Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 17 May 2011 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 17 May 2011 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-20110524-en.mp3

on page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may

Attendees:

Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG

James Bladel – Registrar SG

Berry Cobb – CBUC

Chris Chaplow – CBUC

Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Paul Diaz – Registrar SG

Bob Mountain – Registrar SG

Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Barbara Steele – Registries SG

Rob Golding – Registrar SG

ICANN Staff:

 Marika Könings

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Chris Chaplow – CBUS

Anil George - IPC

Oliver Hope – Registrar SG

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Baudouin Schombe -

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

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you (Bea). Good morning, good afternoon everyone. This is
the IRTPB call on the 24th of May. And on the call we have Michele
Neylon, James Bladel, Chris Chaplow, Mikey O'Connor, Paul Diaz,
Barbara Steele, Matt Serlin, Berry Cobb, Simonetta Batteiger and Bob
Mountain.

And for Staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Glen de Saint Gery.
Thank you Michele and over - yes we have - sorry, apologies from
Kevin Erdman and Anil George. Have I missed anybody on the list?

Michele Neylon: I don't think so.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you Michele. Over to you.

Michele Neylon: All right, good afternoon ladies, gentlemen and Matt. It being Tuesday
it's - well it's the IRTP so as usual we've done our roll call. Now we will
have the usual check to see has anybody got an update to the
Statement of Interest or Declaration of Interest?

No? Going once. Going twice. Okay moving on. Right then. The - one of the things today was - we were looking at was in relation to the Emergency Action Channel.

So there was a conflict of acronyms and I can't remember what the conflict was again. My brain's gone. Yes Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. We can maybe first start with what's on the screen and then maybe move on to some of the other comments, if that's okay for you.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Yes that's fine.

Marika Konings: Good, because basically what is on the - this screen is the email I sent out last week with the, you know, consensus call asking what - anyone had any further comments or problems with any of the language that we currently have in the EAC as it's still called.

And there were two things I highlighted that were based on Barbara's email that she sent I think last week just prior or just after the call we had, because there were still two items I think that the Registrys had concerns about.

And the first one I think is addressed and Section 6 of the IRTP actually states that, you know, that the five-day period within which an undo must be taken care of.

So I don't think there's a need to, you know, further clarify that as the EAC specifically refers to that section. On the second item I didn't see anyone responding or providing any input, because as I understand it

the Registry operators are stating that they don't want to reset a domain name to its original state, but they are willing to update the Registrar of record to its previous state.

And once that is done the Registrar of record would be responsible for resetting the other information such as name servers. As far as I understand Section 6, this actually is different from what is currently required in the case of a transfer undo, because Section 6 basically states that the transfer will be reversed and the domain name reset to its original state.

I'm just trying to clarify from the group whether we need to provide specific exception then, what a transfer undo means in this context or does the group feel that what is currently in Section 6 should also apply to this version of a transfer undo?

So I'm trying to determine what if anything is further required in relation to address this specific comment by the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Michele Neylon: Barbara and then Mikey.

Barbara Steele: Thanks. This is Barbara. From our perspective at least here at the VeriSign Registry, we - when we return a domain name in our undo process that's published out there I believe on the ICANN Web site, we specifically state that we will basically update only their Registrar of record.

So from our perspective and I expect the perspective of the other Registry operators based on the feedback that I got, you know, Registrys feel as though the updating of the name servers and any

other information relative to the domain name should really be with the Registrar of record.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you Barbara. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry, it took a minute to get off mute. I'm fine with all of this. I want to highlight something that's related though, and that is that in the latest version of the FAQ some - and it has to do with the placement of the may versus will.

I think it's our intent with the placement of the may that the option to request a transfer undo stays with the Registrars rather than the Registrys. In other words if I'm a Registry I want a signal that simply says do this thing, and then a clear policy that I follow that does that thing.

And so this clarification that was on the screen a minute ago is fine with me, and I defer to the Registrys on that. But in the FAQ what we said was it's the answer to the question, "What happens when the gaining Registrar does not respond to an EAC request?"

And in the FAQ it says, "The losing Registrar may - I'm sorry. The losing Registrar informs the Registry that they have not received a response to the EAC request, after which the Registry may perform a transfer undo."

And I don't think that that's our intent. I think that our intent on the placement of the discretion is with the Registrar, not the Registry. And so I decided to chime in with this point here just because it sort of fits in

with the points that Barbara made which, you know, my sense - and I don't want to put words in your mouth.

My sense is that the Registrys want a very clear sort of black and white path. If this happens then these things will happen by this route and consistent with existing policy.

And by moving the may back up into the Registrar area I think we accomplished that. So that was the thought that I wanted to put out there.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks Mikey. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So just to clarify - so Mikey if we would move basically that - change it around and say something along the lines of, "If the losing Registrar has not received a response to an EAC request, the losing Registrar may request or may inform the Registry and request that the Registry performs a transfer undo." Does that address your point?

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, I just posted a tentative draft down in the chat, because I rewrote this and then I decided it was easier to present this context on the call.

Marika Konings: Right, but I think it's the way you write it basically means once a Registrar informs the Registry has to undo, and I think as we have currently written the language we're saying it's a may. There's no obligation and...

Mikey O'Connor: No, and that's the whole point that I'm making, is that the may right now sits in Section 4, which is Requirements on the Registrar. And so it's up to the Registrar to decide whether to request the undo.

And then once the Registrar does make that choice then the Registry has a very clear path as to what they do, and that's why I rewrote that sentence that way is to clarify that.

And because in my understanding and again Barbara, you know, feel free to chime in here, is that they don't want to be put in an adjudicary role. They don't want to be in a decision-making role in this.

They simply want to be in a situation where it's very clear what they do and that's consistent with existing policy. And the discretion lies with the gaining - with the losing Registrar as to whether to pursue that or not.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Barbara?

Barbara Steele: Barbara. I agree with Mikey's assessment of that and I believe that the Registry Stakeholder Group members would also be agreeable to that, basically just being consistent with the existing policy and that to the extent that we did receive a notice that again, you know, as Mikey mentioned that we're not making a decision.

We're acting on the notification from the Registrar and, you know, the assertation that they're making that that's the situation and that we're to undo it in accordance with Section 6.

