

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 26 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 26 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-20101026-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
Robert Mountain - Registrar SG
Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG
Rob Golding – Registrar SG
Barbara Steele – RySG
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC
James Bladel - Registrar SG
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC

Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Kevin Erdman – IPC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Anil George – IPC
Michael Collins – Individual
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and (good evening) for anyone. This is the IRTP B Call on the 26th of October, and on the call we have Michele Neylon, James Bladel, Mikey O'Connor, Simonetta Batteiger, Barbara Steele, Paul Diaz, Berry Cobb, and Bob Mountain. And for staff, we have Marika Konings, and myself, Glen de Saint Gery, and Baudouin Schombe will probably be joining us when he comes off the call that he's on.

And we have apologies from Matt Serlin, Anil George, and Kevin Erdman.
Has anybody registered any other apologies?

Marika Konings: Michael Collins as well Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much, Marika. And may I remind you to say your name before speaking for transcription purposes please? Thank you. Michele over to you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon, good morning, good whatever - other time zone you might be in. As per the wonderful GNSO rules and whatever, are there any updates to people's SOIs or DOIs? No takers, no takers, going once, going twice, okay fine I will take it you are all still (capitalists) you were the last time we spoke.

Okay, the first item on our agenda today is the objectives and planning for the ICANN meeting in Cartagena, as most of you are going to be attending. So thoughts - (and thousands in the rush). Okay, Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And just a note and I think I already mentioned in the GNSO group that there is a publication deadline for documents that is the 16th of November. So if there's anything the group wants to discuss with the community or put out for discussion with the GNSO Council, it should happen by that date.

In relation to the schedule, we already have a slot on hold I think for Saturday afternoon during which the IRTP Working Group is expected to give an update to the GNSO Council. It can be a presentation of the final report should we meet the deadline or it can just be an update on where the group is at this stage.

In addition, I would like an indication from the group whether an additional meeting or workshop should be scheduled for during the week as we've been

requested to submit details of such meeting I think by next week - Thursday if I'm not mistaken. So I mean if the group thinks they might have a meeting, I would recommend that I put in the request and we can always cancel that meeting if we don't need it or you know it's not a convenient time. But at least if we have a slot, it means you know it's on the schedule.

So that's it.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Marika. Boys and girls, does anybody have any thoughts?
Okay, Paul Diaz.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele, it's Paul. I just see Bob's recommending we book the slot. I'm not sure if he's talking about the weekend update, which is unavoidable, or something during the week. Actually, if it's the one during the week, I was going to say just the opposite. You know unless we're much further along in whatever our new ETRP is going to look like, I think opening up and having a public session is just going to become - it presents just you know a huge headache because you'll get all of these folks who come in. They've got their own idea, they have no idea what the group has been discussing, et cetera.

I'm very leery about having public sessions when a working group is well into its efforts. It's much different when we're actively seeking public inputs. I mean we always are, don't get me wrong. But I think if we are trying to you know move towards hopefully finishing this thing up in the next couple months, to have a public sessions at the ICANN meeting is just inviting a lot of potential mischief and/or chasing down rabbit holes.

Michele Neylon: And thank you Paul.

Paul Diaz: So I would be against a slot - doing it during the week.

Michele Neylon: Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, this is Bob speaking. Yeah, I would agree with Paul. I didn't realize it would be public record. I mean I was thinking more of just the working sessions amongst us as opposed to a public session, but I do agree with Paul as far as a public meeting.

Michele Neylon: Well see Bob the private thing could just simply be you buying us all drinks.

Bob Mountain: We do that anyway, don't we?

Michele Neylon: Exactly, so that's why. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. There are of course a number of options. You know a working group can have a workshop where you know to discuss results and get community input, but another option is to have a working session that is open to the public.

But what some working groups have done for example is to reserve you know the first 45 minutes of such a session just for working group members to discuss, and open then the last 15 or 30 minutes for others to comment, or ask questions, or provide input on what has been discussed there. So there are different ways such a meeting can be structured.

On the you know actual document and preparation for that, I have you know done some work already on the initial report confirming that two - a final report and (the current situation is to have) Michele to have a look at that. What I did (intend already) to do there is to look at some of the draft recommendations and based on the discussion we've had following the public comments and further deliberation to try and write up some you know potential final recommendation that the group can consider as a starting point to working towards a final report.

