Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 6 April 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 6 April 2010 at 1400 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.

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-b-20100406.mp3

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG – Chair*

Berry Cobb – CBUC*

Mikey O'Connor – CBUC*

James Bladel – RrSG*

Chris Chaplow – CBUC*

Michael Collins – Individual*

Paul Diaz – RrSG

Matt Serlin – RrSG

Matt Mansell -RrSG

Barbara Steele – RySG

Anil George – IPC

Baudoin Schombe – At-Large

Staff:

Margie Milam

Glen de Saint Gery

Daivd Giza

Apologies:

Marika Konings – ICANN Staff support

Olof Nordling – ICANN Staff

Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon everyone. This is the IRTPB call on the 6th of April. On the call we have Baudoin Schombe, Michele Neylon, Barbara Steele, Mikey O'Connor, Chris Chaplow, Matt Mansell, James Bladel, Michael Collins, Berry Cobb. And Matt Serlin has just joined. And for staff we have Margie Milam, David Giza, and Glen de Saint Géry, myself. Thank you Michele. Over to you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Do we have any apologies?

Glen de Saint Géry: We have apologies from Kevin Erdman. And Paul Diaz has just joined.

Man: So should I give out Paul Diaz for being bold?

Man: No we won't. We will be nice to him.

Man: All right. Good afternoon everybody. Since James is in an airport I think we'll let him give that very brief update very quickly now. So James if you could take yourself off mute please.

James Bladel: Hi Michele. Can you hear me alright?

Michele Neylon: Yep.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. So just an update from the sub team on the transfer reverse process. We were able to get some very valuable feedback from other registrars - registries. And I can - policy and legal council as well. I thought that that was very good. I consolidated that into some sort of an organized list that we can present to the sub team.

And then clean up the - clean up the draft proposal. And then get that to this working group for review. So the plan at this point is that the working group is (attempted) to meet on Thursday. This is the sub team. And then we will clean up that document. Incorporate the comments and feedback, and then present that to their group one week from today on April 13.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions or comments? Or anything else on this?

James Bladel: (And then) - for those - this is James again. And for those who weren't paying attention or didn't see it in the press industry, there was some pretty - a couple of very high profile hijackings over the holiday weekend. Domainial (sic) hijackings and I think that that's a - if nothing else, this really serves as a timely reminder that this process is sorely needed in the community.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody have any other comments on this? No. Okay. I see that Matt Mansell has joined us today. Matt are you on the call?

Matt Mansell: I am and apologies - there was no apology last week.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. It will be duly noted next to my (CU) - you shall be horse whipped, don't worry. So everybody Matt - I presume that most of the

registrars know Matt. And some of the others might know Matt. Matt would you care to introduce yourself very briefly.

Matt Mansell: Yeah of course. I am Matt Mansell from (message it all) domainmonster.com, and this is the first real ICANN PGP I've been involved in. So apologies I'm a little slow to catch up with it. Spent some time reading all the documentation. But I am sure I am miles behind still, but trying my best.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Matt. Okay then. You - you all were had a small little bit of - dare I say homework which was to have a look at the initial report that Marika had dropped it off some time ago. Well back in February I think it was. Have any of you had a chance to have a look at it? Rather than asking have you all looked at it? I'm sure you haven't. Because I....

Man: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Grace. At least two people have. Woo hoo. Mikey have you had a chance to look at this?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I am ashamed to admit that having asked for the time to do it I did not. I have been a little distracted with the VI - sorry about that.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. We're - somebody has to take a bullet. And you took the bullet for VI.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Just blame who?

Mikey O'Connor: Blame Mikey.

Michele Neylon: Well we're going to anyway. Don't worry about that. Yeah you should know by now that you're always going to be blamed. Okay has anybody had a chance - those of you who have had a chance to read over it? Do you have any initial faults or comments?

Man: My thought with the working group deliberations (in Section 5.) It's a lot better than I could have done. (Picking) out all of those conversations. Thank.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So Marika did a wonderful job is what you're saying.

