

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 04 May 2010 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 04 May 2010 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-b-20100405.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG – Chair
James Bladel – RrSG – interim chair
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Michael Collins – Individual
Paul Diaz – RrSG
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Steele – RySG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Matt Mansell –RrSG
Bob Mountain

Staff:

Marika Konings
David Giza
Glen de Saint Géry
Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Berry Cobb – CBUC
Mikey O’Connor – CBUC
Baudoin Schombe – At-Large
Anil George – IPC
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today’s IRTP B PDP call on the fourth of May, we have Michele Neylon, Chris Chaplow, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, Paul Diaz, Barbara Steele, Matt Serlin.

From staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings, David Giza, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Mikey O'Connor, Anil George and Baudoin Schombe. I hope I haven't left anyone off the list.

And if I could just remind everyone, to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right. Thanks. And thanks to James for doing a wonderful job, as usual last week. He always puts me to shame.

Now, the - you should all have received an updated draft of the proposed ETRP and also I would back Marika's comment about the lower case e, versus the upper case E. So the upper case E, I'd agree in Europe, upper case E makes a lot more sense.

Have you all had a chance to look over the latest draft, which is also on the Meeting Room Adobe thing? Anybody have any questions or comments?

Chris Chaplow: This is Chris here. Can I start with just a petty comment, seeing as we're talking about acronyms, we've just changed an acronym on the...

Michele Neylon: All we just - all we did was change the case sensitivity Chris.

Chris Chaplow: But it doesn't.

Michele Neylon: It doesn't change an acronym.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, that's fine. The one I'm questioning is the PTRA. I was suggesting it should be PTR little a.

Woman: Where?

Michele Neylon: Hold on. Where is this exactly Chris?

Chris Chaplow: It's in lots of places. Try 3.3. It's throughout the document and beginning in 3.1.

Michele Neylon: Okay. What exact - what is PTR, little r? Is that defined somewhere?

Man: Yes in 3.1 it's, the Pre-transfer registrar and Chris just - that was certainly not a well thought of vision on my part. It's just R is often used to distinguish registrar from RY, which is typically used to indicate a registry.

But certainly not, you know, married to that contention as a convention, it's just something that I borrowed from other groups.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, it's just RA is more popularly used. So I'm just bringing in a little more consistency into it. That was all.

Michele Neylon: I would suggest that we...

Man: Okay.

Michele Neylon: ...you know, have just PTR.

Man: Why do we need the R or the A?

Chris Chaplow: Well, a convenient convention for RA for registrar and RY for registry used in various other places.

Man: The only problem with PTR by itself, is that I will start thinking about PTR records in DNS.

Michele Neylon: Right. Pointers.

Man: Yeah.

Chris Chaplow: I'm sorry. You want to PTR, little a.

Michele Neylon: So you're suggesting PTR. Okay guys whichever makes you happy, personally I'd say whatever works, though I don't like PTR by itself, for the obvious reasons, I'm thinking psychologically. I'm just thinking about DNS records.

Does anyone have an issue with PTR? No. Okay. On a side note, just to - you know, okay, and I'll try to come back to you, we get dialed in. Yes. Okay.

So PTR you would prefer as an option for that Chris, yes?

Chris Chaplow: To be more consistent with other things that have monetary, yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That's fine. That's fine. Okay. James are you happy with that change?

James Bladel: No strong feelings.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Fine. Right. So, does anybody oppose the change? Okay. Okay, so we can make - we'll make that change then. Right.

Any other things regarding to acronyms or anything like that that anybody would like to change at this juncture?

No. Okay. Any other comments on this document? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. There were a number of theme changes on the number - the number of point by Kevin and Michael and I asked them whether they were looking to submit language, so we can include that. And just want to

know whether - I think Michael did send a note to the list and I just wanted to know if that's forthcoming or went bad at the planning.

Michele Neylon: I think Michael said he was working on some draft language, I think. Is that correct Michael?

Michael Collins: That's correct. That's correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Michael Collins: I apologize for not having it ready yet. It was - it's - I'm just not - I've been busy, sorry.

Michele Neylon: Who hasn't. Don't worry, it's fine. I think everybody suffers from that. I'm suffering from bank holidays.

Okay then, there was some - let's have a look at what was there. Just give me one second.

There were a couple of things in relation to this. There was one thing in relation to the identification from Kevin. Is Kevin on? Kevin isn't on this call today, though is he?

Kevin Erdman: I am.

Michele Neylon: Oh you are. Sorry. Hi Kevin.

Kevin Erdman: Hi.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay. You were suggesting some kind of token system from what I can gather?

