Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 26 January 2010 at 15:00 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 January 2010 at 1500 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-20100126.mp3

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

Participants on the Call:
Michele Neylon – RrSG – chair
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Anil George – IPC
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
James Bladel – RrSG
Michael Collins – Individual
Paul Diaz – RrSG
Baudoin Schombe – At-Large
Matt Serlin – RrSG

Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
David Giza
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Barbara Steele – RySG

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording is on. Please go ahead.

Woman: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Well thank you.

Man: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Ladies could we have a roll call please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's IRTPB
                     PDP call on Tuesday the 26th of January. We have Michele Neylon, Mike
                     O'Connor, James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Michael Collins, Paul Diaz, Baudouin
                     Schombe, Anil George, Matt Serlin, Kevin Erdman.

                     From staff we have Glen De Saint Géry, Marika Konings, David Giza, myself
                     Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies from Chris Chaplow and from
                     Barbara Steele.

                     And if I could just remind everyone, please just state their names when
                     speaking. I hope I haven't left anyone off the list. Over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right thank you. Good afternoon, good morning. Any other time zones I
                   have to worry about? No. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: We take it's all morning around...

Man: Good afternoon here, yes.

Michele Neylon: Beg your pardon? Didn't quite catch that, sorry. Okay. Okay then. The - today
                   we're going to have a quick look at the wonderful letter that Mikey has been
                   working on and then we're going to move onto a couple other topics. So I'm
                   going to hand it over to Mikey first since I love picking on him.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Michele. This is Mikey. Okay. It looks like Marika has the latest
                   version up on the screen that you can scroll up and down. The main changes
                   that David and I made is that I removed the Mikeyisms and David added the
                   ter - I...

David Giza: I added the ICANNisms.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. ICANNisms. Substituting ICANNisms for Mikeyisms is a good thing. I did leave one Mikeyism in there. I decided it was so subtle that most wouldn't notice it.

And then I added on Page 2, I sort of added a bullet in the goals area to reflect a point that I think James made on the last call. I thought that was a great one. And then I kind of beefed up the drive out fear one a bit.

And then on the last page, there's a whole new chunk called observations really highlight the sort of no we're not issuing a carte blanche endorsement for all expansions of the budget, but we really like these technical and operational improvements kinds of things. That's also a summary of the conversation we had last week.

And with that I'll sort of throw it open to the floor for any sort of further refinements. I saw on the list that Barbara says that the registry constituency is going to support this which I thought was pretty amazing.

And, so, that's what I've got. And I think that we're probably close enough that we can draw this to a close and then folks can sign on. Probably the easiest way to sign on is to just send a note to the list sort of the way Barbara did saying either that you're signing on as an individual or case you can get back to your constituency and have them sign on that would be fantastic. But it seems like the time is too short for most constituencies to be able to do that.

So there you go. Any comments? I'm going to watch - I can watch the queue for you Michele if you want.

Michele Neylon: I'm here to work. I'm here.

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: Yes no. I know. I just - I can see the calls.

Michele Neylon: Oh you're taking over. That's fine.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. I'll take over.

Michele Neylon: I'm seizing the Chair - I'm seizing the Chair to Mikey then for the rest of the afternoon.

Mike O'Connor: No, no, no. No just for this one. Just for this agenda item. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes. Hi Mikey. Love it. I'll certainly support it. As you've already alluded, I don't think we can get the full registrars because of the voting requirements. There's simply not enough time.

                  My question for you is in - actually it's directed toward David Giza. Following up on what Barbara had said on the list, would it be most effective for us to post this letter to the formal comments for the overall budget process or to fill this out as - create this as a letter and send it directly to, I don't know, Kevin Wilson or, you know, who - what is the most effective way to get this thing communicated to the appropriate people at ICANN?

David Giza: Um-hmm. This is Dave Giza. That's a great question. I actually think multiple communication channels here would be the best way to go. And so my draft budget is due this Friday. And if by chance we have all of the signatories on board by Friday, I'd like to include the document with the budget.

                  But if not, the early rounds of budget review will take at least a few weeks if not more. And so you really won't get a chance to post this to - as part of the public comments to the budget until much later. And I'd actually like to get

Kevin and others the opportunity to look at this letter of support early in the budget process.

So if there's a delay in signing the document, you know, perhaps in the next two weeks when we have all the signatories on board, if someone could forward that to, you know, to Kevin Wilson and just copy me, you know, that would be another way to get it into the pipeline.

