

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer short term planning group teleconference**  
**November 26, 2007 at 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer short term planning group teleconference on November 26, 2007. 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/gns0/gns0-transfer-review-wg-20071126.mp3>  
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

**Attendees:**

Ross Rader - Registrar - group co-coordinator  
Tom Keller - Registrar constituency  
Barbara Steele - gTLD Registry constituency  
Pamela Miller - gTLD Registry C  
Christian Curtis - NCUC  
Paul McGrady - IPC  
Mike O'Connor - CBUC

**ICANN Staff:**

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination  
Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Officer  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

**Absent excused**

Tim Ruiz - Registrar  
Ken Stubbs - gTLD Registry C  
Stacey King - IPC

Coordinator: Please go ahead sir.

(Ross): Thank you. So back on track. Has everyone had a chance to review the draft that I circulated earlier last week, or later last week I guess as it were?

Man: Yeah, I have.

Woman: The data priorities data draft?

(Ross): That's correct, yeah, the one that was circulated on the 22nd.

Woman: Yes.

(Ross): Now there was some question and comment on the mailing list regarding the process that I had employed to put that together, so what I thought we would do on this call is spend a few minutes discussing that, and then go into any questions that anyone had about the specific list of priorities and any adjustments that we wanted to kind of manually make to that list.

I don't think the call should probably take more than 30 minutes today, hopefully it's something that we can run through fairly quickly.

On the first point, were there any questions, comments or considerations that we should discuss regarding the process of prioritization?

Olof Nordling: Obviously crystal clear.

(Ross): Apparently. I know (Mike) had had some suggestions for taking it another step further. I wish he was actually on this call at this point because I think it would be worthwhile going through those.

I think though at this point in the interest of really making this as painless as possible for everybody that we should simply kind of stick with the process as, that we've followed thus far and perhaps take those kinds of things into account should we do this again.

Maybe a quick review of the process would be useful just in case anybody had missed one of my earlier emails on the subject, but essentially what I have done was I took each of your responses and fed them into a spreadsheet.

And then based on that spreadsheet I was able to calculate what's called the central tendency. The central tendency is simply the median or the middle of the road of the responses that were received.

So if for instance somebody had said this was priority nine, somebody else had said this was priority ten, the central tendency would be in at around 5 for that.

So it would receive a ranking of five. So each of that was calculated for the 19 different responses resulting in the list that we received here.

The list itself is very, very straight forward, we could probably shift gears into the next subject now. Everybody's had a chance to review this list, were there any specific comments on the rankings and are there any areas where we could possibly improve these rankings?

We're keeping in mind that this is a rough view of what the consensus is thus far.

(Tom): Yeah (Ross), it's (Tom). There's a particular question I would have is what exactly are we going to do with rankings? Is there, do you envision, do you have a PDP for any of these topics or do you want to kind of group them into things that are more closely connected, or what would be the exact play, the next steps?

(Ross): That would be a good topic to discuss actually. Maybe we could open the floor to that (Tom). Do you have any views on that?

(Tom): Well actually as you can see I'm, I might reveal to the group but I'm participant B who hasn't voted mostly the same. But what I had done as pretty much group, the issues by how they worked together meaning that all I picked out are operational topics which go in the same direction.

And I found out and there was already as you have already outlined it, the way you outlined it, except you already grouped it by certain topics. That's actually what I would do, but you identify three or more general topics and see what we can order.

Through them and you know we prioritize these groups. But I guess there's certain things we can tackle pretty straight forward, but just technical implementation things like the IANA ID, and those are already praying for an improvement through the whole process.

Other things like talking about the dispute resolution stuff, it's much harder to achieve.

(Ross): Gotcha. So how would you revise the list that we've got in front of us now? Would you look for seams in that list and try and group them together and then calculate a consensus based on that, or?

(Tom): Well basically what I would try to do is try to identify the greater topics and then rank them and see you know what do we think should be

done first or not. Always with keeping in mind what can be achieved rather fast and what we think will be a longer process.

(Ross): Right, right. The, one of the recommendations that came out of the review committee was that the (unintelligible) would be very discreet. Are some of these not big enough for their own PDP and therefore would require us to group them together?

Or would grouping them together essentially lead us to biting off more than we can chew at this point?

(Tom): I guess some of them would not be big enough, like say for example say with the IANA ID and I know something only registrar can tell whether that's a good thing or not, that's just something, and the registration process nobody has to take care of actually.

(Ross): Right.

