

**Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team
Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 10 May 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Locking of the Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Drafting Team Meeting on Thursday 10 May 2012 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-locking-domain-name-20120510-en.mp3>
On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Attendees

Victoria McEvedy, NCSG
John Berryhill, RrSG
Luc Seufer, RrSG
Laurie Anderson, RrSG
Randy Ferguson, IPC
Faisal Shah, individual
Brian Beckham, WIPO
Sheri Falco, RySG
Alan Greenberg, ALAC (Vice-Chair acting as Chair)
Gabriela Szlak, CBUC
Lisa Garono, IPC
Volker Greimann, RrSG
Jonathan D. Tenenbaum, RrSG

Apologies:

Michele Neylon, RrSG (Chair)
Matt Schneller - IPC
Hago Dafalla, NCSG
Barbara Knight, RySG
David Maher, RySG
Andrii Paziuk, NCSG

Staff Support:

Marika Konings
Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber

Coordinator: Thank you. The recording has started and all lines are open. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you, (Sam). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's Lock call on Thursday the 10th of May we have John Berryhill, Luc Seufer, Laurie Anderson, Randy Ferguson, Faisal Shah, Brian Beckham, Sheri Falco, Alan Greenberg, Gabriele Szlak. From staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Apologies noted today from Michele Neylon, Matt Schneller, Hago Dafalla, Barbara Knight, David Maher, Andrii Paziuk. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much and I'm taking the chair today replacing Michele who couldn't be with us.

First of all any changes to the agenda? It's up in the upper right hand corner of Adobe Connect. In the absence of anyone yelling or putting their hand up I'm assuming the agenda will be okay as posted.

All right the first item is to confirm the chair and vice chair. That's - I guess, technically, Marika, that's not confirmation but this group may - confirming the recommendation for chair and vice chair to the GNSO Council. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. This is just to confirm...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Marika Konings: ...I mean, we didn't get any other nominations or objections on the mailing to the nomination of Michele as the Chair and as yourself as the Vice Chair so this would be a formal confirmation by the working group that, you know, they

accept the working group leadership. And following that Joy as the Council liaison will communicate that to the GNSO Council for confirmation.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And again not hearing anything on the list. And I'm - if anyone has anything to say quickly I'll - we'll open the floor. In the absence of that we'll pass onto Joy that request to name myself and Michele as Vice Chair and Chair respectively.

All right the next item is the review/discuss outreach questions to registrars and registries. Do we have that on a form that can be posted on Adobe Connect?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I can either just pull up the document and we can look at it. I can also share my screen if people want to actually work on the questions and, you know, I can then show my Word screen so people can, you know, see what is being changed. I don't know whether...

Alan Greenberg: I...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: That - the list is dense enough as it is right now that I don't think we could productively start to try to work on it and get very far. And since it just came in a very short time ago my inclination is to talk a little bit about it in general if people have comments and then defer to the list for specific suggestions, changes, comments, thoughts.

Marika Konings: Okay. I have put it up as a PDF in the Adobe Connect room. Alan, are you still there?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm here. What I see is the charter in there; not the - oh I see - okay, sorry, sorry. But that's not the list that John sent out - that rather Matt sent out this morning.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So what I did because I basically added those at the end the questions - already - I circulated this document to the list as well because I've put them in the format of a template that we've used as well for previous working groups...

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay.

Marika Konings: ...so just to have an introduction to explain, you know, what this is all about assuming as well that the working group will be asking input on the charter question itself. And then I've just copied and pasted the questions that Matt sent - the one section for the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the second section is for UDRP service providers.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: And I've just numbered them so it's easier to refer to.

Alan Greenberg: Okay when I started talking only about the top 1/3 of the document had shown up at my screen which is why I said it wasn't t here. Now I see all the rest of the questions have now shown up also. I didn't realize we have time lags like that in a particular screen on Adobe.

Okay has anyone had a chance to look at these? I have a couple of thoughts, again, not having even read all the words. But I see in the middle of the questions on locking - on questions to the registrar - of when a domain name is locked pursuant to a UDRP. Does the lock prevent transfer to another registrar.

And I would have thought those are not issues that we need opinions from registrars on but those are actual characteristics that are controlled by the registry at that point. Am I incorrect on that? Does anyone have any understanding?

John Berryhill: The registry has no knowledge of the UDRP proceeding.

