

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference**  
**16 December, 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 16 December 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-20081216.mp3>  
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.  
Barbara Steele - Registry c.  
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison  
Michael Collins - CBUC  
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC  
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC  
James Bladel - Godaddy  
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office  
Marika Konings - Policy Director  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies  
Kevin Erdman - IPC

.

Coordinator: The recording has started. Please go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. And, Glen, if you would, can you do the role please?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly. We have on the line Paul Diaz, Mikey O'Connor, Mike Rodenbaugh, Sebastian Bachollet, (James Bladel), Barbara Steele, and we have regrets from (Kevin Erdman). And for staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and myself Glen Desaintgery.

Paul Diaz: Fantastic, thank you Glen. Alright everybody, thank you for joining. We need to go through the initial report today. We're looking to get this out. Very much appreciate the comments that we've received on the list and as we come up on that points that have mentioned on the list we will try and work those into our text.

The goal today is to, you know, get through this, be comfortable with the draft that we've produced so that we can move this to the next step which will be to start the second public comment period, getting it posted, start the comment period and of course solicit constituency statements as well.

So, if anybody has a particular issue they want to raise, any questions or concerns. Okay, then if not I would ask if you can pull up the most current draft that Marika had sent out to us just the other day and basically I would like to just, you know, skim through this. You know, it's clearly marked. We can see where brand new text has been inserted.

Let's make sure we're all comfortable what's being said. If anybody notices any typos, little things like that, please let's bring that to attention. We'll just march through the report and again, jump back to the comments that have been posted on the list and work all those - work through those as we come up to them in the report.

So with that if we can, you know, go straight to the executive summary on page three. If there are any comments, questions or concerns about 1.1. Okay, 1.2, and note that there's a very minor typo which should be in the first sentence, line 60. The working group worked on redefinition of parallel, not and.

Anything else? I don't want to seem like I'm rushing this but it's pretty straight forward so I will go at a fast pace. Please stop me if anybody sees anything. 1.3.

Mikey O'Connor: I was - this is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I was wondering on 1.3 whether we really wanted to be that firm in our statement that no changes are required or whether we wanted to wait until comments were in.

Paul Diaz: Okay, others in the group, how do you feel? Again, we've noted this is preliminary conclusion going out for the draft initial report. So I don't think any of these things are certainly written in stone.

Man: Which line are you referring too (Mikey)?

Mikey O'Connor: I, you know, I'm sort of doing this in (gestalt) mode. I supposed if like we looked at like 105. That's sort of the tempering statement and the - oh wait a minute. I'm in the wrong section. Hold on.

Okay, along these licenses we use this text in several places. Barbara, you've offered up to the list right now some alternative language for 105 to 107.

Barbara Steele: Yes, I think it's just a correction more than anything else. Maybe I'm just not reading it correctly.

Marika Konings: No, you're correct Barbara. I noted that as well and I think Mike Rodenbaugh already noted it as well in one of the corrections he sent. So, I'll change it because it basically says that, instead of recommend - it reads recommendations. So...

Barbara Steele: Right and then I also think that will not take a final decision. I think it should be "will not make a final decision." Is that correct?

Paul Diaz: Sure. I like the way that reads better Barbara.

So, if everybody, if you don't have the email in front of you, beginning in 105 it would now read it should be noted that the working group will not make the final decision in which solution -- parentheses, s -- solution(s) if any, to recommend to the Janis Hill Council before a thorough review of the (unintelligible) during the public comment period in the final constituency statements has taken place.

Again, what we changed there is (there) change take to make with and an m and then after the - if any we say to recommend - oh, I'm sorry, to recommend instead of two recommendations, that's all there.

Marika Konings: And this would then apply to each of the statements for each of the issues which are identical.

Sebastian Bachollet: And -- it's Sebastian -- can't we (factorize) this sentence (unintelligible) three times just to (unintelligible). It should be noted at the end of the three (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay. That's...

Sebastian Bachollet: It's a business summery where we repeat the same sentence, it's (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Fair point. How do people feel about that? Do you prefer to keep reemphasizing the point that we have not taken - made any final decision or should we just do that as an over arching either at the very beginning or at the very end.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I kind of like reminding people that we really want their input before we make the decision. So even though it's redundant, I like it repeated.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Sebastian do you have a problem with repeating just so that we're really emphasizing the point. Fortunately our report's not very long. So it's not like we're greatly extending the length

Sebastian Bachollet: (Unintelligible) it's not a big deal, but I think it's better to factorize - eventually we can put the sentence at the end of each issue saying that - and saying in different ways that we will appreciate to have your comments on that issue or don't forget to make - and just to have more lively report and three times the same sentence, quite long sentence, in the summary.