Because you know I've raised this before. Because I think on a number of items such as the ETRP, you know this working group might spend you know many more months trying to work out a solution. But I think the group should ask themselves as well the question you know is this working group going to be the most effective means to come to you know a complete package on you know all the language.

Everything that's required for such an ETRP or is it more effective to pass that on to either an implementation drafting team or staff to develop a proposal that then goes through the different rounds of discussion, and testing, and verifying that you know it works as intended. So that's you know some of the questions that the group might want to ask themselves in you know looking at Cartagena and beyond.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Marika. I just see Paul Diaz putting on the chat there. (In an informal session) it could be constructive. (The formal scheduled) session could get really complicated, especially if we ask people to stay out of the room before or in the room after the WG participants have huddled in private.

Does anybody else have any thoughts on this? Okay, let's just ask a very, very simple practical question. If we were to hold a public meeting, what would we want input from the public on, working on the basis that we're going to get it anyway? If we were having - if we're going to have a public meeting, we would - the public would want to get involved and would want to give us input. So on what topics if any would we want input if we were to have that kind of meeting? Any takers.

Mikey then Paul.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that we're running the risk of going into an endless loop. We've spent basically the whole time since Brussels reviewing public comments. And if we got another round of public comments, I think we could probably spend the time between Cartagena and San Francisco reviewing

public comments. Of course then we could get public comments in San Francisco and who know where we would get to there.

But on a slightly more serious note, I really don't think we've made enough progress to warrant anything except a status update for the Council that says we've reviewed the public comments and now we're actually going to get to work. So my suggestion would be a short update to the Council, no meeting, no more public comments because we've got enough. You know we aren't even done yet and we're two weeks away from the deadline.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Mikey. Mr. Diaz.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele, it's Paul. I totally agree with Mikey. I think the working group has an obligation to you know figure out the - we've addressed most of the issues; we've bounced around and avoided the ETRP. Most of these things I think we've been able to work through. Now we've got to get back and figure out what if anything we're going to do in terms of this ETRP, and you know my feeling is let's put something together within the group and then put that out to the public. If we invite the public now, I think we're just going to bog ourselves down exactly as Mikey has noted. It becomes an endless loop.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi, this is Simonetta. I just wanted to come back to something that Marika suggested last week that I thought about just a little bit and I thought is actually a good idea.

Marika was mentioning that we could look at this whole section of the ETRP comments and find out what the principles are that we can all agree on of what a policy should look like. So if we start with that where we all agree, we can figure out where to move from there and either have someone else figure out the (complete) policy or at least have a starting point from where we can work (off).

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Just to close this one subject, okay is there anybody who thinks we should have a meeting in Cartagena - a formal meeting. Is there anybody who feels strongly (about that one)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Hello. I can hear chatter in the background, but I'm not too sure what that is. Excuse me. Okay, then Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, this is Bob. I just - you know my sentiment would be it's incredibly rare that we all have the opportunity to be in the same place at the same time. I think it would benefit the group if we could find some way at least to get together and work through some of these issues you know face to face if that's possible without adding too much overhead to the - you know as Paul had said the public comments that would you know be a result of this.

If there's some way to avoid that and just get together and have a working session, you know I think we could maybe cover some ground that otherwise would you know take longer over you know repeated conference calls. That's all.

Michele Neylon: Mikey. Yeah, Mikey. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Just as a question for Marika and Glen, and that is there a way to schedule a meeting of the working group that's not public? Because I agree with Bob. I think it would be very useful to take advantage of the fact that we're all in the same place. It's just awfully hard to do it in a fishbowl.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It is possible to indicate if you don't want to have a meeting appear on the schedule and just ask for a room. I think it will be hard to you know put someone outside of the door and say, "You cannot enter," but I think if we don't publish it and just share the information you know with the

working group, you know it's definitely an option. Although you know the ICANN meetings normally are about openness and anyone can participate and access meetings.

You know as I said what working groups have done in the past is just you know minutes - you know the first hour of a working group just to the (working group amendments) and working group discussions and just you know allow some time at the end for questions or some discussion. You know if the working group is just working through some of the items, you know I would be surprised if there would be huge crowds coming if there's no specific topic identified as such.