Man: In a word yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. She's not here this week so we get - so we'll have to remind her next week. Anybody else have any other thoughts on this?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry just stating the obvious. That we definitely need to fill in the blanks for what our proposed recommendations are going to be and start developing you know, rough drafts. Or bullet point straw men of what those are going to start to look like.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Very good. Michael Collins?

Man: I bet he's on mute. Hey Michael I think you're on mute.

Michele Neylon: Michael are you there?

Michael Collins: Can you hear me now? Hello?

Man: Now we can hear you. Yeah. That's good.

Michael Collins: Oh darn. I think my unmute didn't work the first time. I apologize. I wasted a lot of time because really I was just going to comment that - I was going to say pretty much the same thing as the gentleman before. I apologize to that party. I forgot his name. So we need to work on our conclusions. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Conclusions - so conclusions are the thing you want to look at? Okay. Okay does anybody have any major issues with anything that Marika has put on the document to date? I will take that silence to mean no. Okay? Margie what's the exact process here with moving this forward if people don't have any massive reports - issues with and just want to look at conclusions? What's the next step?

Margie Milam: I guess - I haven't been too involved in this group. I assume you have to pick the particular topic that you want reach a conclusion on. And either have sub group work on it or you know, just break it down by issue. And then (Murray) can update the report you know, as you guys reach conclusions.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Fair enough. Okay then. So how about we take it on an issue by issue basis? And then work our way through it. Now one of the issues is being dealt with by a sub group already. In terms of the fast - the rapid - what are we calling it at the moment? Mikey what are we calling

it? The rapid return? The fast return? The quick return? Do we have name?

Man: Transfer restore.

Michele Neylon: Oh transfer restores. Thank you. I knew we'd given it a wonderful name. But I couldn't remember what it was. Okay so what that tells - that's dealing with one of the issues I believe. That's - that's for Issue A.

Man: Right.

Michele Neylon: That's correct. Right?

Man: Yeah. That's right.

Michele Neylon: Is there anything else in Issue A that we need to deal with?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that - and I would have to think about this is a bit. But one of the things we probably want to take a look at is what's inside and outside of the transfer restore process. My recollection is that that's a fairly narrowly framed process.

And there may be some activities outside of the boundaries of that that we'll want to also take a look at. The one that comes to mind is I think inside transfer restore we don't talk much about the complaint process. The ICANN complaint process as an - escalation mechanism. And we may want to include a discussion of that in this broader topic. So I think the only thing that I caution us on is that there may be a few things that fall outside of transfer restore that we need to address in this broader issue.

Michele Neylon: Okay. All right. Is there anything else within Issue A? No? Okay. Alright Issue B. With additional prop - provisions along - on undoing inappropriate (unintelligible) especially in regards to disputes and registrant (that) had been contact.

The policy is clear. The registrant can overrule the AC. But how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar. Now we've discussed this quite a bit. Is there any lack of clarity or misunderstanding? Or anything in relation to this issue? Are we happy enough with what this issue covers? (Taylor) we've been talking about it for months. Okay. Michael Collins and then James.

Michael Collins: I think that we've talked about it a lot but I am not happy with the progress. I think we've acknowledged the problem and stated obstacles to solving the problem. But we haven't really offered any solutions. We should suggest any and all groups reviewing who is service to consider using Iris or some equivalent method to securely provide registrant email contact info to gaining registrars I think.

And we should probably - and include in our conclusion that we've (hoped) - that as a part of any future changes to a service, a method would be provide to enable registrant information. To - to go to gaining registrars. I think we talk about it but we don't really offer it as a recommendation. And that's all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. James.

James Bladel: Yes. Quickly on Issue B I wanted to point out that - and perhaps give a little bit of a sneak preview of a draft proposal for Issue A is that the

envision transfer reversal process that we've drafted up would only be available to the registrant and not the admin contact. So while both the registrar the admin contact can initiate the transfer. Only the registrant could reverse the transfer. And I think that we may have - whether we set up to do that or not. I think that we've possibly created a mechanism that addresses this problem.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Michael Collins: Actually James - if I might interrupt. I think that is the problem rather than a solution to the problem.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: I didn't understand that Michael.