Michele Neylon: All right, thank you Barbara. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I still have a question for Barbara in relation to, you know, pertaining to the Registrar of record and sort of changing the name service.

Are you comfortable by it currently just pointing to Section 6, which if I understand you correctly that is what currently is in place and that, you know, allows you to, you know, do the same thing?

Or do you think that's still something additional needs to be written in or explained what is, you know, covered on a transfer undo?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I would prefer that it's updated to actually reflect that we would only be changing the Registrar of record, and that the name servers and any other changes would be handled by the Registrar, because that in practice is what, you know, Registry operators are doing today in accordance with the undo mechanism.

Marika Konings: So is that something we can just clarify in the FAQ, which I think we'll provide as well as a kind of, you know, implementation guidance to, you know, our legal and services team to make sure that they understand what the, you know, objective and idea behind the EAC is. Would that be okay?

Or if you actually proposed language for the EAC itself, you know, feel free to suggest it just to make sure that I capture it correctly at the right spot.

Barbara Steele: Yes, I can take a look at the language and see if I can come up with something, because in some cases court orders actually do order us to make changes to name servers and maybe redirect, you know, traffic to another, you know, another name server.

But that again is not, you know, necessarily restoring it to where it was before the states, you know, before the request or the I guess incident that occurred I should say.

So I can take a look at it and see if I can come up with something that would work.

Marika Konings: Great, thank you.

Barbara Steele: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm just wondering if that achieves what we want. If only the Registrar is changed that doesn't necessarily mean that someone's Web site is up and running again, right?

And I also wonder if for example in a thick Registry, the Registrant isn't changed and it's all left the hijacker's information or some other entity's information, is then the transfer undo sufficiently well done from what the Registrars need to take it from there?

Or is - would it be better if we made a distinction between thick and thin and say, "If the Registry has the opportunity to update name

servers or Registrant information and things like that, they should be doing it?"

I don't know. I mean, this is more like a question to the Registrars in this group.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody want to respond to Simonetta?

Barbara Steele: My hand's up Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Barbara go ahead.

Barbara Steele: Okay this is Barbara. I think that basically it gets us where we need to be, and it's mainly because once the domain name is back under the management of the Registrar of record who had lost the domain name then, you know, obviously it's in their interest to go ahead and restore the name to where it was previously.

They have the relationship with the Registrant and would have also the history of what that information was, so I would think that, you know, at the end of the day, you know, once the domain name is with that Registrar of record, the previous version, you know, they would act swiftly to make any other changes to I guess correct the situation until, you know, further communications can occur between the - between themselves and the other Registrar should there be additional conversations necessary.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: Hi Michele. James speaking, and I agree with Barbara. I think that there is a motivation on the part of the Registrar once they have control to restore the other objects, particularly the name servers.

And the, you know, I don't know that there should be a distinction between (caninsec). I think that this is probably true for all Registry models.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have anything else further to add? General agreement from several people on that. Thank you James. Marika is uploading something.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So this is the email that I sent based on the feedback I received from Tim and I think, you know, the main issue for the Working Group to consider is the title.

And I know some suggestions have been made already so maybe that's an easy discussion.

Michele Neylon: Okay I think I - okay one of - the title is currently EAC. I think I suggested that we add Transfer to it, which I thought was just simple and straightforward.

Does anybody have any issues with us renaming the process to Transfer Emergency Action Channel? Are there any good reasons not to rename it to something like that? James?

James Bladel: Hey, you know, as long as we're considering renaming this, I'm wondering why we stuck with the Channel as opposed to Contacts? I

don't know, and it - maybe it's just a minor thing. I don't want to make a big deal out of it.

I just thought that Emergency Action Contacts made a lot more sense than Channel but, you know, the Channel means - to me it seems to describe the method of communication rather than the recipient.

But I don't want to nitpick this. I just thought as long as we're examining - reexamining the name then I wanted to put that out there.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Just Michele speaking as myself, I'm not wed to Channel particularly and Contact makes perfect sense to me as well. So I'm more than happy to change it. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I wonder Mikey, you said this came out of FSAC a while ago. Was the intent about this there also just around transfers, or was the intent around having a communication structure open around other issues too, which then I wonder if we limit this and its naming to just Transfer, we kind of close the door to that one or would have to reconsider it down the road or I'm just wondering?

I don't have an issue with being - it named Contact or Channel or have the Transfer thing in there, but I was just wondering if that's too narrow.

Michele Neylon: Mikey? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh sorry, mute. That was very eloquent. Simonetta had sort of took to a lot of the points I was going to make. It - the Channel word came from the FSAC report and it's useful not to limit it just to the purpose that we're describing I think.

You know, additions to its purpose would have to be, you know, clearly brought through the policy making process, but, you know, I'm actually - if backed into a corner I like EAC better than either TEAC or changing it to Contact for all those reasons. There's actually a surrounding context that the Channel word came from.

Michele Neylon: So Mikey, just bearing with the fact, as I'm probably being a little bit slow today, so are you saying we should rename it or we shouldn't?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm actually saying we shouldn't rename it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. All right, but will you cry if we rename it?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thanks Michele. This is Berry. Believe it or not I actually support Mikey on this as well. If we do narrow this down to just in the transfer realm then, you know, I'm just trying to be forward thinking that future policy development or something that comes up that may, you know, may be able to piggyback off of this, you know, would prompt another name change or something like that.

So I think kind of minimizing it just to EAC will leave that door open, that maybe this is a platform that we can leverage for other issues that we find. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Berry and Mikey just - was I kind of - I think I know what Paul is going to say so I'm going to actually preempt him slightly. Why would we want to leave that door open? Why would we want...?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey speaking with his mouth full.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. You can speak with your mouth full. It's okay. We'll try and understand you. I mean, from a Registrar perspective why would Registrars sign up to agree to something like this where the scope is not defined?

Mikey O'Connor: I don't believe that the scope is not defined. I believe that right now the scope is very clearly defined. However if in subsequent, very careful consensus policy making, for example in the DSSA process, it turns out that a urgent return mechanism is useful in other contexts.

We simply would then have to rename it, that's why I won't cry if we put T in front of it. But it just means that subsequent policy making groups will have to rename it again, which will confuse people. But in this policy the scope is very clear. It's very narrow.