But yes, you know as I said, I can indicate that the meeting doesn't appear on the schedule. But at the same time, if it doesn't appear, it might also be difficult to prevent opposite meetings being scheduled that you know might form a conflict because you know you might be interested in attending other meetings or other working group sessions.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. Let me just follow up. One of the things that we see on ICANN's schedule is private meetings - you know GAC meetings are private. Some of them are, but not all of them. Various constituencies schedule private meetings. Is there any reason why we couldn't simply put it on the schedule as a private meeting?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think there is anything going against that. It's just going a bit against our practice of open meetings and anyone being able to attend and participate. I mean you know I know it has happened in the past if the private meetings concern - you know like the GAC. They close up the sessions. I mean if that's what the group wants to do, fine. I can request it like that. How long would the group like - an hour, an hour and a half?

Michele Neylon: Just before we go ahead, I have just one question. This is Michele. How many of you who are going to be attending physically in Cartagena are going to be around at the weekend - the weekend before the meeting - James,

Paul. I'm not sure if that's Bob's hand - if that's Bob's way of saying yes or is he just going to ask a question. Simonetta yes. (Chris), when are you arriving?

(Chris): Yeah, I think on Thursday. I'm just fumbling to find the - put my hand up.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so you will be there basically. And I will - Berry, when are you arriving?

Berry Cobb: I don't think I'm going to be making it this time, so I will just be attending remotely.

Michele Neylon: Okay, fine. So I mean if you are remotely participating, then you are remotely participating. So that's - it's - I don't need to think about a room for you. I don't know. Is Baudouin going to be attending? (Barbara) said she wasn't attending from what I recall.

So is it easier to get rooms at the weekend than it is during the week, Marika, in terms of (timing)?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The problem is that the weekend schedule is already full back to back basically with GNSO-related meetings, so it would mean that for example I probably wouldn't be able to attend.

Michele Neylon: Of course.

Marika Konings: And I don't know if others are attending the GNSO session, so I think that would be more complicated.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: I mean the next thing would be for example what we've done in the past. I know you don't really like it, but a breakfast meeting. There's not many

breakfast meetings or early meetings and it might not conflict with other sessions that normally start at a - you know at a later point in the day.

Michele Neylon: Okay, ignoring my aversion for mornings as I have an aversion to the concept of morning -- never mind anything else -- how many of you would be willing - clear your statuses please because it's going to confuse my poor little brain. How many of you would be available in principle for a breakfast meeting if that was the only option open to us?

Man: It depends on the day, doesn't it?

Michele Neylon: I beg your pardon.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's likely that Wednesday morning and Thursday morning are the times in the meeting schedule where there is space for you know working group meetings or workshops, so likely Wednesday morning or Thursday morning.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Man: Unfortunately, I'm starting to accumulate breakfast meetings now.

Mikey O'Connor: You know we could just start drinking and run on from the other end. Just say meet at 2:30 or 3:00 in the morning.

Marika Konings: I mean what I can do is request a meeting at one of the normal slots. So you know it would be 9:00 to 10:00 or I think 11:00 to 12:00 and then we can just see when the schedule takes more form - you know whether that's suitable for all members or whether any meetings are scheduled opposite it that might form a conflict.

I mean (unintelligible) that you know we're having discussions within the GNSO Team to see where people are planning meetings, but we don't have (insight) yet where other teams are scheduling their events. So we will get to

see that at some point and then it might be easier to say, "Okay, the only option is really a breakfast meeting if we don't want to conflict with Meetings X, Y Z." Or you know just a lunch break for example would be another time where people might be free to sit together.

So my proposal would be that I put in the request you know for either Wednesday morning or Thursday morning and then we just see you know what is most suitable, and Michele I can liaise with you once I have more insight on what other meetings might be taking place at the same time.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, sure. Okay, then excuse me. James has an idea for an after-hours meeting. I quite like that idea. Is this kind of the GoDaddy party in Cartagena James?

James Bladel: This is me just trying to inject some humor into the discussion, but I think I would probably rather meet at midnight or 1:00 am than 6:00 am - just a personal preference.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think actually we should formally adopt that as our target. 1:00 am seems like the...

Michele Neylon: Do you like 1:00 am?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so do I.

Mikey O'Connor: (We would probably) resolve the whole thing in probably about a half an hour if we did that.

Michele Neylon: I think that's actually a very, very good idea. Marika, would you be able to attend such a meeting if we were to organize one?