James Bladel: Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: Sure, James.

James Bladel: I agree with Sebastian. Those paragraphs are so close together in the executive summary. Perhaps we could just state it once. But in the body of the document if we wanted to repeat it a little further apart to, as Mikey was saying, reemphasize or remind on that point that would be fine.

But here, they're just a little too close together for that degree of repetition in my opinion. That's a thought though.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, I agree. I'd forgotten that we were still on the executive summary.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine with that. I did indeed find the offending line eventually.

Paul Diaz: Okay, back to that. Alright for our draft then, what is the recommendation? Shall we repeat it at the end of all these? You know basically create a fourth bullet point with just this sentence?

You prefer to have it upfront so it's the first thing people read so it's very clear to them these are not final decisions. We're still soliciting inputs, et cetera. How do folks want to go?

Man: No preference.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, it sounds like you get to decide that one Paul.

Paul Diaz: Okay let's...

Michael Collins: Good morning everyone this is Michael Collins. I apologize for my tardiness.

Paul Diaz: Hi Michael. We are just working through the report Michael and on the section 1.3 in our executive summary, recommendations has been to move the final sentence for each of those. We've tweaked a little bit.

We're just saying now that the working group will not make a final decision on which solutions to recommend to the (Janis Hill). Two little tweaks there. That particular sentence, rather than repeating it each time, it becomes quite redundant.

The decision is to either put it up front before we present the three issues or put it at the end as a separate bullet point. I'll put you on the spot Michael. Do you have a preference either way? Seems the group doesn't really care.

Michael Collins: Before or after, seems of little consequence. So I'll go with the rest of the group. You can decide.

Paul Diaz: Marika, let's just make it as the fourth bullet point then.

Marika Konings: Okay. And I'll just put in front of them something like, "for all issues."

Paul Diaz: Exactly, please.

Marika Konings: It should be noted that the working group, et cetera, et cetera.

Paul Diaz: And...

Sebastian Bachollet: Just, it's okay with me but maybe just come to the point that it could be added at the end of the line 61 in the version of the working group. But, I'll make the decision after the call. I don't care. Paul, (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay that's a thought. How do folks feel, would you prefer to have it that far in the front. Is there any concern that we might lose the message we're trying to deliver that even though we've presented these - the three positions of the working group to date, no final decisions are made. Any fear that that point might get lost if it's a little further up in the text?

James Bladel: Yes Paul, this is James. I would say no higher than line 83.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, this is Mikey. I - that's exactly where I was going to put it as well.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I agree with that.

Paul Diaz: Fine. Then let's split the difference. Marika, instead why don't you make that fourth bullet exactly as you've described with the new intro clause and insert it there between lines 83, 84 so it'll actually become our first bulletin in this section.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Excellent, okay, moving ahead then. Section 1.4?

Mikey O'Connor: Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes?



Mikey O'Connor: The line that actually triggered me is in 1.3. If we could just...

Paul Diaz: Sure Mikey, which line?

Mikey O'Connor: ...check our consensus on line 88. Before, we're saying that a policy change is not required. Again, I'm feeling a lot better with that bullet right before it saying that we haven't made final decisions yet. But I just wanted to check and see if our consensus is really feeling that it's not required (unintelligible) right now.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Any suggested text? Are you looking to soften that a bit?

Mikey O'Connor: Just soften it a little. Yes

Man: Maybe there was not wide spread support for or a wide spread agreement for a policy change or...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, something like that. I sort of don't just want to leave the door open for commenters to know that we're really looking for their thoughts here.

Man: Or mixed support for policy changers.

Paul Diaz: Okay, I'm just asking the group here. Let's make sure we're in agreement with what we say because I think there's a difference in saying that there's - what we currently have, you know, appears to agreement that a policy change is not required is very different than saying it wasn't a broad agreement to make a policy change.

I don't think it's semantics I think there's kind of an underlying difference there in the two and which is it folks?

Mikey O'Connor: Paul, I didn't mean to confuse the issue. I'll withdraw that suggested text.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I was just looking to soften that same sentence.

Paul Diaz: What was the first thing we just softened Mikey as a potential softening?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I guess what I was trying to get at is that we want to hold our decision on this until we've heard the comments rather than agree, but previously we'd also said we wanted to give both folks in the public comment period as well as Council when they get updated on this, a sense of where the group stands.