(Tom): So that's the only point that really comes off the top of my head. There are certainly others in that direction which are rather hard to resolve. For example, the one with the lock status for example that would be something that is just clarification work.

But then other points like, what would be, G, for example that is something we could spend years on actually.

(Ross): That's 3G?

(Tom): Yes.

(Ross): Right. Does anyone else have any comments on this point?

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian), I'm just wanting to say I do think there are some issues that need to be resolved together in that some maybe some completely mute depending on the resolution of another or that there really ought to be coordinated so that they're handled in the same PDP.

(Ross): I'm making notes here, the silence is not boredom or anything like that.

(Barbara): Hey (Ross), this is (Barbara). Is the plan that the, all of the issues would be brought forward, and then it's just a matter of how we prioritize them in order to be able to address them and get at least some progress fairly quickly?

(Ross): Yes. Yeah, I think that's the general view. The question is always going to be how do we then implement that. So for instance, here's a great question that would come out of that would be, what about those, what do we do with those items?

So we have a prioritized list, let's for the sake of argument say that this is the right list. The next obvious question is, are there things that are low enough priority in this list that they shouldn't be on this list?

You know so even though the general request has been that we take this list and take it forward to the counsel so they can take a look at what to do next, they are expecting some guidance around what not to do as well.

So there's a couple of very practical implementation issues there. (Christian) just brought up another great one about how would we coordinate these issues within a PDP or a series of PDPs?

For instance the authentication, 3G and 6H are very, very closely related. Should they be part of that same PDP or should there be some thought given to how we could role that out? Definitely.

(Christian), back to your question, did you have any sense of where those dependencies lie?

(Christian Curtis): You know I have a few, I don't have my notes handy, I'm not in the, I was not expecting, my understanding was that the whole process would just be run through the same PDP and the question would be the order in which the issues were addressed.

(Ross): Right.

(Christian Curtis): Just to start with I think that J and O are fairly closely related in that one of the main reasons that I saw for the registrar email to be shared was to handle these urgent disputes and that it's entirely possible that a process could be developed that wouldn't require that or in that the way the process might be set up might incorporated a way for the emails to be shared, that sort of thing.

I felt that those two issues should be handled together. I'm not remembering any others right off the top of my head, but I'll bring them up if we discuss this issue further.

(Ross): Anyone else? I guess I'm used to a regular conference call where there's 35 people on the line, so I just went through my list and no, that's pretty much everybody that's on the call.

So would it be then worthwhile taking a second crack at that list in an attempt to bundle some of these issues up, or should we simply express this, express that there are dependencies within these priorities that the Council should seek to resolve?

(Paul McCready): This is (Paul McCready), the problem with bundling I think is that invariably you're going to end up moving things up and down the list by associated something that the consensus was that it was a lower priority with something that was perhaps higher up.

Is there a way to resolve that and so that the bundling doesn't skew the list? And if not then I would think that we would just want to send it on its way and see what happens.

(Ross): Yeah, you know what? Go ahead, sorry.

(Pam): I'm sorry, this is (Pam), also if you start bundling and the first one doesn't get resolved to resolve the second one, again those, that second one, do they know enough to drop it down to the bottom of the list since it didn't you know take the two of them into consideration.

(Ross): Right, right. Yes, that's true. I think in practice, you know I tend to agree with your assessment (Paul), I think in practice what will happen is that if there's any, if we attempt any bundling at this level, that will encourage further bundling or tinkering at the next and subsequent levels.

And I don't know if there's anything necessarily wrong with that, I think it's just more of an observation of human behavior.

I think if I could make a proposal for the group that we simply express that there may be dependencies within these priorities, and thought should be given, if there is a PDP initiated on any of these subjects as to what those dependencies might be.

I think that might be our most expedient or most efficient way forward. Does that sound like a reasonable approach to this group?

(Tom): Could you outline it again?

(Ross): In other words (Tom) I would, in our quote unquote final report, our final recommendation, I would express a statement something along the lines of just indicating that if any of these subjects are opened up for policy development, that there may be dependencies or relationships with other things on this list.

But if that is the case then thought should be given to what those dependencies relationships are.

(Tom): Okay, so what you're basically saying as we go forward exactly this list to the Council and the Council will take our number one pick and start a PDP on that, and before (unintelligible) see to it whether there are any interdependencies on other subjects and that's it.

(Ross): Right. And I wouldn't say this specific list, you know we still have the open subject of whether or not this is the right list. But whatever list we settle on would then be forwarded on those terms.