Marika Konings: At 1:00 am? Well it depends what's on the schedule for the next morning I guess.

Mikey O'Connor: That's the problem with morning meetings.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. Anyway, okay moving on. In that case, Marika and I shall liaise.

With respect to all the wonderful work that Marika did I've got something I meant to be reading and of course I haven't because I've been very, very bold and very, very lazy, but she has been reminding me. Every single day diligently around 10:00 am Irish time, I get a message from here remind me. So it's my fault, not hers. Marika is innocent.

Marika Konings: And Michele I'm also happy to share it with the working group. As I said, what I've attempted to do is just incorporate the public comments and you know some of the additional discussions we've had and have made an attempt of you know (adapting them into) the recommendations.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, okay. Okay, well that - then I think - okay, share it with the rest of the group because I'm obviously being useless. So just send it out to the entire group mailing list and then let's see if anybody else is a little less useless than I am, and then we can move forward from that.

Paul Diaz also notes his relation to this with regards to the conference place. He thinks that that might actually close around 6:00 pm, which is possible, as he talks about hotels having nice sitting areas. Personally, I'm staying in a dive, which I chose intentionally because it was cheap, so I don't even know if it has a nice sitting area, but I'm sure we can all work that out.

Is that your hand from earlier, Marika, or is that a new hand?

Marika Konings: No, this is Marika. This is a new hand. Actually on the last point on the draft schedule we have, there are actually meetings scheduled until 7:00, so I

guess there is some flexibility there to the notion of whether - when the conference room closes.

And on the notion of - I will send out the report updated version, and I think it will be helpful to get an indication you know from working group members if they have a chance to review it to see whether you know they like the approach being taken.

Because if there would be support, you know we might still need the 15th of November deadline, and then you know it would be important that we make an effort and review it and refine the report. Or an indication saying, "Look this is - the deadline is coming too fast," and we'd just you know take more time and maybe use the document as a basis for further work you know beyond - you know towards Cartagena and beyond.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anybody else? Any other takers? No, okay then Bob and Simonetta you are up.

Bob Mountain: Okay, great. Thanks Michele. This is Bob speaking. So Simonetta and I had gone through and managed to get through a number of our members of the cohorts, and this was regarding the aftermarket survey where we went to people who weren't part of the working group, identified a number of cohorts, and surveyed them about ETRP, asking them if they were familiar with ETRP, , you know, what feedback they might have about it, also asking questions like how many high-jackings they had experienced over the past 12 months, how many they've ever experienced.

So we successfully reached out and spoke with ten individuals representing companies that were across three of the five cohorts we've - we had identified.

So we were able to speak with marketplaces, aftermarket domain marketplaces, aftermarket domain registrars who are active in the aftermarket as well as domainers who are obviously active in the aftermarket.

We did not get through to brokers or clients of brokers so we'll continue to work - get through to them and we'll add that to the summary.

In terms - I'm sorry can you (unintelligible). Yes, okay.

In terms of the marketplaces, so there were two marketplaces we spoke with. One of the marketplaces had never experienced a high jacking.

The other marketplace had experienced one high jacking which was successfully resolved through the efforts of the operator of the (marketplace).

There was certainly familiarity with ETRP. And I will send out the notes out. But just to summarize, I believe the - you know, the consensus on ETRP was - with the marketplaces was probably overkill I guess would be the phrase. It's not a big problem.

And the efforts that have been used by the market - or that have been implemented by both marketplaces have been sufficient to - you know, to overcome any sort of high jacking instances. At least I spoke with one of the marketplaces.

(Simonetta), did you want to comment on the - on your interview?

(Simonetta): I mean you captured it. Well there's not much to add.

(Bob): Okay. All right, great. Well then on domainers, I think this is where we tended to get more traction in terms of getting through to people. We've actually spoke with five domainers, five different domainers. None of them had experienced any high jacking although they were very concerned about it because they all knew people who had experienced high jacking.

There was a strong belief that the tools to present this exists but that you have to be on top of your portfolio.

All of the people who we spoke with or certainly the ones I spoke with were - you know, I would say were on top of their portfolio. They had written (routines) themselves to monitor other portfolio for example.

But they did say not everyone is. And they did have colleagues who had experienced high-jackings. In one instance the (deal) had been a real nightmare.

