

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference**  
**5 August , 2008 at 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 5 August 2008. 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-a-wg-20080805.mp3>  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

**Participants present:**

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.  
Adam Eisner - Tucows Registrar c.  
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.  
Steven Vine - Register.com Registrar c.  
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison  
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.  
Kevin R. Erdman - IPC

**Staff:**

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination  
Marika Konings - Policy Director  
Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director  
Glen de Saint G ry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recordings have started, madam.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right. Thank you. Okay, good morning everyone. This is Mike Rodenbaugh. I'm (with) GNSO Council. I also participate in a business constituency.

(Sharing) this call (is the) Registrar Transfer Policy working group. We've got three questions in our charter, but the first thing we ought to do is take a roll of who is here and then talk about the chair of the working group.

Glen, could you do a roll?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, certainly Mike. We have Barbara Steele from the Registry Constituency, yourself Mike Rodenbaugh, Business Constituency, Paul Diaz, Registrar, Steven Vine, Registrar, Kevin Erdman, IPC, Adam Eisner, Registrar. Am I right?

Adam Eisner: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: And James Bladel, Registrar.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: And for staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings, and Rob Hogarth, and myself.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks a lot. Okay, so I put out a note early last week for expressions of interest for being the chair and actually did not have any responses. So I'm begging because I really should not be the chair of this group as the Council Liaison. I know we've got a bunch of different registrar representatives participating. I'm wondering if anybody from that group might want to chair or Barbara and Kevin are the only other two at the moment outside of the Registrar Constituency.

I can say that, you know, we've got a lot of staff support on this and obviously we'll be relying on the staff as always to do most of the heavy lifting with report drafting and organization. So hopefully the chair will be really running the meetings and making all the (unintelligible). This can always be challenged by other members of the group.

So with that, I'm - I will hope that somebody might volunteer to be the chair. (How long) shall we sit here in silence until somebody volunteers to be the chair?

Kevin Erdman: Well, if it's only running the meetings, I'd be - this is Kevin. I would be happy to run the meetings and try to figure out what the consensus is.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, I would really appreciate that Kevin. Does anybody else have any interest in being the chair or have any questions for Kevin? Kevin maybe just for my benefit and I'm sure others, could you just give us a little bit of your background? We know that you're with the Intellectual Property Constituency.

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, as my surmise, I'm a lawyer with a general practice law firm. I'm a member of the Intellectual Property group at that law firm. It's Baker & Daniels. We're headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana in the U.S. We represent a number of large clients that have significant domain name holdings that have some concerns in this area.

I'm also involved in representing a couple of domainers who are mass users of the domain name registration system and so I know the domain business from both of those perspectives.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Unintelligible). Does anybody else have any questions for Kevin? So I think Kevin by consensus then you will be the chair of the working group. And I'll work with you and the staff, you know, just to get things running here.

The next things we ought to do today I think are discuss - you know I'm assuming that this meeting time is okay for everybody on this call. We're planning to have it at this time for at least another few weeks at which point we'll be able to have slightly longer calls if we need them after two or three.

But the other thing that I should note is everybody (unintelligible) to supply - (unintelligible) can we tell who that is? Or operator can you tell who that is (unintelligible)? Can anybody hear me?

Man: Just barely.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Yeah, we need to turn that - get that music turned off. Operator. Glen, is there anything you can do?

Glen DeSaintgery: Busy trying to get a hold of the operator. Thanks Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right.

Coordinator: Okay, sorry about that. I found out it was on Mr. (Vine)'s line that playing the music. I think he might have pressed the mute button on his phone.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Coordinator: If you can use the star 6 button instead that would be great. Otherwise, it creates music into the room.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Steven are you trying to put us on hold or what. Come on.

Okay, so I was saying that everyone in the group is going to need to provide a statement of interest for this working group unless they've already provided one in an ongoing working group or myself on the Council. So we should try to get those done please within the next week before our next call.

