**IRTP C TRAINING SESSION
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 29 November 2011 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C Training meeting on Tuesday 29 November 2011 at 1600 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-c-training-20111129-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov (transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page**)**

Attendees:

Avri Doria - co-chair
James Bladel –co-chair
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Rob Villeneuve – Registrar SG
Jonathan Tenenbaum – Registrar SG
Barbara Steele – RySG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair
Volker Greimann - Registrar SG

ICANN Staff:
Marika Könings
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being

                      recorded; if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You

                      may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is

                       the IRTP-C training call on the 29th of November, 2011. On the call today we

                       have James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Mike O'Connor, Rob Villeneneuve,

Avri Doria, Philip Corwin, Barbara Steele and Michele Neylon. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And everyone, welcome to this special session for IRTP-C where we will discuss an overview of the training - the transfer process. I think that some folks expressed in some of our earlier calls it would be beneficial to help some of the newcomers who were not on IRTP-A or IRTP-B and who don't deal with transfers on a daily basis to get some familiarity with the process especially some of the terminology that we'll be discussing in IRTP-C.

I volunteered to lead this training and put some slides together but I'm sure that there are other registrars on the call and they will throw rocks at me if I say something that isn't true or is - like gloss over something that's a little more complicated than I lead it to believe. So I'm very grateful that there are other folks that will participate as well and keep me honest.

The only question - or the request that I would have is if we can go through each slide and then I'll allow some time after each slide to address any questions that folks may have. And that way it'll keep it from getting too quiet or too raucous of a session and we'll keep it somewhat orderly by slide transition.

So if there are no objections I will dive right into the overview of gTLD transfers through the Inter Registrar Transfer Process, IRTP.

Okay so this first slide provides some background on what the purpose of the IRTP is. It was developed as a critical component to supporting a competitive marketplace for domain name registration. It allows registrars - registrants,

excuse me, who are not happy with their registrar to take their business somewhere else.

If you recall prior to ICANN and the competitive registrar environment this was not possible; there was one and only one registrar to handle these types of issues so it was important that this process exist to facilitate competition between registrars.

It is a standardized process that all registrars despite their different business models, despite their target markets and how they may operate, whether it's fax, Web, email or whether it's a law firm, you know, that acts as a registrar, whether it's a reseller or retail all of those things have to kind of coalesce around a standardized process in order for transfers to work.

And as we touched in our charter discussion today it is also sometimes used in conjunction with a change of control so not just a registrant taking their business to a new registrar but also taking their - transacting in the domain name and transferring control of that registration to another party.

Any questions on this slide or is this a fairly comprehensive overview or have I left anything out? Okay empty queue, moving on.

Here's some definitions and acronyms that we need to - and sorry for the formatting here. But here's some acronyms and this - what we call the ICANN decoder ring so - I'm getting an echo now. Sorry can someone address the echo? Marika, Nathalie?

Nathalie Peregrine: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Hello? Yes, can we ask the folks to mute their phones or their speakers on their computer or both because I'm getting a very bad echo.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Simonetta has just joined the call so maybe she can mute because she might be causing the echo I guess.

James Bladel: Simonetta? Why did it not echo for Marika but only for me?

Marika Konings: Yes, she has disconnected now and I think the echo is gone so I guess she's trying to redial.

James Bladel: Yes it is gone. Okay so I'll continue. Sorry, that was very, very annoying because it was not just an echo but it was like a very, very delayed and loud echo so - at least it was on my end.

So just diving into the second slide here where we present all the acronyms used in this transfer process the first one being the name of the transfer process itself, IRTP. And I think it's important we note Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, also known as transfers.

Now I point that out because registrars including Go Daddy and possibly some others will have an internal transfer process as well where registrants (and) take the domain name from one particular account or one entity and reassign it internally where it doesn't leave that particular registrar.

Those things are fine and those are, you know, I guess you would say those are private product and service offerings that are offered by those registrars and do not fall under the guise of ICANN's policy. ICANN's policy specifically governs the interactions that registrars have with each other and with the registry.