(Tom): All right. So the, okay so we still have to decide which list.

(Ross): Correct.

(Tom): All right, okay. So if you talk about bundling one thing, I would have a mind to see speed of implementation actually, because I don't really want to hold up certain issues that can be resolved rather fast and will have an impact, a positive impact on the transfer procedures.

Due to the fact that we have a very complicated issue in front of us, for example if you have a look at J, 1J, that is pretty complicated to make all the registrars comply to it.

So even if you think it would be a good topic, it wouldn't be achievable on time.

(Ross): Right, right.

(Tom): So maybe we should have another crack on this list in terms of what goes fast, what goes long.

(Ross): Well one of the things I struggled with in putting the methodology together (Tom) was as it relates to what criteria we would use for prioritizing this list. So I believe, you know you've expressed one criteria which is speed of implementation.

Others may have used something along the lines of you know net value to their particular set of stakeholders. Somebody else may have used cost, others may have said what's in my best interest, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

So I'm not sure that we can take a second crack at this with a specific criteria in mind. Hopefully everybody brought their own criteria to their personal evaluation so that we blended them together with that averaging methodology so we have used a multiplicity of criteria without necessarily having expressed them all.

So even though there are things on there...

(Tom): Well that would be that we just haven't, a mathematical approach to it and say that we cannot come up with any kind of consensus of what we think or not, the whole group.

But that's just like, I mean we can do it, we can go another approach, but I'm not going to be comfortable with it actually, not because of my points (unintelligible), so I wouldn't mind, but we should send a stronger signal of what we think is important actually.

(Ross): Well I guess what I'm saying is if there's a view that we should use different criteria to prioritizing this list, I'd like to hear that from this group. I've heard from (Tom) that he believes we should apply different criteria to the list, and if there's a consensus too around that, then let's do that, let's undertake that work and come up with a second list.

So I'll certainly open the floor to that question.

(Mike O'Connor): I just want to break in, this is (Mike O'Connor), I'm joining the call late.

(Ross): Hi Michael, thanks for joining

(Paul McCready): This is (Paul McCready) again, not to only have one point, at some point in my life I'm going to be brilliant and have more than one thing to say, but it won't be this morning.

Man: You're focused.

(Paul McCready): Yeah, I think that we have sort of the same downside and the first idea was to bundle them together which could skew the ranking. The second idea I think is to identify for the next step what is low hanging fruit and what is not low hanging fruit.

And I think that first of all that's sort of subjective because some people would look at this list and say well certain numbers should be easily taken care of because they were at the top of my priority list and I see very clearly how this could quickly be resolved.

But anybody that's hung around ICANN long enough to know anything about ICANN I think we could all, the consensus (used) that would be everything takes longer than we could possibly have expected it to.

And so I think that there's probably no harm in having everybody go through and identify what they think is the lowest hanging fruit, but I don't necessarily know that that should end up on the master list, perhaps it could end up you know in corresponding report for those who want to go through and do that.

In some respects you know we are, we probably should assume that the people who this is going to have at least as much information about the problems and the ICANN structure of resolution as we do, and therefore you know they'll be able to identify the low hanging fruit.

And I think they'll also be able to identify the bundles. I don't see how kind of separate comments from whomever wants to go through the effort of doing that would be harmful.

But in terms of manipulating the list which was sort of done mathematically and as objectively as somebody can, it seems to me like that might be a step backwards.

(Ross): Anyone else?

(Tom): Yeah, just one clarification. The perception of that report will be the Council and the Council has said it was very clear in understanding that they would just pick whatever we give them and act on it.

So there will be no other negotiations on that level of this list. I mean that's the whole stance of this task force, that we kind of have an output in they don't have to discuss it again.

So we have to come up with one list. If we cannot agree, I agree with (Ross), we should just take the list we have right now because then we've done our work and we proceed.

(Ross): Right, right, right.

(Tom): But if we can agree on certain additional factors, we might want to consider we can do that, but if we can reach them in that call, I would just pass on the list, because we can have ten more calls and probably not agree, so that's the pipeline.

I mean I've seen this with other things you know and I don't really have the willingness to do that with that without sacrifice again.

(Ross): Does anyone else wish to weigh in on this subject?

(Mike O'Connor): (Mike O'Connor) here.

(Ross): Go head (Mike).

(Mike O'Connor): Sorry to come in late, my mom is dying and I just got back from the hospital and I'm not at my best, but I do have a question. And that is what if we just pass the whole list on and said we like them all?