And then, you know, kind of the old tell them you've told them and tell them again. And then the third opportunity would be to post the memo as part of the public comments to the budget a little further into the process.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. Why don't we do it like this? Why don't we send you the draft immediately after this call unsigned but we'll, you know, I'll formally send it to you with the promise that signatories will follow within the next couple of weeks.

And then I'll send you another copy and copy Kevin on the signed version. And then we'll push that out to the public comment thing too. Does that make sense? That way you've got it right away, you know.

David Giza: It would certainly help to have it this week when I submit the draft budget.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. So. Now another question that popped up when Paul raised his question is should we, I mean, I may answer my own question. It may be too hard. I was thinking that it might be interesting to circulate this to some of the other related working groups.

I know that folks on the RAP and folks on PEDNR would probably sign on as well. But it's probably too hard to get any revisions handled. So I think I'll just leave it the way it is. There's an awful lot of cross pollination in this group.

Any other thoughts? Anil go ahead.

Anil George: It's Anil.

Mike O'Connor: Anil. I'm so sorry. I imagine you get that mispronunciation a lot and I
                    apologize. Go ahead.

Anil George: My question is I'm just wondering as a matter of process in terms of our role
                    as this IRTP Part B group, is it appropriate for us to really take on an issue of
                    budget issues?

Mike O'Connor: That's the reason that this is framed as coming from individuals rather than
                    from IRTP. This issue sort of flowed out of our discussion on IRTP when
                    David asked by us to go do an analysis that wound up taking an awful lot of
                    his staff time.

                    But this is a tradition that's been established in previous working groups. I
                    think it was the previous IRTP working group where individuals on the group
                    were more flexible in their ability to sign on to something like this than a
                    whole working group. So we didn't sign it as a working group. We signed it as
                    individual.

                    That's the way this is arranged as well. So you view this as sort of a personal
                    observation of members of a working group rather than a working group
                    position.

Anil George: Okay. So it won't be signed as the IRTP group?

Mike O'Connor: No. Partly because for a lot of us we didn't have to go back to our
                    constituencies and get constituency approval and there's not enough time
                    and it's not clear that there would be. So we didn't want to.

                    So this is purely a personal decision and up on the top of the memo in the
                    first paragraph we sort of qualify this and say - no, no. I guess in the second,

the bottom of the second paragraph. We're really trying pretty hard to distance ourselves from the working group.

Does that take care of your question Anil?

Anil George: Yes. And I'm just curious from the overall - I understand your goal in trying to clarify that these are sort of individual sign ons. I'm just trying to also figure out or just to understand more, how does this fit into the - our mission in terms of what we're studying as a group?

Mike O'Connor: I think that the main connection is that this group is not alone in needing more better and quicker turnaround data on which to base policy decisions. So this is a working group that bumped into an issue that's actually shared by a bunch of working groups.

And so we took a moment to make that observation and support an initiative that will provide better data, we believe, you know, in the future. So it's not directly related to the IRTP issue which is part of the reason we're not signing it as a working group. But it bears a lot on the operation of the working group itself, the working group process, and actually bears on the operation of quite a few working groups as we try and get more and better data on which to base policy decisions.

Anil George: And one more thing. So your primary emphasis here is on data gathering?

David Giza: This is Dave Giza. It's more than just data gathering Anil. It's, as Mikey described it, it's really a systemic enhancement that involves, you know, building a better database, providing better data analysis tools, and then expanding the reporting capabilities, you know, associated with that database, so that information could be provided, you know, much quicker to this working group and other working groups as, you know, as ICANN supports, you know, that type of work in the - policy type of work in the future.

Anil George: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: Is that it, Anil? Take that as a yes. Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Well just - we - following up on Anil's questions, I mean just one comment personally would be that regardless of the working group or the policy matter that we're discussing, be it an IRTP, PEDNR, registration abuse, I don't know any number of different policy discussions, one of biggest problems everybody seems to face most of the time is trying to do a certain amount of triage between myth and reality.

What I personally - and this is me speaking personally, and yes this is also me speaking as my employer since I am my employer. We - I would fully support this any enhancement that ICANN makes to its compliant systems which would enable them to A, act better on people who are disrupting our industry and B, provide those of us who are trying to work on policy development with actual tangible facts as opposed to supposition and myth.

So, you know, I think that's very important because I mean a lot of the - with - in the case of IRTP, people say oh there are problems with transfers. Oh there're problems with transfers. Oh there're problems with transfers. And so okay, well what are the problems and we get a few things back.