Michael Collins: I think that that is the problem. That the admin can initiate it and that the registrant can - can reverse it. I think that is the problem rather than a solution to the problem.

James Bladel: Well this new procedure that we're you know, kind of cobbling together as a sub team Michael would formalize that would provide a standard or uniformed mechanism to reverse transfers whereas registrants just agreed with the transfer versus the admin contact. So I think the answer is in this you know, should this go through under this new mechanism. You know, they - the erroneous transfers would still occur but the registrant would have the ability to reverse them.

Michael Collins: Yeah. That's what I see as the problem.

James Bladel: Okay. So you see it as a problem as that it's a diminishment of the administrative contact ability to transfer and then keep transferred?

Michael Collins: No. I - and keep in mind my background on it a little bit. I apologize but it is a focus. But if someone has the ability to transfer (domain name) that's often used as an evidence of ownership because we don't really have anything else today as evidence of ownership. It's really difficult as a broker or as a buyer of a domain name. Sorry about my dog here (it just wants something). But if the admin can transfer it and then a financial exchange takes place. And then it can be reversed. I think that's a real problem.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: I would like to see the admin not be able to transfer the domain name at all. Or to have - it'd be authoritative I suppose or at least work towards that or at least in the recommendation I had that - you know, if we can't do it today that we should at least recommend it to future who is groups that Iris or something be done. And you know, in future improvements to who is - that this situation - this problem at least be considered then. If we can't solve it today.

James Bladel: Okay. I think we're talking about possibly two different problems Michael which is why I wasn't understanding you earlier. And probably why I was probably sounding a little more confusing. I think the issue that we we're - that I think we're trying to cover under thing procedure for Issue A was one where - for example registrants would hire out with a Web hosting firm.

And the Web hosting firm would try and retrain control of the registration. I don't like to use the word ownership but control of the registration after some sort of a commercial relationship had ended whether, you know, an employee was let go or whether, you know, development contact ended.

And there was, you know, kind of this dispute on going of you know, how to resolve those types of things. So I think by clearly defining that you know, where (we're) transfer authority and reversal authority lives. I thought we were trying to address something like that. But I see there is a queue building up behind me so I will stop talking about it now.

Michele Neylon: Maybe it might be something which we could follow up on the (list) in a bit more detail.

James Bladel: Well I think we would (need) to describe the problems a little bit better Michele. Because I wasn't understanding....

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: This is what I mean. Is it in - it might - it might be helpful if Michael could compost to the list a detail of the problem he perceives. And you can post as well your - what you perceive as being a problem. It might make it a little bit clearer. Mikey and then Paul please.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Actually I was about to take my hand down. Because I think that indeed these are two different problems. So James' last little bit I think is on the right track. I think that the issue that Michael is raising is a separate issue from the one that we're addressing with the - with the transfer return.

And I think really what one is sort of a procedural almost technical complication. And the other is really a deep conversation about who has authority that, you know, - the point that Michael is raising I think is who has what kind of authority over transferring a name. And that definition while clear in policy is not clear in implementation. So you know, I think we're on the right track. I agree a conversation on the list would be a good idea. And then try and get to a resolution on this.

But I think they are quite different.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Paul, Chris, then Michael. Or Michael do you want come back on anything Mikey is saying now? I will give you that.

Michael Collins: No. In order. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. No problem. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yeah. Thank Michele. Yeah Michael I recognize this issue. You brought it up in IRTTA as well. The whole question about admin versus registrant. And I - just for the record I think it's a great idea to have a discussion on the list. So that you know, we can flash out a perhaps provide a little history for people who may not have been part of the A Group.

What the concerns are I certainly would - will weigh in a just remind everybody right now that there is also the unintended consequence here. We are all - registrars are required to publish the admin contact email, you know, if we go ahead and make recommendation to change who has priority there you could be creating the unintended

consequence of a security, a major security problem in that, you know, you would now have that information where as the registrant email contact is not a required field.

