ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 11 March 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 11 March 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-20130311-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendees:
James Bladel – RrSG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Avri Doria - NCSG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Angie Graves – CSG
Volker Greimann - RrSG
Olivier Hope - RrSG
Barbara Knight - RySG
Bob Mountain - RySG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Mikey O'Connor - ISPCP
Jill Titzer - RrSG

Apologies:
Holly Raiche - ALAC
Bartlett Morgan - NCUC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Lars Hoffman
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I would like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IRTP Part D Working Group call on Monday, March 11, 2013.

On the call today we have James Bladel, Avri Doria, Kevin Erdman, Angie Graves, Volker Greimann, Barbara Knight, Bob Mountain, Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor and Jill Titzer. We have apologies from Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg and Bartlett Morgan. From staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all. I note that James is on the call, so James if you want to run the call you're welcome to it, but otherwise I'll keep going. Whatever you want to do is fine.

James Bladel: No, I appreciate the help Mikey. I'm in a very noisy place and may actually have to drop off.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay. Well...

James Bladel: For our discussions I'll just be in the background this time around if that's okay.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great, okay. We'll take the standard pause to sort of run through the agenda and let folks break in to update their statements of interest.

We're going to push out that input template and that ACSO comments document today. We'll take a look at the approach, the work plan, and see

how people feel about that. Marika and Lars have an update for us on some of the data from compliance and from the Ombudsman.

And then I think all of those will likely go fairly fast and so I think we'll try to spend a fair amount of time on number five which is actually to start talking about the, you know, at a very level, sort of the charter questions and how we want to approach that. And then at the very end we'll kind of confirm the Beijing meet agenda and time.

Is there anything that people want to change or add to that agenda? Okay, and last call for statements of interest? All right then.

What you see on the screen in front of us is the draft, the ever so slightly modified draft of the input template and the letter for the ACNSO comments. And I didn't see a lot of commentary on the list.

Does anybody have any particularly strong views that they want to put into this draft or are we good enough to go ahead and release it into the wild? I'm not seeing any hands so I think with that, Marika and Lars, you can consider this approved because we've had it out on this list for about a week so that people could review it.

Oh Michele, I'll stop and let you go.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Mikey, Michele here.

Just having a quick look over and the reason I haven't replied to you on the list, unfortunately Mikey, is I've been up to my eyes with a multitude of other things.

I think maybe it might be helpful just to link to what the hell IRTP is because unless you actually understand what the inter-registrar transfer policy is and know where it is, you're going to be left scratching your head which, you

know, registrars and registries know what it is but others don't. And getting a comment out of those who are not registrars and registries is painful enough as it is without making it more painful.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, that's not a bad idea. Surely there's a place in there that we could do that. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Just a thought here Mikey - James speaking - where we get down to questions A through F with thinking that perhaps there could be a question G which is, you know, a catch-all, any other views or any other opinions that don't fit into the categories laid out above.

You know, I know sometimes we want to direct the responses and the feedback as quickly and as narrowly as possible. But I think sometimes we also want to cast the net, and I think that maybe strikes a good balance.

Mikey O'Connor: Well and this is the very last one of these at least in this round. And so...

James Bladel: Exactly, and if we missed something along the way, speak now or wait for the next five-year transfer policy update process, right.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes. That's not a bad addition, I like both of those. Any objections for either of those from the crowd? I'm seeing agreement from Michele on James' idea. So any other ideas?

Bob is in. Michele has a new hand - it must be. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, just to elaborate on what James is saying. I think it, you know, it might be worthwhile just putting that question in. The wording might be - what was the wording that James used? Something that struck me as a little bit obtuse.

James Bladel: This is James. Something along the lines of, "Do you have any other thoughts or feedback on this topic that don't fit into the categories defined above?"

Michele Neylon: Yes, I might keep it simpler. I mean just something - again, I'm all for simple; I like simple. You know, "Do you have any other comments on domain transfers that you want to share," or something. I don't know, but I do agree we do need something just to capture that.