But then we have to go look and say okay as a percentage of the total number of domain names that are registered - or are transferred, etcetera, etcetera, you know, how many actually have problems? And being able to have tangible figures is a huge improvement.

In relation to sending the letter David, is it - within the decision making process within ICANN, okay obviously Kevin is the financial person but I assume he's also answering to other people further up the line.

David Giza: That's true. Kevin reports to Rod, the CEO.

Michele Neylon: Right. So I mean the thing is would it be complete overkill to send this memo to all of them?

David Giza: I actually think it would be overkill. And I think it might be viewed, you know, unfavorably by the organization. I think, you know, a better approach would be to, again, sort of systemically march the memo through the let's say chain of command.

And the chain of command really involves, you know, you know, Kurt Pritz, Doug Brent and Kevin Wilson. You know, they're principally the budget officers. You know, Rod isn't going to be involved in working with the budget until much later in the process.

So if we...

Michele Neylon: So would it be - would it be okay to send it to the three of them instead of - and I'm not saying send it to Rob. I'm saying send it to the three of them simultaneously.

David Giza: At some point I think you - we - you could certainly do that Michele. You know, whether it's early in the process now, whether it's a little bit later in the process or even if you just, you know, if you just post the memo as part of the public comments to the budget.

I mean all three work for me. I just want to, you know, stay focused on the operating side of ICANN and, you know, and touch bases with those three officers who are most likely going to be the, you know, and almost always are the key decision makers when it comes to budget matters.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: David this is Mikey. And you know the path the best, could you maybe just send me an email of sort of who should get this and when? So maybe it's you by the end of the week, a gaggle of budget officers within two weeks and then, you know, etcetera and then I'll just follow that schedule so you're not surprised.

David Giza: Um-hmm. I'll be happy to do that.

Mike O'Connor: Anything else? I'm seeing a clear data sport. So I think Michele back to you. I'll fold this into a final draft and David and I'll work the logistics and I'll send a note to the list with the final draft and ask folks to reply...

Michele Neylon: I think...

Mike O'Connor: ...to the list. They can sign on. And if we could get that done by the end of the week, then we could have signatories by David by the end of the week and then I'm set. Back to you Michele.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Well (Thad) thank you for your work on this. It's appreciated.

David Giza: Yes. This is Dave again. And I do want to say thank you very much. I can't express how pleased I am, you know, with the level of support. And I will definitely, you know, call upon members of the working group to help us, you know, behind the curtain when it's time to begin some systems requirements and systems analysis work. Because I really would like to take advantage of the expertise that resides in this group, you know, to help us, you know, streamline the system enhancements going forward.

So thanks again on behalf of ICANN Contractual Compliance.

Michele Neylon: Okay then. Now, we were still looking at the public comments analysis grid. That's actually - just before we move onto that, I think we should raise something which is slightly more important which I should have put on the agenda, of course I didn't, and yes you can call me an idiot if you wish. I won't be offended.

I was playing email ping pong with Marika about this. In some of the other working groups, Marika has done a wonderful job of putting together a first draft report which is of course a first draft, and the emphasis is on draft, and you can also put emphasis on first if you wish. It's not final.

But I mean it's the way - it's - that those in - within those working groups they have some - something moving in the direction of being a final product or, you know, outcome as it were.

And I know that several members of this group have also expressed an interest in seeing of what juncture we will provide some kind of outcome on everything else or does this - does the working group become an end in itself which I personally wouldn't really want.

Marika do you - would you be able to talk to us on that please?

Marika Konings: Sure. Yes. This is Marika. Just a note about - well actually I've already started drafting the initial report, trying to pull the different parts together. And some of you that have been involved as well in other working groups, you know as well that, you know, part of that consists out of background, you know, how was his PDP initiated? What all the discussions have been taking place in relation to this issue, some information from the issues report, you know, summary of the public comments and constituency statements.

And it also will contain a part on working group deliberations in which I'll attempt to summarize some of the discussions we've had on the basis of my notes. And also already we'll try to include - because I think on some of the

issues we've spoken of, you know, possible recommendations or ideas that, you know, would require maybe further debate and exploration.

So the group has a basis to work from and, you know, update in the back of the report as needed to get it in the state to put it out for public comment.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Does anybody have any...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry Marika.

Marika Konings: So it's all right. I just wanted - is there anything else you would like me to explain or provide further details on?