And, you know, it's (unintelligible). The registrars do not have a desire to play nicely together and that's what this policy requires. The echo is back. Okay and it's gone now so hopefully Simonetta is back on the line and she can hear us.

The next one is the transfer contact. Now this is the individual listed in Whois that is authorized to approve the transfer. And the important note here is that either the registrant or the admin contact listed in the Whois is - can be considered the transfer contact.

New registrar, that's the registrar that is - will be receiving the transfer. And the current registrar, also called the registrar of record or the losing registrar, will be the registrar that is giving up the transfer - giving up the domain name for the transfer.

So if you want to think of it as source and destination or sender and recipient, however you want to consider those terms. But I think that we say often we say gaining registrar and losing registrar would probably be the most common although I believe the policy refers to it as gaining registrar and registrar of record.

FOA, you're heard this acronym thrown around in our previous call it's Form of Authorization. This is an electronic or paper confirmation of the transfer by the transfer contact. So the gaining registrar has to go to the transfer contact and get their approval or their authorization for the transfer and that is called the FOA.

And auth info or auth info code. This is a unique code, you can consider it like a key or a password for a domain name. It's a - usually a very long alphanumeric string that is assigned to each domain name; it is unique. And it must be provided correctly to the registry when the transfer request is submitted.

So any questions on those acronyms or is there an important one missing from this list? Okay moving on.

So I'm going to show you some animations here that outline what we would consider a pristine transfer. This is a transfer where everything goes exactly

according to plan. And then later on in the session we'll discuss all the different ways it can go wrong or fail or there can be some exception cases. But let's just look at how a pristine transfer would work.

The first step is that the registrant would initiate the transfer at its new registrar. So, you know, if I'm unhappy with my current registrar and I want to set up an account with Go Daddy I would create the account there and say Go Daddy I want you to become my new registrar.

The new registrar then sends back instructions specifically you need to go to your - it's back. So the new registrar would say you need to go to your existing registrar and unlock the domain name and request your - request your auth info code.

Yes, Michele, lots of folks would have a variety of motivations for transferring a domain name. I keep using that as an example but you're correct. Maybe they want to save money. Maybe they want it to be in a different jurisdiction.

So this initial step here the registrant has to initiate the process. And I think the important bit here is that the new registrar, the gaining registrar - okay now it gets a little more complicated.

The new registrar then performs a Whois lookup on the domain name. And it's looking for those contacts that - essentially gets the transfer contact that we discussed.

The registry or possibly in a thin registry it would be the other registrar - would provide the contact information for the registrants and the transfer contact or some subset there of - of the contact information. But basically the new registrar has to figure out who is the transfer contact, how is authorized to approve this transfer.

The next step is that the registrar - and we're assuming it's the same person who requested it because this is a pristine transfer - sends the form of authorization to the transfer contact and says, you know, essentially you need to approve that this transfer has been requested on this domain name; you are listed as the admin contact or the registrant please approve this transfer.

So how does that step look for everybody? Is that okay or is that clear? Basically the registrar - the new registrar has to figure out who the authorized contact is and send them an FOA. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just by way of clarification if in a thick - if it's a thick registry they should be able to use the domain info command or something shouldn't they to get it?

James Bladel: Can you do a domain info command on a name that you are not the sponsoring registrar for?

Michele Neylon: Yes if you have a valid (EPP) key I think you can.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay so that's another - and there could also be an arrow going from new registrar to current registrar for that transaction as well on a thin registry. Anyway I think the key thing here is that the registrar has to figure out who the responsible party is to approve this transfer and then send them the FOA.

Okay the next step is - and this can happen concurrently with the previous steps - it's that the registrant has to go to their current registrar account and unlock the domain name and request the auth info code.

Now it's important to note that in the transfer policy the authorization info code cannot be reasonably denied. So the current registrar can't say yes we will give you that code at the end of your registration period or we'll give it to you if you come and fly to our offices and give us a pint of blood or something, you know, they can't be - put unreasonable requirements in place.

They can put reasonable requirements in place like enter this password or confirm this with your, you know, account on file or something. But I think that there's some restrictions in there about, you know, it has to - the controls for this has to be easy to find and relatively straightforward.