And I suppose it wouldn't hurt to just get a - just - we do have I think six or seven of us on the call today. Get a feel for what we'll be talking about next week and I'm not sure if people on the call want to start diving in today just sort of taking preliminary thoughts on the three questions that are before us. It seems to me that the questions are pretty straightforward.

Maybe we should just start with that issue though and see if anybody on the call has any questions or issues of clarification with the questions that we're tasked to look at. All right, I'm assuming everyone is familiar with the charter and with those questions. That they are clear enough then.

Paul Diaz: Excuse me Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Paul Diaz: It's Paul Diaz on the line. Look, I'm sorry. I've been having some technical difficulties and have missed like the last couple of minutes. And I didn't want to dial back in but it just came back. Did we already take volunteers for chair?

Mike Rodenbaugh: We did actually.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Were you - I'm not sure if...

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry. I wanted to volunteer as well and that was my point.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Oh.

Paul Diaz: I was about to dial back in and then it suddenly came back on.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, Paul. So Paul you are with Network Solutions, right.

Paul Diaz: Right. That's correct.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, we did have one other volunteer, which was Kevin Erdman who is an attorney with the Intellectual Property Constituency. He represents some domainers and other clients with large domain holdings he mentioned to us. So with that, are you still interested in volunteering?

Paul Diaz: Sure. I don't want to in any way diss Kevin, I just - given what we're dealing with here, I mean it makes sense that I - a registrar rep is, you know, more thoroughly involved in this particular process.

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, I'm had to cede the chair position.

Paul Diaz: All by consensus, excellent.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, that's fine with me. Although I certainly will give anybody else a chance to ask any questions of Paul that they might have.

(James Bladel): This is (James) and I agree that we should have a registrar representative on this issue.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, I'm definitely fine with that and Kevin is fine with that.

Kevin Erdman: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: The only other non-registrar on the call is Barbara. I imagine she is fine with that. I (hear silence).

Barbara Steele: I concur that I think that Paul would be a good representative and chair.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, great Paul. All right well with that, what I was doing Paul was just trying to make sure that we all understood the three questions that were put before us.

Paul Diaz: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: If there's any sort of clarification we need to do, let's do it now. We have a GNSO Council call on Thursday morning so we can certainly clarify anything that needs clarifying. That's where we were when you came back in Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It sounds like nobody had any - has any issues with the three questions so I think we can frankly start to discuss the first one today if that's what people want to do or we can put it off until next week.

I would - I should note for everybody that we don't yet and we actually may not get representation from the ISP Constituency or the Non-Commercial Users. I asked them both a couple of times and they have not appointed anybody. We do have one member from the ALAC - (Sebastian) who volunteered I guess today or last night. So he will probably be joining (unintelligible) starting next (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Hi, this is (James). Mike, just a quick question. I know it's on the Wiki, but could we just briefly go over the timeline for the working group and some of the milestones and the schedule of the deliverables.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I was actually looking for some indication of that in our charter. We don't really have any sort of limits or timelines imposed upon us by the Council, which is nice, but I think that leaves it up to us to assign our own (offsets).

We certainly - I suggest that we keep the weekly calls though just (unintelligible) momentum. They are going to start out just one hour each including this one for several weeks. We'll talk about making them longer if (the group) wants to.

But yeah, I mean my read of the charter is that there are - we don't have any sort of target. So I would suggest - I mean Paul feel free to suggest, anybody feel free to suggest. But perhaps we could work up a 120-day schedule or something like that to have this done. I mean even 90 days.

I mean it doesn't - my initial read of the three questions is that they may not be all that controversial. Others might -that might turn out to

be false, but what do people think about 90 days or 120 days as an outside timeline for (this)?

Paul Diaz: This is Paul, Mike. I would think that we - our goal would be to at least have a substantial amount of work if not everything ready by (CAIRO) or whatever that timeline puts us. I guess it's more like a 90-day timeline, you know, that if we're not prepared to present the final report, at least a - you know a substantial update on the progress of the working group. It seems like a logical kind of target goal.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That certainly does. Working back from that, we would really have to have a draft final report by around early to mid October at the latest. Well really, early October. In order for Council to be able to address it, we'd have the materials ready for Council at least ten days.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Even if that's not achievable that we've, you know, addressed most of the work that would be a minimal goal.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think if we'd shoot maybe for 60 days to get our draft final report done. If it doesn't work out, then it doesn't work out.