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's fair enough. That's fine. Paul and then Berry.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. It's Paul. Look, I respectfully disagree with Mikey and Berry. This Working Group has a finite mandate. It is focused on IRTP transfer-related issues.

I fully support what Tim Cole said in his email about the title. We need to remain focused. I like James' point about, you know, changing it from Channel to Contact, and quite honestly if future policy were - the

one that Mikey started or any others, if there is a need for some sort of urgent return mechanism, their charters, their mandates will address that.

We can make the changes when necessary. I don't think it's going to be this incredibly confusing thing for folks, so let's be more specific. Let's stay within our boundaries, our mandate and for that reason I support the TEAC acronym.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Berry and then James.

Berry Cobb: Thank Michele. This is Berry. Yes, you know, my intent behind that was never to say that this is scope creep toe (Alice) to open up SEV1 help desk all of a sudden between Registrars.

The point is is trying to take a services view approach to this, and there are other interactions that go on behind the scenes so that was my only intent. So we can name it whatever we want. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. James?

James Bladel: I generally agree with Paul on this one and, you know, I think whether changing the name of something actually changes its view I think is more of a philosophical debate.

But I do see Tim Cole's point in that if this is initially a Registrar to Registrar transfer only communication channel, it is - it's going to be a tempting target for other interests to want to participate in this communication network and to use it for other issues such as, you

know, maybe issues that are with the emergency and nature of the communication is less universally understood.

So, you know, I think if we can limit it now and then maybe make that a part of the context for other policies I think that would probably be best that the folks are trying to anticipate that in this group.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Anybody else want to jump in? Okay then, so we have - I'm trying to work out do we have actual consensus on this of any description.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we're close enough Michele. This is Mikey. I'm - I don't have real strong views on this.

Michele Neylon: Okay, well I'll work on the basis that we have consensus on adding the term Transfer. We've - okay we have full consensus on adding the term Transfer to the description, and we have consensus on changing it from Channel to Contact, which I think covers all bases.

And at the moment the boys are on the chat now. Just ignore all these silly acronyms that they're putting in there because it's terribly distracting. Okay then, James go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, to Mikey's point I think it is important that we ensure that this idea is linked to the pedigree of that original FSAC report. So if we want to reference that in the body of the report and in the body of the recommendations, you know, I think that'll establish that link and we don't then need to have the burden of carrying a ten year old acronym with us as long as we point back to it and say, "This is where the idea germinated." I think that - I think he has a point there. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Okay this is feedback from ICANN Compliance for the - I presume everybody's on there. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So there's an email I shared with you I think yesterday following some questions that were on last week's calls with - in relation to enforcement or noncompliance with consensus policies.

So it outlined there the different mechanisms that compliance has and that I also attached a presentation that they provided at a meeting in Munich to weeks ago.

There was one issue there and I think some of our people already commented on that in the mailing list where there was a suggestion that, you know, in relation to the responses being required within four hours, that there might be valid reasons for why a Registrar might not have responded.

And I think indeed - I think some already noted that both parts could be the case, for example natural disasters, extreme circumstances. So it was a suggestion to maybe add something like, you know, absent extenuating circumstances and preferably define what those extenuating circumstances might be would give compliance, you know, some more guidance in cases where a Registrar claims that, you know, they had a valid reason for not responding where, you know, compliance could then say, "Well, you know, these are the following valid reasons that the Working Group has considered but, you know, the reason you're providing is not considered a valid reason in this context."

So it was a question whether, you know, the Working Group would consider that as a useful addition and what, you know, kind of examples or restrictions could be set on that that, you know, would make it easier for compliance to follow up on any kind of complaints in relation to, you know, responses not being received.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks Marika. Sorry, I lost the window. That keeps happening to me. Go ahead James.

James Bladel: All right, thanks Michele. James speaking. I would like to come out against the idea of the policy enumerating some extenuating circumstances or exceptions.

You know, we've wrestled with this in other groups I think most recently in PEDNR when we tried to outline different exception scenarios. I think that makes it harder for compliance honestly to try and capture all of those things in advance, and then to try and determine what, you know, what exception was in play in any given scenario.

You know, we're not talking about immediate de-accreditation based on the failure to respond. We're talking about it just kind of serving to build a case history or a record of the Registrar.

I think that, you know, for example one Registrar might consider a massive earthquake/tsunami to be an acceptable extenuating circumstance. And I think the small Registrars might consider a vacation or an overnight stay in a hospital for an important person to be an extenuating circumstance.

And I think that once we get into that we start getting into the sliding scale of judgment and I think it's best not to take a foot down - take a step down that slippery slope. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thank you James. Mr. Diaz?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. I fully support everything James said and just wanted to underscore that, you know, very often what we're really focused on here is establishing a dialog, just as we're not looking for registries to immediately take some action. I don't think we were looking for a compliance to immediately start breach proceedings and the de-accreditation proceedings against a registrar.

You know, when we see a pattern developing, it will be a lot easier for compliance. In all likelihood, most cases one phone call or one email from compliance is going to get somebody with the program, so, you know, I fully agree. I don't think we should start introducing exceptions or trying to define extenuating circumstances. It is a slippery slope. Let's keep this as simple as we can.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Paul. And anybody else want to jump in here?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, I think we should keep it simple. I think compliance will use sensible discretion. You know, I had a sales manager once and he had more emergencies, family problems, children in swimming pools, diseases, anything that you ever believed and after a while you begin

to realize it's not exceptional circumstances. There's something going on.

And I think compliance will use the same logic for repeated offenders. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Just actually on that note, I mean, that was something that I was also very wary of in an email I sent I think probably yesterday.

While I can appreciate - well, I personally can appreciate the concept of extenuating circumstances, I would echo Chris' concerns that, you know, extenuating - you know, you only have one aunt, one mother, one sister who can, you know, get hit by a bus or whatever. If it keeps happening, it's a little bit suspicious, and I would be concerned, but it's...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Sorry?

Man: I said if you want to keep getting hit by a bus it depends on how hard you push.