What would that do to the next phase of the process?

(Ross): Well my understanding (Mike) would be that the Council would then take the first thing on the list and initiate a PDP to go with it. Then when that PDP was completed, they would do the same for the second thing on the list, and we would continue that iteration until the list was dealt with.

Which would have been a great segue to my next point but I'll hold onto it for a few more minutes and see if anyone else wants to weigh in.

Did you have any follow up on that?

(Mike O'Connor): No, I guess, well maybe one follow up and that is does that imply that, presuming which PDP takes some substantial amount of time, that they're going to put them end to end like that? That's your thought?

(Ross): Well I will take the opportunity to segue then. One of the questions we have to deal with on this call is should there be a cutoff, are there things that we have such loose agreements around, or are of such insignificance that we as (Tom) has said, I don't really think these other things are a priority.

So should we implement some sort of a cutoff so that we're not iterating this the next three years essentially is what it would take. Maybe I could throw that into the mix of questions as well for us to discuss at this point.

Any thoughts on that?

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian Curtis). It seems to me that if the Council assesses they do want to have some of these issues later, I mean we could designate a point that we think everything is at such a low priority and importance, but we'd still kind of want to rank those issues so if they do decide they do want to act on them later that there's still some structure so they don't have to go through and rank them again.

(Ross): Right, right. So if I'm hearing you right then (Paul), I'm sorry, (Christian) you would recommend we forward the entire list but indicate a

demarcation point of kind of high priority versus low priority. Is that a fair take on that?

(Christian Curtis): Yes.

(Ross): Okay.

(Christian Curtis): Although the list itself also does kind of indicate the level of priority, I suppose the Council can also just decide at some point it could decide that we have marked as low enough priorities just don't need to be dealt with.

(Ross): Right.

(Christian Curtis): Okay.

(Pam): This is (Pam), I would agree with that.

(Tom): This (Tom), I would actually disagree with that.

(Ross): What are you disagreeing with (Tom)?

(Tom): Well I don't think we should have a cutoff line anywhere and we shouldn't indicate one. I mean there is different understanding of the topic, there are different approaches to, there are different needs in this group.

You know if we would have another two registrars I'm pretty sure they would look differently, not at all how you represent them in this list.

And we have that list we cannot do something, we can't, are not willing to discuss it much longer so I would just give it that at the output and have the Council act on it. I mean why should we, I mean you know if we have to, how would the process look like to determine that one thing isn't important enough to be dealt with?

If one person is objecting, is that enough or not?

(Ross): I think we can fall back to the math again on this one. In other words, there are elements on this list, I think I've said anything that scores a 10 or higher, we've all got a pretty general agreement that they should be dealt with.

Anything with a 10 or lower, so anything lower than a 10, we don't really have a broad agreement that they should be dealt with as a high priority. So the question I'm asking is, if we don't agree that they should be dealt with as a high priority, then are they important enough to warrant the policy development attention of the GNSO?

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike) again. I'm going to chime in on the math approach.

(Ross): (Unintelligible) (Mike), so be careful.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh that's okay.

(Ross): I'm still trying to absorb the charts and analysis.

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah, that's okay, I'm sorry that I couldn't have been on the whole call. One of the things that the math does is it masks some pretty strongly felt opinions on both ends of the spectrum.

And so for example, you know the one I picked out is, and I don't have any of the charts in front of me because I'm in the car, but there was one that had four people that were pretty strongly in favor and four people who were pretty strongly, well in favor of high priority and four people that felt pretty strongly it was low priority.

And the math on that would put it in the middle, which wouldn't really make either side feel like their view was really represented. And so one possibility and it probably is not possible on this call but would be to explain to each other our positions.

Because we might just convince each other that oh, I didn't understand what that meant, sure I'll switch my priority to low priority of course, that makes tons of sense.

And what often happens in conversations like that is that themes emerge. After a while we start speaking in code to each other saying, well that's the same misunderstanding that we had on issue A.

And everybody goes yeah, yeah, yeah right so I'll change my vote or my position. With the goal of seeing whether we couldn't change those charts from really quite disperse, I was actually quite startled at how dispersed the responses were, do more agreeing simply by explaining our positions to each other.

Especially for a new guy like me, I'm hopeful that someone will explain that I've misunderstood something and that my vote was misplaced and feel pretty comfortable about the notion of changing where my position lies.

But the trouble with the math is that you know in consensus lingo that's called the tyranny of the majority. And often the decisions aren't very good when you do that, that's all.