Paul Diaz: It doesn't work out, yeah. That's the advantage of not having a formal deadline yet. Glen, just a question for you procedure wise. At the very beginning, did you say that there's a follow on call at the top of the hour after this one?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay, how long...?

Glen DeSaintgery: Just for the next couple of weeks.

Paul Diaz: Couple of weeks. Okay, so we're sort of - if we use this time slot, we'll be banded - it would be a one-hour maximum call because of the other commitment responsibilities.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes and then in about two or three weeks' time, you'll be able to have a two-hour call if you want.

Paul Diaz: I think an hour a week might be plenty for this.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Mike and all, this is Olof. If I just could remind you of something that sort of puts a bit of a strain on any timeline we put there and that is we need first of all to call for (unintelligible) statements on this. We need to give them sufficient time to provide that. So I mean that's standard old procedure for PDPs.

So I guess one of the tasks that we should try to adjust quickly immediately is to produce some kind of template much in the same way as it as done for the (prospects) for the constituency statement.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That does make sense. I think we should probably talk about the three questions amongst ourselves first and then try to put that template together. How long do we need? At least 30 days for constituency statements, right.

Olof Nordling: Yes, at least. At least (on that). They tend to (slip).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, they do tend to come in late. All right, well I mean Paul you are really the chair now so I would hand over the reigns to you to even run the rest of this meeting if you are willing. But I'd suggest that maybe we should talk through sort of at least maybe the first question. Maybe we can get through all three of them. Just kind of get our brief thoughts out there, where we're at, and...

Paul Diaz: Sure. And just to follow up with Olof's point, an excellent point Olof and have to start thinking in terms of the - flushing out that timeline so folks can understand. As far as coming up with the templates, you or Glen's staff will help us?

Olof Nordling: Yes and to be - well actually, if I may break the news like this, that (Marika) will be your prime sort of staff support. And she has actually - we have looked a bit on a draft template, which perhaps (Marika) if you are on the call, you could following this meeting share with the group either by email or on the Wiki just to have something to start from.

Marika Konings: Yes and I'll definitely - maybe Paul I can first share with you. If you wanted to tweak it and then I will generally post to the group for part of the discussion. And it's not like I'm going to input any comments that come up now and in the discussion on this call.

Paul Diaz: That sounds excellent, (Marika). I would just ask initially to use both email and the Wiki because I know a couple of registrar reps that couldn't be with us today. They not remember to go to the Wiki, but everybody will check their email initially.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Paul Diaz: All right so with that behind us, I think Mike makes a good point. Why don't we - if you all have the three questions in front of you, let's start at the top and, you know, have an initial discussion about the - what's before us. If there are any questions about the questions that have been posed, scope issues, what might be involved in addressing them, we open the floor to anybody.

James Bladel: Paul, this is (James).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Go ahead.

Paul Diaz: I can't - this is (James) and who else is speaking? Both - to recognize both.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Go ahead, (James). I'll (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Just a question. Do we want to do an initial read through and make sure we're comfortable with the language?

Paul Diaz: Sure, we could do that as well.

James Bladel: Or is that set in the charter so therefore that's...?

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's set in the charter. But if there's any issues that need clarifying, then I can take that back to Council on Thursday morning.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Mike.

Paul Diaz: And then Mike what was your point please? You were next.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I was just kind of just taking number one. You know whether there could be a way for registrars - to make registrar (email addresses) made available because that seems like, you know, generally there must be a way that that could happen obviously.

Paul Diaz: Sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It really seems to me the issue comes down to whether we need - whether we want to require that registrar email be provided in the who is or whether there needs to be rules that, you know, the registrar - whether we need to re-evaluate whether the registrant can overrule the admin contact. Those seem to be the two questions in Part I.