Alan Greenberg: No, no but it's saying when a name is locked and I'm presuming is that a registrar lock purely or is that a registry lock - defined lock?

Laurie Anderson: This is Laurie.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Laurie Anderson: When a domain is placed on a registrar lock it's a registrar lock not the registry. If the registry is notified they do put it on their own lock. And then if the registrar unlocks it then the registry - we have to go to the registry to get it unlocked in order to move it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay so it's possible when a registrar locks that they may lock it in one of several different ways so it is something that may vary based on the registrar then. Okay. Does anyone want to go any further into these questions? Now again without a lot of time to really read them and think about them I'm not sure how to productively use this time. But if anyone wants to talk about them then show your hand. Yeah, Brian.

Brian Beckham: Hi, yeah, this is Brian. I think probably - and I think this comes out a bit in some of the subsequent questions that Matt circulated. But it might be that the definition of what's actually meant by a lock would help to clarify some of the subsequent questions.

So in other words where, you know, there's a series of questions that it seems presuppose a definition is already understood as to what the lock means. But maybe just going back a step if we all understand what that's intended to cover that might help answer some of the questions.

Alan Greenberg: Well I guess that generates a question for me of are we trying to define the lock or at this stage should we be asking registrars what different kinds of locks they may be using because each of the locks may have different implications. And currently, you know, no one has ever really defined in terms of this PDP what lock we're talking about I don't believe.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Someone is talking but only very, very faintly. Brian, was that you?

Brian Beckham: No that wasn't.

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay.

Gabriele Szlak: This is Gabriele.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, go ahead.

Gabriele Szlak: Gabriele Szlak. Yeah, I'm not sure who talked before but I wanted to say that I agree with the concern because if, for example, we have the first question there for the Registrar Stakeholder Group and it says do you lock domain names during UDRP proceedings? So if we are not telling them what do we understand and what is understandable by lock then the question might have different answers. That's my concern.

Alan Greenberg: But isn't the issue that - isn't the issue that different registrars may each lock the name but that lock has different characteristics? So I'm not...

Gabriele Szlak: I'm not sure.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm not sure either. If a lock is purely a registrar function then it may impact any change to the domain name or it may impact only certain ones.

Gabriele Szlak: So maybe it's how do you lock a domain name is the question.

Alan Greenberg: It's almost - I would think that we need to find out what the options are or what options registrars use because until we know what they're currently doing we don't even know what the repertoire of different locks is. At least I certainly don't. So I think that's certainly one of the overriding points of if we cannot define what lock we're talking about we need to ask. I'm not - I suspect the latter is preferable at this stage but I'm not sure.

Laurie Anderson: This is Laurie.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, go ahead...

Gabriele Szlak: So it would be possible - oh sorry.

Laurie Anderson: I was just going to say that in our case and in the registrar's cases that we are aware of there are no changes allowed, no, you know, updates to the Whois, no transfers, no updates to the DNS. When the domain is locked there's just no changes allowed whatsoever.

Alan Greenberg: Allowed by the registrant?

Laurie Anderson: By anybody.

Sheri Falco: Hi, this is Sheri. I think that actually though there's privacy - often the registrar - oh sorry, sorry, sorry. I have to raise my hand. New format. I apologize. I'll raise my hand.

Gabriele Szlak: So it - would it - this is Gabby again - Gabriele. And so maybe it would be interesting to add the question what do you understand by locking a domain name or how do you lock a domain name.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think we need something like that. And it might vary based on the different - and the different answers they could conceivably use different locks, different types of locks. Sheri.

Sheri Falco: Yeah, I was going to say that I think that there are obviously some subsections as you're hinting to different types of locks. And is there a common practice for certain registrars, I think, to delist the privacy at that point if the registrant's name gets locked at the registrar level?

But I don't know that that's universal so while typically it might be a complete lock (unintelligible) there may be some immediate lifting of the privacy field or the privacy protection which actually does (unintelligible) in that lock universe. So I don't know exactly the universal process but it is a common practice with certain registrars.

Alan Greenberg: Victoria.

Victor McEvedy: Yeah, I would just say that I came across some material on this during my researches this morning. And it seems that there - well based on some of the existing work that's been done there are indeed different kinds of locks. And that that was one of the issues for standardization.