Michele Neylon: Well it's just going to have to do. Anybody have any input or feedback on that? Anybody? Are you all happy with that? Okay. Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: What? I love it.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you.

Mike O'Connor: I love Marika's report.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. That's something. Do - no I'm just looking for something. I mean the si - I mean the silence I will take to mean that you don't have any issues with something, but I would be happier if people actually said something for the record.

Okay. Berry Cobb is - goes to the record saying he's got a smile - he's happy. And that's on the chat. James.

James Bladel: Yes. For the record, I'm pleased with this. I know that a lot of groups are scrambling to get either a draft or a final document ready for Nairobi. And if that is not the aim of this group then I think that we should optimize the staff resources and time and then as soon as they have a chance at window to squeeze in our report they should. So I'm happy.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you.

Mike O'Connor: So this is...

Michele Neylon: Does anybody have any - Mikey go ahead.

Mike O'Connor: I guess that does raise an interesting question and that is since Marika is the one that's snowed under with a lot of this report writing, I guess to both of you, Marika and Michele, what's your thought? Do you want to have something ready by Nairobi or do you want to push this one past Nairobi to sort of lighten the load a little bit?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean I think I can get you a first draft before next week's meeting. So I think from, you know, Mike's new list, you know, on most of the other draft and most people are reviewing those. So, you know, I'm fine from that perspective.

                  Of course your other question is, if the group wants to have a discussion on and in Nairobi, it would require putting out either still a draft version or an initial report by the 15th of February which is the - your document deadline.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I'm wondering if we are really ready for that because I - at least my sense in terms of the conversation so far is that we probably need a chance to take a look at that first draft and then bake some of our recommendations a little bit more than we'll be able to do in two weeks. What are - I...

Michele Neylon: I put myself in - Mike this is Michele. I put myself in the queue here. I mean the - my idea by asking Marika to move ahead with something wasn't a case of, in my mind at least, and if some people wish to disagree with me that's fine, but was more along the lines of we've been talking for weeks, let's start moving towards something.

It wasn't specifically a case of let's have something for Nairobi. It was more a case of let's actually start working on something tangible rather than talking in circles.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And this is Mikey again. I'm all for that. Just thinking that the decision as to whether to have anything for Nairobi affects the way we behave. And I'm sort of inclined to say let's just keep moving forward. So for sure a draft would be fabulous Marika but...

Marika Konings: Sure.

Mike O'Connor: ...maybe not try to have something done by Nairobi on this.

Michele Neylon: Well I don't think we said we were going to have anything done by Nairobi, did we?

Mike O'Connor: No I know. But I sort of connected those dots and stuff.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay. So you want to see - categorically you don't want anything done by Nairobi.

Mike O'Connor: Well no. I just don't think we need to do - what we're doing in some of the other working groups is actually putting together presentations and planning to have meetings at Nairobi and they need be. I just don't know. I'm going to quit now. Let James talk.

Michele Neylon: Okay let James talk. James.

James Bladel: Yes. And I - I'm - I was the one that said the Nairobi word. But basically I think that we pretty much determined a while back that we were not going to have anything out or open for comment by Nairobi.

And so my point was to essentially let those groups that are scrambling against that deadline and, you know, need time from staff support so, you know, let them push on for that and then we can have something released either at the meeting or shortly thereafter. And I think that's a realistic goal. But Mikey I don't think anybody ever suggested that that was the target that we were shooting for.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. I think that's fine.

Michele Neylon: Yes. I mean I don't - I don't remember us saying anything specific about Nairobi. So unless Marika has better memory than I do. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No I think that's correct. I just wanted to know that there will be an update to the GNSO Council of the different working groups and status of work. So I'm happy to provide - prepare some slides for that which then will be posted as well on the Nairobi Web site.

So, you know, people will have an opportunity to see why they work out as an ad. And you - we might want to include some of the, you know, recommendations or ideas the group is thinking about in the different area to have, you know, people, you know, between the corridors or between meetings kind of have a discussion about it if they would like to or have an idea of where the working group is going, so that would be my suggestion.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any input reports on this? No. Okay perfect. Let's move on to the reviewing the comments which we've been - seem to be doing for a while.

Where were we at on that? Which number were we at? My brain is really fried. Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...refer on Page 3 we were going to start with Issue E but maybe it is worth going back one step to the comment that is on the top of this page. Because I think following our discussion last week or - it relates to the request by WIPO to have some firm or main (moss) discussion on locking domain names that are subject to UDRP proceedings.