Kevin Erdman: Yes. The thought is, that since - ICANN is defining the process, ICANN could define how to prove identity for a registrar rather than depending on, you know, who knows what national law might apply to and, you know, the vulgarities of how different countries recognize non-human individual legal entities.

So, my thought is, that you know, it could be something that is very technologically sophisticated with encryption and things like that, or it could just simply be a code that is, you know, sent directly to the registrant just for that purpose of showing their entitlement to the domain that just got registered.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: Yes, to Kevin, would this allow for a transfer of the control of the name to another entity? It sounds like that part of it might get complicated and I'm not sure how that would work. Do you have any more information about something like that?

Kevin Erdman: Well, it depends on what we would want that token to be used for. I mean, we - if you just say, it's only used just to prove entitlement in this PTRP procedure, so that, you know, if there is a new, you know, a transfer of registrant that they could, you know, transfer that certificate, or you know, I mean, there's different ways one could handle it, that would go beyond sort of the scope of what we're proposing here.

But my point is that, if we want to have a quick and easy way to resolve this potential problem, we need to, you know, have all the mechanisms be pretty quick and straightforward, so that the registrar can, you know, take immediate action.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Somebody else have any thoughts on this? No. David.

David Giza: I'm not certain what system ICANN could use to transmit such a code and you know, and perhaps the task is a bit bigger at the moment than the scope of the working group. But clearly it ought to be something that ICANN compliance and the registrar liaison team investigate and perhaps, you know, then report back on the feasibility of doing something along the lines that Kevin suggesting.

But to do that Kevin, we really need some sort of written, you know, position from you that I could use, you know, for clarity purposes when I discuss that with that registrar liaison team.

Michele Neylon: I think Kevin posted to the list yesterday with some - with an overview of what he was proposing.

David Giza: Yeah, is there any need to update that Kevin based on, you know, what you're suggesting during the call today?

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, and I'd be happy to write it up a little more formally than the informal discussions. But what I was going to propose a couple of changes to the draft policy addressing the items that I mentioned, so I can include that when I circulate those for further changes.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. Why don't you go ahead and do that and then, you know, let me check with my IT colleagues and with (Tim Cole) and see if there's, you know, some approach here that would make sense, given the, you know, the resource constraints that we're currently operating under.

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, and another thing would be, I don't know that it's something that would require a one size fits all solution, that you know, it could be a measure of, you know, how much a particular registrar wanted to do it. It might be - like I said, as simple as just an eight character string or it could be, you know, some more sophisticated public key encryption token of some sorts.

But I'll write that up and circulate it the next few days.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

David Giza: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody else have any other thoughts on this? Okay. Right. Right. The next item on there, we were looking anyway at the reverse - updates reverse policy. If anybody has any other input on this, I think it would be good if we could try and use the mailing list as much as possible.

I emailed the list about this yesterday and I don't whether it was just a coincidence, but I noticed that there was a little bit more activity on us between yesterday and this morning, probably a coincidence.

Man: No, it was inspiration.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I was touched - it makes me feel better. I mean, basically look, we're all working under lots of different pressures and time constraints and God knows what else. If you're not, well good luck to you, but I think that most of us are.

And so if we can thrash things out. Sending quick and nasty emails, I'm perfectly happy with those. I'm not interested in reading the greatest works of William Shakespeare. I probably won't read it all anyway, because I probably get bored after a few lines.

So short and to the point works for me. Matt Mansell, I think will be joining this call a bit later on, but I just want to take this opportunity to thank Bob Mountain for joining the group. Bob why don't you introduce yourself to the group?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, I'm Bob Mountain. I run Business Development for NameMedia based in - just outside of Boston, Massachusetts. So, thanks for, you know, thanks for having me in the group and looking forward to participating.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Bob. So the -okay, what was - Issue A, Issue B, Issue C. One of the things that somebody pinged about off list, was in relation to the issues that were meant to be addressing.

And one - the thing that they felt was, that we had addressed a couple of the issues quite comprehensively, but we seem to have ignored one or two of the issues.

I mean, my reply to that, was that you know, this is something we needed to do - obviously tackle and deal with and obviously people have stronger feelings about some issues than they do about others.

And, but if people feel that we're not addressing issues, please you know, use the mailing list or interrupt me, put up hands, etc., etc., etc.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think if people look at the draft initial report, I think it's obvious where there's still holes, especially when we look at recommendations. And I think that's one of the, you know, the main issues that stands between now and the 31st of May in trying to get this report done in time for publication of the ICANN meeting in Brussels.

So, just to support what Michele says, I think it would be great if people can look at those different sections and you know, start drafting options for considerations or recommendations so that can be, you know, posted on the mailing list, and hopefully, you know, discussed or further refined in that way. Because I think the issues report, you know, covers in quite some detail the discussions that the group has had on these different issues.