Michele Neylon: Well, look, not everybody gets to do it with those nice wide buses now, you know. Ours are terribly boring, so I think actually you get hit by them once and you're just dead.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, just very quickly. In my opinion we've taken a lot of the teeth or consequences out of this recommendation. You know, as Paul was saying, there are no automatic registry actions to undo transfers, there are no automatic actions for compliance. Everything is just, you know - you know, essentially it boils down to now answer your phone promptly or you'll get a strongly worded letter, you know.

And so I think coming up with further exception scenarios or provide those or reasons why we shouldn't have to, you know, I think it personally is not a good use of our time, but, you know, on a more general note, I think it speaks a lot to the maturity of this industry that we have to continue to or we're being requested to paint exceptions for smaller folks.

I think that, you know, it's time to raise the bar on what we're expecting for providers of what we consider to be critical internet resources.

And, you know, I think this is a very small step in this direction, but I think that it's something that we should preserve as much as we can of the intention. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Sorry, Windows is going nuts here. Now that I'm using Windows, the operating systems is Windows like as in Windows of a desktop.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm fine with that - what has been said on this issue. Maybe just to recap then on the EAC, so basically I'll change the language that Mikey put in the chat in the FAQ and then Barbara is

going to suggest some language either for the policy language or the FAQ in relation to the - what is the - what are the requirements or what is expected following a transfer undo by the registry.

And I think that captures everything in relation to the EAC. Do I have that right? Was there anything else that needs to be captured or addressed?

Michele Neylon: Okay. Guys, anybody else have anything they want to raise? Now is the time to speak or forever hold your peace. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I know this is not a very popular topic to bring up but I would like to make sure that the 60 lock-day minority viewpoint is taken notice of and included. And if there are any questions or other additional items this group would like to discuss about this then I think this would be a good time to talk about it.

Michele Neylon: Well thank you Simonetta for raising this point. It wasn't on the agenda for the simple reason that, well you haven't sent the email at the time the agenda went out and as per the new working group guidelines, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, I think we're meant to send out the agendas 24 hours in advance anyway.

So moving to this matter which was shoved under review of final report, I see Paul Diaz already has his hand up. Paul, please go ahead. And please be polite to members - other members of the group, although I know you will be.

Paul Diaz: We'll try Michele. I'm not trying to be argumentative, at least not that much.

Look, just before because this came in the inbox this morning so just before this call I posted a response. And Simonetta, in a nutshell, you know, I'm respectfully disagreeing with the minority position you're taking. I support what is currently the minority view - excuse me, majority view.

But my question for you is, you know, we've heard throughout the working group's existence complaints about lack of data and I'm tossing that one back to you. The question is do you have any data that gets at this concept of multiple transfers, that is transfers between registrars within a 60-day period? Can you quantify that for us because maybe we're just missing something that this is actually a very common occurrence?

From my experience working for a fairly large registrar, we don't see that at all. And so I'm kind of left wondering if your minority position is being driven by a vocal minority and if so, you know, I'm kind of left wondering well, is that really in the best interest of the broader community. You know, we're trying to make an incremental security step here by mandating the lock.

And again, very important and it gets to Mike Rodenbaugh's response on the list to what I said, as well, we're not trying to create draconian rules that will limit people's abilities to do things.

Even within this working group we've pretty clearly in my mind laid out a service that a party such as Sedo or any of the after-market providers could provide. It gets at the whole idea that we've been kicking around this change of registrant versus change of registrar.

There are ways that you could accommodate what I believe is a very small subset of the overall market, give them what they need, yet we can have this broader policy in place to protect the security interest of a much larger share of the marketplace.

So, you know, I'm sorry that I could only post my response a few minutes before the call got under way, but if you're prepared to answer or if you can follow up on the list, you know, I do hope that there's some good stuff for dialog there.

Simonetta Batteiger: Right. I saw your email and it came a few minutes before this call so obviously I did not have time to collect any data or even request the data that I would need to back this up.

I think I could get the data about this. It's not something that I can get within four minutes, obviously, but I can share with you that there's numerous occasions where you would want to have a domain transfer twice around an escrow transaction.

And I think that is a very common thing that happens all the time. And you probably don't see it if you're just one side of the transfer because you wouldn't necessarily see the twice change of hands because obviously you will only be involved with one of these transfers.

And I can see how for you this may not look like it is something that happens all the time, but it is a very common thing around domain name transfers that are traded in the market and - or just change hands between two parties where two people come to agreement even outside of Sedo.

So I do see your point that you would like to see data on this. I don't think I can get this data in time for us to include it in this final report, if this should be final for Singapore.

So my intent with putting at least the wording in there is so that whoever takes this report is either able to request the data and know what they should be asking for, and I'm happy to include a sentence that states this data should also be collected and taken a look at so that you can really make a good choice.

But I don't think - I mean, we were not able to get to the - how many hijacking cases data. We don't have any idea how many of these hijacking cases have the jumping issue and I cannot get to enough data for the legitimate transfer piece quickly.

So if we include this minority viewpoint, at least whoever takes this recommendation needs - has an opportunity to understand what they need to be taken into account when they make their decision.

So I would - unless we change our mind and we do want to open this up for comment, again, which I heard from (Jeremiah) last week that this group decided not to do, I am hesitant to take this point out of the minority viewpoint because I do think it needs to be looked at.

And I see your point, too. Obviously it needs to be quantified, as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you Simonetta. James, then Barbara, then Mikey.

James Bladel: Michele, thanks. James, speaking. I don't agree with the - what's included in the minority statement. I don't think there's any surprise there. I do, however, support the process of including minority viewpoints. I want to make sure that it is included intact in our final report and our final recommendations, you know, so that it is then considered.

You know, perhaps, you know, this section could also acknowledge that something like 90 plus percent of the - of registrars accompanying 90 plus percent of the market share already practice this but, you know, I don't think that that's a huge issue.

I think the more important case and this goes to a little bit to what Paul and Simonetta were discussing is that we have later on our report recommended an issues report on the concept of change of control and I can see that that probably will, you know, dollars versus donuts turn into a PDP at some point down the road.

And I would strongly encourage, you know, our colleagues from the aftermarket to get engaged in that PDP and to, you know, include as many of their clients and other folks from that industry as possible because we've got a real problem here in that we have - we're using transfers differently.

We're using them to do different things. We're not using them to transact names for the most part in the primary market. It's using them to ensure that there is a level playing field for competition and for competitive services.