Olof Nordling: Olof here. Mind you if we go into the Who Is, well we're actually dealing with something that's out of scope for this particular PDP. So the question is more is there any other way that this could be achieved than to have it as a part of the mandatory Who Is.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, well I just want to take issue with that. I mean I'm not sure that - you know this group could back and say, "We believe that the Who Is should require that field." I don't see how that would step on the toes of anything else that's going on right now.

Paul Diaz: What exactly is going on right now in terms of Who Is deliberations? What particular issues are they looking at at the moment?

James Bladel: Hi, this is (James). I'm on that group as well. We are currently defining testable hypotheses to submit to the Council based on all of the

research submission suggestions that were collected during the comment period. We are expecting that to wrap up within the next two to three weeks as Glen mentioned. In other words, we certainly wouldn't want to couple any time dependent items to progress on the Who Is issue.

Paul Diaz: All right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it - I just - my sense and Olof tell me if you feel real strongly about this. But my sense is that this group is equipped and I mean is specifically tasked with looking at this particular issue with Who Is. You know and maybe we should just look at what the pluses and minuses would be of adding that field to the required record.

Olof Nordling: Right. I'm just concerned that we're moving into a particular field that has been the subject of such controversy from other perspectives and that is now advancing along in other tracks. So I mean deliberations I guess that's pretty much okay. Whether we can sort of come out with an outcome automatically would result in that kind of change of a policy starting from another policy area.

Well, at the end of the day, that's the decision of the Council. I'm just a bit concerned that we're starting to dig with an issue that is close to what has caused so much controversy during the year.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right. Well, I do hear you, but I do think this is a very, very small piece of the huge Who Is issue, right. I don't think this really brings in, you know, privacy. This doesn't necessarily - we don't need to have the privacy debate in this working group, right. That's for another group.

But we should certainly look at what alternatives there are to - I mean I guess isn't the essence of this question - and registrars tell me if I've got this wrong. But the essence is trying to figure out ways to automate approval so that the registrars have less hands-on contact in the process, correct.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, I mean this is how I read it Mike and it seems sensitive to Olof's suggestion that we also think about are there any alternative structures that we might recommend putting in place. And thinking about what (James) said, I'm of the - my thinking personally not as a chair but as a Network Solutions rep is that I need to go back to my customer service, my engineering folks, and ping them about, you know, what - how would they like to see this done so I can come back with thoughts and suggestions for the group.

I'm thinking we may be better off kind of mulling this over over the next week and hopefully coming back to next week's call with some suggestions. And sensitive to the Who Is concerns and sensitivities, ideally come back with some things that might be outside of, you know, just adding registrant email say to Who Is output records because that is going to cause a stir. Ideally look for some sort of alternative solutions that could be implemented to speed up and ideally automate the process.

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin and I just wanted to bring up the - about that. It seems to me from a user perspective wanting to have reliable - and made authentication is maybe into the second topic, but at least having a reliable identification of the true owner of the domain name registration. And making sure that there is actual consent to the transfer is, you know, a huge concern for a domain owner registrant. And whether it's

an email address or whether it's something else, but it seems like there ought to be some mechanisms that takes into account authentication and the reliability and not just the, you know, automation and speed of it.

Paul Diaz: An excellent point, Kevin, and one that Network Solutions certainly shares. We've very publicly and very consistently raised our concerns about the way they transfer policy. It's currently constructed because we see the current policy leaving - exposing registrants to the sort of abuse you're referring to absent any sort of affirmative approval of a transfer request.

However -- and Olof or (Marika) please help us out here -- I think that that particular perspective may be a bit beyond the scope of this particular working group. That is recommending some sort of affirmative consent to a transfer. I know that this has been, you know, a very sensitive, a very, very delicate part of previous work that's been done to update the transfer policy.

And I would definitely appreciate some staff guidance here on, you know, what their view is or Mike's guidance from a Council perspective what the view is on making any recommendations that would potentially require some form of affirmative consent to a transfer.