Also looking at the - looking at the questions there, it would be very helpful to provide links to explain what-the-hell FOAs are and the TDRP and any other...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: And the assumption there is that people are going to have the issue report in front of them where it's all pretty...

Michele Neylon: Yes, but I'm working on the assumption that people have as little time to answer these things as I do, so making it as simple for them to do what is possible. I like just kind of laying things out very, very simply as part of my, "let's try to use few acronyms in ICANN," because even when we know what the subject matter is, it's very hard sometimes to understand what-the-hell people are talking about.

It's the kind of thing that, for example, the CCNSO would have a loss of experience with this area because they have a lot of different domain fronts for models. But if you start talking about FOAs, they might not know what-the-hell you're talking about. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll let Marika and Lars drive those in. Those don't seem like substantive changes. Volker's on that.

Anything else? Okay, well I'm going to call that done unless another hand goes up. I don't think those are substantive of enough changes that they

need another week of review. Anybody disagree with me on that? They seem like incremental changes?

Lars, go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, I'm just (unintelligible) pull up a letter too, because this is just the questionnaires space and we've got the covering letter too which is a separate document and I don't know how to put on both at the same time.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes.

Lars Hoffman: I just pulled it up.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's put this one to bed and then - yes, that's right. I thought they were all on the same.

So last call on this one. Okay, go ahead Lars. Why don't you bring up the other one and maybe let us independently view it so that we can scroll about. That would be great; there we go.

Okay, maybe similar commentary here. You know, all of the lengths, ideas seem to apply. Yes, Lars is already on that - and additional question from James.

Anything else? You know, it's pretty much parallel with the other document. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: So this is a very, very minor nit-picky thing. But I just don't like the last sentence of the first paragraph, "You are strongly encouraged to provide input or information."

I just - I would say something like, "We would welcome input or information from you or your members or your respective communities," or something like that. I feel like one is in order and one is an invitation.

Mikey O'Connor: I'd consider that a friendly amendment. It makes it friendly, thus it's got to be a friendly amendment.

James Bladel: And I don't know who wrote this, it might have been something taken from something that we've said and so it originated somewhere, you know, and I was the source of it, I apologize for wasting the group's time. I don't know where it came from.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. Anything else people see in this one? As I say, it's pretty similar. Okay, I think we'll call that one approved as well subject to the same edits as the last one, Lars, as you said.

(Chris), go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Hi Mikey. Did I miss it or have we got to decide on a date, a return date, hopefully one that fits our plan and would be respectful to everybody?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I don't see it in the document. I think what we wound up with though is on the last call, we put that return date after Beijing. We decided it was pushing too hard to get this back pre-Beijing. So I think it was on the order of a week or so after Beijing.

Lars, Marika, do you remember what we wound up with there? Go ahead Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, I think it needs to be a minimum of 35 days for the LSO, and so it would be after Beijing. And then we'll calculate the day and just put it in accordingly, but it's 35 working days I believe.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that was my recollection is that we could just barely fit in before and it got too tight, and so we yielded to the inevitability and let it drop out after. And probably even if 35 days comes like two or three days after the Beijing meetings are over, it's probably not a bad idea to push it out another week because people are traveling and it would be a shame to lose comments just because, you know, it was too tight after Beijing.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, I was just going to reiterate or emphasize what you said there. Since we're already missing - not able to put it out in front of Beijing, it makes sense to just wait on whatever time folks will be spending in Beijing and just add that to the deadline.

Just inject the admission that folks have enough documents that are going to flood on top of their inbox right as they're leaving for Beijing, and they're going to be digging out from the documents when they get back from Beijing and it just seems cruel to throw one more log on that fire. So if we can hold off, you know, even a week after I think that would help.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, that seems like reasonable instructions. I saw an agreed checkmark go by from (Chris) who brought up the point, so thanks for bringing that up (Chris).

Anything else on this one? Okay, I think we'll call these both done. Thanks all.

