

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 12 October 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 12 October 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-b-20101012-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG Chair
Paul Diaz - Registrar SG
Matt Serlin - Registrar SG
Robert Mountain - Registrar SG
Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG
Rob Golding – Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC Barbara Steele – RySG
Oliver Hope - RrSG

Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Berry Cobb – CBUC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC
Anil George – IPC
James Bladel - Registrar SG
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Michael Collins – Individual
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

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

Gisella-Gruber White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the IRTP call the 12th of October and on the call we have Barbara Steele,

Kevin Erdman, Paul Diaz, Oliver Hope, Bob Mountain, Michele Neylon, Rob Golding, Simonetta Batteiger, Matt Serlin.

And for Staff we have Marika Konings and Glen de Saint Gery. We have apologies from Chris Chaplow, Anil George, James Bladel, Berry Cobb and I think probably too Mikey O'Connor who is at a meeting.

Baudouin Schombe is on another call and he will probably be joining us a bit later. Thank you Michele. Over to you and just a reminder, would everyone please say their name before they speak for transcription purposes? Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. I think there might be - what's his name might be at that meeting as well. Michael Collins might be at the same meeting I think. Maybe I'm mistaken. I think there's some kind of BC meeting today in Washington.

Gisella Gruber-White: That's right, yes.

Michele Neylon: Yes, that's where I lots of them have disappeared to. Okay, first off as per whatever guidelines that I can't remember the name of, do we - does anybody have any updates to their Declaration of Interest or their Statement of Interests?

No, fine. Moving on. Right, okay if you can see the agenda there it's up on the Adobe Connect room. Bob and Simonetta, could you give us an update? And Bob, it was lovely seeing you last week in Prague.

Robert Mountain: Yes it sure was and what a great city that is, yes.

Michele Neylon: Oh, it's fantastic.

Robert Mountain: Yes, unbelievable. Yes, so on my end all of my surveys have been sent out to the cohorts. I actually dug up a few extra people that I thought might be helpful, you know, in terms of gathering feedback on this.

You know, as I was traveling last week I did not have the chance to talk to them as a, you know, and interview them with the survey. But they do have the surveys and by next week's call I expect to have some feedback that I can share with the group.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Anybody else have any...?

Simonetta Batteiger: I have been traveling to Germany the last couple of weeks so surveys have been sent but I haven't started following up with phone calls.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any other comments, queries, questions for either Simonetta or Bob in relation to this matter? No. Okay, moving on.

We're moving through this agenda really quickly. Okay then, up on the Adobe chat we have an email in relation to the compliance ticketing system. Marika, could you remind us what this was about?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. There was a question - I believe it was from Mikey if I'm not mistaken on how complaints that are received by ICANN are being followed up and whether it's tracked, how those complaints are being resolved.

And also the additional question was whether additional funds had been granted as the Working Group had submitted a request for additional funds to improve the ticketing system some time ago. So as a result of that this is the feedback that Pam Little provided.

Michele Neylon: Right, okay. I think those Registrars - and I'm not sure about other Stakeholder Groups or Registrars were asked to vote on their portions of the budget or something there recently.

Anyway does anybody have any other questions or queries in relation to this with the - unfortunately Mikey isn't on the call so does anybody have any queries in relation to the compliance ticketing system? No?

Paul Diaz: Other than what it is.

Michele Neylon: Beg your pardon?

Paul Diaz: Where is it because I've only have a remounting to compliant sets like ad hoc and talk.

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay. It refers to the - if you are - Paul, our apology as to sound. Go ahead Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. It's Paul. The only comment that I wanted to make was the very last line, budget to improve this system, you know, sort of remind folks in this group that quite a few of us signed a letter that was sent to ICANN supporting additional resources for ICANN compliance to improve this reporting system and its - most of its efforts in general.

And, you know, I don't know if there's some way to sort of express frustration, perhaps displeasure amongst some that, you know, the budget that's been allocated according to this appears to be not fully up to the expectations of certain community members.

You know, it just seems a lot of budgets were increased last year. The small dollar value increase that we were seeking for compliance that they should not get it and that, you know, the additional ability to get detail in compliance

related reporting would be pushed out in another fiscal year is at least in my view disappointing.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any other comments or thoughts? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. In response to the earlier question, the C ticketing system refers to the online system that's being used for people submitting complaints to ICANN.

So online when you go to the ICANN Web site I think it's on the home page, there's a list to, you know, if you have a complaint and if you go into that system you're basically asked to indicate what the complaint refers to.