Olof Nordling: Olof here. We should keep in mind that we have quite a (swath) of proposed PDPs coming up. And what - one of the criteria for this little priority-setting group trying to bunch them up together was to try to - one of the criteria was to try for whatever low hanging fruit. It may be things that are comparatively simple to change while keeping - and of

course some of them, which are the most - another slightly contrasting was of course (to solve) the most important issues early on.

I think this is - I have to check again whether in the other PDPs foreseen, this is not covered really what you're mentioning here to have affirmative consent, but let's keep it on hold for right now. But if that's the view of the working group and it's not covered in the other PDPs, well that may be an interesting outcome. Whether it will fly is another thing of course.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes and it seems to me that it could be one of the options we might lay out in response to number two.

Paul Diaz: And thank you, Mike. I was - you beat me to it. It certainly seems that it could tie in as an option. I just again Olof would appreciate if you could look at that or speak to any of your colleagues about that.

Olof Nordling: I'll do some reading. I can't recall them all by heart. I mean with (19 different)...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Yeah, you said that cheat sheet, which is very helpful. But even then, I had to go back and review because it's a detail.

Olof Nordling: No, but I'll get back to (the list) on that then.

Paul Diaz: All right.

James Bladel: Question for Olof and the group. This is (James).

Paul Diaz: Please (James).

James Bladel: Olof you mentioned that there were additional forthcoming PDPs in this area. Are they interdependent? So for example...

Olof Nordling: I think that all depends. I mean if you starting (queuing) or something, you've quite quickly come into some degree of overlapping with others, and that's what we experienced during the very first PDP on the - trying to clarify some of the provisions already in there today. And we have found that well where we perhaps wanted to go was going a bit too far in some cases, notably into one of these that we'll cover under PDPC. And the general feeling from that exercise was that it would rather be handled in PDPC.

So a certain degree of overlap there will always be. I mean many of the issues are interrelated. I mean if you solved one, maybe another one goes away automatically since we're dealing with the same policy basically.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

Paul Diaz: And just a follow on for Olof and/or Mike from Council's perspective, they were going to take - the Council was going to authorize the PDPs in alphabetical order so we go through A, B, C, et cetera. Or was there a willingness to perhaps jump around if there was progress say in this working group and some of the things we're coming up with naturally tied with issues in say C.

Could we have, you know, a PDP group for B immediate follow on or even overlap with this group's work so that again those issues that could be mutually resolved are done so? Was there any thinking how that will play out?

Olof Nordling: Well the thinking first of all was that well it would be great if we could run things in parallel. But realizing that there would be limitations in the necessary participation, it was - the assumption was made that that would probably be handled sequentially and was not specifically said that, "All right, A, B, C, D, and E," in that particular order. But let's take that as a first assumption and I think that's a perfectly possible to modify if there are good reasons for it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, that's about what I was going to say too. I think there's certainly some flexibility to move things around and bring other issues into ongoing working groups - to have working groups overlap. Just the real concern was there's so many issues within this IRTP right now. I think there's a dozen or more issues that were identified to be addressed.

Olof Nordling: Nineteen to be precise.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Nineteen. So you know just given manpower limitations, these working groups felt that they needed to be broken up to be laid out essentially sequentially. There was a thought that they would overlap if that made sense if there was enough people to (do the work).

Paul Diaz: Okay, well you know my view then wearing the chair's hat is, you know, why don't we - this working group. We're A - we're first in line. Let's address the issues to the best of our ability and not necessarily

overreach a mandate, but not necessarily feel hamstrung or constrained if there are issues that we feel could and should be addressed. And if three particular questions have been put before us, let's do our best to address them.

If we as a group determine that or, you know, make a recommendation that they be better handled by one of the other groups, okay. But we may be helping our colleagues and potentially helping ourselves if we participate later and trying to address them now. The first one is taking a whack at this particular process.

James Bladel: Thank you, Paul. That's what I was - exactly what I was looking for were some boundaries on where our discussions can and can't go.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah and I hate to put boundaries on working groups. I mean you know obviously we want to stay focused on these three questions. But to the extent there's ancillary issues that we can lay out for - either to be tabled for future discussion or if we think it makes sense to talk about them a little bit with this group, we should go ahead and do that while we're convened.