(Ross): Right, right. You know I really struggled and (Mike) to the last point, I think you make some great suggestions there and I might suggest a pass forward for this call to take some of that into account.

On the last point, I really struggled with whether or not we could rely on a mathematical approach to this or not. And in looking at the composition of this group, I believed it was a fair risk.

That the composition was roughly divided between supply side of the group and the buy side of the group. So the buy side of the market, I'm sorry, so that we would somewhat avoid a lot of the kind of stuffed ballot box problem that we might otherwise get in a larger working group.

But to the other points you make, I think you raise a really, really good point there and what I would like to do is open the floor up to anybody to make a case on a point that they feel passionately about, something that they believe wasn't treated kind of fairly in this end ranking.

And then if the results of those pleas, anybody wishes to change their ranking I'm happy to produce another list as a result of that. I know (Tom), you've expressed some concern around some of the rankings, so if anybody wanted to kind of take the floor at this point and make an appeal, I'm happy to devote the next, you know probably, we can

probably squeeze 15 to 20 minutes into this call to take that into account.

Would anybody care to do so?

(Tom): I would. You can imagine.

Man: And I would to, but go ahead (Tom).

(Tom): Well one thing I really care about is the lock status, because what we see in the industry is that everybody has their own implementation of that that is not very well risk (unintelligible) in the policies we have and it is misunderstood by a lot of them and just causing a lot of confusion and concern at the registrants.

And it's very hard for the registrar actually to try to help a customer because every implementation of that detail with the various registrars is totally different.

So if we could at least achieve a standard here, it would make the whole transfer procedure much easier and more transparent to the user or to the support teams that actually have to deal with the customer.

(Ross): (Tom), that was Q that you were addressing, was it?

(Tom): Sorry?

(Ross): It was Q you were speaking to?

(Tom): I was talking about Q.

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike), and since I think I might have been on the other extreme of that one, let me come in as the advocate on the other side and show you how this might resolve.

The reason I put that really low in the priorities was not because I disagree with your point (Tom), but rather because I thought it was such a no brainer that we could essentially put it on the pile that says well this is so obvious, why don't we just make a pile of really obvious things to do and say you know those are low priorities for us because they are essentially implementation details of something that we all agree should be done.

So what I did is I sort of saved my votes for things which I thought might be more, since I'm in the business constituency and sort of representing the end registrant, I sort of saved my vote for the things that gave the registrants more options and flexibility in the process itself.

And that's why I gave it such a low priority but it wasn't because I disagreed with your point, I think you're absolutely right that this business with varying implementations of the same thing, but something that clearly harms the process makes it much harder to implement, makes it much harder to roll out ac(Ross) a bunch of registrars.

And that's one of the reasons why I asked that question, because when I first started working on this list, I basically found nothing to disagree with, I thought they were all great ideas.

I was hoping that we could just sort of say this is great list, go ahead and do all of this stuff. There's a counter balance for you.

(Ross): I think (Mike) just to clarify on that point if there is no cutoff, if we say these are all important it's just that these things are more important than other ones, that's a statement of timing not of the merit of the issue.

So something that's ranked at the top, presumably would be of, would be something that we would want to do immediately rather than wait a year to implement.

But I don't think anybody and I'll certainly try and make this clear in our final report, that you know I think it's the general view of this call that these are all important issues.

(Mike O'Connor): The trick to the timing ones is that we might wind up bundling a lot of sort of technical implementation issues to the top and it's very likely to be quicker to agree on and quicker to do.

And by so doing and making some of the harder ones drop to the bottom of the list we might miss the opportunity to sort of tackle the hard problems first.

(Ross): Right, right. So back to (Tom)'s proposal, or explanation, I don't know what to call it now, his (advocation), is anyone, does anybody want to trade any or modify any of their priorities? I have the sheet up in front of my, I can probably do this very quickly, or record them fairly quickly.

Okay, if anybody wants to take another look at their lists, please feel free to send it to me off line. Anything I receive before the end of day today would be very, very helpful.

(Mike), would you like to make a case for a pet project?

(Mike O'Connor): Well the one that I was entranced with when I looked at the responses, was the one and again because I'm in the car I can't name it, but it was one of my top three and I can't even remember which column I was on the list.

And it was the one that had four advocates on each side, I know that doesn't give you much help.

(Ross): I'm still trying to find your top three here.

(Mike O'Connor): Well, I mean if you can, oh that's right you know, you've got the secret decoder ring. Two of my top three didn't make it into the front ranks, one of them did.