But, I agree, we don't want to necessarily want to make it sound like it's authoritative or a final decision. Same time I would like to try to provide readers of the report a sense of where our working group stands.

I'm okay with softening it, I just don't want to cut it back so much that all of a sudden we're not taking any position, we're saying, you guys tell us what you want to think.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I, Mike Rodenbaugh, isn't the way that James put it more accurate than the way it is now. Think he said something like there

appears to be - or there is no agreements that a policy change is required.

Paul Diaz: Okay, how does that sound to folks? So it'll read, just to repeat, based on our discussions in the working group and taking into account the current phrasing of issue one, which limits it to a technical assessment of the issue, there is no agreement that a policy change is required.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that'd work for me. This is Mikey.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: I think Paul - this is James. I'm just trying to figure out if that just inverts the sentence to make it a little more softer or if that actually changes the meaning.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I think it changes the meaning. It sounds like it's the complete opposite of what we were conveying previously to me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think it does change the meaning, but I think I'm okay with changing the meaning in that way.

Paul Diaz: Well there's a difference of course between changing and softening too. And again, I'm not trying to be difficult, just trying to be the chair and determine where the group is standing on this. How do we want to present this?

Man: It seems to me we're about 50/50 on that issue. You know, about half of us think it's the policy change - we should at least continue to explore it and the other half probably think not.

Paul Diaz: Yes. There's certainly two camps. I'm not sure what the breakdown is but, yes, those are definitely the two views.

Mikey O'Connor: And this is Mikey. I - that's part of the reason why I'd really like to hear from the commenters because I'm a bit on the fence on this one. I could go either way with compelling arguments.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And I'd like to make it clear to the commenters that this isn't just your normal pro forma comment thing. We really are interested in deep thought and good analysis to supplement what we've already discussed because one of the things about is technical sections of the report is that we had great technical expert conversations with people.

And I would hate to miss the opportunity to improve the functioning of the domain name system if in fact one exists.

Barbara Steele: Well this is Barbara, I mean, would it be possible for us to say that there appears to be agreement that a policy change may not be required? That soften it enough that leaves the door open, but yet it doesn't say that, you know, we're not in agreement, that we're not going to change the policy.

Mikey O'Connor: I could go with that.

Man: I like that Barbara.

Paul Diaz: Mike, are you okay with that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Can you say it again?

Barbara Steele: There appears to be agreement that a policy change may not be required.

Mike Rodenbaugh I guess I just don't like it as much as pointing out that there are two views on this of substantial weight. Why don't we just say that?

Mikey: I - this is Mikey again. I really like the idea of actively asking the community on this one.

Paul Diaz: Right. And remember the first bullet - this will actually become the second one, we're working on. We're going to lead with the revised text we had noting that, you know, we've not made a final decision on what to recommend and that we are awaiting the comments received from the public comment period.

Mikey O'Connor: I think the reason I'd like to amplify that, especially in this technical one is because it's technical and, you know, it's got technical and policy components and essentially operational components too.

And there are operational reasons why we might want to do something here. It might require a policy change it might not. But it's one for the operational community and the technical community to weigh in it I think.

Man: I don't like the third - the clause right in front of it either which says that it limits - the phrasing of the issue limited to the technical assessment of the issue.

I'm looking at the phrasing of the issue. I don't understand where that comes from. Not really sure what that means, technical assessment of the issue, but maybe somebody can explain what's intended there.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I wrote that particular part it's what I understood from the last conference call we had a discussion on that this question really talks about making (unintelligible) the email data available which would only be possible to do by technical means.

Which would then fit in with the second paragraph which basically says, well if we're not looking at these technical solutions we might look at other policy changes that (unintelligible) are not implied in this question but might fit under another PDP. That's how I understood the discussion last time, but maybe I got that wrong.

James Bladel: And this is (James). I understood it to mean that any time we strayed away from the technical aspects of this issue, we started to wander in to the "who is" territory. And that we were acknowledging, but avoiding that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that was -- this is (Mikey) -- that was sort of where I was at as well.

Michael Collins: There was one non "who is" policy issue that we talked about too that was changing the authoritative roles of the registrant versus the (admin) contact, like on here.

Mikey O'Connor: That's reflected in here, Michael, I believe.

Paul Diaz: Yes it is, we'll get to.

Michael Collins: Correct it is, I'm just saying that (unintelligible) as another example of a non technical policy issue that we decided to not act on, but leave it as a comment I think.