Paul Diaz: Agreed. All right then, well in some ways we've already touched on number two list with the previous discussion - to try to cover the three today looking at number three, policy provisions for partial bulk transfers.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Can we stick on number two for just a moment there?

Paul Diaz: Sure Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Just a factual starting point. Could you or anybody else on the registrar side give us an idea? I mean some registrars as I understand it have some sort of authentication processes that they offer, correct.

Paul Diaz: I'm pretty sure that's correct, but I would like to confirm that with my customer service colleagues.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I think that's something we should try to get out on the table, you know, pretty quickly is what are the options that are in the marketplace now that (some) have.

James Bladel: This is (James). I'll have to check on that as well. We have some methods in place and I know that we're working on some additional developments in that area.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I know there's one that's not electronic authentication. I just know one from my experience at Yahoo that (Mark Monitor) has. It's called their MVD domain. And they would have to call me on my cell phone and I'd have to get a secret pass for that sort of thing. It's not necessarily electronic authentication, but it still is one potential option. I guess it does really high end security.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. Another aspect that perhaps deserves some consideration is that while - in recent years, we almost all have this EPP, extensive provisioning protocol, with the auth-info code. Now has that changed? I mean of the - let's call it severity of this particular issue. Has it eased off - the pressure for it?

Barbara Steele: Olof, this is Barbara. Also, I would say that the auth-info in EPP obviously has been, you know, fairly broadly rolled out and I would

have to confirm with the other members of the registry's constituency just to see if there's anybody who hasn't rolled that out yet, but that may very well be a good solution.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, it's an open question for me, but will notice that (in basis) support.

Mike Rodenbaugh: The other area I think we should probably get on the table factually on this number two is what have been the security concerns or issues that have arisen. I mean I know of a couple, you know, fairly recent, well publicized (attacks) on registrar accounts, but you know actually laying out the facts for the group to consider would be useful. And I don't know if anyone - if any of the registrar folks have information on that or whether we should go maybe to APWG, which I can do. Ask them for some thoughts on it.

Paul Diaz: I think both are probably a good idea Mike. You know to have the third-party APWG and then to whatever degree we can - registrar reps can bring their examples to the table, we should all do that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think you know earlier rather than later. Get the facts on the table before we start discussing them.

Paul Diaz: Absolutely. Making some notes. Others have anything on two. Okay, how about our third question here about the partial book transfer?

Olof Nordling: I think first of all - Olof here. Since bulk transfer as it's now seen, it's a registrar operation in a certain sense. So basically what's happening when a registrar (folds) or something, there is a bulk transfer in that provision for that. But the question is whether to cover partial bulk

transfers between registrars - registrar initiated. I think that's pretty clear that that's covered. It's also clear that it covers the registrant initiated bulk transfers of numerous domains from one registrar to another.

I leave this as a bit of an open question since that's the (implication) I gave it in (issue support). But that's - in the white sense, is it too white?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Are you saying Olof that there is a provision for partial bulk transfers already?

Olof Nordling: Oh no, not for complete bulk transfer.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay.

Olof Nordling: For example, when a registrar is (V) accredited.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, I understand that. And then you mentioned there is a difference between whether the transfers were initiated by the registrant or by the registrar.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, you could see sort of a business deal between two registrars - one taking over for example all registrations under (info) from the other. That would be a partial bulk transfer.

Another way to look at it would be the registrant initiated. The registrant having for example acquired a company with a lot of domain names, and the want to consolidate all of them to one registrar.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So they (go one by one, right).

Olof Nordling: So they would like to move it from the registrar that the acquired company used to their own registrar. That would be another partial bulk transfer if you'd like.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right and today, you've got to basically put them in one by one at the registrar level.

Olof Nordling: Yes. Yes, normally that's the way it has to happen.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. Also another (use case) may be in the case where a registrar has a reseller that has become accredited and they want to transfer the domain names to either their own accreditation or they may very well become affiliated with another registrar and want to transfer the domain name to that registrar using a partial bulk transfer.