So I think that, you know, we need - the only way we're going to make some significant progress and to weigh on these issues is to disentangle in the minds of people the idea that transfer is a change of control, and I think the only way to do that is to come up with a distinct, secure and aftermarket friendly change of control process.

And I would hope that everybody that has strong opinions in this working group gets involved in that one when it comes up. Thanks.

Barbara Steele: Hi, it's Barbara.

Michele Neylon: Barbara, then Mikey then Bob, then Simonetta.

Barbara Steele: Okay. I just wanted to point out, I obviously don't have visibility into, you know, domain hopping in the case of hijackings but I can say that our experience at VeriSign with transfer dispute cases for a while there it seems like a lot of them that came through, in fact the majority of the ones that came through, the domains actually went from one registrar to another registrar. That was disputed. But, you know, by the time it got to us, it had gone to yet a third registrar.

So we had to address that in our supplemental rules that accompanied the whole transfer dispute resolution policy and I think a lot of other registry operators adopted the same, I guess, process that, you know, if we do find in analyzing or adjudicating a dispute between registrars if a domain name has gone to yet a third registrar, you know, we keep that registrar involved and we let them know that we've received a dispute on it.

And to the extent that we find that the transfer between, you know, the first registrar and the second registrar was not in accordance with the policy, then we reserve the right to basically be able to pull that name back from the third registrar and return it to the original registrar. So I just wanted to point that out.

And then there was also it seems to be several years ago ICANN had conducted a study, and I don't know if this is something that Marika, you know, maybe you can see if you can find information on, relative to domain hopping.

And it seems like there was a lot of three-letter domain names that were being transferred from one registrar to another and then, you know, straight on to a third registrar. I like to refer to it as domain laundering.

But it seems like there was a study that was conducted by ICANN several years ago looking into that and there was a specific complaint relative to, you know, either one or two registrars that were kind of involved. And it seems like that activity was happening a lot amongst those registrars.

So that might help us get some information, as well, relating to this particular topic.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Barbara. Mikey, then Bob, then Simonetta.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Michele. This is Mikey. I'm probably going to annoy everybody, but it seems to me that we are moving too quickly to a final report on this topic. And so I would - you know, I think what we are doing is we

are driving ourselves perhaps to a false lack of consensus because we're moving too quickly and too single-mindedly toward a Singapore deadline.

And given the fact that this working group has already taken a very long time, I can understand the motivation for that, but conversely, because this working group has taken a really long time does not in my mind make it necessary that we arbitrarily stick to that deadline.

And just given the richness of this last 15 minutes of conversation, I would request that we reconsider the Singapore final report, no public comment process that we're following and consider a more in-depth discussion of this topic amongst the working group and another round out to public comment after we've really run that to ground.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Mikey. Bob and then Simonetta.

Bob Mountain: You know, just to I think Paul's point, I think the request for data on the hopping on the aftermarket side is totally fair. And I was just going to volunteer to do the same and I'm happy to dig around and see if we can get some data on that, as well, incidents that we have may have experienced on our side and see if that helps to clarify the picture.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Bob. Who do we have next? We have Mikey - I thought you were already there Mikey. How did you manage to get back there? I'm confused.

Mikey O'Connor: Old hand. Sorry.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That's okay. I was getting worried there for a second. I think I was losing my mind. Sorry. Simonetta and then James.

Simonetta Batteiger: I just wanted to agree with James on one point and this was one of my other recommendations or - well, I guess points from the email I wrote before last week's call is should we take this piece and say the working group - or we have this recommendation in there that we'll take a look at what is the difference between transfer the old school way with no ownership change at the same time and transfer the way it is used for lots and lots and lots of transactions today already that has ownership update at the same with transfer between two parties.

And as a party of this, that group that looks at that topic should also be looking at this.

So this was one of my suggestions last week to say we could take this recommendation and add some language to say that we recommend that someone take a look at the difference between transfer and owner update and how this whole thing works and as part of that, they should also be taking a look at this.

And then I have no issue with including this language and also what my points were, so that working group has a starting point to go from and also take Paul's suggestion to say well you should really be looking at all the data, I mean, the data about hijacking, the data about how many legitimate transactions have multiple touch points and all these things.

I mean, this is all stuff that the group should be looking at and I think once the EAC or TEAC or whatever it's going to be called has been up and running for a little while, we have better data on that front and I think it's up to the aftermarkets and other players in this world to come up with the data to back up my statement that there is considerable concern and there is legitimate uses for multiple transfers in relatively short amount of time.

So I don't disagree with anyone. I just want to make sure that whoever makes the decision has an insight into all these things that one should be looking at to come to a conclusion.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. James?

James Bladel: Hi. James speaking. Thanks Michele. I wanted to respond a little bit to what Mikey was saying, you know, I understand that a lot of folks are saying that this is - you know, this is maybe something that's too big to tackle between now and Singapore. I just want to point out that this something that we identified very early on in this working group and then all of the oxygen was sucked out of the room with things like the eTRP and the EAC and so we just never got to it.

So I would be - just remind folks that this is completely and totally a failure on our part if we don't come up with a recommendation here. However, if it is sufficiently contentious that we just feel like we can't go forward with that or if I end up in the minority on that, then my recommendation as a fallback, reluctantly would be to include this topic in the recommendation that we have for an issues report on change of control and that we add it to that and say this is a part of that, this is a part of that confusion, the misapplication of the IRTP in commercial or

transactional settings that is causing the concerns relative to the 60-day loss.

And because I'm concerned that we don't come out here that it opens the floodgates for the 60-day lock after a domain name is initially registered, which is also sort of a universal best practice but not required in the same language.

So, you know, I just want to point out that if we don't have a recommendation in this area, then it is a failure, I believe, of this working group and that we should try to come up with something. Worst case scenario would be to include it and that call for a change in control. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Matt and then Mikey.

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele. This is Matt. I have chosen to remain silent for just about 57 minutes which I think is a record for me. I'd just like to agree with what James said and I think what Simonetta has put out in terms of a minority viewpoint is certainly fine. I actually - I appreciate Paul's point about data. I just - I worry that the search for data around this is going to delay this even further, so I would actually be supportive of just including the minority viewpoint as it is because I do think that we do have a minority supporting the view that we included in the report about the 60-day post transfer lock.