And had the domainer not been aware they felt it would have been - he probably would have lost it. He was successful in getting it back again but only because it went to the litigation.

So again, that was, you know, (unintelligible) the domainers I spoke with believe - he believed that ETRP had some definite potential, just wanted to see if (unintelligible) the details brought forth a little bit and perhaps the onus of responsibility placed a little bit more on the registrant, the losing registrant as opposed to the losing registrar.

I think the other two I would have to say were not in favor. They felt there was probably a bit of overkill. (Simonetta), anything to add?

(Simonetta): One of the individuals I spoke to mentioned a few things that I found very interesting because he - and I didn't mention that to him.

He also came up with a comparison to the credit card industry and also to the telecom industry when he was thinking about phone cards where I guess he had some experience.

And he was mentioning how in both areas the companies that are working on the prevention of these things before they're actually happening is where they put most of their focus.

And I'm sure everyone knows these somewhat annoying calls you get from your credit card company when something happens with your card that they find is unusual activity and they want to verify that this was actually you charging something to the card.

So basically setting up some kind of a risk profile system at the registrar level is something that he felt should be done both on the gaining as well as the losing side of any incoming transfers.

And he mentioned a ton of little things that could be done like for example, checking if someone who has just created an account with an email address that contains a lot of numbers and weird characters for the very first time enters a completely new credit card number and immediately starts asking for an incoming transfer, that could raise a red flag that you would start looking at this transfer before you even execute it.

And things like that which I thought was some interesting thoughts that we could maybe take more of a look at to come up with some kind of a recommendation of what can be done at a registrar level to prevent the fraudulent transfer to happen in the first place. So I thought that really had potential.

And the second comment he had - and that's in line with anyone I spoke to is that everyone I was speaking to was mentioning that there needs to be some way for the other side to make their case.

And obviously the first thing that domainers think of and marketplaces think of in this context is what if a seller is just after the sale going back and saying well I (sold) my \$300,000 domain and now I'm just getting it back.

So they didn't really think that this was a working solution for the buyers in a marketplace scenario and that there needs to be some kind of a dialogue going on between the gaining and the losing side before you decide if this should be reversed yet for now.

(Bob): Yes. We also spoke with three registrars, again registrars that are not part of the working group.

In the past 12 months none of them had experienced any high jacking. Although if you - over the past, you know, (unintelligible) and I said when I took the time constraints off we had (unintelligible) results.

One of them had had no high-jackings ever. One of them had had two high-jackings, you know, in the past few years since they've been affiliated.

And one of them had had a 100 high jacking attempts over the past ten years. So there's a big variance there. I wasn't quite able to figure out why one of them was at 100. But I keep trying to circle back with them and try and get a little bit more detail now that we have (unintelligible).

But yet they are able to successfully (develop) these. The way they did that was to (unintelligible). They were able to (unintelligible) I believe (unintelligible) of the losing registrar to resolve this (unintelligible).

There are comments that (Tim) (unintelligible) I also heard was the suggestion of some kind of early warning system so that when a - when someone does attempt fraud that the identify of that person would then be shared with other registrars that would be perhaps part of this early warning system.

So (unintelligible) was suggesting that that we might want to take a look at as it might help other registrars to avoid, you know, some fraud that was attempted first at one registrar and (unintelligible) another.

So that (unintelligible), you know, preliminary findings based on our first (client) interviews. And go write these up and distribute them to the group so that everyone will have a chance to look at it. And as well we'll, you know, try and get to the other two cohorts that we weren't able to get to so hopefully before the next call.

(Michele): (Paul), go ahead.

(Paul): Thanks (Michele). This is (Paul). And (Bob) you just said it. All I was going to ask -- this is all great information -- if you and (Simonetta) would please put your notes together and, you know, post it to the list so we can see it in writing.

You know, I don't know if you've spoken to any of my colleagues but for sure Network Solutions has dealt with high jacking cases in the very immediate term and quite a few over the past year if you're going that far out.

Also would note that some of the ideas that have been expressed in terms of potential best practice recommendations and whatnot are things that I'm sure some registrars are already doing. I know we do.

And I think that's a good idea or the working group to highlight things that we think may be helpful.

We may want to consider working or if we can draft these up, sharing them with (SSAC). I know that they are finally in the final stages of publishing their follow-on to (SSAC) 040, this new report.

