

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 05 April 2011 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 05 April 2011 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-20110405-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG Chair

Robert Mountain - Registrar SG

James Bladel - Registrar SG

Berry Cobb - CBUC

Chris Chaplow – CBUC

Paul Diaz - Registrar SG

Mikey O'Connor - CBUC

Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG Rob Golding – RrSG Baudoin Schombe – At Large

Staff:

Marika Konings

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies: Oliver Hope - Registrar SG

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Barbara Steele – Registries SG

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Anil George – IPC

Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Coordinator: And this call is now being recorded. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon everyone. This is the IRTPB call on the 5th of April. On the call we have Mikey O'Connor, Michele Neylon, James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Paul Diaz, Simonetta Batteiger, Bob Mountain. And first off we have Marika Konings and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

We are waiting for Baudouin Shombe who is on another call to join us. And we have apologies from Anil George, Kevin Erdman, Barbara Steele, Matt Serlin.

Now I'll ask you to say your name before you speak for the transcription. Thank you very much and over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Good afternoon everybody and welcome back to IRTP Part B, the most exciting working group within the GNSO. Drum roll please Mikey. As per usual, I must ask, does anybody have an update to their statement of interest or an expression of interest, conflict, whatever the - whatever that's called? Going once, going twice. Okay, no takers. Fine.

We were sent an email within the last couple of days about some changes in relation to the inner workings of the GNSO stuff. Marika, is there anything in that that we need to be particularly careful of because to be particularly honest, I haven't had a chance to read it.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the main thing to take notice of is that the different labels for a level of consensus differs slightly from what was originally in our charter. So I think that something, you know, when the time comes when we get back to the recommendations and look at the different level of consensus might need to have a look at that and see which labels apply.

I think for the rest, working group guidance basically qualified existing practice, providing further detail as well from (disparate) resolution mechanisms. I guess there's disagreement between working group members and the chair or the liaison and working group members.

There're different steps that can be followed so - in that respect and we encourage people to review it but I think the most important thing for the workers - working group is doing is the different level or labels for the different levels of consensus that we'll need to record in our final report.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any questions or queries related to this? Nothing. Perfectly clear? Okay moving on. Right then, the public comment period is now closed and Marika, as with her new shiny title of senior policy director, has put together a summary for us of the comments received.

We didn't receive that many, to be perfectly honest. We received - how many were there? Six or something? There was...

Marika Konings: There were seven.

Michele Neylon: ...one, two, three, four - seven, sorry. I missed one. Okay so ALAC, the BC, the registries, the registrars, Internet Commerce Association, the trademark people, INTA and the registrars (or as I) always say that and...

Man: GoDaddy.

Michele Neylon: And GoDaddy. Hello GoDaddy. Good afternoon. How are you? We won't make any comments. Anyway, right then. So Marika sent around the summary of comments to you all yesterday at some point during the day, depending on where you are based. It was sent by you, James, so it's - it - we're going to blame you for it whether - regardless. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I didn't have a chance yet to put the different comment into a table format which we used in the previous one of comments to, you know, for review and capturing in that way as well the responses of the working group to each of their different comments.

And my question is that your working group members saying that's used for when I can prepare that for the next call so, you know, you can use that as a way of going through to different comments and responding to each of those.

Michele Neylon: Well, okay the question I suppose is this - is that are we going to need to do a huge amount of analysis of these comments? I mean, are - is there a lot of pushback in the comments that we need to address?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If you can see in the comments, I mean, the bulk of the comments relate to recommendation one as that was as well the area where we asked specific input and, you know, feedback on a number of questions. So I think that's where most of the work still, you know, lines I had and, you know, the working group I think is conscientious of that as well as that was one of the items where we made the, you know, basic recommendation where we didn't go really into the details.

I think for some of the other items, it's probably more a question of, you know, recognizing the comments and, you know, there's some small points that people made that, you know, the working group might want to consider or, you know, certain clarifications might want to be added to some of the recommendations.

But I said, I think the main work lies in item one and it might be helpful to have that in the table format so, you know, it can be easily tracked and I think we are trying to use a way of, you know, recognizing comments received and being able to provide those submitted comments a way as well to track what was actually done with our comments and showing that the working group that look at those and that, you know, reviewed them in detail.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mr. Bladel, good afternoon. You have your hand up.

James Bladel: Good morning thanks Michele. This is James speaking. And I think that this is kind of a - builds on what Marika was mentioning about the public comments but I was also thinking about some of the questions received during the interaction with the community and then also with the council update that you presented on the weekend before San Francisco.

And it just - it seems to me that the general themes are that we need to, one, identify the level of consensus for all these recommendations and I think that we understand them to be widely supported if not unanimous.

But then, two, a lot of these were not necessarily receiving pushbacks but just more - requests for more detail, more elaborate, more specific recommendations with, you know, some - perhaps some implementation details. So it seems like, you know, from where I'm coming from it seems like that's what our task is before us between now and the cutoff for Singapore.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And we're getting lots of expressions of report from - of support for this from Mikey and Paul. So what would be the suggestion moving forward today then James?