So - that I think is my preferred way forward, but I suppose I'd agree with James, as well, if that is no longer the case, then I would be supportive of including it in the change of control recommendation. But

again, my strong preference is to continue forward with the majority viewpoint and just included as the minority.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to make just one last pitch of a little bit of delay, and we've been at this a long time. We're all tired. We're all striving for a Singapore deadline, but I think we should step back and, you know, I agree with James, we - I wouldn't call it a failure, but we didn't focus on this appropriately. And now we're sort of playing catch-up.

And the sense I get, the intuitive feel that I get is that we're not that far apart, but that we are rushing this. And because we're rushing it, we're missing an opportunity to keep a group which is way up a learning curve. You know, one of the big things about having spent all this time together is that we do know each other and we do understand each other's points of view and we do seem to get quite a bit done in a very effective way.

And I'm just lobbying for a little more time to give this problem a bit more of a look before we - I mean in consensus building there is a point in which you have to say, no, we don't have consensus or whatever. I just don't know that I would be comfortable with myself if I didn't say, look, you know, consensus building does take some time and I'm not sure we've given this quite enough.

So my encouragement would be drop the target back to Senegal and focus on this one between now and then. Get this one right. See if we can get it to the point where we really have a consensus view and can do a really good job of teeing up the discussion about change of

control at the same time, but keep the team together to do it rather than just stopping and...

Michele Neylon: Mikey, as working group chair, let me tell you that if this is going to be moving toward Senegal, you're going to have to find another chair.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm perfectly happy to take that job. I do not think that it's appropriate for a chair to use his personal circumstance as a way to direct policy at ICANN. And I protest that remark.

Michele Neylon: I think - okay, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: That is out of line. Sorry.

Michele Neylon: Not - hold on Mikey. I would - I'm - what I'm trying to say - what I would like to say to you is this is that I cannot see - I personally cannot see how we will be able to reach an agreement on this particular point. I cannot see that happening.

I do personally think that maybe this - it might be better addressed in some other fashion.

Mikey O'Connor: I think if the chair...

Michele Neylon: But I don't...

Mikey O'Connor: ...believes that we cannot reach an agreement, then we either need to change the chair or we need to declare that circumstance in the report.

Michele Neylon: Sorry?

Mikey O'Connor: I do not think it's appropriate for a Chair to predetermine the outcome of a policy debate.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, if you don't like that then I'm more than happy to either recluse myself or resign as Chair.

Mikey O'Connor: I would encourage you to reconsider your remarks.

Michele Neylon: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Michele. Hopefully, I can try to mend both sides of this bridge right here. In general, I do think we're much closer than we are. But at the same time I know that, you know, we have gone through this. Really what's dangling out there is our absence of data.

So my first question is how long do we think it'll take to get some of this data? And if it doesn't take that long, will that impact the deadline for us publishing the final report?

And then the secondary part of that question is, if for any reason, you know, I think even if we get the data my gut tells me that I don't think it's going to change much in terms of our majority and minority positions.

Matter of fact I truly believe that we'll still be going to print with the majority and minority position even if we did have the data. So the secondary question is then, could we not go ahead and package up for the final report with both the majority and the minority positions and turn it over to the council?

And then let's think about how the council's going to handle this. Again, recognizing that I don't think a minority position is going to become a full consensus position.

How is the council going to handle this? And if it will take us a while to capture the appropriate data, can we submit that under separate cover for the council to consider when they go to specifically vote on this particular consensus policy? Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Berry. Simonetta, James and then Marika.

Simonetta Batteiger: I was wondering about the same thing, how quickly can we get to the data? And I think while it would probably be possible for me to come to some data on how often does it happen that you legitimately need to transfer multiple times?

We have seen that -- we were unable to get to the hijacking data pace. So I'm wondering if what James was suggesting earlier with bundling this up with the other topic. And this has been kind of put out there in 12 to 18 months by the time we have some data from the emergency action channel.

And it also gives us enough time to prepare the data from the market place side of things. We could at least get the EAC in place to start collecting the data if we get to the Singapore deadline now.

We will have the EAC up and running quicker which will give us one of those data points we'll need to look at anyway. And I really wonder if

there's considerable disagreement with that approach in the group that this makes sense to bundle together.

Looking at this piece and looking at those transfer and ownership thing together in one goal because the topics belong to each other. And by that time you should have more of a base of data to look at, to really come to good decisions which we are currently lacking which I also agree with Michele that short of coming up with this data which will not get before we have the emergency action channels.

We will not really come to an agreement on this item in this working group which I think we should strive to at least get something done now and then be aware that we need to revisit this topic and make sure that the people that revisit this topic have the information they need.

So they can understand what kind of data do they need to be looking for and what kind of questions do they need to ask themselves to come to a good policy recommendation which I think - and that's the piece that I agree with Mikey on.

We haven't spent enough time researching and focusing on and in part we were unable to research it because we have refusal to publish one piece of data right now.

Michele Neylon: So which bit of data is that Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Sorry?

Michele Neylon: Which bit of data is the refusal...

Simonetta Batteiger: We don't have the hijacking numbers.

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay. Right, sorry. James, and then Marika.

James Bladel: Hi Michele, James speaking. I just wanted to kind of take a step back from this (unintelligible) and maybe try to come at it from more abstract perspective. You know, I think that there are calls for data and we've seen this, you know, a couple of different subject areas.

I don't know that that's going to help. And I'm not trying to be cynical. I'm trying to be as practical as possible. If I come out with data that shows x and Paul has data that shows y, but I'm focused on the x and Paul is focused on the y, then I don't know the data helps close gaps in per- gaps of perception.

If something is disproportionately harming my business, I'm going to focus on that rather than something else. I don't know that requesting data is going to, you know, lead us to the promise land.

So I just wanted to kind of put that out there. Secondly, you know, I think that if I'm hearing Mikey correctly we will want to -- I think, you know, I get what you're saying Mikey.

I think the thing, the charged word that you said was (Senegal), okay. And I think that a lot of folks are looking at this CDP and all the other CDPs and the possibility that we'll be chasing new gTLDs, you know, after Singapore.

And we just wanted to make sure that this topic and the future IRTPs working groups don't get run over by an army of steam rollers that is possibly coming down the pipeline after June.