Mikey O'Connor: I guess I would suggest something like this to just replace this first sentence in 1.3. Say something like based on the discussions in the working group, there's support both for continuing to consider policy change and there is support that policy change is not required.

Something just more balanced that reflects that we do have balanced different views on this. That we were - again, that it's going to be reaffirmed in the first bullet that we're looking for input.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Our focus...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Would another option just be just to take out that whole sentence? So we just talk about what the group has spoken about and as well the alternative options.

Mikey O'Connor: That's not a bad idea. I like that idea.

Paul Diaz: Okay. But if we do that of course...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...line 86 through most of 88 would be struck?

Man: Yes.

Man: I mean, aside from any readability issues, I think that's a good idea.

Mikey O'Connor:(Mikey), I'd be fine with that.

Paul Diaz: And just to remind folks that in doing that we are - we won't be providing even any sense of where the group stands right now - or Mike Rodenbaugh's - what he just suggested.

Man: Well we will but the last sentence says after review and discussion, none of these options received broad agreement.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Is that enough for folks?

Mikey O'Connor:Yes, actually - this is (Mikey). That sort of fits in with my notion of throwing this to the community and seeking guidance. Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So then the suggestion is we strike that first full sentence, lines 86 through most of 88. It will begin the working group noted that and just keep the rest of the text as is. Anybody have a problem with that approach?

James Bladel: This is (James). Not a problem at all, but just for readability, maybe consider moving the qualifier that is the last sentence beginning with however and rephrasing that so that's more of an introductory sentence than a concluding sentence. But I really don't feel strongly about that, I was just making a suggestion.

Mikey O'Connor:This is (Mikey). I don't have strong feelings either way on that.



Paul Diaz: Would anybody like to lead with that? Think it's a better idea to lead?

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Mikey). I'm fine with it where it is.

Man: All right.

Paul Diaz: In the interest of moving through this and I keep repeating this is our initial report. Why don't we leave it because we're all in agreement with the text that of spending more time trying to wordsmith?

Mikey O'Connor: Good here. (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right. Then continuing on line 97, the rest of 1.3. Is everybody comfortable with how it's been presented? In particular there was comments by both (Kevin) and Mike for issue three. Let's make sure that we've captured what they're offering. They offered on the list, make sure we get it in here now.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I have an issue with two as well.

Paul Diaz: Okay, let's take it in order then Mike. Let's go back to issue two. Where are you? Which line?

Mike Rodenbaugh: 112 and 113.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So, whether this should be an issue for GNSO policy making or for market solutions. So as I said in my email, I feel like that question was

answered when we launched to PDP, but if people aren't clear on it then what do we need to do to clear on it and get passed that hurdle?

It seems to me we should make a request to ICANN Council to give us some guidance unless anyone has other ideas as to how we get clear on this.

Paul Diaz: Okay, other spots?

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Mikey). I was - Mike Rodenbaugh, I was sort of putting this sentence in the same category as the one that we just hammered out in the first one.

This being the (deer) community, we don't know how to figure this one out. Let us hear your thoughts type sentence. Are you thinking this is different in some way?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I - the sentence was intended like that, at least from my perspective. Not intended as to question whether this is, you know, within this scope of policy making or not.

So if that's not clear for the sentence, we might need to change something. But the intention was indeed what (Mikey) just said as saying you know, we don't know yet whether this option or the other one.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, that's completely different than what it says now. Now it says we don't even know if it's something we should talk about. And I thought we moved past that a long time ago.

So I guess it's just not accurate then as it's stated at the moment and we should say something like opinions in the working - we should just maybe use similar language that we just hammered out for issue number one.

Mikey O'Connor: But on what we did in the issue number one was we sort of deleted that sentence.

Paul Diaz: Yes, we conclude now with the idea that after review and discussion, none of the options received broad agreement. That here would be the, you know, some form of policy prescription or leaving it to the market to decide. Neither of those options has received broad agreement.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So we have broad agreement that there is a need. And then we don't have agreement as to...

Paul Diaz: How to address a need.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well, that's fine. That's what we should say then, just get rid of this is it policy making or market solutions overall. It should say something like opinion in the working groups differ as to how these...

Mikey O'Connor To achieve these goals.

Mike Rodenbaugh: How these options would develop.

Paul Diaz: Taking notes Marika? You getting this too?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Marika Konings: Would you like to read then, however, opinions in the working group differ as to whether these options should be an issue for GNSO policy making or for market solution? Or maybe to refer to the previous sentence should read these other options?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I would just say something like opinions in the working group differ as to how these other options should be developed. I guess it's...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: You don't want to make the distinction there that part of the group feels it should be market solutions and the other ones - other part feels it should be GNSO policy making?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Actually no, I mean, if a part of the group is feeling that we cannot make policy on this, then that's an issue I want to get clear.