James Bladel: Well, what - one proposal might be to flush out item number one based on the feedback that we specifically requested and received. And then next task might be to go through each of the remaining recommendations and make a determination of whether or not that is still work that remains for this group or if that's work that we're recommending it'll be taken out by a subsequent working group or drafting team or implementation team or whatever.

And then, you know, put levels of consensus on all of the recommendations and then wrap it up and deliver it to council.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Anybody else have any other comments at this time? Don't all rush.

Chris Chaplow: Chris here Michele.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Sorry. I just joined late. There was also a request by (Christina) and council if I remember correctly, for us to prioritize in some way the list of recommendations I think. Wasn't that correct?

Michele Neylon: Yes. Well, she did ask about that. I mean, the only thing that - well that kind of threw me because I didn't really view what we were doing as being a set - something that you could break into kind of priorities. Personally I couldn't see how you could do that.

But that's just me. I mean, if somebody else has some input on that please feel free.

Chris Chaplow: Well we had no intention to prioritize in what we'd done and people weren't picking it up as number one ahead of number two and three.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: So (it could possibly be) picking something up that we hadn't intended but we'd been asked to do it so maybe we could give it a go. And if we can't do it then say that we haven't done it or something.

Michele Neylon: Well maybe I suppo- I've got a queue building up here. I mean, the last thing I'll say on this before I go to the queue is this. You know, the reason why we hadn't done it from my perspective was that we - it wasn't really an issue. It was not like we're kind of going o- we were asked to deal with specific queries. It's not like we're kind of inventing something kind of new and - or something. I don't know. I'll take Marika then James then Berry.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just know that I'll try as well in the table and to capture the comments that were made during the council session as well as the public session and I'll look at my notes and then, of course, others are welcome to add to that.

On the issue of prioritization, I think there is something the working group might want to consider, is in - for those items that are requiring for the work by the community and the council such as - I think there at least two or three requests for issue reports.

That is where the councils may want to express a preference or indicate to the council like if you have to do, you know, pick between these three items. We would suggest that you start first with that one and then that one and that one, taking into account, you know, that the current workload situation on the council level that, you know, it's unlikely that they'll be able to take all of those issues on at the same time.

But I agree that from the perspective of those items that move to implementation, there seems to be less sense of - or usefulness and prioritize in those because those are basically passed on to, you know, staff for implementation and that just takes its course and they might identify that, you know, more time or less time is needed.

But I think they normally are done in, you know, the most expedient way as possible.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James and then Berry.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Michele. This is James speaking and I'll be brief. I think I'm agreeing with what Marika said. We really only need to prioritize those items that require follow on work and I think that there was either mistaken or perhaps we implied that, you know, by the order we presented the recommendations that that was our preference of level of consensus but we just need to be clear that they're being presented in the order that they appeared in the charter and leave it at that. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Berry. Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Michele. This is Berry. Just to carry on with what Marika and James said, I definitely support some sort of prioritization. In fact, you know, I think what we're starting to experience from the thought out of RAP is that the council is looking for much more of a prescriptive case on how a lot of this should be implemented.

And better yet, I think the more prescriptive we are as to what should be moving forward and how it should move forward, the better chance it has of getting implemented in a much more expedient way.

We're competing with a lot of other work out there. You know, we in this working group are the experts with respect to these recommendations and when they get passed up to the next level, some of that seems to get watered down.

So anyway, again, I think Mikey can back me up with this. The more prescriptive we are in how we present these recommendations to the council, the better chance it has of getting implemented in a much more expedient way.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Anybody else? No? Okay then, right. Okay so Marika's going to do up one of those little table things. And she's going to try and put in there already what - some of the comments that we've received from - during the public meetings in San Francisco.

We agree that with respect to those items - and please correct me if I get this wrong - for those items that don't need extra studies or whatever that they'll just go to implementation and that we are to prioritize the ones that need further work. Is that correct? Have I kind of summarized that correctly or does somebody agree - disagree with me? No disagreements? Okay then.

Now looking at the comments that we have received, the bulk of them seem to be in relation to the emergency action channel. So since I'm Irish and properly quite illogical, I think we should come back to that.

Item number five I put on the agenda for today was to discuss the approach, further refinement of that but since received so many comments in relation to it, I think we'll take that off the agenda because it's actually on the agenda indirectly.

Now in terms of timelines, Marika, what's the final date that we would have to have something if we were trying to put this to bed by Singapore?

Marika Konings: I don't - this is Marika. I believe the publication deadline for Singapore is the 30th of May but I think taking into account that this actually will go to the council and it's not a document that will be available for, you know, public review or public discussion, I'm actually assuming that the eight day publication deadline applies.

I think earlier would be better because I think if we only submitted eight days in advance of the public meeting that the council has in Singapore I think it's likely that a deferral might be requested as stakeholder groups and constituencies will need time to review and discuss the comments or the report.

So I think it might be better to stick to maybe the 30 May deadline to give the council as well as the constituencies and stakeholder groups sufficient time to review the recommendations and have it on the agenda then for the council meeting in Singapore.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And what's the meeting before that? When...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) you have the calendar at hand. Okay, I'll quickly look it up. Basically for any normal calen- for any normal GNSO meeting, the deadline is eight days in advance of a meeting taking place.