So I would suggest that we could probably pull that out of the work product - the considerable work product that there already is on this topic. Perhaps - I think it's one of those reports talking about - well it's a Recommendation 8 or 9 - one of those reports or reports leading up to that. It seems that there are formal locks and there are informal locks. So I think that there is an issue there.

Alan Greenberg: Marika, are you familiar with what Victoria is talking about or where she's pointing to?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It might be referencing a document that was developed by the IRTTP working group and where the different status values in relation to, you know, Whois are defined. And those include as well various lock statuses. If you give me a second I'll pull it up and I can post the link in the Adobe Connect.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm not sure we need it now. But if we have an existing list of types of locks it probably would be something good that we could present to begin with. And then they can identify yes we're using Lock Type A or Lock Type B or say no the lock we're using in a particular instance is different from those.

So if we had that, you know, predefined list of known locks then that would probably be part of the preamble to the questionnaire then. Sheri, is your hand up again?

Sheri Falco: Yeah, actually. Yeah, there are certain - I think there are certain sort of back end defined things at least from registry providers which may or may not interact with registrars. But things like server transfer prohibited, server delete prohibited, those are just examples of phrases that have specific meanings.

And so I think you're right, I don't know that - I mean, there might be a universal concept called Server A or Server B or we might aspire to create one at a registrar level. But I do know there are some specific language index definitions that registry back end providers use. So we could take from that preexisting established definition...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: But in general those are locks that they initiate based on some circumstance not that the registrar initiates I think.

Sheri Falco: Right.

Alan Greenberg: I may be wrong.

Sheri Falco: No - yeah, who knows.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, in some cases the registrar doing something deleting a domain name causes the registry to put a certain lock on it. But it's not necessarily something they explicitly do.

Sheri Falco: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So that's yet another set of locks but not ones initiated by registrars I think. There may be some exceptions to that.

Sheri Falco: Okay. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: We may also want to list those just to - for clarity so people don't get them confused though.

Sheri Falco: Yeah.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Anything else? So we have a suggestion essentially to rephrase these that when we're asking about locks we also ask about type of lock but try to give them some guidance ahead of time for what answers - what kind of answers we're looking for and list as option - selection options the kinds of locks we know about.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Marika, is that something you feel you could do to rework this or do we need more discussion on it first?

Marika Konings: Sorry, Alan, I was busy finding the link. What would you like me to do?

Alan Greenberg: Okay no I was saying do we have enough - I'm not sure we want to do it at this point but do you have enough information right now - what I said was we would change this document to when we ask about do you lock also ask which kind of lock. And in the preamble list the kinds of locks that we already know about, the registry ones initiate registry-initiated ones and the various types of registrar initiated ones that we're cognizant of.

And so that they - if they're initiating a lock that's identical to one of our known types A, B, C, D or whatever. And if not then they would be asked to explain exactly what they are locking. And I'm saying...

Marika Konings: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...you know, at the point when we want to rework this and get it closer does that give you enough to go on?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. That's fine. I can add that and probably we need to look to some of the registrar and registry participants to make sure that we have all the relevant locks mentioned there. But I can definitely (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, and the fact that we're now asking that question may in fact change the structure of some of the questions. It may be that - I see in the middle of the registrar ones there's a whole bunch of lists of is the name locked or when the name is locked does it prevent X, does it prevent Y? And so that may be eliminate the need for those questions.

Those questions presume there is only one type of lock that a registrar will do during a UDRP and that may not be the case so. Okay I'm happy that we know what the next step is to refine these questions. Is there anything else anyone feels we want to talk about right now or go onto the next item?

We are on a tight schedule today. The GNSO meeting immediately following this meeting and some of us would like to get off early to prepare for that meeting. I'm sure Marika is one of those. All right...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I do have one question because one thing the working group might want to consider as well if there are any other groups, any other GNSO stakeholder groups or constituencies or other part of the ICANN community or outside of there that should be included, you know, once we finalize this template or if there are any specific questions, for example, that should go to any of the other parties, you know, to make sure that we cover everyone.

Alan Greenberg: Well certainly if one wanted to go to the intellectual property owners, or IPC, wouldn't we want to go to them with the results of the registrar - of the answers from the registrars and service providers and ask them do you believe there's anything else needed? I'm not sure we'd want to ask them at this level. Comments? Okay none.