Marika Konings: No, no. As I understand it, some feel it's not because it's not in scope or anything, but it should be left to the markets to deal with it. That's as I understand the sentence would read.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we were getting close. Let's go back to wordsmithing. Marika, can you replay the latest version that you've got?

Marika Konings: The last thing that Michael has however the opinions in the working group differ as to how these options should be developed. And my question was whether we would add something to that distinguishing

that one part of the group feels that this might be done through GNSO policy making and another part of the group feels that this might be - need to be left to market solutions.

I think everyone feels that shouldn't be mentioned, I'm happy to leave it as just read.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm okay with that. This is (Mikey).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Leaving as is or trying to insert the policy making versus market solutions?

Mikey O'Connor: Inserting the policy making versus market solutions. But, you know, I think that the clarification that we're trying to get at and that we all agree on is that we're not trying to say that a policy solution is off the table.

And so what we're trying to do is remove that implication from the sentence. So leaving it as a possible of several solutions is fine. Mike, are you okay with that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think so if someone could just read it one more time? I propose that would be helpful.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) said it would included as however, opinions in the working group differ as to whether these options should be developed as part of GNSO policy making or left to market solutions?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I like that.

Mikey O'Connor: Me too. It's (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Okay. Others? Anybody wants to make another tweak or is everybody comfortable with that? And then will we drop the final sentence again, right, because we're going to just have it appear once up at the very beginning.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thanks Marika. Okay then moving to issue three. And here's where we have Mike and (Kevin)'s inputs. If everybody saw this on the email list. I guess in line 123 then after existing market solutions the recommendation is to add however, some constituency statements expressed a contrary view.

And the bulk transfer provisions should be considered. And I guess it will end there because we're now going to drop the final sentence. So we're adding a sentence, make again the other view, you know, appears we have two views within the group.

Mikey O'Connor: I don't get that. This is (Mikey). It seems like that's repeating the stuff that's on line 121 and 122. Aren't we saying it's either bulk transfers or market solutions? So what's the third option? It sounded like it was either bulk transfers or market solutions or bulk transfer.

Marika Konings: New partial bulk transfer provision.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Marc: This is Marc. I like adding in the provision about the constituency groups because my recollection is that some of them didn't feel like there was a need for partial bulk transfer.

And adding in the sentence does give them the opportunity to further comment on, you know, why they think that would be a good solution. Maybe that'll change some of the opinions in the working group. Perhaps, perhaps not.

Mikey O'Connor: I am fine with that. This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel: This is (James).

Paul Diaz: Sure (James).

James Bladel: Do we want to identify the constituencies that felt that way? I'm not trying to be difficult here, just - I want to be sure that if we're saying that we should incorporate provisions for handling (partiable) transfers between registrars and if the registrars for example are not amongst that constituency, I think that's noteworthy.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Mikey). My only thought on that is we then sort of getting wrapped up in having to do that sort of all through the report. And it might get pretty cumbersome.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean, I think the constituencies know who they are.

Man: Yes, true.

Mike Rodenbaugh: You know what I mean. (Unintelligible) they read the comment on it so I don't know that it's necessary to call them out. And then we get in the position of, you know, what if we forget somebody?

Paul Diaz: Of course the statements are part of the report and constituency reviews could change once this initial report is put out there. You know, thinking may shift given what we're presenting, the working group.

You wanted to highlight (James), how would you suggest doing it? In the affirmative, some constituencies such as X, Y, Z or some constituencies but not somebody else?

James Bladel: Yes, I think the latter, you know, something like other, you know, constituencies aside from the registrars.

Paul Diaz: Okay, so...

James Bladel: I wasn't so much interested in calling out those constituencies that supported it so much as highlighting that the one that's mentioned in the chart in question did not. If that makes any sense.

Mikey O'Connor: This is (Mikey). I guess the reason that, you know, the constituencies who are likely to support a change in this are folks like customers, like me who might find some mechanism like this useful but I guess I'm not surprised that the registrars who maybe only see a cost or an operational negative impact oppose it.



I don't think it's necessarily that noteworthy. I don't feel real strongly. If you want to have it in there, it's okay with me, but...

James Bladel: But it's just as thought at this point, Mike, that I think that we're passively kind of blurring the line between a tool that registrars use between themselves versus something that is mandated to be extended down to registrars and consumers.