And that system is then used to turn it in as well to assign complaints to relevant categories and to Staff to address it. So that's what the C ticketing system is about.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Any other comments or questions or queries or anything else? No? Okay, just with my - taking my Chair hat off I just would like to add my voice in supporting what Paul Diaz was saying.

I think it is very important that ICANN put funds into compliance, that failure to do so where - while ICANN budgets expand in other areas I think is fundamentally flawed.

How they can - how ICANN as an organization can justify opening extra offices in California instead of improving a compliance ticketing system is beyond me.

Chair hat back on. All right, moving on. Okay then, Marika, could you bring up the comments on the initial report again so we can move forward? Marika has her hand up again. So Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. Just in response to the comments by yourself and Paul. I don't think there's anything preventing this group if you want to submit comments to that end to submit that either to Kevin or, you know, write a letter to the Board to express your frustration.

I do think that they're going to start consulting on the FY12 budget relatively soon I think, you know, earlier than they used to be. So that might be another opportunity to, you know, express preferences or needs.

But indeed if there's frustration I would recommend that you address that to people that might have an impact on that.

Michele Neylon: Old dime - I'm - Marika, you have met me, haven't you?

Marika Konings: I have so...

Michele Neylon: You know how quiet and how afraid I am of making my opinion known.

Marika Konings: Yes, I know you don't need much encouragement but maybe as a group effort, it might even have more weight I guess.

Michele Neylon: Okay, well we'll see. It's something we might wish to consider discussing further. Anyway we'll move forward from there. Paul has just put up a couple things on the chat about talking to Kevin directly.

Personally I'd prefer for us to do stuff by - in writing because that way they can't ignore it, whereas if you do stuff in - kind of informally the problem is that it can be as if it never really happened.

Okay where - how far down on these did we get the last time because as we've been traveling and missing meetings and God knows what else, does anybody remember how far down we were?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think we're at Comment 38, and just to point out I actually realized that I hadn't done the update following our last meeting. So this version is now posted also on the Wiki so if people want to have a look at the comments that are still there and track changes from our meeting two weeks ago, and then make sure that it reflects accurately the group's discussion. But I think we left last time at Comment 38.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect, 38. So 38, George Kirikos has posted several emails, the summary of which is those ad hoc locks that purportedly violate the existing transfer policy should be eliminated.

Do we have anything we'd like to say en route with respect to those? Okay, working on the basis that silence won't work for me, and I'm going to start picking on people, does anybody want to volunteer something before I start picking on them? Okay, Matt?

Matt Serlin: I knew that was coming Michele.

Michele Neylon: Hey listen, look, you know, I just sent you a voodoo doll.

Matt Serlin: Yes. No, I had actually my finger on the mute button. I guess I don't understand the comment because I don't know what he's referring to when he says ad hoc locks.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Matt Serlin: So if we can specify what he's actually talking about it would be more useful and Marika, maybe you have more info about the comment, but just that sentence in and of itself is not a whole - not a lot of meaning there for me.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I think maybe we should come back to those. I don't think that now is the time to go wading through the entire - I think there's about ten separate comments, ten separate very long emails so maybe coming back to that.

Marika, could you summarize in a bit more detail 38 for us for next week if you wouldn't mind?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Yes I'll try to find the relevant part and then see if it provides more details.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I don't want to go dragging through those emails and that'll take forever. Another Comment 39, there will be no need for a 60-day lock after a Registrant change if there would be properly authenticated Registrant changes.

This is also from George Kirikos. So this is in relation to a change of Registrant. This is not in with respect entirely to inter-Registrar transfers. Matt, go ahead.

Matt Serlin: I beat you to the punch this time. I mean, I agree. I actually - I'm not a proponent of the 60-day lock after a Registrant change. I think it's unnecessary.

I think if we had better mechanisms in place to ensure that Registrant changes were proper and authenticated, then it wouldn't be an issue. But I'm personally not in favor of them blocking transfers after a Registrant change.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody else have any other comments or thoughts? Oliver?

Oliver Hope: Well yes, I mean, I just wanted to agree with that really. You know, I agree totally. I don't think there should be a block on someone transferring it after a, you know, after a Registrant change. So I just wanted to sort of echo those sentiments really.

Michele Neylon: But what about the case of say somebody grabbing an account and then changing Registrar to escape?