And I think for some there are some, you know, suggestions that have been made during those discussions that are incorporated in the report, but I think the group needs some further time to, you know, I think, Issue A, you know, we haven't had - a very detailed policy that where we're considering of incorporating,

But I think for the other issues, we don't have that much detail yet on the kinds of recommendations that we want to put out for community discussions.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika. I mean, basically guys, look if you have an idea, if you have an recommendation, even if it's just something kind of vague and just kind of like, "You know, I like the idea of doing X, or I like the idea of doing something else, or I don't like that."

Just chuck it into the email to the list. Some people are - there are other people who will be able to take that and turn it into something much more flattery and everything. But let's just get some stupid ideas and throw them out us, then we'll get some wonderful ideas and whatever.

I mean, just you know, share your thoughts. Let's get some movement on this.

Okay. The - okay, let's have a look at this. Right. Okay. The updates of expedited transfer of reverse policy incorporations to draft report. Okay. So with the minor changes that were suggested with regards to the acronyms and that Chris was talking about.

Okay. And also as well, I think in this final draft here, there's just a suggestion that maybe ICANN staff can give a better overview of the historical sequence of IRTP.

And what else do we have here? Section 2.5, there's a note here saying, "This section should be expanded to demonstrate why existing methods are deficient. Would referencing the SSAC reports suffice do you think or do we need to go into more detail?"

Michele Neylon: Anybody? James?

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. Yeah, I think that would be sufficient possibly if we can just note that incidents of high jacking is still a problem.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So maybe if we could just reference - I'm just trying to use this - this (unintelligible) was getting bogged down in trying to...

James Bladel: Right.

Michele Neylon: ...in trying to, you know, write some great flowery thing, where we can just say, "Look, hey, this problems - I see the SSAC reports and reference the ones that are there."

Okay. Any other additions? Are there any other additions or changes that we need to make to this before we can just kind of combine it back in?

James Bladel: Well, we're just pending some additional language from Michael, Olof and Kevin.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, let's work at basis.

James Bladel: Work on the list.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so that looked - let's move this forward. We can add this as - as soon as that - as soon as anything from anybody else is forthcoming, it can be added on, but the actual document we have here as it stands should be okay, if you know what I mean.

If that kind of makes sense. Okay. Now, let's see - what do we want second. Sorry, my head's all over the place. Today being shoot - today being Tuesday, after a bank holiday in Ireland, it feels like Monday.

Okay. The identification thing, we're going to have a follow up on that on the list from Kevin.

And on the Issue D, the recommendations when a lock is used. Does anybody have any thoughts on this at present?

Marika Konings: (Michele) this Marika. Would you like me to pull up the draft of the initial report, so people can see what is there for the different issues...

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Marika Konings: ...at the moment?

Michele Neylon: Yes, that would be very helpful. Thank you Marika.

Man: Michele could you repeat exactly where we are again? I apologize I got lost.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, I've been jumping around the place a little bit. It was in relation to the Issue D on locking.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Issue D is covered on Page 27 and 28. And if you look at the preliminary conclusions, there is one suggestion there that was discussed in relation to the public comments received which doesn't specifically address the charter question, but was raised and that was one of the suggestions that were made by the working group at that point.

Michele Neylon: I'm just trying to view this.

Marika Konings: I can put things in document, if you want everyone...

Michele Neylon: No, good - I was just trying to - oh, okay. Could you just increase the magnif - oh you've let it again. All right. Go on.

Okay, so for example, we have the - there's a couple of things here, readily and reasonable,...blah, blah, blah. Okay, so what, I mean, do people have any other thoughts on this at this time?

Marika Konings: This is Marika again. There's one - as you'll see in the text, one of the ideas that was discussed in relation to this issue, is while this is including of messages in relation to the status value, what we discussed with Scott Hollenbeck.

And we haven't drafted a specific recommendation around that, but that might be an area where if you had discussion and I think there was welcome support and possibly exploring that further to make it clearer what, you know, it would imply with a certain status value and might help us more clarify to registrants what a lock status means or how they can actually go about unlocking it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, I'm going to take my hat and chair off for a moment. Because personally, as a registrar and also as a registrant, I would find it very helpful if when somebody does a WHOIS look up on a domain name, I can know with certitude whether the domain is locked, be that internally at the registrar level, at the registry level, or whatever, for whatever reasons.

If there's a lock of any kind, I should be able to see that in WHOIS. I shouldn't have to wait to be told afterwards that the registrar has some internal procedure or process or whatever.

But the problem at the moment, as I understand it, is that the current policy restricts the use of a lock, so that if, for example, I as a registrar wanted to

restrict a transfer due to a number of valid reasons, I couldn't do so by putting a lock flag.