(Ross): There's A, K and E were your top three. Where the dispute options for registrants to be developed was A. K was...

(Mike O'Connor): One of those was one that....

(Ross): Was it additional provisions related to transfer registration involve privacy service should be developed? And E was Mike, you came in at four which was whether reporting or (unintelligible) registries and dispute providers should be developed.

(Mike O'Connor): There was one that basically put the registrar, the registrant into the process a little bit more than they are today.

(Ross): Okay, that was related to, the dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented.

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah. And I think that one fell fairly close to the bottom, or that might be the one that has the four and four. Where four people said pretty low priority and four people said pretty high priority.

If you can help me out by looking at the details and seeing if I'm working on the right one.

(Ross): I would say the (unintelligible) view on that was four, five, I'm just looking at the spreadsheet here, four, five had ranked it very low, and a few that have ranked it kind of middle of the pack.

(Mike O'Connor): Oh no, then that's not the one I want to.

Man: Were you talking about K?

(Mike O'Connor): K.

Man: I'm looking at the PDF that we got and there are four that happen in the top three, two that happened on the very bottom and two that have it at fourteen.

(Mike O'Connor): I'm so sorry guys that I can't be looking at this, it's just been a tough week. Let me tell you what, let me make sort of a generic case, they're all sort of the same issue for me.

And that is that the one thing that I would just love to see is a little, is more opportunity for registrants to guide the process than they have today. It's my understanding, and again I'm a new guy, and this is not exactly my field, that today this dispute process is primarily initiated and managed by registrars.

And my goal with putting all those pretty close to the top was to put the registrant a little bit more into the game.

Woman: So are you proposing then that they would be able to come directly to a dispute resolution provider to initiate a dispute case?

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah. You know that was the goal was to give them an opportunity to initiate these things themselves rather than having to rely on their registrar.

Again, for similar reasons to (Tom)'s in a way, except on the non-technical side rather than the technical side, which is that some registrars are more responsive than others, and by being able to approach a dispute process directly, my focus is sort of customer service, vendor accountability, that's sort of the short version of what I put lots of chips on.

And one of those three was split pretty dramatically and I'm sticking myself because I can't tell you which one, but this is...

Olof Nordling: Perhaps, this is Olof, I've tried to read the list with your thoughts in mind and maybe, I don't know but one that struck me a bit as being in that quarter was perhaps the R, where the registrants should be able

to retrieve all (unintelligible) codes from third parties other than the registrar.

I don't know if that, but I'm trying to help out.

(Mike O'Connor): Thanks Olof, that one I gave a fairly low ranking to, again not because I disagree with it, it's sort of the same point I made with (Tom).

I put a lot of things into sort of technical implementation and process improvement, all of which I like a lot. But I sort of saved my chips for giving the registrant a bit more of a say in the process itself and put those pretty high.

(Barbara): From a registries point of view, this is (Barbara) again, I guess you know I definitely think that it's important that registrants have more control over how they can I guess maintain their domain names.

Being a (skin) registry from our perspective, if a registrant would come directly to you know Verisign as a registry, or to use it as a provider for either those instances, we would still need to have cooperation on the part of the registrar to validate that it is truly the registrants for the domain names.

So I guess has any thought been given as far as how that would work?

(Mike O'Connor): The way I would have handled that had I God-like powers, I would have said....

(Ross): Actually Mike, I'm going to interrupt the question because I think that's where we kind of strayed from assessing the priorities to having policy discussion.

Just in the interest of time, I just kind of want to cut that one off, I really apologize.

(Mike O'Connor): That's okay.

(Ross): Does anybody want to speak against that proposal that (Mike) has made?

(Tom): I don't want to speak against that, just want to have a clarification. If (Mike)'s saying he's agreeing with me and that it's the other stuff that can always be done, how do you think that should be achieved?

I mean even if it's a small thing it has to go through the policy process, it's not solving itself by itself.

(Mike O'Connor): I agree, the thought that I had was that some of the technical sorts of issues perhaps could go through a policy process that wasn't quite as policy-like if you will.

Some of these proposals just made so much sense to me that it seemed to me that some of those could go through a really expedited process unless some terrific issue arose that we hadn't anticipated.

Whereas some of these other ones are tastier from a policy standpoint, and thus would need more sort of policy making, thinking, proposal generating, negotiating, etcetera, etcetera.

And the ones that struck me as kind of quote easier, I wound up putting on the low end of the list thinking that the subsequent policy process would also be easier.