Oliver Hope: Yes, I mean, there has to be - as long as the change is properly authenticated. I mean, so I think that's where the issue, you know, comes along is making sure that that Registrant change is an authenticated Registrant change.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Paul, Matt then Simonetta.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. We'll certainly follow up and support what Matt and Oliver have just said. With that noted however I would be against this Working Group coming up with a recommendation that very specifically says what that authentication process must look like.

I think that this is something that fundamentally goes to the competitive nature of our market. Some Registrars already offer very secure means of protecting their Registrants.

Others do not and, you know, there's the opportunity to discern and choose amongst different players in the marketplace. And this just seems ripe as one of those classic unintended consequences if you create a very prescriptive policy which as I remember George, and it's pretty hard to get through all the details because his emails were always so long.

But, you know, he had a very, very clear idea what he wanted done. Honestly I'm not sure how that fits in in most players' business models because it was paper-based and very, very, very long-winded.

Nevertheless if that were anything like that, were it ever to become required policy it just seems to me there's a formula for failure and that bad guys will learn how to beat that system now.

They will have a blueprint for what we are required to do and they will figure out ways to get around it. Better to let the market continue as it has where

some proprietary policies are available to certain Registrars whose clients want them.

And, you know, maybe some statement that all Registrars should take security seriously. That's about as far as we can go.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Thank you Paul. Matt Serlin then Simonetta.

Matt Serlin: Yes, thanks Michele. Yes, just agree with - to start off to agree with what Paul said and - but then Michele, just to go back to a point that you made about the what if scenario and, A, you know we can't create policy to guard against every possible what if scenario that's out there; but B, there was a reason that we created the expedited transfer return is to address that specific issue.

And as I've said before in regard to the 60-day hold, you know, I think the percentage of hijacked domains that take place after a Registrant change is minute compared to the number of Registrant transfers that just happen as a part of doing business. So, you know, that was the only point I wanted to make.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi, this is Simonetta. I just wanted to also say that I agree with what Paul has said and what Matt also said. I think what George was referring to here is that he really felt strongly that if you start preventing things early on, you have a good chance to catch things that after the fact a 60-day lock is just trying to heal the symptoms and that stands in the way of doing a lot of other after market and other regular business. So I agree with his comment here.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments? Okay, moving on. Forty - any changes in relation to locking of domain names subject to UDRP proceedings should be considered as part of a PDP on review of the UDRP.

And that was a comment from the Internet Commerce Association. Do we have any reaction to that apart from a simple yes or no or...? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think that's actually in line with one of our recommendations. I do recall that we were talking about it because I think it was raised by comments that were made by WIPO.

And I think in our recommendations we do say that, you know, any changes in relation to that issue should be considered if and when a review of the UDRP takes place so...

Michele Neylon: Well that makes sense to me. Any other comments? No? Okay, use of Registrar lock status should be left up to the individual Registrants. That's the next comment and that was from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Any comments on that? Paul Diaz agrees with that. Somebody disagree with that?

Matt Serlin: Yes, I'd agree with that.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Matt Serlin: I don't want you to have more silence.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. Silence is golden after all. That's okay, I can talk to myself if nobody's going to talk to me. It's all right. It's cool. It's fine. It's cool. That's of course if I've been drinking a lot and then it just gets really freaky.

Right, next one. Registrar Stakeholder Group. Registrars should have the right to employ locks as a security measure as long as the process for their removal is consistent with ICANN policy.

Any comments on that? Deafening silence. Paul Diaz agrees. Simonetta agrees. Other people agree. Nobody disagrees. I personally agree. Okay, Marika has a hand. Go ahead - well she probably has two. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm - I wonder if this is a bit of a vicious circle because part of the reason why we're looking at this charter question is that the policy's actually unclear on the readily and I think available means.

So I'm sure we'll discuss it in further detail but I think there was also an agreement that some of the language might need to be clarified.

Michele Neylon: Oh, I definitely agree with that Marika. It can't - which actually the next comment is specifically in relation to this. From the Internet Commerce Association, clarification would be helpful but ICA would like input from Registrars on the question of whether administrative considerations - oh God, included termination that the RN...

Oliver Hope: Registered name holder.

Michele Neylon: What is that? Oh, registered name holder. Oh, okay. Thanks for the translation. Request as bona fide and not fraudulent allow for compliance within a five-day period. Okay, any thoughts on...?

Simonetta Batteiger: My feeling about this comment, I don't understand it fully.