I'd have to knock the transfer request. If I didn't do it that way, I could run it full fowl of David.

And I think this is something that needs to be looked at. Chris put up his hand in agreement, so at least somebody agrees with me.

Does anybody disagree with me?

Okay. Nobody disagrees with me. And welcome Matt. Nice to see you're on the call, as well.

Okay. So I'll throw something. I throw an email to the list about what I think and then you can all argue with me about it.

Okay then. The readily to the issue - let's think about readily accessible reasonable means. This has come up a few times within, both within this working group and elsewhere, I think.

Do we need to define that and how clearly do we need to define this?

Does anybody have any thoughts on that? Okay Matt and then Marika. Or let Marika go first, since she's a lady.

Matt Mansell: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Marika go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Thanks for that. Just a note, I think in the context of discussion around the same terms and in other working groups, some suggestions were made that in just trying to define what, you know, clearly and readily available means,

the working group might as well consider giving examples of, you know, what it means and what it doesn't mean, 'cause maybe, you know, a definition might be difficult, or as well difficult to enforce.

And I guess there, maybe the questions are for David, what kind of clarification would help the compliance team in, you know, deciding whether it fits the criteria or not.

Michele Neylon: Well, just as David is here. David what do you understand it to mean?

David Giza: Well, unfortunately, it's a bit of a legal interpretation. You know, reasonable is, different - there are different points of view on what's reasonable.

And so, I think, having examples, to Marika's point, would probably be the best approach, because if I were take this into ICANN Legal, I think they would resist the notion of trying to lock down definition around readily, accessible and reasonable.

And essentially, leave it open for interpretation, through the business conduct of the parties.

So, I would favor the idea of some examples and use that, as sort of the least restrictive approach in terms of getting, you know, some clarity on this phrase.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt.

Matt Mansell: Yeah, thanks Michele. I was actually - that's pretty much what I was going to say, and that, you know, maybe instead of defining readily and reasonable that we give some examples, such as, you know, using a Web interface or calling into a customer support line.

And also, give some time frames too. Like, you know, a registrant should expect that a lock would be removed within, you know, 24 hours, for example, or something like that, just to give the folks reading this some idea of what, at least, this group thinks readily and reasonable might mean.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Do any of you have any - what can I say- any kind of examples, in - that you can think of, that you would be able to share? You don't have to answer that immediately.

What I'm saying, is if you could share them with the list, this would be very, very helpful. So that's - if anybody has any suggestions. I'll - I'm going to pop an email to the list shortly afterwards with a couple of things that I want to be asking you all to share with everybody else.

So just even your whatever suggestions, would be welcome. Yes Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's not a comment on this issue. So, anyone wants to comment on that, they should go first.

Michele Neylon: Go on Marika. They're all being very shy this afternoon.

Marika Konings: Yeah, 'cause we've now moved onto Issue E and I just wanted to point out as well, that there the working group did consider some new language that was proposed by the registry stakeholder group. So I'm just wondering if that language needs further review and whether that's support for putting it forward as a recommendation or you know, with - 'cause I know there was some concern, I thinking, for - in relationship with time frame that was proposed in that language.

So, the question is, does the group want to look further at that or you know, look at the original language and see if there's any way of you know, clarifying that or, what's the question.

Michele Neylon: This is the bit you've got in red on the - on that piece there, yes?

Marika Konings: On Page 28 at the bottom.

Michele Neylon: Right. Well okay. I - one thing I would suggest there, instead of calendar days, that it be working days, that's just me.

Man: Yeah, I'd agree with that.

Michele Neylon: Now, I know that there would be differences between working days between countries and everything else, but just to say, for argument sake, that yesterday was a bank holiday here in Ireland. I think last Friday would have been a public holiday in a lot of European countries.

And you know, Semana Santa in Spain, that's a complete write off. You know, depending on the country, where I'd prefer working days as opposed to calendar days. That's just my own personal preference and you can all reject it or accept it or otherwise.

Marika you still have you hand up?

Marika Konings: Oh sorry. No, I'll take that down. But, so you - you are supporting the rest of the language as put forward or it is something that maybe I should put again to the mailing list, so people can comment on it in that way?

Michele Neylon: Well, I wouldn't -whatever you're more comfortable with, but I mean, I think people - we need to - okay, I'll put it this way. If you could just post that snip as a text to the list and if anybody has any strong feelings about it one way or the other, let them make those feelings known on the list as soon as possible.

Marika Konings: Okay, I can put it together then with the current language, so people can, you know, see where the difference lies. And is there agreement to change the calendar date to business days, or I change that already?

Michele Neylon: Well, I would say working days, not business days.