Mikey O'Connor: That's tasty. I buy that.

James Bladel: I mean, we can stay away from it if you like. I just wanted to point out that...

Paul Diaz: Well let's see how it sounds again (James). So right now we have, however some constituencies' statements expressed a contrary view et cetera, et cetera. But the idea is to put some constituencies' statements aside from the registrar constituency?

James Bladel: Yes or other than.

Paul Diaz: Other than?

James Bladel: Other than registrars or something like that.

Marc: This is Marc. Personally, I don't really like calling out one group. I don't like what some people may take from that. I don't know what they would take from that, but I personally just don't like calling out one group.

I think it should be sufficient just to say that some constituencies disagreed because by mentioning one you - I mean, you may give more weight to that one group.

James Bladel: But I feel that one group has already called out kind of in the initial question.

Marc: I don't feel like they're called out in the initial question. I mean, that's just a technical fact of that's what the question is, it's between registrars. I don't think necessarily that just because it's between registrars that their views should be given any more weight.

And I think by adding those in there that they create the impression that their view does have more weight.

Marika Konings: And just - this is Marika. Just for the record, in the summary we do know that the registrar constituency also believes the partial bulk transfer option would be useful tool for registrars as long as it is properly defined. So...

Man: Right.

Marika Konings: But Michael (unintelligible) is saying that registrars expect a contrary view.

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Again, you know, as role as the Chair here, I keep emphasizing, reemphasizing this is our initial report. This is, you know, designed to

give the community a sense of what we've accomplished as a working group and we're soliciting their inputs now.

I think that the various constituencies, you know, will make and probably underscore the positions that they did in their first round. So I'm more inclined to agree with Marc and others that highlighting a particular group (unintelligible) best thing right now.

Marika Konings: Paul, if I can - if I could maybe add something.

Maybe something to as well distinguish between what the constituency statements of (unintelligible) to make preliminary conclusions of the working group because I guess on some of the other issues, the constituency statements might have said something different as well from what the working group has come to conclude or not preliminary conclusions.

So instead of maybe going in to detail here about that some constituency statements said something different, we might eliminate it by just pointing to the fact that these are preliminary conclusions of the working group and refer to the constituency statements in the other chapter.

Paul Diaz: How do folks feel about that?

Man: How would that read now?

Mikey O'Connor: Would you help us? Where would you insert the extras?

Marika Konings: Basically on 1.3, line 83, I would just make it preliminary conclusions of the working group to clearly distinguish between 1.4 which would be initial constituency statement.

But to make sure that there's no conflict between what the constituency statement are saying and what the working group is thinking at this point in time.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Marc: I like that. I think it kind of makes it less final. And it distinguishes between the working group's thoughts and the various constituencies. Anything that I think increases clarity is good.

Paul Diaz: Anybody against that proposed change? Okay, thank you Marika it does seem like a very good idea. Getting back to our text here. (James) are you still uncomfortable with it or (unintelligible).

James Bladel: No, it's fine. It's preliminary as you said, so.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to clarify my point. Do we still want to put this sentence - like have them put in a suggested - put it in the report or with the clarification that this is preliminary conclusion of the working group - that sentence is no longer relevant or just want to be clear on what's supposed to be inserted and whatnot.

Paul Diaz: Okay, question for the group, but I thought Marika, that we would just include - I guess we'll call it the red text. I'm reading off of Mike

Rodenbaugh's edit to (Kevin)'s original post. So include all the red stuff and then just - we don't need the final sentence.

Marika Konings: Yes, my only point was there that we haven't done that in any of the other issues where there have been as well, other views expressed by means of constituency statements.

So I'm wondering if by including it here, it gives the impression that in the other issues, constituency statements were in line with the thinking of the group.

Marc: Yes, this is Marc. I agree. I think by changing the heading of 1.3, it mitigates the need to put that additional part of the sentence in there because when you change the heading it makes it clear that this is just the conclusions of the preliminary working group. And then when you read down to the constituency statements would follow, you'd see that there are differences.

Paul Diaz: So, for the group then, how will this - you want to take it from the top Marika? How will this section read?

Marika Konings: Well, basically it would read as is and without the suggestion that (Kevin) has made. Just leave as it is and just take out the last sentence that is then, you know, in the beginning of the section as we discussed before.

So would just be, based on the discussion in the working group, there appears to be broad agreement so there's no need to incorporate provisions for handling partial bulk transfers between registrars at this stage.

The working group believes that these scenarios can be addressed either through the existing bulk transfer provisions or through existing market solutions.