And I think then from here we're onto item Number 3 which is the work group approach. And I'm sort of winging this, but I'm assuming that maybe we take a look at the work plan at this point? Is that the idea when we - put this one on the agenda and if so a copy of that up on the screen would be great. We'll give Lars a second to - yes, there we go. There it is.

This has been distributed and we talked a little bit about it last week. As with what most work plans, we probably want to focus on the near term part more right now and deal with the later bit later. But you know, I think it's good to take a moment to just to look this over again.

Just to remind you again of the color code. The orange things are sort of deliverable events. And I can't remember what the yellow ones are - they're check points. I'm not remembering why we have the one on 15th of April.

James Bladel: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh James, go ahead - sorry.

James Bladel: So the orange items - sorry, I tried to raise my hand but my Adobe connect is very slow right now - my fault. But the orange ones were, you know, major events, document deadlines or things of that nature, milestone events. And then the yellow were work client check-ins.

And I think we also highlighted in orange - I believe we also highlighted the meeting deadlines as other milestones for ICANN meetings. So those are just roughly what the colors mean.

And I think what we had to do today, looking up, was to just kind of sign off on this, and you know, I think we've had ample opportunity for folks to weigh in if there were any changes or concerns. So I think, for the most part, everybody is good with this.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, well that was sort of my sense was that we felt like this was a pretty good first cut work plan. Work plans are often changed but that this was at an overall level, a pretty good approach.

And so I would be quite happy to sort of skip through this. None of these things are ever cast in stone, it's really more of the structure of the work than

anything else. And so I think, unless somebody's got strong views one way or the other, we'll not dwell on this one today.

And move onto item Number 4 which is the data from ICANN compliance and ombudsmen. And I think we have to hand this over to Lars and Marika for that one because they're the ones that head the action.

Who wants to take that? Marika, Lars?

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Lars Hoffman: Hi there, this is Lars. Marika you go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Okay, I can talk about compliance. We actually reached out - this is Marika. We reached out to our compliance team and have asked them for input and some data on the charter question and they've said that they should be able to come back to us, I think, in the next two weeks. So hopefully we'll have some data for you shortly.

And I think Lars can give you an update on the outreach we did to the Ombudsmen.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, Lars?

Lars Hoffman: I just - I reached out to (Chris) with a similar question that Marika did with compliance - (Chris) the Ombudsmen - I'm sorry.

And he got back to me fairly swiftly, obviously his record is less detailed but it's what you would expect from compliance. And so he had to look about what complaints there were in general about people who had issues with transferring their domain in the widest possible sense.

And the numbers I just put on the chat because it's easier to copy and paste than just to tell you. It's about 20 this year and there's never been more than 50 over the past eight years it seems - to the offers.

None of them it seems - I've asked him to clarify but he hasn't gotten back to me. I refer to specifically to the IRTP. There were other general complaints to him, and that's all I have from him so far.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, but that's useful. I think that what would probably be helpful is to the extent that our charter questions can be lined up against those complaints and, you know, sort of align them with the charter questions. That would be one more way to sort of line these up.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Some of the additional feedback we got as well from the Ombudsman is that normally those kinds of complaints he would actually pass onto our compliance team. So normally those items, you know, if not resolved before they were handed over to the compliance team, should also come up on those data. So I'm not sure whether or otherwise will be duplicating because I think the Ombudsman doesn't track or, how do you say, tag rather the complaints in the same way as the compliance team does when they do try to identify to which issue it specifically relates and, you know, which policy it effects.

So I'm not sure if you're trying to detail that information for that which would actually duplicate what we are getting from compliance as well.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that is a fascinating question from several standpoints. One is the double counting kind of question that you're raising. Another one is sort of a process improvement thing just to make sure that the complaints aren't dropping between the cracks. But I'm not sure that's in our charter to chase.

So just sort of a heads-up to the Compliance and Ombudsman folks that it would be nice to know that there weren't any gaps between the two of them in terms of the handoff of those complaints. Because I agree, we don't want to double count them for sure.