Olof Nordling: Right. Good point.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I suspect and you know Kevin I'm pretty sure I speak for you on this. But I suspect that everyone on this call has agreed that there should be some sort of partial bulk transfer policy and we should spend some time figuring out what that should be, right. It seems just very inefficient today when obviously there's a lot of parties that have thousands of domain names and should have flexibility to move them when they want to.

James Bladel: I agree Mike. This is (James). I would like to get some more information on this from our team internally because I believe we have some market oriented products and solutions in this area that may or may not preclude the need for a policy. But I understand if your - if our

objective is to coordinate amongst all registrars that a policy might be the only way to do that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I believe that's our objective here is to really take parts of the transfer policy that have been ambiguous or lacking in some way to try to fix them by (following) the registrars.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, agreed. Fix and focus is certainly the goal for the entire process. All right, other thoughts on this one today.

Kevin Erdman: Well - this is Kevin again. But I think another point that should be addressed in making a policy about, you know, partial bulk transfers is whether that policy itself should be, you know, a minimum criteria policy or whether it should be a uniform - that is setting a standard that all registrars have to follow.

Because I think one of the difficulties in larger transactions involving a lot of domain names is that different registrars will have their own different internal procedures making it very difficult to you know - for you know an acquirer of several domains that may be in multiple registrars to be able to relocate them at a preferred price (advantage) to manage that whole process.

And I would advocate making such a policy not just a minimum threshold, but a uniform procedure that all registrars would follow so that, you know, there's complete transparency in - you know once you've figured out the details that you need to provide to get the transfer done. Not just - you don't have to then figure out what extra little thing you have to do for registrar A or registrar B.

Paul Diaz: Agreed Kevin. Although Olof and (Marika) I mean my understanding is since this is a PDP working - policy development process working group, I mean the outcome of our efforts will be ultimately considered consensus policy. Therefore, they are binding on registries and registrars, correct.

Olof Nordling: Yes, indeed. I mean if it goes all the way and adopted by the Council and subsequently by the board, well it changes the IRTP.

Paul Diaz: So then your concerns are addressed Kevin because this would become universally binding on the contracted parties.

Kevin Erdman: Well, the point that...

Olof Nordling: It depends a little on how we phrase it of course - the (limitations) in the policy. If we add a piece on partial bulk transfers, well it can be worded loosely or very tightly. So that's...

Kevin Erdman: Yeah and I think that is the point that I'm making is to have a policy that just doesn't contain or (hears) the minimum that needs to be done for a bulk transfer, but to outline the whole procedure so that if you comply with the, you know, protocol or whatever you want to call the end result of this policy. If you comply with that, then all the registrars will complete the transfer based on fulfilling those requirements.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Kevin Erdman: I don't know what the correct terminology for that is, but that's the objective I would hope to be able to...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think you're basically talking about, you know, writing a new section into the IRTP to address bulk transfers, and then the IRTP is binding on all registrars and registries.

James Bladel: This is (James). Can I get in the queue?

Paul Diaz: Please (James). Go ahead.

James Bladel: I'd just like to reemphasize a thought, which is that this is - in my reading, this is somewhat of a convenience issue. It's not saying that bulk transfers can't be done manually. I just want us to be careful that we're recommending policy for something that could be conceivably seen as an area of competitive differentiation between registrars.

If they can provide a service that more conveniently and easily handle bulk transfers at the initiation of - or at the request of a registrant, then that could be a marketable service to the type of registrant who would make use of that. And certainly that wouldn't be, you know, the entire universe of registrants, but just a few large portfolio holders that would see that. So I just would - just put out on the table that maybe this is something we shouldn't automatically assume needs to be in a policy.

Paul Diaz: That's a fair point (James).

Mike Rodenbaugh: I definitely agree with that (James). I think we should do some factual outreach especially, you know, to my constituency and the (high PC and to the registrants) constituencies and see if this is a pain point for people. I certainly personally have been involved in a few bulk transfers and while yeah, I guess it takes a little bit of time to entire them all one by one, that's the registrar ultimately that's doing that.