Paul Diaz: And it stops there.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Mike, how are you with that?

Man: Well, then in the next section with constituency statements, do you - do you summarize them? Or - I'm sorry...

Marika Konings: Summarize in this chapter and not here because I thought it would be - I can include it completely here because I thought it would be difficult to make a summary of with what already is a summary.

But I'm happy to include that section here in the executive summary if people feel it should be called out here. But then I would propose just taking the complete text of that chapter or at least on the different issues and put it in here as that is already a summary of the constituency statements.

Mike Rodenbaugh: What section is that?

Marika Konings: Let me just check which chapter - chapter six.

Mike Rodenbaugh: What line? There we go. Got it.

Marika Konings: Yes. Page 27.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, 638, okay.

Marika Konings: It would like, add four pages to the summary if we would just add that to it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, I don't think we should add four pages to the executive summary.

Paul Diaz: Right, so it defeats the purpose of an executive summary.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Definitely.

Paul Diaz: But, Mike are you okay with us dropping that extra sentence now because (Kevin)'s not with us, but since you were working off of his, it seemed you guys were thinking along the same lines.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, I'm not really convinced we should completely eliminate that now right now. But I...

Marika Konings: Could we do something else? You know, maybe add a sentence to the section saying it should be noted that constituency statements might have a different view from the working group conclusion?

Draw attention to the fact that on all these issues, there might be different views and, you know, for that please check chapter six for further details? Something like that?

Man: That would go in 1.4, right?

Marika Konings: No, 1.3 like at the end and basically to link it to the conclusions of the working group or the preliminary conclusions and basically it's saying, you know, do please note that these are the preliminary conclusions of the working group.

You know, they might not be in line with the constituency statements and these should be reviewed separately from the - something along those lines.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I guess I just think on this issue, it warrants calling out that, you know, some constituencies do think that we should look - do think that we probably should look at this.

Again, I guess I just feel like it's similar to the other two issues where we're not as - we don't have as one-sided a view as it's being portrayed right now. I mean, this starts off by saying there's broad agreement and I don't even necessarily agree with that statement. But we're trying to accept that text while still getting in the caveat that not everybody agrees with it.

Man: I thought the sentence here talks about broad agreement in the working group which I thought there was at least on issue three. I mean, do you disagree?

Mike Rodenbaugh: But there's no need to incorporate provisions? Perhaps I'm the only one who thinks that's still on the table, I'm not sure. I thought there was still several of us, Michael Collins and well, (Kevin) and myself at least that all believe that, you know, this is still something we can consider. We want to hear what the public and the constituencies think about it.



Man: I mean, I thought it - I mean, this is the preliminary conclusion. I mean, I thought at this point, there was broad agreement. That at this point, not as a final determination, but at this point, there didn't seem to be a need for handling partial bulk transfers, which is not to say that that would be the ultimate conclusion.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right.

Man: You know, the ultimate conclusion would depend upon, you know, I think we're all in agreement here upon further feedback from the community.

Michael Collins: This is Michael Collins. Actually Mike, I am going to agree with them on that.

I think that the things that bothered - that concerned me the most about transfers - expedient transfers to registrar, and along with a balance for security, are issues regarding how easily people are able to work with the losing registrar to acquire things like the (unintelligible) code and unlocking the domain name.

I think this is just allowing the provision for bulk transfers wouldn't resolve issues in itself. And may bring up new security problems we had discussed. So actually, I think I'm going to be in agreement on (unintelligible) that there is still further work on the transfer's going to be done in preceding CBT.

Paul Diaz: And echoing both Michael and Marc's point before, of course we're prefacing everything with the new first bullets, getting it - you know, the group has not made any financial decisions.

We're actively soliciting inputs from constituencies and the public. You know, before figuring out what those final conclusions would be that we present to Council.

So, you know, maybe we're good. I just would like to come back. I mean we have made efforts in both issues one and two to accurately capture the sense of the group at this point in time.

You know, it does seem and maybe, you know, the qualifier broad agreement might be overreaching. Maybe it - there appears to be agreement, but there's no need, you know, take it down a notch.

But fundamentally do we - do folks want to include the proposed new sentence about constituency statements? Are we good with leaving that off or address it as Marika suggested as well?

I'm just looking at the clock. This is all excellent. I'm pleasantly surprised in how much debate we've had today, but I'd really like to at least try and get through this particular issue before, you know, we figure out how we're going to finish up working on this draft report.