So once the auth info code has been returned the registrant has the auth info code, they provide the auth info code and the confirmed FOA whether that's a paper FOA, a fax or an electronic form, and they send all of this back to the new registrar. So now the new registrar has an unlocked domain name, a authorized FOA, Form of Authorization, and it has the auth info code for the domain name.

The next step is that it then essentially sends - since it has all of the required pieces it sends the command, the transfer command to the registry and says I have everything in order, everything looks legit, please transfer this domain name to me.

Are we okay with that slide? Okay.

Now the first thing that happens is the registry checks all of the information that the new registrar has provided to it and essentially makes sure that the code is valid and that the domain name is unlocked. And what it does then is sends out a notice to both registrars that there is now a transfer pending on this domain name. So example.tld is now marked as transfer pending.

The losing registrar may, at this point, send a FOA to the transfer contact; hey just wanted to let you know that your domain name has been marked as transfer pending. I wanted to give you an opportunity to authorize that with me. The important thing is is that the transfer can't be held up on account of this step being done or not being done.

The new recommendation from transfer - IRTP-B will modify this and will require this to go out to the - from the losing registrar to the transfer contact.

But once again this is not a dependent step so the transfer cannot be delayed or stopped dependent upon this happening.

So it's more of a notification step I think or a courtesy from the current registrar to the registrant. And it could be, you know, it could thwart a hijacking attempt if, up until this point, the registrant was unaware that this transfer was under way.

And the important thing here is in the third bullet point that this now starts a five-day, calendar day, clock ticking. And if there are no objections or no other formal denials are issued then the transfer will take place at the end of the five day period.

Any questions? Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just for the people who are new to the entire IRTP thing with respect to the second bullet point there at the moment that losing registrar FOA is optional. Once the IRTP Part B recommendations come into force then it becomes obligatory.

James Bladel: Right. And I tried to reflect that although clumsily I think in the may, which is how it currently is, and the must is how it will be here shortly where IRTP-B is...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes it's just - just so that people understand, I mean, the specific thing just to say is that, you know, because we went through various things in the previous working group the actual policy is changing. So, you know, there was something to come out of the far end it wasn't just a lot of paperwork and (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Right, right. Jonathan.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: Yes and - for a little bit more clarification on that so when is that going to be implemented, the - making it required?

James Bladel: If I'm - and, boy, we just lost Marika. But I think we're very close here to hammering out some final implementation language and then there will be a formal announcement from ICANN. But, I mean, it has gone through the Council and the Board and been accepted there so we're just hammering out the implementation timeline now.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: So - and then - so what impact is that going to have then as far as - so then the losing registrar will be required to send this FOA and get some kind of confirmation from the customer, some verification that, you know, that they are who they say they are and that they approve the transfer. What's the timeframe on that then and how does that impact the current process?

James Bladel: Well the way we're currently doing it now I think FOA is a bit of a misnomer it really is just the notification.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: Okay.

James Bladel: Michele, you know, help me on this. But I don't think that there is any timeframe. I don't think that if the registrar - sorry the registrant is silent or does not respond I don't think that, you know, that means anything or if it takes them a day or 10 days. The current registrar cannot stop the transfer from happening based on this not being done.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: Right.

James Bladel: So they have to send it out but they don't necessarily - the transfer process is not dependent on a response.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: Okay and then even once the changes are implemented then it's going to be the same thing. It's just we're going to be required as the registrar to send the notice as part of the process but that's it just sending the notice to whatever the current contact information that we have on file, I mean, is it that kind of thing?

James Bladel: Yes...

Michele Neylon: James, mind if I step in?

James Bladel: What - okay well I had Barbara in the queue first, Michele, so Barbara...

Michele Neylon: Oh okay.

James Bladel: ...can you go ahead? Is this in response to Jonathan...

Barbara Steele: I'm happy if Michele - this is Barbara. I'm happy if Michele wants to go first.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Barbara.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...go for it Michele.

Michele Neylon: No just to answer Jonathan's thing. The - (unintelligible) it does - all you're being asked to do is to send the FOA; you're not asked to do anything beyond that. So if the - if you send the FOA and the recipient of the FOA ignores it, nothing happens, you know, nothing changes; the domain will transfer.