And that they would proceed fairly quickly, and I think that that made the, another version of the comment that we were talking about earlier where we were ranking the list based on speed of implementation.

Things that wound up at the bottom of my list I would imagine in many cases would wind up at the top of the list in terms of speed of implementation because they would be pretty broad agreement and it would be pretty much a technical issue to sort of figure out to get it done.

(Ross): Right, right. Does anybody wish to modify their rankings based on (Mike)'s advocacy?

(Christian Curtis): Sorry, when you say modify your rankings, are you suggesting we might adjust our own personal rankings which would then adjust the overall based on the math?

(Ross): Yes.

(Christian Curtis): I may have misunderstood this overall, I was kind of doing this list here as a starting point for some thing that we would all eventually agree on rather than just using the math itself to...

(Ross): Yeah, what I was trying to, (Christian), correct?

(Christian Curtis): Yeah, yeah.

(Ross): I'm still getting used to the voices, sorry. What I was trying to do was get the big objections out of the way first. So (Paul) has, sorry Mike has raised one, (Tom) has raised one, I don't know if there's others.

But in hearing specific advocacy on those pieces it was then my goal to be able to get down to a discussion of, is this the right list?

(Christian Curtis): Okay. I'm, this particular issue was one that struck me as a place where the math might have failed us. It scored what, sixteen, and four people had it in their top three, which made me think that maybe we want to adjust the list to account for discrepancy if it would be generated inside the math.

(Ross): Right, okay, okay. Is that all? So what I'll take that, let's leave the, as a result of the advocacy let's just leave the list as is, but let's now talk about the general list we've got, about 8 minutes left in this call.

Is this the right list? Is this the list we want to send to the Council and is the order in which it should be sent to the Council?

I've heard a couple people say no, the list is wrong, we've heard at least one person say there are two or three areas where we should look to adjust this list.

What I would ask is are there specific adjustments that should be made and that will seek obviously broad agreement about moving specific things up or down this list at this point.

Would anybody like to open that up?

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike). I'd like to throw out a proposal, which is maybe we could clump this list into some sort of like groups and by doing that eliminate some of the tension that the math has caused.

Because I think what (Tom) and I have demonstrated is that in a way we're ranking unlike things, and because of that, given our different approaches to this, we've placed them in different places on the list.

And maybe by clumping we can eliminate some of that. And I'll throw out just one, I'm not proposing it as the one, but just as an example.

What I found is that my sort of consumer rights customer service vendor accountability issues were one clump, and that clump wound up at the top of my list. In the middle of my list was another clump, which was essentially process improvement, product improvement, quality improvement kinds of things.

And at the bottom of my list was essentially technical implementation kinds of issues. It's not that I don't want technical implementation kinds of things, it's just that I thought they were easier to get done and if there was broad agreement and so I kind of took my chips elsewhere.

What would happen if we went to the Council with some sort of clumping like that and said well here's a set not of one list but of three lists and we think that the policy process that's subsequent to this might be different for each of those clumps?

(Ross): So the proposal as I would understand it would be in effect asking for three policy development processes dealing with the larger subject area of each. Would that be a fair characterization?

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah, I think that's fair.

(Ross): Does anyone want to comment on that?

(Paul McCready): This is (Paul McCready) again and I apologize but I'm going to have to drop off the call because I'm, in four minutes because I have other things scheduled, but it sounds to me like this is kind of what we talked about once before on this call that perhaps we could you know clump together things based upon subject matter.

And the same issue that I had then I still have a few minutes later which is how do we deal then with the, when something that's lower down the priority list gets moved up because it's associated with something exceptionally that is higher up the list.

Especially when all these things are quite highly related to each other, it's not like we're talking about apples and apples, we're talking about different kinds of apples really.

And so that is the same sort of question there, and since I'm going to have to go I have a hard stop, another comment about the idea of going through and sort of verbally negotiating over the list.

You know we already have the issue of the problem with the majority and I think that we end up sort of compounding that by allowing the majority, whoever that is, I don't know, to put together their list based

upon their mathematics, and then to go through again and have that assuming it would be a vote down situation.

Where it is a majority of the people on the call voted yes for something to be moved up that it would be moved up even over the objections of others on the call, then we end up in a situation where we have the majority who's sort of been able to weight the list the way they want and now they have a second shot at the apple of weighting the list the way they want based upon the number of votes on the call.

And so we end up in the situation where instead of really over-representing or even adequately representing everybody, we end up in the situation where again the majority is represented twice on the list.