It's not me, so it hasn't been a huge problem from my perspective. But I know it apparently got raised as an issue for us to consider, so there must be some pain somewhere.

James Bladel: Right and I think that the pain is there and we can probably substantiate that with some further data. But my question is is the purpose to solve that through policy or allow all of the rainbow of registrar business models to address that? Because I believe they are out there now to some degree or another.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I'd like into the queue.

Paul Diaz: Please go ahead, Barbara.

Barbara Steele: I guess from a logistics standpoint, to the extent that you're initiating transfers aside from what is now I guess in the policy of bulk transfer where I can authorize as the registry to transfer all of the domains in one registrar account to another registrar account. Would it not be necessary outside of that to in essence obtain a form of authorization from each registrant to - you know prior to effecting a - what sounds like you all are calling a bulk transfer, which is initiated at the registrar level?

James Bladel: Barbara, I was counting that as a separate scenario because that would be initiated with - between two registrars or at the request of ICANN in the case of registrar failure. I read this particular question to be registrant driven. But if I'm mistaken in that, then I (see) your other concern.

Barbara Steele: I can just (see) this - as a registry, we have received requests from registrars as well coming to us asking us to transfer a partial portfolio of names if you will from one registrar to another. In most cases, it is due to perhaps a reseller becoming accredited.

So you know in that particular case, I would think that you would not want to have to go through the process of obtaining these forms of authorization from each individual registrant in order to be able to do that. So I guess I'm just a little bit confused and I personally would think that there would be a need for this particular type of service or capability.

James Bladel: In that scenario, I completely agree that we would need a policy to handle that operation.

Paul Diaz: Okay, if I can jump in folks because I'm looking at the time and I realize some of you have another commitment at the top of the hour. I want to be a very accommodating, open chair, so I will put it to the group on the call. We've gone through all three of the major question in front of us and on my own notes, I realize we all have quite a bit of conferring with colleagues, and extra research, and homework to do.

What is the group's feeling in terms of how we would like to address the issues moving forward? Should we take them in the order currently provided? Do we see - does the group see either numbers two or three as perhaps easier to address or perhaps of greater concern to their interest and therefore they wouldn't want to put them at the beginning of the queue?

You know looking ahead to next week's call, you know we would ideally like to dive into this and really start getting into the details of the issue of where do folks stand, where would they - you know how should we proceed. Will we start with number one and work through the list, or what do you all want to do?

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. While you are all considering that, I could just get back to a question earlier on of whether any of the other PDPs cover - whether there should be affirmative consent by the registrant. And there's none of them that explicitly mention it and so - nor is there any that is close to this one or issue one in our set to that particular issue as far as I can see. So we're not entering - perhaps we enter uncharted territory, but we don't encroach upon any other PDP as far as I can see.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Paul just a suggestion maybe for the group. Maybe we should go back and look at all three questions preliminarily at the same time just to try to start the ball rolling, to understand what is out there in the market now, and what is really the harm that's going on. Try to get those sort of fundamental elements on the table and then take them one by one.

Paul Diaz: I'm fine with that as well. Others concur.

Kevin Erdman: Sounds good to me.

Paul Diaz: Okay, then you know Mike makes a great suggestion. Let's follow that at our next call. And our homework for the week is to, you know, work with our colleagues, identify trouble areas, and potentially solutions as

well. And we can have a more general conversation next week and then lead into more specifics focusing on the various issues thereafter.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Thanks Paul for volunteering for the chair.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And again for a point of clarification, (Marika) you are staff point of contact.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Paul Diaz: So we will work with you to communicate again both via the Wiki and email to all of those who express interest. You know basically what we did today and where we intend to go moving forward, that's the plan.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Very good. Okay, well I'll be in touch with you to assist with that. And for everyone else, thank you for your time. We're right at the top of the hour, so we'll finish this up, and we're scheduled to meet again the same time, same day next week. We'll talk to you all then.

Barbara Steele: Thank you.

Man: Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Mike.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much.

Paul Diaz: Very good guys. Bye-bye now.

END