Registers - registrars like that because that provides a bit of security if there is a conflict or a dispute over a transfer. Haven't necessarily thought through all the way you know, recommending that admin no longer has any authority to initiate a transfer.

This is certainly one possibility. I am not sure Iris or any other system is necessarily the silver bullet here. There are certainly implementation questions - concerns about Iris. It's not anything that would happen in the near term. Even in ICANN time, that's something that is well off into the future. So it would be great to have a debate. But I just you know, kind of sensitize everybody - remind everybody that this is a tricky one. And it will require a lot of thinking through.

Good debate to have. But I agree I think let's keep transfer restore focused on the narrow little slice that we're trying to have it address, this much more fundamental question about admin versus registrant authorities and how to make sure that you don't have these unintended consequences or these problems after certain transactions. A good debate to have. Let's tick it off on the list.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah. Although by now it might be stating the obvious, but I sort of categorized things in my own mind. So here we're talking of two different problems and the confusion between them. One, where the registrants and the admin contacts are in unison, as it were, in the

other where the two parties are in dispute. And I wonder perhaps some of the registrars who have dealt with some of these hijack problems might be able to enlighten us if that's easy to detect. Is it easy to categorize on or the other straight away? Or is it a bit of a mix up?

Michele Neylon: Anybody? Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yeah. Just (following up) Chris. When you say in unison the two, do you mean that - the same - (answers) the same person as both admin and registrant? I wouldn't see the conflict. What do you mean unison in that they both agree which again, why would there be a conflict?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me just - let me take a crack at clarifying. I think what Chris is getting at is - let's say that there is one situation where a domain has been transferred where both the admin contract - contact and the registrant agree that that's a bad thing. And another situation where a domain has been transferred and they disagree. And I think that what this particular issue is talking about is when they disagree. When they agree that the transfer away has been - is a bad thing. Then this issue is kind of moved.

Man: Okay. Can I follow up?

Michele Neylon: Please do.

Man: Okay thanks for (Kelly)'s poll again. Yeah. Look, when they both agree it's very simple for the - in this case a losing registrar the original registrar to work with them to get it because fundamentally the case was - it's a case of hijacking.

In the instance of where there is a disagreement between registrant and admin we're back to Michael's original concern or question, registrant will overrule and it leads - my registrant network solutions will work with the registrant as the ultimate authority with a name. And we don't try to insert ourselves arbitrating or adjudicating a dispute between the admin and the registrant. We will work with the registrant as policy ICANN rules currently - as they currently exist.

Michele Neylon: Michael?

Michael Collins: I'm not sure I have anything else to say. There's been enough - I - except just a reminder.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: Okay. I know I was - well except just as a reminder that not only are their legitimate sales of domain names, you know, but there is also legitimates sales. And quite often the financial motive behind hijackings are to solid domain name in the marketplace. And the - and so there is victims on both sides.

And it would be really good if we could reduce the hijackings and reduce this problem. But also we have - we have no real way. It's a very difficult thing to know who has the right to solve something in this - in this space. And I was just trying to make it a little more secure on both sides. That's all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any comments on this? Okay then. I would suggest then that we could try and (flash) out some of these matters on the main list so that people have an opportunity to put

- to provide you know, examples of what they're talking about so we can actually see what people are talking about rather than just kind of, "Oh I like this idea." Ah, what the hell? Sorry the screen is all doing weird things. Margie what're you doing to me?

Margie Milam: Sorry. I goofed. I will pull them back up.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anyway, moving on. Okay. So Issue C which is in relation to whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant near a change of registrar. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant which often figures in hijacking cases. Does anybody have any further comments on this? Okay. Does every - what does - okay Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: I guess I was going to ask James if he's still here. Because I thought James might have some perspective on how this is - how this is received by the customers. And how well it functions because I think it's a good idea to reduce hijackings. And I think this is a tool that may be used very well to reduce hijackings by the regist - by some registrars already.

And again, anything that we can do to make these - make the domains more secure is probably a good thing provided it doesn't - does the unintended negative consequences aren't too great. And he may have more experience on what we can do to minimize this unintended consequence.