Any other thoughts about this topic? All right, I think what we'll do then is keep moving. But many thanks, Lars and Marika for staying on top of that and sort of keep us informed as that process unfolds a bit. We'll want to make sure that we capture that information and pull it back into the relevant charter questions as we go here.

Unless there's anything else on that I think we'll move on to item Number 5 which is the charter questions and the discussions of how to tackle them.

And I could use a favor from Julia, Lars or Marika. If somebody could promote me to a host or - good, a presenter is fine. What I'll do is I'll do another one of these mind maps of mine and take notes on the screen in front of us as we go.

I'll just go through the motions here and get that going. Just a few more clicks here and we'll be in business. It looks like that's big enough to read. Sing out in the chat or something if it's too small.

And I could use another favor and that is to paste the charter questions maybe in a note on the other side of the screen just so I can copy and paste them in. I'm starting to get enough balls in the air that it's getting a little complicated to look up the charter right now.

The thought on this section was to actually begin, you know, at a fairly high level, a discussion of each charter question just to get an initial sense of the group and an initial sense of things that we might want to explore. While all

the questions are showing up, if somebody could just rattle off the first one for me so I can get it in here that would be really helpful.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Sorry, I don't have the first charter handy but I had a question for you and for the group.

Last time around we did a primer on transfers in general and how the process works. And I think that we talked about doing something like that again with the disputes. Was that correct?

Maybe this is a charter question zero is do we need some background on these things first before we can dive into the issues associated with the mechanisms?

Mikey O'Connor: That's a good question. You know, we had that on the agenda last time and - no, maybe it wasn't on the agenda, it was just in the work plan. That was probably it.

You know, we had a work plan item to determine training and information requirements, and then nowhere in the work plan did we actually have a training session or information requirement session. So maybe this is coming back home to roost and it seems like a good idea to me.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Some of you may recall but I think that was an IRTP almost Part A or B, but we did actually have at the stage a presentation that I think was given by (Roy) - no it wasn't. The name escapes me now, but actually somebody that was working for Neustar but has since left.

So we do have slides that were also included in the initial report or that were preliminary or the final issue reports - sorry, getting completely confused there. James is saying, "See." No, but actually on the TDRP I think that was earlier. I think that was at a - when we were talking about some other process. I don't remember what, I think it was A or RB.

But there are some slides there, but I think at the stage there was a feeling that maybe - or was done by a registry rep but they are involved in the process. So maybe one of the registry representatives will mind having a look at those slides and maybe using that as a basis. And then again - "Yes," James says with Eric Brown, he's correct as he gave that presentation.

But maybe that's a good basis to start from, so I think maybe someone from the registry side might be able to add to that or just provide an overview.

And it may be of interest as well to reach out to some of the providers that are involved in that. I don't think Kristina is on the call today, but (Naff) is one of the providers and I think as well the Asian Dispute Resolution Center is also a provider for the TDRP. So maybe they are able as well to provide from their perspective an overview of how it's done from their side so that we may be at least cover the TDRP side of things.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Marika. Oh, I've got a bad feeling about my power. If I suddenly drop off this call it's because the power just went out. We're in the middle of a blizzard here in my part of Wisconsin, so James you may get to take over whether you want to or not.

Barbara?

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. Thank you Mikey.

I just wanted to say that, you know, as a registrar rep, I'm happy to take a look at it. If somebody can make sure that they forward it over to me just so I

know I'm looking at the right documents, then I'm happy to look at the processes.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe we'll give Lars that action. Okay, thanks James. Nothing like question zero, I love ripe zero things. They are usually the most interesting.

All right, so here are our charter questions. So let me just - I'm not sure how many of these we'll get through today but - that's not satisfactory, sorry. That's better, easier to keep track of on the screen.

So taking a look at this one, it says, "Whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions."

And one has to remember that some of these questions - well, all of these questions were developed quite some number of years ago, and in some cases, requirements have changed, etcetera. But the situation back, you know, for those of us who have been on these all along, we sort of have to cast our mind back to around 2007 and the state of the various agreements when we think of the context of these.