Marika Konings: Oh sorry. Working days.

Michele Neylon: That's me personally. I think - does anybody disagree with that change?

Man: Yeah, Michele, the only thing that I would ask is maybe for David to comment. Does that run contrary to what other language states about working or calendar days?

David Giza: It doesn't matter if it does. The short answer is no. I think five working days would work in this instance.

Man: All right.

David Giza: I mean, I'm 110% behind it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody oppose this? Does anybody have an issue with this? You're not going to suddenly turn around and throw a standard of works makes three days?

Come on. Now's the time. Say something. No. Okay. Fine.

Nobody's rejecting that, so we can change it to five working days Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay. I'll add that to the list in combination with the current language so people can provide their input on whether they would like to put that forward as a recommendation for change to the consensus policy from this group.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Barbara?

Barbara Steele: Hi. Sorry right. I just had a quick question with regards to the working days. Is there some place that you can easily get a list of what are working days in the various countries? Because I anticipate that registry operators may very well get complaints regarding this and to the extent that they do, obviously, you know, registry operators are dealing with registrars all around the world.

And so, it would just be, from an administrative standpoint, easier if we had something to reference to let us know what are working days in whatever country that has jurisdiction over the domain name.

Michele Neylon: Well, timeanddate.com, I think has - is a pretty good reference.

David Giza: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

David Giza: Yeah, just a suggestion for Barbara. If she anticipates that that might be a source of confusion, some country codes and other businesses will request that we send them our holiday calendar that we observe. And so perhaps, you know, rather than verifying taking on the burden of that task, maybe if it were sent out to your registrars and ask them to submit the calendar that they observe.

Barbara Steele: Okay. Good suggestion. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: James you have your hand up to that - do you have anything else to add?

James Bladel: I'm lowering it as fast as I can.

Michele Neylon: Ah James you don't have to paranoid. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Hey just because you're paranoid, mean we're coming after you. Thanks Michele. Let - you know, it just seems to me it's going to be kind of

administratively cumbersome for everybody to feed the registries what their calendar, their holiday calendars are.

And maybe just another tack for this, what if you change the - go back to calendar days, but pick a number that's big enough that it would basically have the same affect of five working days at a minimum. You know, throw it back to, I don't know, ten calendar days, so that way you don't have to worry about weekends and a long weekend because of some holiday and all the rest.

I just - I can't imagine ourselves feeding all the various registry operators, "Here's the calendar that we follow", and more importantly the registries, you know, trying to make heads or tails of that when you've got hundreds upon hundreds of registrars.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else have anything to say? No. Okay. Noted. I disagree with you Paul, I - but noted.

Let's - oh Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: Well, since you made that comment, I'll say that that sounds - I agree with Paul. It sounds like a reasonable accommodation.

Michele Neylon: The reason I disagree, is that if we're making the thing - if we're making the period longer than it's probably not helping the registrant too much. That's the only reason that I would have an issue with it.

I prefer the idea of the shorter period. And Marika than Matt.

Marika Konings: This is in regard - I just wanted to suggest that I can put both options in the email and ask for people's feedback on that. And I mean, if there's no clear support for either or from the working group, there's always an option of putting that back as well to the community and suggest the two options and

see what feedback is received and, you know, decide in the second phase of this working group or try to find a compromise in the second phase of the working group on, you know, which time frame to pick.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks. Matt.

Matt Mansell: Yeah, it's a good idea Marika. I think I, in principle, would agree with Paul, but I'd also agree with Michele in that I think ten days is way too long, so I think if we were going to keep it as calendar days, I would actually vote for making it shorter, so something like three calendar days.

But I agree, if you make it ten, you know, then that doesn't serve the registrants at all, I think they'd love that.

Michele Neylon: I mean, let's - okay, look, I have my view, other people have their views. Let - if Marika puts both wordings there, then maybe we'll have - I mean, there's no reason why we can't have a kind of a - what's the word, a split- what the hell would you call this, a split decision. There's a proper word for that, which I can't find at the moment.

Paul Diaz and then Michael Collins.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. And I just wanted to emphasize, I'm in absolute agreement with you that a shorter time frame. I was merely suggesting to remove any sort of administrative burden that could become realistically an issue later on.

You know, if the goal is to push, now we're talking perhaps three calendar days, versus five working days, whatever the number is, I agree, you know, push it down, but just the idea of going back to calendar days was just to avoid the administrative confusion.

I mean, hell we can't - we still can't get, you know, time straight scheduling these meetings. I can't only imagine how many mistakes or - how much

confusion there will be when we try and factor in, the holidays throughout the world.

That was the only suggestion. I through ten out as a number just to make sure that you would have that five working days, that you'd initially mentioned. If you want to push it down, by all means. That's fine by us.