Man: Maybe we could, you know, add an (unintelligible) or, you know, add a note right after the heading of 1.3 and just make the point that, you know, it should be noted that these are, you know, merely preliminary conclusions and they are not final determinations and...

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Man: ...you know, the working group at this point is still looking to the community for further input...

Paul Diaz: Right.

Man: ...with regard to...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...it's final recommendation to the council.

Paul Diaz: I think just before you joined us, what we've decided is that the repetitive sentence that appears in each of these - we (massaged) it a little bit and that is actually going to become the first bullet point for this section 1.3.

Man: Okay.

Paul Diaz: And it says exactly what you just said.

Man: Okay.

Paul Diaz: That, you know, we're actively seeking inputs because we've not reached final decision.

Man: That being the case, I mean that would seem to me sufficient.

Paul Diaz: It covers it. All right. Mike, I want to come back to you because you and (Kevin) made the effort and took the time to craft something. Does it cover it well enough for you or do you want to try and find some alternative?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think that's okay. I think in addition to what you just said we also should take (Marissa's) - I'm sorry, Marika's suggestion and put a little text in 1.4. Obviously not the entire (unintelligible) six, but some - let's see what do we have here now?

Okay. I guess I'd like - I think (Marissa) - I'm sorry, I have a friend named (Marissa) Marika. Marika - those are - you had a good idea, but we would say something like the constituency statements may differ from the views of the working group and therefore should be read. So if you incorporate that much into 1.4 then I'm fine with it.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Marika. So, your proposal - what you suggested earlier, if you had sketched it out. Let's conclude that now with an additional bullet in 1.4. And I don't think we need to worry too much at the moment about the exact text because we definitely will need to review this again.

And with only two minutes left before the top of the hour and I have hard stop today folks, I will ask - we obviously need another session to finish working through this report.

The question is when? I understand already that there are conflicts with this time slot next week for a few members of our staff. So, next Tuesday is not going to work. Glen, do you still have that - do you call it doodle?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Paul Diaz: The software that we could find dates that work for people.

Glen Desaintgery: For which - for what - what would the possible dates be?

Paul Diaz: And that's what we have to...

Glen Desaintgery: Next week?

Paul Diaz: ...ask the group now. I mean next week with the holidays upon us, you know, I basically am thinking what are people's availability. The remainder of this week or Monday.

Glen Desaintgery: The remainder of this week or Monday. Okay, I'll do that.

Paul Diaz: And I would ask if you could check your emails and please vote for times that work or do not work for you. It's very straight forward. Just remember that the times are always set at UTC. So...

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: ...when you're choosing the hours - for instance, I'm on the east coast so I have to add - UTC's five hours ahead. Looks like there's plenty of calculators online you can quickly figure out what the times are. That's very important. If you see 2 pm for example. That's UTC. So for me that would mean nine in the morning. Please be sure to do that, but...

Sebastian Bachollet: Except that is the new (unintelligible) you can use clock and who you are - in your time zone, but it will be said if you use it on that

at the beginning of the question. I guess. (Unintelligible) UTC time or not because...

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I'll put it in UTC because there's another version that's coming out that hasn't got that possibility anymore.

Man: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. Yes, I'll do that...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: ...everyone, please just read the instruction carefully, but let's try and set up a time because I mean with the holidays upon us people away, we really need to carve out another hour to try and work through this, get it down so that we can, you know, get the report posted and start the public comment period during the breaks.

Otherwise, you know, if we have to wait for our group to finish up until after the New Year and then start the report, I'm beginning to think it might not even be possible to have this all wrapped up before the next ICANN meeting which honestly I think is a fair goal of ours.

It should be our goal to have this wrapped up by the beginning of March. So look for the note from Glen, vote for the times that work for you. Hopefully, we can get through the remainder of this is one more session, one more hour.

And then we will, you know, set up the public comment period and figure out those next steps. With that I thank everybody for their time. Very, very good discussions today and...

Marika Konings: Paul, can I just make one point?

Paul Diaz: Yes Marika.

Marika Konings: It's Marika. I just would like to point out that the ICANN office does close between Christmas and New Year. So, you know, we get the public comment site up before that time, otherwise it will have to be after the New Year.

Paul Diaz: Well appreciated Marika. And I think travel schedules and whatnot, it would be burdensome to ask anybody to be focused on this stuff during the break.

So, again, please vote what times work for you and let's try and knock this out no later than next Monday, but we can get this done before the holidays are upon us. All right everybody. Thank you again for your time and we'll look forward to talking to you - wrap this up very soon.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Bye-bye.

END