James Bladel: Hi this is James. And you know, we - famously - or infamously do have an opt in sixty day lock for changes of registrant that prevent a name from transferring. Feel like you know, from talking to our domain

services folks (that deal with that) the very effective tool against hijacking.

I think that the more sophisticated attack will probably learn what our procedures are. And learn you know, other ways around them. Like finding other weak links in the system whether it's you know, some - something like a public email account like Gmail or Yahoo or something like that. They'll go and look for something else. But I think that - we've seen it both ways. I think that you know, for - when it works and when it prevents an attempted hijacking. I think that that's probably quietly happening in this kind of (scheme) all the time.

I think that if it - just any attention at all its attention at all its attention for introducing delay in a commercial transaction between you know, two domain registrants. So I think that you know, that's probably why it's become more of a lightning rod than you know, there's not going to be any (tip or take) parades for this policy. But - but I think it does good work.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt?

Matt Serlin: Yeah. I will - I'll sort of agree and disagree with James. I mean I'm all for measures to limit the amount of domain hijackings we have. But our experience has been that that's a pretty broad breast stroke in which to apply a policy that, you know, to James' point I think there is lots of ways that people find ways around that and our experience has been.

And James kind of alluded to this you know, it does introduce delays when you have a party that's buying a domain from another party or, you know, as on UDRP decision and transfers you know, and updates

the ownership and then has to wait another sixty days. And so I'm actually not a fan of that becoming a policy that every registrar would have to implement.

I just - I think its way too broad of a policy to address a very specific issue.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James and then Matt.

James Bladel: Yeah. Just to respond. I think Matt's correct. I don't think that we would hold up a UDRP decision for this Matt. But I - you know, I'd have to check on that. But you know, I just want to empathize once again that we very clearly say it on our Website. That if your intention is - (about) changing this registrar - if your intention is to move it to another registrar we ask that you reverse that sequence. Move it first and then change the registrar at the new registrar. So we're essentially saying you know, reverse the process - or the sequence from changing the contact information versus changing the registrar. Why not transfer it first and then change the registrar?

Matt Serlin: Because the transfer itself is not a trade if you will. So I think that that's an important distinction. A lot of folks view a transfer as a trade. A lot of folks view a change of registrant as a trade. We're trying to give folks a recipe for distance not time, we're trying to get folks a recipe on how to you know, how to conduct that (smoothly) without encountering the logistics of a legitimate transaction.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt Mansell?

Matt Mansell: I think the point that James made you know, is it - is - simply the fact that the change of registrant is a very good indicator of fraud. So wouldn't a solution (varies)? Is it a workable solution? I don't know. The - when the transfer takes place - or when the transfer is notified to the new registrar if there has been a change of registrar within a period of time, the new registrar is notified of that in some way so that you know, the - it can be dealt with accordingly.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Change in registrant. Registrant you mean. Is it?

Matt Mansell: Registrant. Yeah sorry. But to provide that information forward for (what that it was).

Michele Neylon: And how would you do this?

Matt Mansell: That's what I don't know.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And American Matt?

Matt Serlin: American Matt? Wow.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Or I can have original Matt and new Matt. I could have American Matt and English Matt. Or I could just have English Matt. Or I could have younger Matt and older Matt. I mean guys you choose. I don't mind.

Matt Mansell: As long as I'm the younger.

Michele Neylon: Well either that or else you're - I gather that you're really going heavy on the oil of Olay.

Matt Serlin: Yeah. Thanks Michele. I don't want to - you know, I don't want to spend too much time in this. But just to pick up on what James said. I mean our experience with GoDaddy frankly is really not at all (coloring) my - my opinion on this. I mean actually they're great to work with on this.

My fear frankly is when you expose it to the entire registrar community. And you've got registrars that we already know are unresponsive dealing with other things, that this is just going to become one more thing that's a hurdle that people have to try to you know, contact customer service. Frankly it's (reachable) are the folks at GoDaddy and things like that. So just to be clear you know, my - I'm actually you know, we work really with GoDaddy.