And on that note I think Michael Collins actually posted a note to the list in which he provided some of the provisions that are actually contained in the UDRP relating to that which is if I remember correctly basically would mean that, you know, if we would make any changes here to may - from May to month or actually end of actually changing the UDRP which might be, you know, beyond the scope of this working group.

Michele Neylon: Michael Collins to something? Do you wish to add on this? You had your hand up anyway. I see that. Go ahead.

Mike O'Connor: I'll bet he's muted.

Michael Collins: Took me a minute to find the mute button. Sorry.

Mike O'Connor: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: Okay. I'm here. I was talking for a little bit. No I think Marika communicated my concern very thoroughly.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And do you also have anything further you want to mention on this - on this particular comment? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: There are a - there're sort of a growing momentum for PDP to take a look at the UDRP. And in some of the other working groups what we've started to do is suggest topics for that PDP. We could do that in this context as well. Rather than recommending that this group take anything on, simply redirect that WIPO suggestion to the now emerging - our P PDP process.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to add that, you know, one of the people that actually made a comment in relation to that actually recognized as well that, you know, it might not be possible to change the IRTP to reflect it, you know, from May to month.

But a person actually suggested adding three lines saying the register of record may be obligated to keep the domain name locked in case of core proceedings, arbitration proceedings or ICANN dispute resolutions, policy administrative proceedings, and presuming they're to actually, you know, make sure that people that review the IRTP are aware that there're other policies that might have those kind of requirements. So, you know, just to see whether that's something the group is willing to consider or whether indeed it's to be part of a separate kind of review of UDRP.

Michele Neylon: Michael again?

Michael Collins: I did just want to make it clear that I did not object to something like Mikey suggested. I don't have a problem with, you know, trying to protect people

that are in UDRP activities from, you know, from having to deal with people who are just skipping from registrar to registrar to try and invade the process.

I don't really have a problem with the - you just have to solidify and solve the problem. But I just don't think that we have the scope - don't have a big enough scope. Well I like what Mikey suggested. That's all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So, does anybody have an issue with us suggesting that this may need - may - that this particular thing may need to be addressed in some kind of policy discussion - separate policy discussion around UDRP?

So everybody's happy with that. Okay. I'll take that as that everybody's happy after moving that. Okay moving onto Issue E.

Marika Konings: Sorry I was on mute again. So this is Marika. Issue E whether and if so how to best clarify denial reason seven. Domain name was already in lock status provided that the registrar provides or better the accessible and reasonable means for the registered name holder to remove the lock status.

And so one comment here state that registrars should be required to document why a domain is in lock status.

Michele Neylon: Any comments? Thoughts? Tumbleweed. Okay. And oh, I've lost - I think tumbleweed went from - went the other way. Okay. Michael Collins then Mikey.

Michael Collins: I think that's a reasonable requirement. And I think it would actually be a timesaving thing for registrars. I think that they probably - I'm presuming that they probably get a lot of customer service issues about what they get a - they get a notice that the domain's locked and the customer can't figure out why.

So they needlessly inquire about why it's locked. And I think if the notice told them why it's locked, they might be able to solve the problem without the time and effort.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: That's almost precisely what I was going to say is that as I've been participating in PEDNR, I started drawing sort of a farcical diagram of a domain renewal process. And what it was really intended to do is to highlight how complicated the process is.

This is sort of a good example of that kind of complication where perhaps some standards or minimums or some sort of clarifications would help both registrant and registrars simplify their processes. So, you know, I'd sign on to this one.

Michele Neylon: Oh okay, Paul Diaz and then James Bladel.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Thanks Michele. Look, as a registrar rep I'm interested in following through on this one and want to get the group's thinking. What do we mean by required documentation? Would it be enough to have a statement in say the service agreement that the registrant's going through?

Are people expecting some sort of big flashing red letters somewhere, you know, calling out what is going on? You know, we have so many calls for standardization and notice and all the rest, but what are people asking for here? What is a required a document? Why it's in Loch Ness? What will that look like? It may sound nice but devils in the details, what are people really asking for here?

Michele Neylon: Could a non-registrar replay to Paul Diaz please?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Mikey or Michael please.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. Can I just respond? I'll be in the queue as well to respond on what I think the comments are intended?

Michele Neylon: Well that - Marika go ahead since you are a lady. Sorry. Sorry.