Well I guess once we formulate it we can then decide who do we send it to.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Review of the public comment form draft. We're getting that on the screen.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Marika Konings: A comment - just to mention one thing I didn't change yet and something we did discuss at the last call is to number the charter questions because at

some pointed out we have a 4A and 4B that are closely linked so I didn't make that change yet but I have noted it and I'll do that for the next revision.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think anything that people may be referring to we should do numbers instead of bullets. These issues are confusing enough as it is; we may as well make it a little clearer. Has anyone had a chance to look over this and have any comments? Do we need more time or do we just say okay with one more pass prior to when we actually start the comment period? And we do need to decide when we start it. Brian.

Brian Beckham: Yeah, hi, this is Brian. Just one thought is going back to the question of the definition of lock it might be relevant whether whoever looks at that, Marika or whomever, the interplay, for example, of Paragraph 8 of the actual UDRP itself and Paragraph 2E of the rules so those are maybe just something to bear in mind in terms of getting to some sort of a definition as to what we're meaning when we're referring to locks for UDRP purposes.

And then sort of a follow up question is whether - with respect to the questions which are in the charter whether the discussion (unintelligible) emerge from the question which Matt has circulated might inform those charter questions to whether the charter question should be sort of put on hold until we have some more background information to make sure that we're getting all of the questions on the table that are relevant to be asking.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, a question. Are you implying that we shouldn't do the public comment period until we get the responses from the registrars and UDRP providers?

Brian Beckham: Yeah, that's a good question. I suppose in a sense it's always going to be a bit of a chicken and egg scenario. So I suppose, you know, certainly it's probably not, you know, necessary to hold up starting some sort of public comment cycle to wait until all of the questions that have been circulated this morning or last night have been answered.

But it's something to think about in terms of whether, you know, we should all kind of go offline and at least think a little bit about whether those questions might help to further inform some of the charter questions so there might be a charter question that's not there that ought to be or there might be one that would already be answered, you know, via the replies from the registrars or the providers.

So it's - yeah, like I say I'm not suggesting that it's a sort of a necessary logical chain of events but just something for us to maybe think about.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, it certainly would be easier to frame the questions that we're asking the public if we knew what we meant by lock because if we don't know then they're likely to have different views of it as well. And then we may have problems summarizing their answers if indeed they're answering different questions.

Marika, do you want to go before Victoria?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just want to point of clarification because of course nothing prevents the working group from initiating additional public comment periods at a later date.

So, you know, it doesn't mean if, you know, we launch this one now and we get new input based on what registrars or UDRP providers - information they give us and there's a need to add additional questions there's nothing preventing the working group to, you know, initiate new public comment forum or, you know, another means of getting public input. So it's not that this is the only opportunity to do so. So just to clarify that.

Alan Greenberg: Other than it's another two-month delay.

Marika Konings: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I suppose, you know, maybe I'm making an obvious point given my email (unintelligible) but, you know, my own feeling having - you know, I only was just quickly looking around for stuff not really closely reading it. But my own feeling is that there is almost nothing that hasn't been looked at on this topic, that hasn't been defined, that hasn't been discussed, hasn't gone out to public comments, that hasn't, you know, had constituency input, that hasn't had UDRP provider input.

So, you know, I would just wonder if we could somehow rationalize and draw from what's been done and then figure out, you know, where we'd like to expand. And, you know, just so that we make the best use of our time and energy.

And as I say I think that very little is un-reviewed here already. So I just wonder if - I don't know how we might do it but there might be some - and I'd be happy to help having raised the point. Maybe we can rationalize some of the work that's gone before and then I think that could inform both questions and order and so forth.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Sheri.

Sheri Falco: Yeah, I just wanted to just comment that I agree with that sentiment. I think it's wise and although there may not be anything prohibiting us from going out two different times I think just for the sake of efficiency and thoroughness we might just want to, you know, do a really thorough overview of where things have already been, where we are, what the open questions are, clearly define those and then present them from a knowing place as opposed to a continuing inquiry that might be already known.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I guess I'm going to defer to Marika. I admit I'm a newbie here and I haven't read all of the past reports in detail. I had the impression though that

although there's been a lot of discussion of the overall concept we have not - there has not been a lot of definition and formalization of what people are doing and what the options are. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And that's exactly right. You know, most of the documents that Victoria quoted in her email all relate to the work that was done in relation to the inter transfer policy discussion. So those questions really focused on, you know, when can a domain name be locked; when should it be unlocked in the context of transfers.