Michele Neylon: That's cool. Michael.

Michael Collins: Well, I think that Paul may have just helped me out, but I wanted to clarify that my support of Paul's statement, was I thought he was using ten as an example, not the - stating the - I mean, the amount of days.

But that, just in general, working with calendar days is going to be simplest. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Matt do you have anything else to add?

Matt Mansell: No. Sorry. I'm all right.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I can about the paranoia. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, Chris speaking. Just reminding all, remember everybody, that the holidays, the working days holidays are not national, they're also regional and local.

And we can quite easily get four calendar days, holiday in a run, if we go Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. So it's just a reminder on that point.

And then it does occur to me, whether one might choose a registrar based on the number of - the calendar that they might publish or publish on their Web site and whether they have four days in a run at any point.

Michele Neylon: That's an interesting question. I mean, okay, how - let's just say, for example, if we were to, is there any way we could word it that would exclude Saturday and Sunday?

But then it just - then what you do is, Friday a working day in Israel, or is that which day - or is their Saturday. I can never remember. Or is that even possible?

Chris do you have any thoughts on that?

Chris Chaplow: Well, we have weekday and weekend, don't we? That's how we define it in the West. I mean, I tend to like working day and I initially agreed with you, but I'm just conscious if we're talking of three calendar days, we can go over that, with that under the four. You come back on a rich chunk. You come back on Monday morning and find it's all over now.

Michele Neylon: True. Okay. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. I'm kind of sorry I opened this can of worms, but I believe we're over thinking this. I mean, if there's a possibility of a four day weekend somewhere, why not just say calendar days?

Worse case that means, you know, a registrar's going to have one working day after such a long holiday to deal with it. Too bad. It is, what it is.

And you know, the five calendar days, realistically is going to mean three working days at a minimum for - in most circumstances. You know, factoring in weekends and what not.

I - my whole goal, was just to try to simplify this and I think we're kind of getting a little down in the weeds.

Michele Neylon: But this is an ICANN working group. How could you possibly suggest that an ICANN working group would get tangled up.

I'm shocked Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, but Michele this is one of the functional ones. Let's just get through it.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, couldn't resist that. Chris you still have your hand up.

Chris Chaplow: Sorry. It's not up. No, I'll take it down.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. Okay, I think we are probably getting a little bit bogged down on this.

Let's get some - let's put something on the list and then we can somehow - we have some kind of compromise that everybody's happy with. I'm not - that's fine. Let's just move forward.

Does anybody else have any strong feelings on that section? No.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just went off the point, is I know that, I think Mikey has - isn't on the call and then - it's just been in the last week, as I think he's busy with the BI working group.

But as a chair of the (Mile)'s working group, I actually asked him for - to provide some feedback on - to the group on what that group actually discussed.

I know they've passed the ball, you know, forward and didn't deal with the issue, but they did discuss it in great detail.

So I'll ping him again to see if there's anything else he would like to share in that regard, you know, just to make sure that we - he didn't forget anything about what they may have discussed and covered in that working group.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Perfect. Thank you Marika. All right. So, okay. So, just looking at the different issues. Well, excuse me.

We haven't got any conclusions though, for any of the issues. Do we need to get conclusions at this stage Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it would be good to, if not conclusions, have options.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: I mean, are you looking at the last chapter or are you looking at just the individual...

Michele Neylon: I'm looking at the individual issue that's...

Marika Konings: Yes, I think it would be good, because that's probably the main focal point of the community, what they'll be looking for and wanting to comment on. So, if - to me, if we kind of come to agreement on preliminary conclusions, you know, it might just - it might be helpful all we spot is options and get into it on those.

Or, you know, the conclusion might be as well, like you know, the working group doesn't see any recommendations they would like to make at this stage.

I mean, that's - you know, a recommendation...

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...our conclusion as such as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So let's stay with - say for example, with Issue A, as a preliminary conclusion there, can we just say we are suggesting or recommending our new process?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So we have something for Issue A. Okay. So Issue A we have something, so we can move forward on that one. So for Issue - I'm sorry, this thing is scrolling and the Adobe's taking forever.

Okay. So Issue A we're good. Now, the disputes between registrants and admin contacts.

Marika Konings: On Issue B, there is a - I'll put it up shortly, 'cause James sent some suggestions, I think, there to the list on an email trying to get discussion started.

But if you look here at Page 25, one of the other possible recommendations that were raised, I think, some time ago, is whether the group wants to recommend a PDP to require WHOIS was one of the issues, ideas.

I think Mikey was spearheading that effort or that suggestion that at some point in time. But that's an idea...