Marika Konings: Okay because I think when - this is Marika again. So when the comments are I got to think (unintelligible) this comment this person made is that in EPP that you can attach actually (Sata)'s values to this data. So think what he's trying to say is that if you have an automated system and you link sort of lucks status two - the status of date in EPP anyone can see it automatically without having to look at the registration agreement and call the registrar.

                   What is the reason, you know, why the domain was lost? So it would be an automatic kind of thing if I understand his comment well. I'll post the link to the comment in the chat form...

Man: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...so people can review it for themselves. But I think that was the thought behind it and the document might think about paperwork but I think it relates to the actual automatic status messages that are related for EPP.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. I think I remember seeing something in the comments about this. I mean it's also - depending how familiar you are with the EPP and statuses, it is possible to be a bit more verbose than just simply saying locked or not locked.

Paul Diaz: Michele can I come back with that?

Michele Neylon: Oh please...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: This is Paul again. Just to counter both what you and Marika said, not counts or two to follow on and for example, you know, if somebody checks a name in WHOIS and they look for the - show me the underlying registry data, some registrars automatically put that in or they provide a link that goes back to the registry.

The registry WHOIS is going to show the status of the name. So I just pulled up one quickly that I knew off the top of my head. And in there I see client transfer prohibited as the status. I know what that means but that's not in laymen's terms. However that is leveraging the EPP protocol. So, you know, it comes back to what are people really for because if you want it to say something that in plain English domain is locked, that doesn't exist in EPP.

So now we're talking about making a change to make this simpler, easier to understand. I'm not trying to be difficult here. I am trying to get a sense of what people really want and then look at what we already have. Is that realistic or are we talking about creating something all new because given what we already have, I think a lot of people are going to say that's still confusing to end users.

So you're looking for a change and that's going to be a significant change in terms of how the systems currently operate.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Michele. And Paul basically hijacked my entire counterpoint here. But no, I think I just want to sign on to a lot of what Paul has said. This is - on the surface I think it's a good idea and it has the best of intentions. And I think that in general I support this.

However, when we start to dig a little bit deeper, you know, some of these domains are very, very old and can accumulate a very verbose lifecycle trail of statuses and messages.

And more importantly, as Paul was alluding to, the discretion that registrars have in changing the language or the text of some of these status messages is constrained by the EPP protocol. So we would have to undertake - not saying it's impossible. I'm saying it's difficult and probably time consuming to undertake a protocol change. I think that's IDF. Paul maybe you can help me there.

But anyway we would have to go through that and actually modify or revise the protocol to get some of these things to be a little more human readable as opposed to machine readable.

I don't get them either and I work for a registrar and I sometimes have to go look up what the status means, so.

Michele Neylon: Just I - as far as I know guys, just like somebody who is more of an EPP geek than me, might be able to correct me. But you can add extensions to EPP without changing the protocol itself.

James Bladel: You can do that. I think that, you know, the E is more extensible, correct? But I don't know that it's always that straight forward because it is a coordinating exercise.

You need to get the registry first of all to not only champion but adopt that and then that needs to be first rolled out in an optional adoption by their registrars and then make it a requirement.

So it is possible, it just takes some time, takes some more.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay. Let's see. Mikey, Michael and Matt Serlin. And hi Matt. Welcome to the conference rolls. How're you doing?

Matt Serlin: Hi Michele. How are you?

Michele Neylon: Not too bad. Not too bad.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I sort of support what everybody's been saying. I think that it's quite worthwhile to uncomplicated the statuses and the process for registrants to figure it out because I think it would remove the registrant's experience. By the way, somebody is breathing really heavy right now. And I know that I'm not that sexy.

The process to get it changes, I think may indeed be a lot of work. But I think it's worth it. And the reason I think it's worth it is because we may have tripped on another one of these sort of overarching issues like we've started encountering in RAP where I'll look at this whole status notification, WHOIS display, WHOIS consistency, etcetera, etcetera issue could go a long way towards addressing issues that are showing up in at least three working groups that I'm on right now.

And so (basically) this is another one of those ones where we frame it up as an overarching issue. We don't attempt to solve it in this one - in this working group except to say that it bears on issues that we're working on but is probably worth a broader look simply because there're similar related issues in other policy areas and sort of pun it back to the Council to maybe start an investigation.

One of (unintelligible) in RAT we ran into is some of these investigations may not really lend themselves to PDP processes. And this might be (unintelligible).

So anyway, there's a ramp about this where I'm sort of signing on to what everybody said so far.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Whoever's on the line who is panting heavily into it, could you please put yourself on mute? I've no idea who it is but please for the rest of us, think of the children. Michael Collins then Matt.