So I think perhaps for almost all of these, one of the things that we're probably going to have to want to take a look at is something along the line of what has changed since this question was posed. I'll just put that in.

And then from there, I guess I'm interested in the sense of the group. Is there anybody here that has strong feelings against this idea to the extent that

these don't exist today? Quite frankly, I'm not sure whether reports like this exist yet or not, maybe that's the first question.

Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Thank you Mikey, this is Barbara. So I think it goes back to - I don't really have any strong preference one way or the other relative to the reporting. But one of the things that I believe we had raised as the Registry Stakeholder Group is whether or not it's still, in light of the new gTLDs coming on board, if it still makes sense for registry operators to even be a first level dispute resolution provider given that, you know, we're going to have a lot of registries out there that are going to have the requirement to have the ability to do this.

But yet the likelihood of them actually seeing a dispute probably is pretty small, you know, the brands especially. There's not going to be transfers typically in most of those cases if they've selected one registrar to register the domain names for them.

So you know, I think the bigger question is, you know, when you're asking what's changed, you know, should we have this or should we go to an approach similar to what there is with the UDRP where you just have ICANN approved providers, if you will.

Mikey O'Connor: That is a fascinating question, and the - thanks Marika. The question I think that's on my mind is whether that's in scope. It sounds like one we should think about given this is the last one, this is sort of the last chance.

Barbara, for sure it seems to me like that's a candidate for the any other comments section of the registry's response to our calls or comments. And I'm wondering if we - I guess I'm sort of looking to you some of you older hands at this; James, Avri.

Given that this is the last one of this series, how do we want to handle what are very interesting questions that - I'm just scanning the other charter questions to see if there's a graceful place in the charter questions to put that issue that Barbara just raised. And if not, what I think I'll do is build a new - I think I'm going to put this in our catch-all. I'll build a catch-all bucket for now so that we don't lose it and we can sort of at our leisure puzzle our way through the scope thing.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Just a thought here. You know, recognizing that the pattern from IRTP (unintelligible) has been to collect or catalog any new ideas or questions or issues that we've identified along the way and either, you know, absorbed them into our IRTP or tack them on to one of the other ones where we felt it was appropriate.

I think this being the last instance of the IRTP Working Groups, I think we have to be careful about doing that. Because one, you know, we could - it's a slippery slope to overloading this working group. And two, you know, it's - there's no - this is the caboose. There are no other cars coming down the tracks to drive these issues onto.

So I think we have to kind of balance those two considerations fairly judicially in determining whether or not we - whether we add to the scope of the charter questions to this working group.

And I would just come down on the side of only under extreme duress. Like yes, we really can't proceed unless we resolve this question, or this is something that has come up since the original charter or some other sort of very compelling case or criteria for adding onto the charter. Otherwise, I think we should guard it as jealously as we can within reason. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. Yes, it is tricky. I think we just have to, right now, acknowledge that it's tricky and sort of take these on a case-by-case basis.

And Barbara, I think one of the interesting puzzlers that maybe the registries could help with could be to make the distinction between the number of registries and the number of registry back-end providers and the extent to which back-end providers would be doing most of the heavy lifting on this.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Could I be in the queue?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This might actually be an item that may come up as well in the discussions on whether the procedure should be opened up to registrants. Because the thing may be linked to that discussion, there may be indeed a conclusion or a linking in then in each new gTLDs and many more registries coming on board and saying, "Well, with opening up to registrants," of course there's the potential impact on the number of cases.

And there you could potentially draw a conclusion and say, "Okay, for that reason you may want to indeed have only one set of providers," and then that should actually involve registries for example. So I think it's an item that may in any case, or that specific item, come up in other items for the discussion.

And I think linked to that is as well the point we've made in the issue report is that in relation to the change of registrant policy, we actually didn't give any consideration in relation to that discussion on how disputes should be handled under that policy. So that is another item that will need to be reviewed in the context of the TVRP, so there may be a need in any case to do a, you know, broader review of what needs to be changed in the TVRP to accommodate, you know, potential changes if the group would decide it would be opened up to registrants and how to accommodate as well the

disputes in relation to change of registrant policy that may allow for, you know, addressing some of the questions that come up.