But like you guys control at least three registrars that I know of and I know one of them already sends this FOA to registrants. And a lot of registrars will

actually use it as a kind of hey are you sure you want to leave us type of thing and the message that goes into it at the same time.

But they have the obligatory FOA which you have to have as per ICANN policy but you also have something kind of informative saying, you know, you don't need to transfer you domain away if you just want to change the name servers, that kind of thing.

Jonathan Tennenbaum: Right, okay. Well that's definitely helpful, I appreciate it. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan and Michele. Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Steele: Hi, this is Barbara. So just to kind of, you know, further put a spin on it - and they're exactly right, I mean, to the extent that, you know, the FOA goes out - the confirmation FOA from the losing registrar goes out to the registrant the registrant, you know, would have to respond to that and let the losing registrar know within the five-day transfer grace period that they do not want it to transfer.

And if they fail to do that - if they are just silent and fail to do that then the transfer will proceed, you know, on that - after the five-day transfer grace period so - and that just happens systematically unless the losing registrar sends the denial of transfer (NAC) command through. So hopefully that helps a little bit more as well.

James Bladel: Yes it does and it raises another question but I'll hold that and then maybe I'll ask you that question either offline or later in the process, Barb. Thanks.

Okay so that's kind of the second to the last step here in that everyone is notified that this is happening and that the registrar of record - the current registrar notifies the registrant that the transfer is taking place and then starts the five-day clock.

Phil, I see your question in the chat and that is a slide here coming up in just a couple of moments here so hopefully we'll cover that then but if we don't please raise your hand and if it's - if we leave that out, if we fail to address your question.

Okay so here's some exception cases; things that can happen or go wrong or how the process can fail. If the registrant does not accept the FAO or if they cannot provide the auth info to the new registrar then the new registrar cannot request the transfer. They cannot send the transfer request to the registry without those pieces of information in hand.

If the name is locked or the auth info code fails, it doesn't match what the registry has on file, then the registry will reject the transfer. And again during that five-day period the losing registrar can reject or (NAC), which is the not acknowledged, the transfer but their (NAC) must be associated with one of the acceptable reasons for denial that's spelled out in the current IRTP policy.

So let's take a closer look at that in another slide here where we lay out the reasons for denial. There's another possible exception case where the registrant and the admin contact disagree.

Remember that both of them are authorized transfer contacts so it's possible that one, for example the admin contact, could start the transfer process but the FOA would then be sent to the registrant who would then reject the transfer.

Now what happens if those two individuals or entities disagree on whether or not the transfer should take place? In that respect the policy says that the registrant's FOA overrides the admin contact. So any questions on this slide? Okay.

So here's some reasons for denial. And like the previous slide these are also being modified slightly by IRTP-B so once IRTP-B is in place it will change these slightly. So I'm giving you kind of a snapshot of the reasons for denial as they stand today.

The first one is - and this is when the current registrar - the registrar or record can stop the transfer from happening. One is that there's evidence of fraud. Two is that there's a current pending UDRP action on the domain name. Three is that they're current under court order not to transfer the domain name by a court that's - I think that they say a court of competent jurisdiction or some other term of ours that refers to a court that applies to this particular name and this particular registrar.

If there is a reasonable dispute over the identity of the transfer contact so we're not clear that the person who authorized the transfer is the person who is who they say they are or they're portraying themselves to be.

Nonpayment for a previous registration period - and I think it's - previous is bolded here because we can't stop a transfer from happening for a current or future registration period. And by the way Number 5 includes credit card charge backs as well; I think that's specifically cited as an example in the policy.

Number 6 is express written objection from the transfer contact which essentially says that I am the authorized transfer contact and I expressly forbid you to transfer this name as part of a transfer protection service or hijacking, you know, guard service. Think of this, you know, as possibly as an anti-FOA so this is I authorize you to stop all transfers from taking place.

If the domain name was already locked; now again this is, you know, that the name is locked that the registry and registrar - and there's some clarifications coming out for IRTP-B.

If the transfers was requested within 60 days of the original creation of the domain name. And the final one is that the transfer was requested within 60 days of a previous transfer.