So, you know, I would just point out that -- I think this goes back to what Matt is saying -- is we got here, what we have is a majority statement and a minority statement.

Or as Mikey shifts columns and let's just call it two minority statements going back to what Berry said, you know, the council is going to be presented with two positions.

They can decide status quo or we, you know, they clearly agree with one position or the other or they can punt to a working group. I don't know that that's something that this group necessarily needs to answer.

I think it's perfectly acceptable to submit both the report and the statement. And say, "Look, you know, we couldn't get to an agreement here. We thought about data but you know data will only take us so far.

And, you know, we probably could have spent more time on this but we, you know, from a practical matter we kind of spent a lot of our time on the first charter question and left this one dangling."

So, you know, I'm just trying to kind of bring everybody back to the idea where we need to go from here and I certainly, strongly feel like we need to have this working group effort put to bed by Singapore for it and potentially some of it's future iterations will be lost. So thanks.

Michele Neylon: All right James. Marika and then Simonetta.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On the question raised, you know, on whether data can be submitted to council at a later stage? I don't think that would be an issue as I guess through the stakeholder groups or constituencies of judicial data can be, you know, presented when the grouping (unintelligible).

And I do want to warn the group I that if there is need for a position that does not fully support our minority view point or there might be additional comments or letters or campaigns on a specific recommendation.

I do think it's very likely that the council might, you know, push this back or indeed have another working group looking at this. And, you know, listening to the discussion it seems that indeed a lot of it linked to this chain of control and some of the concerns, you know, relate to debate about that.

So I'm wondering if it's worth just doing a little (stroble) on this call now to see where people stand. Whether people feel to include the recommendation as is with the minority view point and, you know, anyone who wants to sign off to that, you know, can do so.

Or whether there's current remorse for action incorporating this under the recommendation that deals with a PDP on the chain of control, specifically, called out this issue and further data gathering for consideration as part of that PDP.

Michele Neylon: Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, you can put me down in the group that states that I would like us to be looked at the same time with ownership issue. And I also wanted to make one additional comment on James's assumption that if the data shows x people will not change their point of view.

I think it will be whatever the data says we'll give you an idea as it's like one compared to 100 as does one compared to 10,000. What is the relationship? And after the relationship is a very clear one between numbers of times where this would have helped.

And number of times you do transfers where those transfers would be problematic because of this recommendation, then I think both sides will have to state why they think the vote doesn't justify one or the other course of action.

But I think absent of this data all of this is just to be called in German ((German Speaking)) which kind of means it's like looking at a glass ball, you don't know.

I trust that whatever group takes a look at this would be mature enough to take a look at this data and come to a good recommendation based on hard facts rather than gut feels.

And I'm not saying that I wouldn't change my mind if I see numbers that point clearly in the direction that this relationship isn't right and the recommendation worded here should be done.

I just don't have anything to base this on other than my gut feel that we have tons and tons of legitimate transfers that would be affected by

this. And people that would feel very strongly that this should not be done versus I don't -- when I take a look back at the - at the survey we did with the same group of people around there experiences with hijacking cases.

And nobody spoke up and said they have lots of them. So if I just thinking about these two things and I don't have numbers to back it up, I just have a hard time believing that this ratio justifies this recommendation.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. James and then Mikey.

James Bladel: Hi Michele. So just to talk about data a little bit, I wasn't saying that people ignore or willfully step aside from data Simonetta, that wasn't really what I was trying to communicate.

I was just merely saying that the data is interpreted, the data itself may be objectively true but it tells a different story depending upon the different needs that individuals have from the data.

And so I think that that's unlikely to change or be swayed by a presentation of data. So I just - I'm mindful that if I were to say for example, that, you know, one percent of GoDaddy customers had blue eyes, let's say, and, you know, that may be important to somebody.

Someone might say, "Well, it's just one percent, 99% of your customers don't have it so you're fine." And someone else might say, "Well, wait a second, that's, you know, 100,000 people or something that need to be addressed."

So, you know, it's just that it's a matter of proportion. It's a matter of need and it's a matter of interest. And you can look at the same number and come away with two new very divergent opinions.

So I'm just cautioning against the idea that the data will always bridge gaps in perception. So I'm not saying that it hurts, it never hurts to have more information but I don't put myself in the column that it solves problems. I think it actually just, you know, creates new things to talk about. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: First apologies for my outburst earlier Michele.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. You - I understand where you're coming from and I'm sorry if I came across - if my comment was - came across in a particular fashion and that was not my intention. And I'm more than happy to discuss that with you offline.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, well, anyway...

Michele Neylon: Or online if you wish...

Mikey O'Connor: With that said. I'm sort of moving into the column that says this recommendation is premature. It's not supported by enough analysis. It's not supported by enough data. And it's not supported by enough public comment for me to be comfortable in supporting it.

So I'll move into that column with Simonetta. And I would also point out that one of things that the DSSA working group has been working on

pretty hard at least the leadership group has, is trying to figure out ways to get competitors to share very sensitive information in a way that protects them.

Because if we don't figure out a way in networking group for a sensitive and/or embarrassing information to be shared with the group, but redacted and cleansed of any identity, we're not going to get to the bottom of a lot of discussions that we're going to have.

And I would suggest that we may have the same kind of problems to solve here when it comes to hijacking information. I am - I'm not keen on the idea of walking away from policy that's based on data.

And if it's any use whatsoever, I think that the DSSA working group in the next couple of months is going to figure out a way to handle sensitive data and protect the people about whom that data exist.

And so that's another reason why I'm falling out of the column that supports the recommendation is because I think with some time we can get better data. We can get better analysis and we can get public comment on our results.

And I wouldn't be surprised but that we could also get the consensus but I'm very uncomfortable with trying to drive an arbitrary deadline based consensus around this topic.

Michele Neylon: Mikey just one question. And I'm - just one very, very, very simple question. A part from this one recommendation, this particular one in relation to the 60-day lock, are there any other recommendations or points in the final report that you have an issue with?

Mikey O'Connor: No, I'm fine...

Michele Neylon: Beyond, you know, the choice of word here, choice of word there, you know, which were discussed.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes. No, I'm fine with, you know, I'm fine with the report and I'm not too bad with this recommendation. But I'm pretty uncomfortable with the process by which we arrived at it.