So it think, you know, in conclusion, I think it's good to list those questions that we may initially believe are not per se in scope or be separate issues. But I think some of them may be pulled back in as we start deliberating on these items.

And one other note I wanted to make as well, if you do come up with certain questions that some have noted that indeed there is no IRTPVs or even foreseen at this stage. Of course there's always the option as well, should the group decide that there is a particular issue you would want to take up, but you don't see as part of your charter, to actually go back to the GNSO Council and say, "Well we've uncovered, you know, pretty big gap and we do believe we can solve relatively easy within our mandate, so we would like to suggest, you know, add it to the charter."

So that's also an alternative approach you could consider the panning on the issues you're identifying.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think we're on the right track, you know, documenting the caboose, etcetera.

Let's see, Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Thanks Mikey, this is Barbara again. I think the main reason we felt that it (unintelligible) because so many of the charter questions in this particular PDP are related to the transfer dispute and, you know, potential modifications to that dispute. So I think we've, you know, felt that it does belong in this PDP.

And obviously, you know, when all these questions even came about, it wasn't a very different world than what we're looking at, you know, beginning this year with the large number of registry operators.

As far as how many of the registry operators will have back-end service providers that would be able to provide this for them, you know, that is a very good question.

I know that from our perspective, you know, we plan to deliver, you know, technical services, not necessarily policy related services. That's not to say that all - and I'm speaking from VeriSign's perspective, that's not necessarily the say that all, you know, all registry back-end service providers, you know, are going to go that route. I think maybe some will be willing to do some additional policy administration type work as well.

But you know, that's definitely feedback that I can get from the Registry Stakeholder Group to see what at least those operators that are doing back-end registry services would be offering in this line.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Barbara. I think, you know, I think this is great. I think we're sort of on the right track of let's not lose track of this. It's clearly something that's important to a lot of people.

It may or may not fit, you know, I'm drawn to your point about, you know, the number of charter questions. The deal with the TDRP and it's true that all of those were swept into this piece of IRTP for a reason. And so that sways me in that direction.

I don't want to linger on this today. Clearly this isn't one we're going to solve today but I think it's terrific that we've captured it.

If we go back to the charter question that we were working on, is there anything else that falls out of that sort of like that question of Barbara's did

that people want to mention right now? Because clearly that was a very productive discussion we just had about the question of Barbara's. And I guess I'm reluctant to try and get a sense of the group right now; I'll sort of wait for that.

Let's move on to the next one unless there's something. Sorry for the jumpy screen. That was due to a million tons of snow going off the roof and causing the power to flicker.

This is one - Bob, you're still on the call, good. James is not by-the-way.

I think, Bob, you were saying something about more data, right? Isn't this one that you wanted to maybe see if we really had a problem to solve at all or am I just miss remembering?

Bob Mountain: I think, you know, this is Bob. I think in general that was my request. Before we go diving into solutions that we, you know, take some kind of measurement as to what the degree of the problem is. I'm not sure if it was necessarily for this one specific issue, I think my comment was more in general.

But you know, with that said, I think I would agree that this one probably would fit well into that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think this one works better for that than say the first one because, you know, I'm not sure that there is a recordable event associated with inadequate reporting that we can point to and say you know, "213 people were frustrated by bad reports in 2012," you know, whereas this one I think is somewhat easier to get some documentation for.

Does that sort of fit with your view or are you thinking even data for charter question A would be useful, Bob?

Bob Mountain: Let's see. I think B is definitely quantifiable, so I guess the trick is, you know, pursuing the stakeholders to get the data back and to what degree they're willing to, you know, expose those numbers. You know, probably anonymizing it is key like I think we did the last time.

I'm just rereading A just to see if that - probably that's not as much a problem as a sentiment as to whether it needs improvement. You know, we're hypothesizing that it does here.