Michael Collins: Yes thank you. I just wanted to answer Paul. I think that where I would like to - documentation seems so formal. I think some kind of notice, but I think it should be at whatever place you receive notice - notification that a transfer fails because the domain is locked, whether that's an email that you - that a customer receives when a, you know, from the registrar when the transfer fails or if it's - if it occurs live on a Web application during the process and you get a notice that the transfer has failed because it's locked.

And the status that Paul mentioned, I'm not apologizing if I don't have it exactly right, client change prohibited or something of that nature. To me that's just another way of saying that it's locked. And it doesn't - that doesn't really help me know why it's locked. Is it still in the, you know, the first 60 days? Is it because the client has put in a locked status? Has the registrar put it in lock status for some other reason?

It just seems like it'd be good to know these things and it would actually simplify the transfer process if it was - that information was included. And I'm with Mikey. I think that while there may be a good deal of work to accomplish that, it seems like the reasonable end worthwhile thing. That's it.

Michele Neylon: So I just - Mike - Michael just want to clarify one thing. With regards to the message about the reason why the transfer failed, you're referring specifically to the losing registrar.

Michael Collins: I suppose the losing registrar's the one that would have that information to know why it's locked, but it's usually the...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: That one that's the gaining registrar or wouldn't, you see, is what I'm getting at indirectly.

Michael Collins: The gaining registrar is usually the one that gives you notice that the transfer failed is my experience. So I'm for - I'm hoping that the EPP information that tells this gaining registrar that it's failed because it's locked could include some information about why. I would be nice. I don't know. I'm not an EPX - EPD expert. I don't know how to accomplish that but it seems like it would be really nice.

    If when I did a notice that my transfer failed because the domain is locked, it would be helpful if I knew why it was locked. It's how to accomplish...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: ...whether it was just waiting. Maybe I needed to wait seven more days or maybe I need to go to the - into the losing registrar and unlock it. I thought I had and maybe I haven't. You know, it just seems like it would be helpful and it would save registrars customer service time if this was included in the notice.

Michele Neylon: Well the losing registrar will have the information which they could or - they could share possibly. The gaining registrar won't get enough information back although that is the domain is locked. They won't get anything beyond why unless somebody can - has more information about it than I have. Matt?

Matt Serlin: Yes Michele, just to second what you just said. I think that's exactly right. That's the behavior that I'd expect. I'd imagine the losing registrar really is the one, at least under the current EPP protocol the losing registrar is the one to tell you why the domain is locked. And I - as a gaining - I don't think a gaining

registrar would want to take on that responsibility because frankly the losing registrar could have lots of name for any number of reasons that would be unknown to the new registrar.

And I just kind of want to pick up and I don't - I don't want to spend too much more time on this. But I just want to kind of echo what James and Paul said is that in principle, you know, reading something that says registrars should be require to document why a domain has been locked is, as we all agree, a good thing. But, you know, as Paul said, it's a devil from the details.

And I think that's right. So I think when we talk about, you know, registrars changing their systems and how they communicate with the registries and EPP and all that stuff, I think that's a lot more complex and a longer term issue.

You know, I think Paul was the one that mentioned, you know, is it something that we put in our terms and conditions or on our Web site. So maybe it's not for this group to decide how something like that is implemented, but I do think that we should, you know, be mindful of that in anything that we present back to the Council as a recommendation.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Just one thing, the - I mean from what a lot of people have been saying here that, you know, some of the status changes and everything else would involve the involvement of the registries.

But this also came up in another working group which some of you were on, the PEDNR because people also complained in that group that some of the status messages which again were related back to EPP was a perfectly fine for a machine to read were as clear as mud as far as a normal human being was concerned. So again, maybe there is something there worth looking at possibly.

Okay. Marika, yearly checks to verify the registrant's lock and unlock as they please. Was there more context to that particular comment?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So basically the person that you need verification should be making sure that indeed (unclined) are able to switch this lock on or off as they wish. I can main - maintain a Web page explaining for each registrar in this specific procedure to follow for end users wanting to change the locking attributes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any thoughts on that?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...calls.

Mikey: My concern...

Michael Collins: Well I guess I'll take that - I'll go with that one too.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: I'm not sure that - I'm not sure that's necessary if there's no complaints about a given registrar. I guess that would be a compliance question but it seems almost excessive to me without cause for concern.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Matt?