Man: Right.

(Paul McCready): And so I like all these ideas, again I don't see any problem with if somebody wanted to go through them and say you know as a supplement to the actual list that was prepared to say you know this is a list that was prepared and I think that these are the four things that go together.

I think that these next four things are the low hanging fruit, I think these six that we think really are urgent. I don't know that, if there's any harm in doing something that is supplemental to what the group does.

But again every time we add in another round of subjectivity, we end up sort of reducing everybody's voice just a little bit more if they are on the, on the nay side of something.

So again I hate to only have one thing to say, but...

(Ross): Third time's a charm (Paul).

(Paul McCready): Thanks, yeah, hopefully.

(Ross): I do have one question before you go though, is this the list then, is this what I'm hearing from you, is that a yes to that question?

(Paul McCready): I mean I don't, the answer is, yeah, I think it is because I don't know how else we do it. I mean everybody was given an opportunity to comment on it and to put in their thoughts on how things should be weighed. I think a lot of people did that.

There was lots of notice about it and you know and I think that since there was you know several weeks of people wanting to engage and an advocacy, there certainly was time to call people on the list or send emails and do that sort of thing and discuss it.

So I think that you know we have a list that's you know at least we have some sort of mathematical standard, now am I happy with everything on the list? No, but you know I didn't get any more votes than anybody else got.

So I just don't know how else we do it in a way that's more objective than what's already been done.

(Ross): Right, so it's the A list and you're moderately okay with it.

(Paul McCready): I'm certainly, yes, I may not be okay with the list but I think I'm okay with the process that got it there.

(Ross): Okay, great. Thank you very much, I appreciate your attendance today (Paul), thanks.

(Paul McCready): You bet.

(Ross): In hearing (Paul)'s statements, is there anyone else that would object to this being the list going forward? Or does anyone object, I'm not sure where the group is at this point. I haven't quite heard from a lot of people whether this list is acceptable.

And certainly we each bid to get our own perfect list, but this is not the, this doesn't match anybody's specific list. So (Barbara), (Pam)....

(Pam): This is (Pam). I would agree that this is the list that should go forward.

(Barbara): I would agree as well.

(Ross): (Christian)?

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian). My one trouble is really with A, which fell so low when it is clearly such an issue that was so important to so many people but that really strikes me as a very odd discrepancy.

But I mean if there's no better way to resolve it I do think that overall this is a fair compromise, I just find that particular anomaly troubling.

(Ross): So I think at this point what I would like to do, having heard from virtually everyone except for (Ken) and (Stacy) is leave comments on this list open for the next let's say 48 to 72 hours, but I'll confirm this through an email a little bit later today.

Leave this list open for comments for some period of time, and if anybody wishes to make these types of supplemental comments, we can certainly include these in the recommendations going to Council.

There's absolutely no issues from that aside from my perspective, what I'm really attempting to do here is get down the process from a timing perspective enough that we can actually get started with the meaningful work of actually starting to work on developing policy around these provisions.

Knowing that we will get to the last one on the list sooner or later has been, always been kind of comfort for me knowing that no matter where it is on the list we'll get there sooner or later. We'll let the policy chips fall where they lie.

Forgetting anything at the top of this list is preferable at this point to continuing discussion around is this the best list, is this the best process, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Would anyone have anything to add to that in the dying minutes of this call?

(Mike O'Connor): I think that's a really important clarification at least for me (Ross), is indeed eventually we're going to touch all of the things on the list. That takes a lot of the pressure off.

(Ross): Okay.

(Mike O'Connor): I would also agree that it is surprising that that one fell below, and maybe if we could agree as a group that that gets sort of a special nudge somehow, that would be great.

(Ross): A mulligan or something. If that comes out of discussion on the list I'm more than happy to move that up somehow.

Does anyone else wish to comment before we close off the call? I do appreciate you for my typical optimistic fashion I estimated thirty minutes for this call, it took us an hour. It's still much better than many of the calls I've been involved in over the years so I do appreciate you taking the extra time to help talk through this.

I view this as been a very productive discussion and I think we've actually achieved some good progress here, so thank you very much to everyone.

I'll follow up with a message to this later on today, my observations, formalize the call for additional comments and supplementary information and adjust the schedule based around that.

And so you can expect to hear a little bit more from me later on today. And without any further ado I guess I'll call the call to an end. Thank you everyone.

Man: Thank you.

Man:           Bye.

Woman:       Bye.

END