Michele Neylon: Mikey that's fine, I'm just asking just for everything else. I'm just trying to understand - I'm just trying to understand -- it's -- okay, to the rest of you on this call apart from the 60-day - the 60-day thing, is there any other topic that people are uncomfortable about? James go ahead.

James Bladel: Michele this is James speaking. I wasn't necessarily going to answer that direct question. I think it's - the answer for my personal position would be no. But, you know, we had a fall position here and it wasn't my first choice and I'm sure it wasn't the first choice of the others.

Although I think I and Simonetta said that we can live with it which was to bundle this recommendation into the call for an issues report for a change of control to see if we can direct some language there. Does that bring us back to a full consensus?

And maybe we should try and test that question. Because, you know, if the key concern here that we don't have enough data, we don't have time to get the data and we don't feel like we want to proceed without the data, then maybe holding it in to that follow-up effort is -- I mean they're clearly related, so maybe that's the appropriate way to go.

And then we can get rid of the majority/minority sort of dueling statements or whatever and just say, "This is what the whole working group wants to do. It's not everybody's first choice, but we can all get behind it."

So can we maybe test that question or I don't mean to...

Michele Neylon: Okay, so what was the actual question James? Sorry.

James Bladel: The question is if we took this particular recommendation, and try it in the - with the objective of getting rid of majority/minority statements and just say, "Let's take this recommendation and say, in addition to studying the issues report on change of control we should also look at the imposition of 60-day lock after a previous transfer and after the domain name was initially registered."

Because I think those are two sides of the same point. And can we include that into the call for an issues report about change of control? Because I think that gets to what a lot of folks want and it gets Mikey and Simonetta some more time and some more data.

So, you know, I mean and we're calling this I guess the last resort or the fallback position to keep -- if it's the last part or point where everyone is still on the same page, I think we should put that out there.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks James. I think what we should do is just follow-up on all of this by email. Let's pounce backwards and forwards a couple of options and see if we can work through.

I think James has offered a very interesting possible solution that we can kind of get past this. Does anybody have -- does every -- okay, just one thing, just now on the Adobe Connect could do - how many of you would be in favor adopting of James idea?

I'm seeing six. I'll put myself down as well just to make sure that we're getting there. Chris are you happy with that idea? You are?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I'm just finding my way to the buttons.

Michele Neylon: That's okay, that's okay. Okay, so everybody agrees with this. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So what I can do based on our discussion now try to, you know, wrap this into the other recommendation and, you know, put some new language out for consideration, highlighting in that email then as well what, you know, what was discussed today to make sure that people that weren't on the call can see, you know, where the group stands and, you know, express their views.

And then the (unintelligible) question will still be I can get something out probably tomorrow morning early European time. And how much time do people need to review this specific, you know, wrapping this into the language and the rest of the report so we can maybe set ourselves a deadline for review and actual publication and submission of the reports. Or am I being too ambitious?

Michele Neylon: Okay, then I see James has volunteered to help you with some of this wording Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: And Simonetta as well. I think the three of us can probably get this done pretty quickly.

Michele Neylon: So, what's pretty quickly guys? Let's talk timelines.

James Bladel: 24 hours.

Michele Neylon: 24 hours? Okay, good. I like that nice and short and because of...

Marika Konings: I'm in Europe right now so when it's later in the day for you James I won't be able to respond anymore but I can tomorrow morning.

James Bladel: That's fine, I'll put something together and you guys can work on while I'm asleep and then we'll have something by this time, you know, close of day Europe tomorrow, close of day Europe Wednesday something like that.

Michele Neylon: Sounds good to me.

Marika Konings: And on the rest of the report because that's still out there, how much time do people need to review that? Because once we have the language on this it's easy to plug that in, but I don't know if people already had time to look at the rest of the report and go through it and how much time people need and, you know, to provide any kinds of edits or changes.

The publication's (unintelligible) in Singapore on Monday and then we'll have a little bit of flexibility on ideas and principals that not intended for community discussion.

But, and I think it'll be good if we can get it out as close as possible to the day as well to avoid that. The PPC might look at us and ask us questions why we didn't submit it on the 30th, but we do have a valid excuse.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, does it mean the GNSO update, which I think is on the schedule for us is just Marika?

Marika Konings: On Sunday for now.

Michele Neylon: On Sunday or something.

Marika Konings: Well, for now. It might be changed if there's a board meeting item.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Let's proceed that way and we can try and drive this forward then I think everybody should be equally unhappy or happy depending on how you want to look at this.

Are there any other matters that anybody wants to raise at this juncture?

Marika Konings: So just a last question. So can I put out on the mailing list that people have until Sunday evening close of business wherever you are to provide edits on the other part of the report noting that hopefully you'll get, you know, language out for this, you know, combined

recommendation on first, change of control and the 60-day lock, you know, sometime tomorrow hopefully.

Is that reasonable people to have until Sunday evening so I can finish up the report on Monday and get it out?

Michele Neylon: Sounds good to me Marika. Does anybody have any issues with that? Anybody have any issues? Is that okay for everybody? Okay, then if that's the case then I'll give you back three minutes of your lives.

And I shall speak to all -- actually hold on a second -- am I going to be able to speak to you all next week? I'm completely confused. What date is next week?

Man: The first of June.

Man: No, the 31st of May.

Michele Neylon: Oh, right. Yes, I actually won't be able to speak to you next week.

Marika Konings: If we get the report out, there might not be an immediate need for a call.

Michele Neylon: Right, well, what I was going to say is that I am unavailable -- I didn't realize I'm confused about dates. I thought Mon- I confused Monday and Tuesday. I am not available next Tuesday but if somebody else is available to handle this call and you want to have one, then please step up.

James isn't available either. I think that's actually because both of us are traveling. Is there anybody who would be available to look after - to babysit this call next week if needed?

Berry Cobb: Michele this is Berry, I can do it.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Berry. All right if we need to have a call next week then if nobody has any objections then Berry will be - will become the orchestrating. But let's hopefully, we won't need this.

Okay then. And I'll leave you all to it now. Thanks everybody.

James Bladel: Thank Michele.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Man: Thanks Michele.

Michele Neylon: Bye.

END