Now - now wait a second here. Go back here. So, you know, a couple things here first of all the lock and the unlock function cannot be hidden or, you know, you can't be required to answer trivia questions or pay to unlock a domain name. You know, this is a - there's some guidelines here about what registrars can and can't do, you know, relative to making sure that the registrants have access to the locks on their domain names.

Yes, thank you, Volker, for clarifying. And I'm going to ask you to raise your hand at the end of this slide and please state that for Item Number 5.

I wanted to point out also that reason for denial Number 8 and reason for denial Number 9 are reasons that registrars can reject a transfer but are not required to reject a transfer. This is something that we wanted to discuss in IRTP-B but we were unable to reach a consensus on that.

So it is however kind of a common practice that if a domain name is - was registered on Monday that you can't then transfer it on Friday or if a domain name is transferred you can't then turn around and transfer it again right away. Those are options that are available to registries and registrars but they are not universally required.

So that's those items there. I see that we have Volker who wants to comment on Item Number 5 and then Barbara is also in the queue. So, Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yes, just checked with the transfer policy and the current registration may be a reason for denial as well if the current - if the domain expiration has not yet occurred and the current registration period is unpaid then the transfer may be denied as well.

But to clarify that further the nonpayment alone is not sufficient for denial; the domain must also be put on registrar hold by the registrar prior to the denial of transfer.

James Bladel: Right, okay thank you. So there's two important points in Volker's comment there is that the current registration - well really there is only two, right, there's current and future or something because then if it goes past the expiration date it becomes a past registration period.

So I think that that makes sense. If the registration has not yet expired then nonpayment for the current registration period is acceptable. The other part is is that it's not just enough just to deny transfers. The current registrar must also engage a registrar lock for nonpayment.

Okay Volker your hand is still raised; did you want to add to that or is that...

Volker Greimann: No I just forgot to take it down.

James Bladel: Okay fair enough, thanks. Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Steele: Hi, James, thank you. It's Barbara. I also just wanted to kind of make a general statement on behalf of VeriSign and I believe that it may work this way at other registries as well. But when the original shared registration system was designed there was actually a systematic restriction on transfers within the first 60 days after the creation date.

So for any of the domains that are currently managed by VeriSign our systems will actually not even allow - it will also basically reject or error out a transfer that's requested for Reason Number 8. So that's not something that registrars - at least in our system - would have to specifically say no I'm going to (NAC) it. Our systems automatically do that on behalf of the registrar.

So when the changes in 2004 came into place and the IRTP became a consensus policy the transfer was requested within 60 days of a previous transfer, (unintelligible) for the transfer, that was actually a new addition. And we opted - and I think the other registries also opted - not to put a systematic restriction in place there and just, you know, allow the registrars to have the option of denying the transferring and (NAC-ing) the transfer.

So like I said I'm not sure how all of the other registries operate but I think most of them actually also provide a systematic restriction for Number 8.

James Bladel: Thanks, Barbara, that's good to know that registries will just automatically block Number 8 but we'll leave it to registrar discretion for Number 9. And I can tell you that representing Go Daddy that we will always (NAC) a transfer, I think, if it comes within 60 days of a previous transfer because we believe that's an important security step to prevent what we would call registrar hopping of domain names. So we like to make sure that that's not allowed.

Any other questions or comments about these reasons for denial?

Okay next slide here touches on disputes. I'm sure I'm going to miss a lot of things here and I'm going to lean on Barbara and Volker and Michele to help me flush out this slide.

But, you know, taking a look at disputes here there are a number of - let's think of them as kind of the spectrum of options that folks have for disputing a transfer and escalating time and cost.

So the first step is that any discussion between a registrant and admin contact can resolve a conflicting FOA. Remember we said that the registrant's FOA trumps the admin contact's FOA. So I think the first step is making sure that those two entities are on the same page relative to a transfer.

The second one is if there's any kind of a dispute over the legitimacy of a transfer the losing registrar and gaining registrar can discuss this and can work with the parties involved to resole or reverse the transfer. And I think that in cases of suspected hijacking this is the fastest remedy available.