Michele Neylon: Okay. All right. So let's - okay, let's say for - a preliminary - something just to put in there in the conclusion section. This - we are considering the option of a PDP to require, I think, WHOIS, for all GTLDs.

Would that be a fair summary?

Does anybody have a - is anybody opposed to putting that in as a consideration as conclusion for option, for Issue B?

James.

James Bladel: So we're selecting options now, or are we testing for consensus on the options that we have?

Michele Neylon: Well, I'm just kind of putting in - I'm just trying to do - Is I want - if we can put something in the preliminary conclusion section for each of the issues, even it's it not something fully - what's the best word, I'm trying to think of the - something which is fully worked out, but just - rather than looking at kind of Issue A, we have something Issue B, we have something Issue C - we don't, but we should have something in there.

James Bladel: I'm not opposed to putting it on the table for discussion, but I think that, when it comes time to actually deliberate the issue, I would have quite to bit to say on that. So...

Michele Neylon: Okay.

James Bladel: I was just curious as to where we - you know, what we were - what our objective was for this call. So...

Probably just looking to capture it and put it on the table, then I'm fine with that.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, I'm just looking - I'm just looking at the draft report James, I'm just going to go right. There's the sections with TBD...

James Bladel: Right.

Michele Neylon: ...in there, which is a bit kind of, you know, - after how many months of telephone calls, if all we can manage is a TBD, then that's a bit strange.

Michael Collins.

Michael Collins: Yes, I wanted to add to that possibly, at least as the option, that the benefit would be that if we had a thick registry, we might also be able to require a secure method for a gaining registrar to acquire the registrant's contact information, so that we could eliminate the admin contact, as a - someone who can approve the contract - the transfer.

I think if we could eliminate having two different parties that could initiate a transfer, and then - but only party has ultimately got the final say, I think, it would make this more secure.

My understanding is, that today, because the gaining registrar, we don't really have a good means for the gaining registrar to securely acquire the registrant contact information. We can't implement that, but I think we had a thick registry that it might be possible.

Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any other thoughts on this thick WHOIS stuff?

No. Okay. Issue C is something...

Marika Konings: Could you hold on a second. There was an email from James to the list, I think, as well, trying to take some discussion. I'm just pulling it up and...

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...James has got a position, to indicate if there was resolve relating to comments of some of recommendations or conclusions.

James Bladel: This is James speaking. Just for context, this was a response to discussions or an exchange that Michael and I had on a call back in early April, April 6, I

believe, where we were kind of - you know, I felt Michael maybe you can correct me.

I felt we were kind of talking past each other a little bit, because we were reading the question differently in what we were trying to resolve and I think that, you know, I was trying to take a - kind of narrower literal approach to what the question was asking, where I think Michael was touching on a broader issue.

Michael Collins: Yeah, I would agree that we were trying to do two different things with this.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm looking at that email there.

James Bladel: Yeah, I can summarize Michele real quickly, so that we don't have to read it. I apologize that we went on a little bit here, but I think, I was trying to address the standardization of procedure of how to implement when a registrant overrules an admin contact and you know, what - whether or not, that could be uniform between registrars who all have their kind of, their own internal procedures to implement that.

Whereas, Michael, I think, was discussing and jump in here, if I'm wrong, Michael was just kind of discussing the problems that are encountered because there are two separate entities or could be two separate entities that are empowered to enact transfers, to be the transfer contact, but only - but one prevailed in any kind of a dispute.

And so, he was kind of talking more of the abstract level of the issues that that presented, where I was looking more of the, you know, practical - how to implement the changes without really looking at why those disputes arise in the first place.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Paul Diaz: I just follow up with, that if I could, I would say this to Michael, I would say that that's correct, but I - and I think that my goal was to try and avoid the potential disputes between a registrant and an admin contact, as opposed to enabling a procedure to resolve them.

Because, I think, that the inter-registrar transfer is often used in the after market as a proof of control of domain name and essentially proof of ownership.

And that gives the admin contact that control when they might, not in fact, be authorized to sell a domain name or transfer control of domain name.

That's all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks Michael and just, you know, going kind of a little bit further into the email, I think, that you know, one way to at least, you know, take a stab at this issue, would be you know, do we continue with this process, where an IRTP can be initiated by both the admin and the technical contact?

Certainly, the ability to dispose of an asset would indicate that one has control over it. But, I think that, you know, Michael's correct as dispose of problems in the secondary market.

One idea that I threw out there, you know, at the bottom, is - could this just be as simple as establishing that the AC can transfer the name, but only registrants can effect a change of control, whether that's to the same registrar or in conjunction with an inter-registrar transfer.

You know, is this already understood in the existing policy, but there's a perception problem that we need to close the gap on? I don't - you know, I

just wanted to put that out there as one possible remedy that we may be talking about a gap in perception.