And when issues come up we resolve them. That's not at all my concern. My concern is this becoming policy that every registrar has to deal with. And now registrants are trying to track down customer service folks or registrars that we know are difficult to get in touch with.

Michele Neylon: Just one thing Matt. Just - if you were to take the unresponsive, slow to act registrar out of the equation would you have any issue with the concept?

Matt Serlin: Yeah. I mean I - just on the face of it. I still would. I mean I think it would - you know, maybe there is another step in the process that you can do to validate. But you know, we do a lot of you know, - a lot of our

clients go through corporate mergers and acquisitions and things like that.

So for legal reasons they're having to update the registrant of a domain name. And then to you know, have to keep a name at that registrar for another sixty days potentially creates you know, problems. And James is right, you know, transfer the name then do the registrant change. So there are ways to work around that. And - but again I just don't know that you know, that changing the entire - that adding such a you know, a time constraint of six - another sixty days after registrant change before you can do a registrar transfer. I am hesitant to say that that's a good idea. A, and B that it's really going to prevent a lot of hijackings that we see.

Michele Neylon: Chris you had your hand up. I think.

Chris Chaplow: Must be left up from before.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Never mind. Alright. That's okay. James then Mikey.

James Bladel: Yeah. I just wanted to follow up and agree with Matt. (Buster) Matt - I know Matt that you know, that is a problem. Is (another way of) slow responses to but non responses registrars. And you know, I think that we also have to bare in mind that you know, when we're talking about hijacking we're talking about (meaning) Web site possibly a revenue generating Website that is offline and out of commission.

So you know the damages could be measured in minutes or hours. So you know, even a slow responding registrar to your point Michele is not acceptable. And I think it's that fear you know, that we would lose

control to one of those types of registrars. Not to Paul's organization or Michele's organization or Matt's organization or the other Matt's organization, you know, but we would lose track of them to a very small or non responsive organization. That - and it's that concern and that desire to protect our customers that wants us to slow down this process just a little bit.

It's possible that if we had at our disposal a mechanism that could yank that name back in - you know, in under a short period of time that, you know, this might not - this might obsolete this practice. I don't want to say that you know - I don't want to commit to that because obviously we're just theorizing at this point. But it's possible. But if we had something like that in our bag of tricks we wouldn't be that concerned about you know, assuming that something is a hijacking first, and then proceeding accordingly.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey. And then Michael Collins.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that we're all kind of in agreement in a way. I think we're all saying that - that event when a registrant and a registrar change close together. That event is special sometimes. A lot of times it's not for all the reasons that have been stated. But sometimes it is. And I think that's all that this issue is really trying to get at. I am not sure that we've gotten to the point of specifying a particular solution.

And in a way I think the sixty day hold might have been a little bit of a distraction. And as I re-read the report - actually read the report, that's probably a better way to say it. We might want to sheer away from that particular example. In favor of some other examples as a way to shape

our conversation because I think we're all interested in the same thing which is making it easy for people to do the normal course of business.

But make it hard for bad guys to steal domains and hide by quickly shifting to an unresponsive registrar.

Michele Neylon: Anybody have any comeback on Mikey or should I move to Michael Collins? Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: I withdraw my request to speak. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt Mansell. We call you young Matt I think.

Matt Mansell: I am happy with that. I think - you know - just - obviously I'm (new to this report). But the question is you know, whether special provision is needed for a change of registrant near a change of registrar. And I - you know, I am speaking (as second to Mikey).

I think absolutely everybody seems to be - could be wrong - everybody seems to be in agreement. That actually it is a special circumstance. So it's not more a case of what can - you know, what can we do to deal with that circumstance? And I don't think anyone here is disputing it isn't a special circumstance. Although and if they are then I think they should speak up and let's hear the other side to it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you Matt.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just want to highlight something that James put into the chat. Because I think in fact he's on to something.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: We (clearly) have two big events. We have a hijack and a sale. And one of those events is not benign. And one of them is. And what we want to do is make the benign ones easy and the not benign ones hard. And if there is a way to do that then I think we're on to something. So I just wanted to pull that up in to the transcript.