It didn't address, you know, questions on, you know, what does a lock mean. It didn't address questions of, you know, how does it impact the UDRP. And maybe they tried to explain how, you know, this issue did come up in the context of those discussions.

On one of the public comment periods there was a submission received from WIPO. And, you know, maybe to paraphrase basically they said like look as you seem to be looking at the issue of locking would you also consider looking at locking of - in the context of UDRP proceedings.

The work that the IRTP working group looked at that issue and said well, you know, we do see that there's an issue but we don't consider that part of inter registrar transfer policy which is what we're looking at. So that's why we're recommending that, you know, we think this is important but not in the context of the IRTP. But we recommend to the GNSO Council that if or when a review of the UDRP takes place then this issue is taken up and reviewed in detail.

And so one - when the review of the UDRP started with the issue report this was an issue that was covered in a whole bunch of other items that was raised. And as well some comments were received as a result of that on this specific issue. But it wasn't the only issue that was being considered.

So when the Council reviewed that final issue report they said well, you know, the overall review we want to put off to a later date together with a review of all the other rights protection mechanisms. But on this specific issue of the locking subject to UDRP proceedings as this was also mentioned in one of the other working groups we want to have a specific PDP on that issue only.

So I think, you know, also as these charter questions, you know, as far as I'm aware these specific questions haven't been raised before, a public comment hasn't been received on those. I'm not really sure, you know, that there is duplication. As I said, you know, as the IRTP really looked at locking from a very different angle.

Alan Greenberg: As the person who wrote most of those documents I suspect you're - have an accurate view of it. We have Victoria and Sheri. Are those new hands or old?

Sheri Falco: Oh sorry, mine is old. This is Sheri.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh mine's old.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Well if that's where we stand then I think going forward from my point of view it sounds like having an idea of what registrars are currently doing would give us a better handle on being able to phrase the questions for the public comment period.

Are there - do we believe there are other inputs we're likely to get on the public comment period that are the chicken and egg in the other direction; that is we'll know better what to ask registrars if we do the public comment period first or do them - or do them in parallel.

I suspect there's more to be gained by delaying the public comment which also implies no open session in Prague then - or perhaps just a very brief review of what the problem is. Any thoughts? Is there any compelling reason to do a public comment period quickly I guess is the question.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Marika, we were certainly asked to do a public comment period. But do you believe is there a compelling reason to do it before the registrar review?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'd say the first step public input and in my view, you know, asking registrars and UDRP providers is also part of that step of, you know, requesting input. So personally I don't see any major issues with, you know, doing it sequentially.

Alan Greenberg: Sequentially of registrars and then the public comment?

Marika Konings: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. That seems to make sense to me. I don't - let's put it to the list and I'll put out a specific question on the issue after this meeting. Let's make a note about that. And we can make a formal decision at our next meeting. But my inclination at this point is to say the facts point to doing the registrars first so we're better informed of what we're talking about before we ask the public comment.

I'm reluctant to do two public comment periods, you know, in a row. That doesn't usually get well received by people commenting when there's no real output from the previous comment. But let's put it to the list and see what people think.

All right next item on the agenda was continued discussion on approach and proposed work plan, which I think we have just done - and include plans for possible meeting in Prague. Do we have - Marika, have we done a brief survey of how many of the working group members will be in Prague?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No we haven't done that yet.

Alan Greenberg: Let's do that between this meeting and the next to get a feeling for it. I don't think this is a topic of enough stirring interest in the general public, in the non-registrar public, to make a public meeting at this point to just give an overview of what the issue is. I don't think it's going to resound with a lot of people other than people who are actively involved in one side of the UDRP or another. Are there other people who feel strongly about that? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just something, you know, as the meeting has been requested, you know, the working group can also consider of course if there are sufficient people there to consider just as a working group meeting. So just - even if you don't want a public meeting, you know, if there are sufficient working group members in Prague another opportunity will be just to use that time as a working group meeting.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, that's why I asked for a survey of who's going to be there. So at this point I don't think there's a compelling reason for - to have a public meeting. I don't think we have a lot new to say. And I'm not convinced that the - that this subject is going to be of great interest to attract a huge crowd of people other than registrars and UDRP people I think, maybe an occasional registry.