Michele Neylon: Good feedback. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes, I have the same question Simonetta and in fact it's easy enough to go back to Phil and ask for clarification here. I'm not sure if he's saying that the five-day period is an issue - they need more time to allow for effective screening or whatever.

It seems like there's something they care about and it might be very important to us. I think we need to reach out to and ask for clarification.

Michele Neylon: Well he's normally on the call so maybe if we wait until the next call he might be able to clarify that.

Paul Diaz: Sure, ping him on the list. It might be easier for him to see it on the list than the mp3.

Michele Neylon: Yes, perfect. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I - maybe just to point out for some that are new to the group is that the draft recommendation that the Working Group suggested relating to this issue talks about, you know, providing a maximum of five days for a Registrar to unlock a domain name if a, you know, bona fide request is made. So that's where at least the five days comes from.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Now I have a query from Rob Golding to go back to Point 30, and since everybody types very, very quickly if I don't do that now it will probably never happen.

So I'm just going to scroll back up to see what the hell Point 30 was. Okay, right. This is in relation to - okay, this is from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Requiring thick Whois could have as a potential side effect the Registrant contact information is more readily available for individuals with nefarious intent to obtain access to the information as well was the comment. Rob, do you - what do you want to add or...?

Rob Golding: The information in our statute is easily available to query talks. This is, you know, very useful as a Registrar and the information in the thin Whois is still available.

You can go to the correct Whois for the actual Registrar and you can query it there. So what's the difference? What additional security risk could it be to make them go to two Web sites to look something up or to put 43 queries?

To my mind having thin Whois and trying to mandate the thin Whois simply makes transfers more awkward in trying to verify who the current contacts are.

Michele Neylon: Paul Diaz?

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Michele. As we've noted in the past in this group and specifically for Common Net being the largest Registries, since the Registrant email address is not required to be published, we've often noted that many Registrars use that as a form of security and that if there's a dispute, if an admin contact requests a transfer it goes through.

The Registrant comes back and says, "I never approved that." We have the ability to take the Registrant's word because we know that their email address was not published and was therefore not socially engineered to conduct a fraudulent transfer.

Trying to move Common Net to a thick Registry model and thereby requiring the publication of the Registrant address, we've suggested in past discussions that that is a potential security problem because you will now be putting what is the ultimate authority for a name, the Registrant's email address, out there for public viewing.

Michele Neylon: Rob?

Rob Golding: I'm still not quite grasping it because truly he doesn't publish the Registrant email address during a transfer. You only need the admin to approve it. You don't even give the Registrant the possibility to approve it. You just have the new Registrar...

Michele Neylon: The - but as per the policy Rob, the Registrant overrides the admin.

Rob Golding: Right, so - but if you're not publishing the details the new Registrar can't contact the Registrant.

Michele Neylon: They can on a thick Whois.

Rob Golding: They can on a thick Whois but not in thin. So I'm - you're denying the Registrant the ability to deny the transfer and therefore creating a bigger situation where domains are much easier to hijack if you've got access to the admin's intel.

Michele Neylon: Paul?

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry Rob. I didn't follow that last - so how are we - how would it make it easier or we would be denying the...?

Rob Golding: Yes, if you've got both email addresses you contact both of them and say this - somebody has requested this transfer. Do you approve it? And either admin can say yes or Registrant say yes or admin can say no or Registrant can say no.

And as we said Registrant overrides admin. If you're only publishing one of those email addresses, only one of those people can be contacted. So that's...

Michele Neylon: That's not true. The - with the current - the holding - the losing Registrar can contact them.

Rob Golding: Right. Okay, but the gaining Registrar can't.

Michele Neylon: Not in thin, no.

Rob Golding: Right. Right.

Michele Neylon: In - but the losing Registrar, and Paul or Matt can correct me if I've misunderstood this, but the losing Registrar can contact all the contacts that they have on file and say, "Hey, we've received a transfer out request for this domain." You know, you can expedite it or cancel it by clicking here type thing.

Rob Golding: Right.

Michele Neylon: Is that correct Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes, I believe so Michele.

Michele Neylon: Now with a thick Whois I think it doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to display all of the contact points. You could store the details on the Registry but you're not obliged to publish them.

With a thick - in a thick Whois that means you can access certain details over EPP as the gaining Registrar if you have a correct EPP key. You can run certain commands which you can't do in thin because you've no way of knowing whether or not the data is there.

The other thing with thin Whois is that there is no standardized format for the Whois output, plus as Whois is only going to be reliable at the Registrar of record, if the Registrar of record's Whois server is non-functional, dysfunctional or whatever, then it becomes a huge problem for transfers.