And (Ron Malhan) had basically scooped a lot of the ideas in Circle ID a couple months ago. But, you know, it's going to have a laundry list of things registrars should do, registrants should look for and the registrars in terms of protecting their domain names.

A lot of this stuff is kind of commonsensical. Other things are more sophisticated, really will get folks thinking.

The important thing ultimately is that, you know, again, some registrars are doing it. That's the nature of the competitive market. It's good to highlight but, you know, we probably don't want to get overly prescriptive and certainly not overly detailed in some of these because the bad guys will be watching and reading as well. And we don't want to give them blueprints to further (getting) the system.

(Bob): Yes (Paul) this is (Bob). Yes, we'll actually circulate the notes, you know, following this meeting.

The other thing I talked about was - and (Paul), none of the registrars that are part of this working group were actually on the part of our survey. Just wanted to try and get, you know, other perspectives other than the people on the call.

So one of the things that did come up was the organization, the registrar alliance which was sounded like they're sharing information today about ways to (avoid). And I believe you're part of that aren't you?

(Paul): Yes. In fact I'm the one who vouched for you to get you in.

(Bob): Okay, I thought so. So I thought that, you know, very interesting group. Sounds like they're doing a lot of the things that might be helpful, you know, at least other responses we're getting for this.

So but anyways, yes, we will circulate the notes and thanks.

(Michele): Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. (Paul)'s comments reminded of a - on a follow-up item that I had. And I'm checking one, that (SSAC) report is coming out. And the last thing I've heard is that it's supposed to come out I think sometime next week. And as soon as that happens I'll forward a copy to the working group.

(Michele): Okay just one question there to (Bob) and to (Simonetta) there before we move on. This information sharing, what information were you talking about sharing?

Sorry, I've just - if I'd actually seen your notes I probably have understood this. But just because the two of you talking about it I'm a bit confused.

(Bob): Yes this is (Bob). You know, it was - one of the suggestions was if someone experiences a fraud attempt that they circulate that to this list so that I - you know, with as much information they have about the - you know, the attempted - the person who's attempting the fraud to highjack the domain.

You know, just as a way so that if this person's trying that other places that, you know, they'll know about it and they'll be on the lookout for that particular person.

(Michele): So okay, so it's not something kind of specific. It's not like - it's kind of a general sharing of information?

(Paul): No, hang on (Michele). It's (Paul).

((Crosstalk))

(Paul): Just for the non-registrar members of the group, don't anybody feel that you're being left out.

This group is a private list okay? So it's for registrars, registrars only. It's really for people in the customer service departments. So the pointy end of the spears here who see the fraudulent attempts as they're occurring.

And the list is actually quite detailed, quite actionable. They will share IT addresses, email addresses, names that are being used by well-known and new guys who pop-up attempting high-jackings, attempting God knows -- all sorts of things.

And it was created by senior customer service reps at a handful of companies and extended to their points of contacts across the registrar community because we realize that there were no other good (foura) to share this information to make sure that, you know, some cases in the past people have taken the attitude that hey, just let the problem go away and it's somebody else's problem.

With things like high jacking and some of the other fraud attempts that we see nowadays, you can't away from it. And that that sort of very short term mentality we found - collectively found was very, very detrimental.

So now it's a, you know, it's a data sharing forum. But again, it's a private list. It has nothing to do with ICANN other than the fact that we're registrars. But - and it's only available to registrar reps. And basically you got to get vetted by somebody who's already in to join up.

(Simonetta): This is (Simonetta). This is exactly what the feedback was from one of the domainers saying that something like that should be done. And I'm glad to hear that it is (unintelligible).

And he mentioned that again, I guess he has a background in the credit card processing field. And he said this is exactly what they've been doing when they started to share problematic credit card numbers, problematic IP

addresses and just patterns of what people are doing in terms of email addresses formatted this way in combination with country login from XYZ or key location of the card use is port authority terminal in New York City in combination with this, this and that and just these patterns should be shared. And if that's (already done) that's great.

And I just wanted to mention, I know this registrars only right now, but we have a lot of data like this as well that we all would be happy to share with that list.

I mean we have a registrar accreditation as well but be interested to get someone in our security and compliance team linked up with that group.

(Paul): (Simonetta) it's (Paul). Because you are accredited you'd be absolutely welcome. And please ping me off list. We'll put you in touch with the folks and get whether it's you or your colleague -- whomever -- in the loop.