So again I'll put the question to the list to make sure we catch people that are not on the call today. But my inclination is to say we probably don't need an open meeting and a working group meeting I think would be a good idea face to face if we have enough people there. No nays? No hands up at all.

Next step and next meeting is I presume we're going to meet next week? I presume the time is still acceptable? I don't know that thing is that you put up, Marika, it's far too small for me to read.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I put up is, you know, we started working on it at the first meeting is a mind map to try to map out, you know, the different steps we want to take and the drafting there, you know, the outreach questions, the

charter questions and other issues. So I just started adding there a bit what we discussed today to start off...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...you know, first asking - I think you can actually turn it into a full screen. I can as well try to enhance it here.

Alan Greenberg: Oh there's the full screen button at the top. I see. Oh it doesn't quite go full screen but it goes full window, close enough. Is that on the wiki by the way?

Marika Konings: Yes, it's in a PDF format on the wiki.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: So basically in the second section it captures a bit some of the discussion points we had in previous meetings and the idea to, you know, this is a bit in combination with the work plan to keep track on the things we said we wanted to do or wanted to explore and to make sure that we've, you know, actually done them as well when we...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...you know, look back.

Alan Greenberg: That's a new one to me so I haven't looked at it at all yet.

Marika Konings: That's actually something that Mikey has been introducing in some of the other working groups and it has been a very useful tool in first of all, you know, outlining, you know, the different steps or the approach the working group wants to take in tackling some of these issues. And then as well looking back making sure that all the bases were covered. So...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...I'm trying as well to see if we can make it work here but it has been very valuable in some of the other groups.

Alan Greenberg: Okay that's good. All right we're - I wanted to end by 45 minutes after the hour and we're getting close to that right now. And unless I see any other - I don't know how to go out of full - oh there we are - out of full screen.

Unless there's anyone else that wants to bring - to raise any issues right now I think we're going to have a number of questions raised on the list which I'll put out and we'll do a survey of who's going to be in Prague. And hopefully we'll be in a position to make some formal decisions on all of these issues at the next meeting next Monday - or next Thursday rather.

Yes, Brian.

Brian Beckham: Yeah, hi, this is Brian. I just wanted to ask a question which actually an email which was just sent out to the list by John Berryhill raised, which was I understand Matt put these questions together quickly and they were for the group to really give feedback on.

But on a very quick read through of the questions that were intended to be directed at the providers there was one which like the question that John has raised from the registrar perspective triggered to my recollection the EDDRP. So I wonder if - I'm just trying to understand in terms of the intent for next steps for these lists of questions whether these are something that will be refined by the group during subsequent calls or over email?

Because I think, you know, at least a rough skim of the questions that were intended to be directed to the provider I can say that the vast majority of those are quite frankly information that's simply not in the purview of the provider.

So I suspect that might also be the case for the questions that are intended to be directed at the registrars to whether - rather those questions were refined on the list by the participants in this group that were coming from the registrar perspective or whether that would happen informally with registrars who are not part of the group just a question I wanted to raise in terms of how that would relate to the next steps in terms of actually sending these questions out to registrars for specific feedback.

Alan Greenberg: Well subject to the - what we discussed earlier of including in the questions what kind of locks do you use and giving a preamble saying which locks we know about ahead of time I think other changes to these questions are what we want to solicit over the next week or so for - on email.

So those kind of thoughts I think are something you should be putting into the mailing list and hopefully we'll - we can come to a - if not a decision then at least have more thoughts from other people at our next meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Brian Beckham: Right, in other words it was just...

Alan Greenberg: These questions came out this morning. I don't think any of them - anyone's read them in any depth at this point. And...

Brian Beckham: Right, no, no exactly. And my question was really just aimed at getting to the idea that we're actually asking the right questions that's all.

Alan Greenberg: That's the whole purpose. This is the first cut from one person and now we need the rest of the group to speak up and either agree that these are a great set of questions or how do they need to be changed. So the bottom line is we want something useful coming out of them so that when we get the answers we can do something.

You know, you're correct that sometimes you ask the wrong the questions and you're no more further ahead when you get the answers. And we hope that will not be the issue here. So I don't think there's much we can do on the call today. But I am looking for input over the next week so that when we come together again we can make some suggestions.

Anything else before we adjourn? Then I thank you for your participation and we'll see you a week from today and look for you on the mailing list. Bye all.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Man: Bye everyone.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Man: Au revoir.

END