This is one of the reasons why we really want registrars to communicate with each other and why IRTP-B requires there to be a transfer action channel that can respond on very short notice to emergencies.

The next one is a more formal process called a Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy - TDRP - which is spelled out in the IRTP. Based on our discussions in the previous working group, IRTP-B, and discussions with Barbara and some of the other registries we find that this is a seldom-used policy; it is very slow.

I think that we heard somewhere in the neighborhood of six months to get these resolved so not necessarily a good remedy in cases of what we would consider fraud or theft or hijacking but possibly an option available for a genuine dispute between two parties. And, you know, of course there's - courts are always open for individuals to take these issues.

Okay and, Barbara, can I ask you to clarify, I didn't want to include RFE here because I thought that was specific to VeriSign but can you expand on what the request for enforcement looks like?

Barbara Steele: Sure, I mean, basically - this is Barbara - the way it's structured is the transfer dispute resolution policy allows those registrars that aren't able to resolve a dispute between themselves, which the policy does encourage, to file a dispute either a first or a second level dispute resolution provider.

And all registry operators are designated as the Level 1 or first level dispute resolution provider. And to the extent that there is a dispute then the registrar that claims that either a transfer has occurred in violation of the policy or it's being denied in violation of the policy can file a request for enforcement. And

that is consistent across all registries and that's specifically called out in the transfer dispute resolution policy.

And then the registry operator, once they receive that the other registrar would have an option - or the opportunity I should say - to respond to that within seven days. And the transfer dispute resolution policy, or the TDRP, specifically outlines the timeframe and the windows that all actions should take.

And I'm trying to think that if - the longest it should take I think is something like 105 days unless there is a dispute over the accuracy of the Whois. And then it can be deferred over to ICANN for clarification on that. So there are some instances when it could take longer than that. But the way that the policy is written is it should occur within, you know, a very specific and finite period of time.

Again the second level that the registrars would have the option if they chose not to go to the registry operator they could bypass the registry operator, or the first level dispute resolution provider, and go to the second level dispute resolution provider which there are I believe three to five different entities that have been designated by ICANN as being authorized to handle transfer related disputes.

And so to the extent that a registrar goes to a second level then they could not appeal it to the registry operator but they could appeal it to the courts if they didn't like the decision. If they opt to go to the registry operator first then they - and they didn't like the answer that the registry operator gave them in response to the dispute they could appeal it to the second level or to the courts.

So it's a lot of information so I'm trying to boil it down into the nutshell. And hopefully that helped to put a little bit more color around it without confusing everyone too much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Barbara. And I knew I wasn't doing that bullet point justice. The TDRP is its own policy and I think that it has, as you mentioned, a very complex process as well.

Barbara Steele: Yes.

James Bladel: And so...

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: If I could add, James - I'm sorry - if I could just add...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Go ahead.

Barbara Steele: ...the part that I think you were - the part that you were thinking about that may be VeriSign only is what we call the ARS which is the Application for Reinstatement of Sponsorship and that's something that VeriSign has put in place.

                   To the extent that the registrars are able to work out amongst themselves, that they don't a mechanism by which to transfer the domain name back then we have a form that's available on our submission - transfer dispute submission area of our Website that basically will allow the losing registrar to file this - what's called an ARS, and like I said it's VeriSign specific.

                   And to the extent that the gaining registrar responds to that and concurs that the domain name was transferred inappropriately then they can agree to it within a seven-day period and we will go ahead and affect the transfer back.

James Bladel: Okay so that's...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...basically the mechanism for the previous bullet point; if the losing and
                   gaining registrar agree then they can use the ARS as a mechanism to
                   reinstate - or reverse the transfer.

Barbara Steele: Right that would be at VeriSign only like a VeriSign managed TLDs.

James Bladel: Okay.

Barbara Steele: I don't believe the other registries currently offer that but maybe some of the
                   registrars who have had some experience with transfer disputes with them
                   may be able to speak to it.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. So I think that the takeaway here, I mean, is that the TDRP is a
                   very complex, very slow, might slightly be less complicated or less - or faster
                   than a court action perhaps but it's certainly not something you would want to
                   engage in an emergency situation where time - where, you know, you were
                   measuring damages by hours.