(Simonetta): Okay.

(Paul): But when I say registrars only I just mean look, we're not extending out to the intellectual property and the business constituency and the others. It's meant to help the folks that are really at the point of interaction with customers and dealing with the fraud, share information and get things done.

(Simonetta): Yes.

(Michele): Okay, moving on, thank you (Bob) and (Simonetta). If you could try to put some kind of notes together and just email them to the list that would be helpful.

Because I think I suspect that several people would have, possibly have questions or queries on what you've got so far. But at least having it in writing would help us to see exactly what it is that you have.

Does anybody have any other questions or queries for (Bob) or (Simonetta) at the moment?

I'll take that resounding silence to mean no. Now there's another matter which isn't on the agenda though it should be. But I was - my brain wasn't working fully yesterday when I - when we were doing up the agenda.

Next week there is a change in the time of this call for European participants. Marika, could you explain this because you explained it to me yesterday? And it made sense to me at the time but I'm at a loss to explain it now.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So in Europe we're ending daylight saving coming weekend which means if we keep the call next week on the same, you can see time it is an hour earlier for European participants.

For the week - the weekend after that the US is changing also their time. Then the proposal would be for the week - I think that's the weekend of 7 of November. And there all (why don't) we just, you know, stick to our same local time which means that we move the UTC time so nothing changes for anyone.

It just means for next week calls for those in Europe that the call will be one hour earlier.

(Michele): Just related to that -- and I should have actually asked you that yesterday and I forgot -- will that - will any of the other calls be rescheduled as well or is it just this one as in is this being done with all the GNSO calls?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes. Our - the proposal is for once US and Europe have switched time to just change the UTC time which means that the call stays at the same local time.

And for next week we're just, you know, checking group by group whether, you know, it is an issue for some members, you know, or not and then it (at least) continue.

I mean the working group could decide as well to change the hour if that's more convenient or, you know, pick another time for next week if - because of the change in time it's not workable for some.

(Michele): Okay. Who's dialing in from Europe apart from me? I think (Chris) is. It's not a problem. And what's his name? there's a couple of others from the UK as well as far as I know. But of course they're not on the call today.

(Simonetta), are you calling in from the States or Germany?

(Simonetta): From the States.

(Michele): Okay.

Marika Konings: And (Michele), what we can do, I can ask Gisella to just send out a notice and ask people to indicate whether it, you know, is a problem for them if the call is an hour earlier for those in Europe.

(Michele): Yes, cool, perfect. I have just realized as well that next week at this time I won't be able to make the call because I think I'm on a plane somewhere.

So normally I ask if (James) can share the meeting as I'm not - if when I'm not around. (James) are you available next week or are you away?

(James): Good question. I'll have to check but probably make that a more democratic process anyway than...

((Crosstalk))

(James): ...anyone else would like to, yes.

(Michele): Yes, so is anybody who would like to throw themselves on the sword and like to chair the meeting next week as I won't be able to attend it? I'm traveling and so is Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. That's right. I'll ask one of my colleagues to be step in.

(Michele): And (Barbara)'s not able to attend next week. (Barry)'s suggestion that we postpone. I don't mind personally. Oh, okay. (Paul)'s not away - isn't available next week either. Okay they're all dropping off like flies.

A couple people expressing a preference to postpone the meeting. Is there anybody who has - okay Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. You know if we're postponing and if several members are not available maybe it's a good moment to then encourage people to actually review the document and share comments on the mailing and (tell me) that we can have a dialogue on the mailing list to see, you know, what might be achievable for Cartagena if there's anything you want to put out or share already with the council or the community at that stage.

I hope to get those documents out later today.

(Michele): Okay. All right then so we will postpone the meeting next week and we will focus on the reviewing the documents in the meantime yes? Agreed? Disagreed? Agreed. Okay one person agrees with me.

Okay, you all suddenly agree with me. Thank you. All right.

Also, as we are pretty much nearly at the end of the hour I don't want to go diving into comments now because we won't actually get anywhere. So I

would therefore humbly suggest that we wrap up the meeting today and look forward to discussing things with everybody via email over the next few days.

Is - are there any other matters that - would anybody wants to raise at this juncture?

No? Okay then I'll speak to you all in two weeks time then. Thank you.

END