Rob Golding: Yes, I agree. I agree with all of that. I still don't see why thick Whois is inherently less secure than thin Whois.

Michele Neylon: Well, Barbara might be able to speak to that but Simonetta has her hand up first. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I was just going to say the same thing that you just mentioned that all - but to me there is a difference between what is available and you can access as a Registrar and what is displayed and really published all over the Web.

So if the information is there at the Registry level and you have the opportunity to double check something, I think that would add security rather than take something away.

But of course you could always argue as well that if that information is there if some - whether it can get access to it and that might not be that great either.

So - but the other point that Rob was just making I also found interesting that in the thick model it is standardized so that you can actually come off with a method to verify information that works across TLDs.

And I think that would be something that might be helpful for finding ways to verify information and making things more secure. So in that regard I think it would be better to have the information and have the opportunity to verify something rather than not have anything at all.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Barbara.

Barbara Steele: Yes, this is Barbara. I basically agree with what Paul has said. I think, you know, obviously by having a thin Whois the information is not available. It's not held at the Registry so obviously it's as secure as it can get because it's only available through the Registrars.

However, you know, I think that there are points to be made that to the extent that the Registrant email address is not made public in even the thick Whois,

then I think that does go a long way to alleviate the security concerns that have been expressed.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Matt?

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele. I guess the only point that I'd make is, you know, ICANN has clearly stated a preference for thick Whois information as part of the new gTLD program requirements.

So moving forward all new gTLDs will need to be thick. All of the sponsored TLDs and gTLDs that have come online have been thick. So I guess my question is shouldn't we strive for a consistency and whether we as a group agree with it or not, push that all gTLDs be thick?

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Matt Serlin: I'm sure Barbara now will have a voodoo doll with me too but...

Michele Neylon: Okay then, do we have anything further to say on this point? No. Fine. Perfect. We'll move on. And - okay, now where the hell am I going to?

Rob Golding: Three?

Michele Neylon: Okay, right, 44. New proposed language to reflect current terminology. Okay, new proposed language to reflect current terminology. Prior to the receipt of the transfer request the domain name was assigned, the client transfer prohibited status and may have other client prohibited statuses, e.g., client updates are prohibited or a client lease is prohibited, assigned as well.

Pursuant to the Registrar's published security policy or at the direction of the registered name holder, provided however the Registrant must include in its registration agreement the terms and conditions upon which it locks domain names.

Further, Registrar must provide a relatively accessible and reasonable means for the registered name holder to remove the client prohibited status. Wow, what a mouthful.

That was from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Have we all managed to successfully navigate that comment?

Paul Diaz: No.

Matt Serlin: Is this the - oh, sorry. I jumped right in front of Paul. I'm sorry Paul. But I'm going to keep going.

Paul Diaz: Is this - are we referring to the losing Registrar or the gaining Registrar?

Michele Neylon: I presume this has to do with Registrars in general with the Registrar where the domain is.

Matt Serlin: The transfer - okay. Well maybe Paul can make it clear for me because I'm struggling.

Michele Neylon: All right Paul, go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Sorry Matt, I don't think I'm going to be able to help. I think all the Registry has done - Registry Stakeholder Group has done is changed what's in the existing language where it says domain lock, and put in the more current and appropriate client transfer prohibited and the various EPP related statuses.

But we still have the same issue with the questionable language, what does it mean to have a readily accessible reasonable means. The other things - I think all they've done is cut and paste to take out the old domain lock language what exists and update it with the current EPP statuses. So no, it doesn't really help clarify much of anything.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Barbara?

Barbara Steele: Hi, it's Barbara. I think it also tried to convey that if the Registrar within their agreement with the Registrant and the registered name holder makes it very clear what their policy is on domain locks and how to, you know, deal with those relative to removing them, then, you know, they should be permitted.

So I think that there was, you know, there was an attempt to try to clarify that and, you know, allow the locks to occur so long as, you know, it was clear to the Registrant what they needed to do in order to remove them with that particular Registrar. So that was the intent. Whether or not we got there, perhaps not.

Michele Neylon: Okay, just put my own hand up. This is Michele. I think a lot of the language with respect to this policy is pretty horrendous and very hard to make sense of.