Matt Serlin: Yes. I don't know if David's still on the call but I think it would be interesting to get his take on it. But I for one think it actually would be a good thing. I know we have clients that run into issues all the time and understanding how to actually unlock a domain that a - at a registrar. So I'd be a part of that.

Michele Neylon: Just before I go down the queue, David are you still on the call?

David Giza: Still on the call.

((Crosstalk))

David Giza: Yes I was - I would support the last comment. It kind of gets back to where
                     we started with my comments early in the process about information
                     education and the, you know, the ability of all of us to keep it simple so that,
                     you know, registrants in particular understand how these processes work. So,
                     you know, I would favor the activity.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Hi Michele. This is James. Yes. I just wanted to agree with I believe it was
                     Michael and Matt that, you know, this is a compliance issue and even - I'll go
                     even a little further than the commenters, checking to see whether the
                     registrant has sufficient access to the lock function and being able to lock and
                     unlock the domain is important.

                     But that should also be verified that whatever commands the registrant is
                     making to the lock status is being transmitted in a timely manner up to the
                     registry.

                     You know, it's certainly conceivable and possible that although the registrar
                     control panel looks like it's unlocked, that the registrars in fact may be sitting
                     on that command for a little while or not sending it at all.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. I - just my own comments on this. It doesn't specify which
                     type of lock they're talking about there. So a blanket ability for registrants to
                     lock and unlock domains at will is something which I think will be slightly a bit
                     too broad because already some of the registry operators have policies
                     affecting locks post transfer.

And also as well there are some reasons why registrars may lock domain names without voiding anything else. So I just would be a bit cautious of a blanket. All registrants should have the right to lock and unlock domains. So I'm currently getting a number of complaints from registrants who - whose domains were bulk transferred to us from another registrar, we're locking them to 60 days because in some cases there was a certain amount of doubt over the registrant data.

So, you know, does it - I just think a blanket things will be a bit dangerous. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe just to clarify because I think the comment are make - in his, you know, in the whole thing that specifically talks about the client transfer prohibit stratus. So only the registrar unlock and not any kind of internal locks or locks applied by other in the process.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, any other thoughts on that? Okay. Now what was the next one there? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So we went through all the comments for all the issues. There were as well some other more general comments or considerations that were made by a number of people that I've grouped together in this last section. So, you know, we can quickly, I mean there are only two there so we can quickly run through those.

So the first one is, I think it's an issue that the group has had it stuff as well as is there a need for development, policy development to address issues that have only occurred once or twice? These are more general statements.

Michele Neylon: Any comments guys and girl, or girls? Do we have more than one girl? What's the word - oh okay only ICANN staff did include. Any thoughts? No. Okay. Mikey.

Michael O'Connor: I think my thought is one word, no. You know, I don't think that we need to do policy that on things that only happen once or twice.

Michele Neylon: Okay, fair enough. Does anybody disagree with that concept? Does anybody think that we should have policy development processes if one single registrant on the face of the entire planet is affected by one random thing? Okay. Next one.

Was the consideration should be given to the potential impact of the UDRP especially in relation to confusion over a different interpretations of provisions rates, denial of a transfer of domain subject to UGRP proceedings. Oh my God that's a mouthful.

Marika can you enlighten us as to what they're talking about there?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it relates to what we've discussed before that, you know, there're certain elements in the IRTP that, you know, have an impact on UDRP or the mains that are subject to UDRP proceedings.

And I think by making a comment in the report or pointing out which issues might, you know, require further consideration in the case that there is a UDRP review would I guess address this comment.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any thought? Comments? No? Okay. Last agenda item, next meeting. I unfortunately will not be around next week. Please get out your violins and cry. Would one of you be able to replace me or to Chair the meeting in my place rather than trying to replace me entirely?

James Bladel: Hey Michele this is James. I'll help out if you need a sub.

Michele Neylon: All right. Thank you. Thanks James.

James Bladel: Unless there - unless there're objections from the group from the iron fisted heavy handed approach of (fast flux) side.

Michele Neylon: No problems. No problem. Does anybody have any objections to James chairing the meeting next week? That's fine. So in that case I will - we'll have - the meeting will be at the same time as usual next week. And if anybody has any issues please ping us on the list.

I wish you all a very pleasant morning or afternoon depending on your time zone. And as I won't be speaking to you this next week, I'll speak to you all in a couple weeks' time. Okay? Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Michele.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Michele.

Man: Thank you Michele.

Man: See ya.

END