Do we go out to the stakeholders, and you know, confirm that? Do we poll them? I guess that would be, you know, probably a slightly different way to get the data but it's still I think a valid approach.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's an idea.

Bob Mountain: That's my opinion.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I think the anonymizing clearly is going to be - oh sure, I can spell anonymizing.

Bob Mountain: I don't know if that's a real word anyways.

Mikey O'Connor: Good, then I don't have to worry about spelling it wrong. One of the big drawbacks to this particular outline is that it doesn't have spell-checking in it. And I've never been any good at spelling, so this is really putting me in a difficult spot.

Anything else about this one? This is one that is a big deal for me, not necessarily to change the TDRP, but just to continue to address the multiple transfer domain hopping thing. So you know, this is personally one that I'm interested in.

But I think this is also a good candidate for - remember how much times have changed discussions because it may be that some of the other things that we've done have improved this, etcetera, etcetera. So that's kind of my initial reaction to that.

Bob Mountain: Yes, this is Bob. Yes, the question I would have on this one is my understanding is the concern is around registration hopping and moving away to, you know, people who are harder to reach.

So if we are to get data, I assume we're really talking about getting data from the people who are on the early part of that, you know, that established in traditional players. It's going to be harder to get data from the, you know, people who are down-the-line on the hopping, I'm assuming.

So I think we probably just need to set expectations on how far the trail goes with, you know, getting feedback on this particular one.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, and I would think that actually those registrars that are early in the chains are the registrars who are dealing with the customer who calls them and says, "Yikes, my domain has been stolen." But you're right, the data we get will tend to be biased, so maybe that's the thing to acknowledge.

Barbara Knight: Just to follow up, I'm not sure - it might be - we might not have the entire chain documented. We might just have the initial departure or, you know, the first couple of hops. So I'm not sure if biased or...

Mikey O'Connor: Incomplete maybe.

Barbara Knight: ...indicative but not complete. Right, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's a good thought. Kevin, go ahead.

Kevin Erdman: Yes, this is Kevin. I just wanted to chime in on this one as I thought that this would be one where, I think, having data would be very pertinent because, you know, we have this image that there is somebody out there that is hijacking a lot of domains and they're skipping them around in order to avoid, you know, the post-transfer, figuring out who it was that took the domain. And, you know, while we have antidotal instances of that, I don't know that we have real good statistical evidence.

So I'm wondering if this is a problem that's more in the line of somebody, you know, let's their domain drop out and then it starts getting hopped and they're trying to figure out how to get it back rather than an actual, you know, high jacking event. So that's where I think having real data from somebody would clarify this a whole lot more than us speculating about it for a long period of time. That's just my comment.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's a good comment. And it's too bad James isn't on the call because I think I pinged him either offline or in a private chat because I was curious whether this was going to be impossible to get. So then, you know, what needs to be - you know, then we need to think about how we're going to handle that.

And the sense that I got from James was that he thought that he would be able to get some sort of data on these lines. Clearly, they would have to be anonymized, and clearly they would have to be mathed in such a way that it didn't give away, say the number of high jacking events a year at Go Daddy.

And presumably that issue would be the same for any registrar that, you know, you don't want to be announcing to the world precisely how many times domains are high jacked.

And so I think there's a puzzler in terms of how to mask that data, but I think there's a willingness to try and figure that out. It's just my - I hope I haven't put words in James' mouth. He can beat me up on the next call.

Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Thanks Mikey, this is Barbara. So, you know, I can say from a registry operator's perspective, the number of disputes that we're getting now - and we probably get more than any of the other registry operators - is very, very small.

And those that have multiple hops, if you will, those are, you know, those are obviously a subset. So I think in order to get any sort of meaningful data, we would have to get it from the registrars. And I'm not sure, you know, how the registrars track it and whether or not they would be able to, you know, give us some high level numbers of how many issues are raised to them for resolution that they, you know, have multiple hops. I'm just - I'm not sure how you get a number that's going to be meaningful.