I think it does cause confusion. But are we in the - are we the best group of people to clarify it? Possibly not. Okay, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering in light of the discussion that we had with Dan and Pam whether, you know, looking at the specific language is still relevant as I do believe there was, you know, general agreement that this provision in itself might be no longer relevant, you know, due to the nature that you cannot deny a transfer that has not been initiated.

So I guess the question would still come back on, you know, the reasonable or readily available because I think there was also agreement then if that provision would be deleted that there should be another provision that just deals with the fact of, you know, Registrar locks and the need of having, you now, clear policies around that.

So - but that might be more of an implementation question in that stage instead of trying to reword this particular provision, you know, if there indeed is agreement that it should be deleted altogether.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Rob Golding has a question. He wants to know is there any way we can get a list of statuses published on some kind of ICANN/Internet Web site with a translation into what he said proffering which I'd go with, you know, simple, clear English.

So for those of us who don't eat, sleep and drink EPP what the hell it all means. Who actually handles those kinds of things internally Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Who handles what?

Michele Neylon: The wonderfully accessible ICANN Web site.

Marika Konings: We all handle that. If we want to post something we request our Web admin team to post something there. So if there's a specific request on - if you could identify a relevant section where you would like that information to go, I'm happy to take that back to the person who's responsible for that section.

I do believe that - doesn't the EPP protocol itself, the RFC, have definitions or explanatory notes on what each status means that might be easily, you know, put somewhere?

Michele Neylon: With no disrespect to RFC authors, it's written in RFCesque which is not English.

Marika Konings: Another question would be who's going to propose then a definition that's agreed by all? Is there - are there definitions available that everyone in the community would support or would we need to create another Working Group to adopt appropriate definitions?

Michele Neylon: Well I wouldn't want it to be a Working Group. I'd want it to be a - what's that called when it's not a PDP? It's an implementation group or something. There is a glossary Rob is pointing to. Are those covered in the glossary Rob?

Rob Golding: No.

Michele Neylon: No. Okay.

Marika Konings: I'm happy to suggest that. I think we have a communications team that's responsible for that one so I'll ask if they can include definitions for that there.

Michele Neylon: That would be helpful. I mean, I'd ask if anybody else has any other suggestions or thoughts on this. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I just wanted to go back to the Comment 44 and say that I would agree if I understand this right. Maybe I don't, so it would be helpful again to clarify what this comment is actually referring to.

But if it says that the Registry Stakeholder Group would like to have clarity for the Registrants, what they need to do in order to get a lock removed, then I would agree with that.

So it must be clear to the Registrant what they can do and how they go about getting a lock removed when they really want it removed or set. So I would agree with that statement but I'm not sure if this is what they wanted to say with this comment.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Barbara, any further thoughts on this?

Barbara Steele: Hi, this is Barbara. I really don't have any further thoughts at this time.

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's cool. No problem. All right then, we have now gone through pretty much all of the comments. We need to just get some clarification from the ICA on one or two of their comments.

But apart from that we're pretty much done with the comments. Does anybody...?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We actually skipped all the comments on the ETRP...

Paul Diaz: Right.

Marika Konings: ...to start up with the easy stuff.

Michele Neylon: Oh, so we're not done with the comments is what you're saying.

Marika Konings: Indeed.

Michele Neylon: Okay, where do - where are my ETRP - oh God, right.

Marika Konings: They start at Number 4.

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay. Let's go back to those then. Damn, and I thought I was off the hook. Okay, so try Question 8, ETRP Number 4, need for clearer terminology in relation to the ETRP.

There was a bunch of those type of comments so Marika has her hand up again. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering if it makes sense to wait until we also get the feedback from the after market surveys that's specifically related to this issue and see whether, you know, there's a way to bundle some of those comments because I guess otherwise we might be repeating ourselves

because I presume some of those comments will be similar to the ones being made by the different submissions here.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Marika. I think that direction makes a hell of a lot more sense and as - forgive me for being an idiot. As Bob and Simonetta won't be able to give us feedback on this until next week, and as it's already 13 minutes to the hour, and as a load of other people have - weren't on this call, and you all who were, how about we finish up now and we adjourn - readjourn next week?

Does anybody have any issues with that? I'll take the resounding silence to mean no. And I'll speak to you all next week and Matt Serlin, your voodoo doll is sitting here beside me looking very well. Thank you.

Matt Serlin: Excellent, thanks Michele.

Michele Neylon: No problem. Bye-bye.

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele. Bye-bye.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele.

Gisella Gruber-White: Michele, bye.

Oliver Hope: Thank you.

END