small company and there is a trademark and so those to come to UDRP those often get kicked out as not being cybersquatting because it's purely a business dispute.

But the panel expressly says this needs to go to court. This is more than a documentary hearing.

So we have to also as we're going through this keep in mind that, you know, we might have buckets and one of those might be, you know, doesn't apply at all, you know, you must go to court because there's going to be too many legal issues to sort out.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, well I think that that's one of the places we're heading is a much clearer definition of those cases where we the policymakers, the registrars, the registrants who we are representing, those of us who are representing registrants, all agree that this one falls outside the policy. And I think that that would be a great good that we do if we can make that distinction clearer. So yes I agree.

Kevin you're next. You're muted....

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin Erdman. Yes I just wanted to (unintelligible) to (Christine)'s comment that - and sort of go back into the history of how the UDRP developed.

Because before the Internet when there was a trademark infringement the trademark infringer was within the legal jurisdiction territory of the, you know, parties that were having the dispute.

So the whole dispute resolution whether it's a court or a tribunal and all that were all there. And so a conventional legal process would work really well.

And I think what one of the things that prompted the UDRP is that we could have a trademark infringer that wasn't actually in the jurisdiction where the harm was occurring and that the - one of the release that was possible, which was, you know the - either the extension or the transfer of the domain was something that ICANN had control over.

And I think it's a reasonable policy consideration to not just say whether or not it's suitable for the dispute resolution process because some disputes may be easier for the tribunal to take actual physical witness testimony and all that than others.

But I think it's also important to say well, gee if it's a problem, along these scenarios, the Web site designer, the business partners typically they're all in the same jurisdiction and therefore they can use their legal process to get a resolution.

And I don't think that ICANN should step in and say hey well we can provide a different resolution process for that.

I think we ought to, you know, as part of our filtering through these scenarios say will gee, you know, we are ought to be looking at ICANN for situations where they are a unique and jurisdiction so to speak that you don't have the remedies available in your local traditional legal jurisdictions.

So that's my extra gloss on to (Christine)'s comments. And that's all. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Kevin. And (Christine)'s given you a thumbs up on that and hopefully I captured it right.

I think that's it. I think the queue is empty at this point. Let me do a last call on scenarios. This has actually been remarkably productive.

And I think what I will do is take an action item out of this to transmogrify this into something that's a little bit easier to read and push it out to the list with the hope that - and I think at some cases I'll add a few words because these are pretty terse sometimes. These are more like notes.

But maybe what we do is we look through the list in the next day or two for this first try at scenarios. I may even try and clump them a little bit. And let's try to get any that we've missed.

So for those of you, especially those of you who deal with these cases all the time or are representing organizations that have departments that do that I

will try and make this list suitable for you to take to that department and say does this cover all this stuff that you see?

I'm thinking of James and Volker and Barbara, you know, folks that have a pretty high volume of this kind of stuff going through.

And let's try and verify that we at least covered most of the high spots and then spend next week trying to put these in clumps that we can say okay this is clearly in, this is clearly out, et cetera. Does that seem like a good plan?

Not seeing - I'm seeing checkmarks and I'm reading the chat. Oh James is gone.

Looks like we have a plan. So I think with that we'll close a little bitterly and I'll do a little work. Hopefully pretty quick and then we'll see you in a week. Thanks all. And belatedly safe travels to James. And with that...

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks...

Man: Catch you later.

Mikey O'Connor: ...we can roll up the recording and call it a day. Thanks all.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks Mikey. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

END