Mikey O'Connor: Well we may wind up with a situation - and again, I think what I'm going to do is capture this point but wait until James, at a minimum and some of the other larger registrars are on the call, to sort of work through this.

Because I think the answer that you would get from a registrar like Go Daddy is, "Yes this happens and it happens enough that we're concerned about it."

And then the question is, you know, how do we document that sufficiently? And so I think the main thing that I want to get on this point was that this is a good candidate for that kind of data if we can figure out how to develop it.

Volker, go ahead. Oh the masked stranger is gone, Volker is back.

Volker Greimann: Yes, you have an old man attitude now so prepare for punishment.

No, I wanted to go into this as well. We see a couple of those complaints each year. I don't think it's more than one a month.

But for us as a registrar, it's very hard to recognize the high jacking attempt from any other transfer because what we see is a transfer first and foremost where we have everything that's involved in a normal transfer to be correct. So we have a confirmation on the FOA and then we have (unintelligible) off code, and then we have a third party complaining that there has been a high jack. And mostly, the former registrar saying, "Yes we have this complaint that there was a high jack, but we can't provide any evidence of that affect."

And so for us as a gaining registrar, it's very difficult to determine if this is actually a high jack and how do we deal with that. And I haven't really found an all-inclusive answer to that yet.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, and that says to me there's the opportunity to - no, I'm not going to go there actually. I could explode our scope - never mind.

Somebody else was in the queue but they dropped out and that's lovely because it's three minutes till the top of the hour. Oh there's - Avri's hand went up and now went down.

Avri, you want to chime in with something quick before we wrap up?

I do note that anonymize is in the dictionary, and I did misspell it, so there you go.

Avri Doria: I don't think I ever put my hand up - I didn't.

Volker Greimann: I think my hand is going down.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, never mind. Oh Bob's hand is up. Okay, go ahead Bob.

Bob Mountain: My hand was up - thanks Mikey, this is Bob. My hand was up, I was going to start jumping into the rat hole of survey structure and questions but I thought...

Mikey O'Connor: No, no, no, no. We're not going there. We'll save that for another day.

Bob Mountain: Yes, right - that tar pit. But hey, are we going to talk about the ICANN face-to-face meeting before we finish up today?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I'm going to give it about two minutes starting right now.

                  The plan at this point is that we're going to do it at seven thirty in the morning on Wednesday. Breakfast hopefully, treats of some sort to bribe people to show up. It will be a working meeting with a little pair of bookends to sort of introduce the topic at the beginning and take questions at the end.

                  But we will do this in a similar way to the ones that we did - I think the one in Brussels was the working meeting. So you know, there won't be a big, fancy slide deck. We may steal some material out of the initial report by way of introduction for people. So that's kind of the sketch that I have in my head.

                  Anything on your mind about that Bob? Yes, go ahead; your hand is up.

Bob Mountain: Yes. Do we want to invite outsiders then or is it just going to be a working group strictly internal of our meeting?

Mikey O'Connor: I think, you know, it will be a public meeting. We'll put it up in the schedule, encourage people to come. You know, it is a great chance to give people to speak to our charter questions that I don't think we want to miss that chance.

Bob Mountain: Yes, I know in Costa Rica were actually, you know, trying to build attendance to that. So I'm not sure if it's that desirable where we should be doing that okay or if it's just, you know, post it and that's good enough.

Mikey O'Connor:	Yes, I wouldn't think that these issues are quite as hot as the issues that we were dealing with in Costa Rica. You know, that might be - let's save that question for next time because we've lost so many people already here at the top of the hour.

So I think that's it. It's twelve sharp here, and anything else on the Beijing meeting on people's minds? Yes, only the die-hards, especially on Wednesday after music night. That's good. Okay, I think that's it.

Julia, you can wrap up the call for us. I thank you for your help today.

And thanks all. I will not be on the call next week probably because I have jury duty. I may be able to monitor the call, but I certainly won't be leading it. So next week you'll have James back.

See you soon. That's it for me, bye-bye.

Group:	Thanks Mikey.

END