Michele Neylon: Sorry James, just before I left, Michael. Go ahead, could you clarify what you mean by change of control?

Do you mean, about talking about an update to the registrant?

James Bladel: Well, I'm trying to - I'm sorry, for clarification, I'm trying to just draw the distinction between a change of control, like change of registrant, versus maintaining the same registrant admin technical and billing contact, but simply moving the name to a new registrar.

Essentially, what the IRTP was designed to do. If we were to say, for example, preserve the ability of the admin contact to maintain control ownership contacts, whatever, but simply move the name from one registrar to another, but reserve any change of control events, whether that's a change of account at one registrar or a change of control in conjunction with a transfer or what we will call in the country code world, we would call it a trade, that only the registrant can affect a trade.

And I think that that would get to the heart of Michael's, what I perceive to be Michael's concern, which is that there's this blurry aspect of control here, or this divided control and that two parties who could be different can dispose of the name.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I think I understand what you're talking about.

Michael.

Michael Collins: Yes, thank you. I think that that would probably solve it, as well as, the alternate method that we've discussed, but forgive me, but wouldn't that still require possibly a thick registry, 'cause I'm not sure that the - that contact

information is passed with the domain name, the registrant's information is that passed with the domain name transfer in a thin registry?

I'm not sure.

Michele Neylon: No.

James Bladel: No.

Michele Neylon: 'Cause that's one thing I was going to mention James. I mean, I understand where you're coming from, but I can see how you could easily end up accidentally or on - or intentionally, depending on your technical implementation, with making significant changes to the registrant data, simply because of your implementation of EPP.

And it wouldn't even be intentional, if for it - for within registries. You wouldn't it with thick, but for thin ones you would, if that makes sense.

Anyway, okay.

James Bladel: Oh yes - you know, this gets back to, I think, the initial question, which is, what is this charter question, you know, attempting to uncover?

Because I think that what Michael has raised, is an important issue and it's a large issue, but you know, was it the intention of the charter to be -to take a more narrow view and how wide spread of a change do we want to recommend here?

I think if there's an opportunity to simply and efficiently resolve the larger problem, we should take a look at that. But if you know, if it's going to drag us into some intractable issues, like WHOIS, and thick versus thin, then I would hate to see this question, you know, receive no attention, because it's just -

it's, you know, its fate is chained to some of those issues that have been an impasse for years.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody have any other thoughts on this? David.

David Giza: No really, at this point, I - you know, I think we've exhausted the debate. You know, I think, James is onto something here in terms of his suggested course of action.

But beyond that, I really have nothing more to add.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Guys, it's coming - it's top of the hour, so okay - Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is the time - I was just hoping that maybe James would be willing to think a little bit more about it and maybe put forward like a proposal or a recommendation, no - option that could be included for further discussion in the report, as well to get some, you know, input from the community on this train of thought?

James Bladel: Sure are you - I couldn't escape without an action item, so I will take that.

Michele Neylon: I would also, - it would also be helpful if Michael or whoever else if they have any other thoughts on this, to you know, throw their hat into the ring as well, just so we have...

James Bladel: Actually I would be really - I would suggest, perhaps Michael and I can work on this offline and send something back to the list, that way we - where we can hammer out the different ideas and make sure that we're looking at that in the same way.

We don't repeat from the same thing that originally kicked off this discussion.

Michael Collins: I'll be happy any way I can.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So basically, you're taking ownership of this. You guys caused this, you can fix this.

Fine. That's okay. No argument from me on that one guys. Right. As we've reached the end of the hour, I'm going to call it a day.

I think it's got - look if we can please try to use the mailing list and just, you know, make - just you know, question things, put forward suggestions. If something's not clear, you know, throw it in there.

Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this Marika. 'Cause I think the only issue we didn't cover, is Issue C and I'm - that I just wanted to encourage everyone to look at Matt's email and start a conversation as well on some of the suggestions he made in that email.

Michele Neylon: And yes James, I am retired, so - and you're going to have to deal with this.

If you're feeling oppressed, stand up and run me over with your stupidly large car or something.

James Bladel: Oh, you're a benevolent dictator.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, well, you know. And no guys, if you just please, you know, put your thoughts into the - onto the mailing list. I mean, those of you who are new to the group, don't be afraid, just throw your ideas out there.

The worse thing that can happen, is that somebody might disagree with you.

Well, I presume we're all meeting again next week. If there's anybody has any issues with the meeting next week, please you know, let us know and just try to keep discussing it on the list.

And I'll speak to you all next week.

Man: Well thank Michele.

Marika Konings: Thanks Michele.

Man: All right. Bye.

Man: Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye, bye.

END