Michele Neylon: How many - does anybody know how many of the hijacks (work) on a high profile domains that we've seen over the last year or so have (not led) to sales almost immediately? And how many of them were just hijacked just for you know, laughs and giggles?

James Bladel: Well some - Michele this is James speaking. I think that there's some notorious chasers the way they are pointed to a defamatory site. Or the traffic is redirected. I've never seen a hijack result in (fish) but I've suppose that's possible and in other cases it is you know, it is attempted if it's a generic word or something of high value to the domaining community.

Then it's you know, it's almost immediately offered for sale. But I think that that's - community is getting you know, developing a sense of you know, suspicion when something looks to good to be true, kind of like the guy in the - that's got the very expensive stereo system in the back - the trunk of his car and he's selling it for a tenth of what it would be retail.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: Thanks.

Man: You were there for a minute Michael and then I think you (mooched) off.

Michael Collins: Darn it. I hit the button the wrong way. Thank you. It's - well that was distracting. I think that - I forgot where I was going with this. Darn it.

Michele Neylon: Would you like me to come back to you in a minute?

Michael Collins: Yeah. Forget it. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay. You can (go anywhere) - look - guys if any of you have any thoughts that you kind lose in the moment you can always come back or post it to the list. Matt Serlin.

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele. I just want to kind of pick up on something that the other - I guess the younger Matt which I am in a little bit of denial of. But anyway...

Michele Neylon: We can say younger lemon if you wish. You can be the older lemon.

Matt Serlin: What the other Matt brought up and maybe we need to you know, maybe we need to actually look at some data. But I'm not of the opinion that registrar transfers and registrant transfers are special events.

                  And Matt I apologize if I misunderstood or put words in your mouth. But I thought that's what I heard you say is that those are you know - that that is a special case. Well from my standpoint I don't necessarily think that that is the case. At least in our you know - the clients that we're

dealing with that oftentimes we are doing registrant and registrar transfers together.

So - and you know, and again without you know, without looking at data to actually back that up it's just everyone's individual experience. But my individual experience would be that that's not such a special case for us anyway.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James and then Matt Mansell, then Michael Collins. James.

James Bladel: Yeah. Just responding to Mr. Serlin. I'll dispense with the Matt's here for simplicity. But you know, that's an interesting point and I would even point out that - or even just kind of float out the idea that they're not a special case. They are completely undefined by policies.

If you look at country codes for example that have functions like a trade that's done at the registry level, you know, that's a completely different animal than anything we have cobbled together with registrar and changes and IRTP. So I think that that's something you know, we're considering is the possibility that you know, it's not special it's just - it's like dividing by zero. There is just no definition for it at all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt Mansell then Michael Collins.

Matt Mansell: Yeah. I just worth clarifying for the other Matt. You know, I guess probably a better use of my language is a special indicator rather than necessarily a special case. I completely agree that it's not uncommon for registrar and changes to happen. You know, registrar transfer.

But I do certainly believe - and I guess I was putting my question out to the group. Is it's a special indicator that it could be used in one way shape or form for the outgoing or the incoming registrar. And I'm not sure what that use is. But I think it's definitely a special indicator.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: I wanted to say that I think that the domainer community is getting a little wiser as a group not all individuals. But that it would be handy for them to have as many as tools as they can to make these analyzations because I don't think there are very many domainers that want to buy hijacked domain names.

And one of the things that I think that would help it is this policy may encourage the very action that I think James suggested where the registrant change would occur after a registrar transfer. And if this policy did influence that, I think that would be positive because one of things that we would have as a buyer of a domain name is you would be able to look and see who the registrant is. And hopefully the contact information would be you know, not the hijacker but the actual owner.

And that would give you an opportunity to confirm whether you're dealing with the - a hijacker or an owner. But once a registrant change occurs then you're dealing with you know, you're dealing with a hijacker. But the contact information may not yield as much value. And - so I think there is some value to pushing people into the registrant change first before the registrar change possibly. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have anything further on this to say at the moment? James.