                   So, you know, and again I think that it's important that registrars are familiar
                   with the intricacies of the TDRP but registrants would simply call their
                   registrar and say look I didn't authorize this transfer please help me get it
                   back.

                   And so I think it was - it's more of these are mechanisms or avenues that the
                   registrar would follow to try and escalate the dispute over the transfer. So any
                   other questions or comments about these bullets here?

                   I think we're getting close to the end here and that might have even been the
                   last slide. Let me see if there's anything left. Yes so that is the last slide. So is
                   there anything that - any follow up questions or any slides that someone

would like me to go back to? We have probably about 10 more minutes here if there's anyone that would like to see some of those animations again one more time or any other item.

All of this including the MP3 and the recording will be posted to the list though so that staff will make that available to everyone. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Well I'd just like to say that, you know, that you did such a good job and if you ever - if you ever lose your job at Go Daddy you can always move into the training sector, James.

James Bladel: Well I would need Barbara and you to ride shotgun on that, Michele, but thanks - and Volker.

Michele Neylon: No but jokes aside, I mean, the thing is this - and I've said it to other people as well - I said it to them in Dakar and I'll say it again; I mean, if anybody has - if there's anything about any of this that people don't understand and they don't want to post it to the main list, I mean, you know, just ping one of us off list or whatever, I mean, either myself, yourself, Volker, whoever you're happy, you know, pinging if there's something you're not sure about.

James Bladel: Right.

Michele Neylon: I mean, or just ask it on the mailing list, I mean, because, you know, it's acronym soup and there's lots of the acronyms. And, you know, sometimes it's - you might think well why isn't it done this way and the answer is well because nobody ever thought of doing it that way. Or is there a policy about X? Well maybe there isn't.

James Bladel: Yes, yes. And some of these things I think is a good point, Michele, is there's policies and then there's absence of policy where a practice and, you know, just kind of some industry conventions have stepped in to kind of fill those gaps. I think that this is a complex issue.

And it is very important not only or the after markets as we discussed earlier but just to make sure that registrars can compete with one another and that registrants have choices and options that they can exercise.

But it is kind of the complicated process. It has a lot of acronyms which is part of ICANN so of course it does. And feel free to reach out to, you know, the dirty businessmen on these groups if you need help because I think that we're more than willing to spend some times and help clarify some of these issues.

And also possibly give you a little bit of insight into how some other registrars, let's go ahead and say the ones that don't come to ICANN meetings and don't show up on these calls, but they're out there and they do - I want to say get creative with the policy, play games with the policy; how do we want to - it's whatever diplomatic way we can say that they kind of can get a little - it can get a little interesting when we try to dispute whether or not something was an authorized transfer or not.

So that's kind of where we have here. And, Avri, I'm reading your chat here. I don't mean to put you on the spot but is there something - did I leave something out?

Michele Neylon: That's just saying - about asking people on the list - people asking questions.

Avri Doria: Yes - not at all. What I was basically saying in the middle of the conversation is ask on the list because there's bound to be somebody else have a question - that has the same question, that's all I was saying. No I...

James Bladel: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...leave anything out. I thought it was great. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay good, good point too is that if someone has a question then I think - Phil had a question earlier. Did we cover your question on the reasons for denial, Phil? He's typing here. Yes, okay good.

                   Okay and Michele, is that a new hand or...

Michele Neylon: That's an old one; ignore it.

James Bladel: Old one, okay.

Michele Neylon: I mean, unless you just want me to keep saying how wonderful you are. I can keep doing that.

James Bladel: No, no, no. No I think we can wrap up a few minutes early here. I just wanted to make sure that there weren't any loose threads here and that everyone who had questions got them answered. We will set this recording - this MP3, this little cartoon of the slideshow we'll put that up onto the list. And I assume that means it hits the wiki somewhere although to be completely honest I haven't navigated that thing very well yet.

                   So all these materials will be available if anyone wants to discuss or if someone feels they might have some benefit to our future conversations. So thanks for the extra hour, everyone, certainly appreciate the time. And we'll go ahead and close the call.

                                    END