James Bladel: Yeah. I am just wondering, Michael you mentioned changing the
                  registrant first and then executing the transfer. Do you believe there
                  should be an artificial delay or cooling off period in between those? Or
                  do you believe that those happen you know, right on top of each other?

Michael Collins: I really am not sure...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: I'm not sure that I have the experience is one of the reasons I asked
                  you James what your experience was. I know there have been some
                  complaints. Certainly I've read about people that weren't happy with it.
                  But I wonder if it was effective enough to outweigh those complaints? I
                  just wasn't sure.

Michele Neylon: Paul Diaz has just posted a link to an article on domain name (wire)
                  which is giving you eight clues that a domain name is stolen. I think
                  this is written primarily from the perspective of domain investors. And
                  it's not a bad starting point. Don't agree with all of the points on there.
                  But that's just me being biased.

                  Okay then. I think there has been a fair amount of discussion. And
                  there is a certain amount of agreement and certain amount of healthy
                  disagreement on this one. So maybe if Matt Mansell since you're new
                  to the group, if you could possibly post the list - an overview of what
                  you think we should do here would be helpful.

Matt Mansell: Will do.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele just picking on you Matt.

Matt Mansell: (Noted it).

Michele Neylon: That's okay. Right. Next one, Issue D, whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of registrars locks status, when it may, may not, should, should not be applied. Now if you remember this was when we had all this discussion of the RFCs. And we have Barbara's colleague spoke to us a bit explaining about the various locks statuses and everything else.

Does anybody have any strong feelings about this - about Issue D? Beyond what's already covered in the document. No faults? And yes Matt it is an impossible task. And yes that was intentional. I've - this is Michele - this is my own view. My only thought about registrar locks state - registrar locks statuses is I (abhor) internal locks that can not be viewed by third parties using Who Is.

I find that very very annoying and it causes lots of headaches. So if somebody is going to put - if you're going to put a lock on a domain for whatever reason then it should be flagged in Who Is so the rest of us don't waste loads of time with it. That's just my own thoughts. Anybody else have any - ah Mikey has his hands up. Mikey, sorry I missed you there.

Mikey O'Connor: No worries. This is Mikey. I think we probably do want to come up with some sort of recommendation here. The bottom of the second to last paragraph is sort of the standardizing of locks. And I think that was a lot of what we were talking about with the fellow from Verizon - (Verisign). About all of these different lock statuses and human

interpretable versions and all of that. So I think a recommendation along those lines wouldn't be a bad idea. I wouldn't want to just leave this one without speaking at all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody apart from Mikey have any thoughts on this? No? Okay. Issue D - sorry E. (Skipping) letters here - Issue E. Whether (and if so) how best to clarify Denial Reason Number 7.

A domain name was already in lock status provided that the registrar provides a readily accessible and reasonable means for the registered name holder to remove the lock status so we haven't really come up with any conclusions on this. And one of the points that's in the notes here is that we really haven't come up with definitions of readily and reasonable (is our best) open to interpretation. And I believe David Giza gave a few thoughts on this previously. Dave didn't you?

Dave Giza: That's right Michele I did. Although and quite honestly I can't recall at the moment precisely where those thoughts were leading other than to you know, take it upon you know, maybe a sub team here to work on those definitions. And then come back to the group with you know, some potential language to consider.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. I suppose the other thing as well of course is if we're looking at the complaints that David and his team gave us. I mean how many times does that - does the lock - the ability to remove a lock appear as a complaint to something which we could look at?

Now I think that was all of our issues, wasn't it? Yeah it is. So what I would suggest if we could is for next week, if people could take the time those of you who haven't done so already. Please go over the

initial thing here and if you have any thoughts or any ideas please share them with the list. And then we can see about trying to actually come up with a plan of action to try and move this forward. Does anybody have any other inquiries or issues they wish to raise?

No? You've all gone deadly silence. Okay. If that's the case then I will call this a day and I will speak to you all next week.

Man: Thanks

Man: Thanks Michele

Michele Neylon: Bye now.

                                    END