I would actually - to double check that because I think there's some additional requirements if it concerns policy recommendations, so.

Glen DeSaintgery: Which meeting are you looking at Marika? The May...

Marika Konings: The one before Singapore.

Glen DeSaintgery: The one before Singapore will be the 9th of June. And the document deadline is 1 June.

Michele Neylon: Okay so the 30th of May.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) to confirm was there a different deadline in relation to documents that concerns, you know, policy related votes. I recall some kind of difference that they had on policy decisions or issues.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, I don't think there was a decision made on that. There was talk of it.

Marika Konings: I'll double check on that and if it's different I'll send a note to the (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay so we're looking at the end of May basically if we want to get it in for the last GNSO meeting before Singapore.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Michele Neylon: Is that correct ladies?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Ladies and gentlemen of - members of the working group, is there anybody on here who feels strongly that we will not be able to make that deadline at this juncture? So are we all feeling optimistic? Mikey, are you feeling optimistic?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, that's a - I'm always optimistic so that doesn't work.

Michele Neylon: Bob, are you optimistic?

Bob Mountain: Absolutely.

Michele Neylon: Good, good. I love the way he says that with, you know, totally - he's unflappable. Paul, are you feeling optimistic?

Paul Diaz: Yes, come on Michele. Let's get going.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Right then. All right then, so can we - so let's see. It's 20 past 3:00 today. So let's see if we can actually get through some of the comments that we've received in relation to the other recommendations or are there any other matters that somebody wants to raise as a matter of urgency today? Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, this is sort of a process thing but, you know, it might be easier to just write a draft of the emergency action channel stuff based on the comments plus sort of common sense that probably flows mostly from registrars and registries so that, you know, we've got a draft to work from.

And, you know, I don't know who should write it but it does seem like rather than stepping through the comments sort of one at a time it might be easier just to sort of have a person or a small group go off and punch out a draft for us to review.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so you're volunteering for that, are you Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I could do it if...

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...nobody else (bids for it).

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's one volunteer. Would somebody else like to volunteer to help Mikey with this?

James Bladel: This is James. I'll volunteer.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey, James, thank you. So you'll be able to report back to us - you'll have something ready before the next meeting?

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Sure.

Michele Neylon: Perfect.

Mikey O'Connor: The rednecks strike again.

Michele Neylon: Well it's - we finally found a use for you. So I think this is a good thing. You still have your hand up Mikey. Anything else on that matter?

Mikey O'Connor: No, sorry.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. Right. Can we move on to reviewing the other comments which are not related to the emergency action channel? Right then. Charter question recommendation 2. The registry G - reg -- oh God, I can't speak, sorry -- the RYSG -- okay there you go -- notes that most of the registries

agree with this recommendation. ALAC recognized the importance of registrant education of the ALAC and at-large, may be considered one of the possible channels for the implementation of this recommendation.

The BC also notes support for corrective approach and offers its support for developing and promoting best practices in this area. Okay, do we need to no- to do anything further here rather than just to note these and thank them for their support? Is there anything else we need to say to them? Deathly silence.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Too slow on the trigger. I think that we might want to go just one step further and place a burden on the ALAC and the BC to get going on this. You know, I think thanks is great but I don't know exactly the process. And maybe this is a question for Marika and Glen. If we are, as a working group, saying to a couple of stakeholder groups we accept your offer and want you to get started, how do we go about doing that in this report?

James Bladel: This is James. One suggestion would be we, you know, give them some specifics of, you know, how they might start that in process and then also may tie dates to the follow up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I like that. So anyway, I - you know, I think we might want to...

Michele Neylon: Marika has also got here hand up there Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Sorry.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think at the same time we probably need to (change their) comments. I might - there are other groups or constituencies or stakeholder groups that might be involved in this effort. So just because maybe the ALAC and BC specifically expressed an interest in doing it, so I

think we should be wary as well in just tasking these two groups and taking care of it.

But, you know, maybe recognize that, you know, there is already an interest from these groups and, you know, maybe call that in saying these groups, you know, are waiting to take this forward but recognizing as well that of course it shouldn't be a closed effort and others who are interested should be able to join as well.

Michele Neylon: All right. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm a little uncomfortable just leaving it at that because, you know, this is sort of like there's...

Michele Neylon: Well how about...

Mikey O'Connor: ...no to-do item assigned. I'd like us to assign somebody to actually do something by a date and...

Michele Neylon: Okay how about then - okay here's a silly suggestion, just a silly suggestion, that maybe the - we could follow up with the ch- ask the chairs of the - those respective groups to come back to us with actionable follow up items or something. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's in our brief to say to the groups that have already volunteered through their comments and others - I agree with Marika on that - that they should get going. I think that's part of what we, as a PDP team, have the authority to do or at least we get to state it as an action and the council gets to approve it. So I just as soon not leave the ball outside our court. I'd like to hit the ball.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well if you can come up with some wording for that, Mikey. Marika and then Simonetta.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think we do need to be careful to, you know, not just ahead because it's actually, you know, the council's prerogative to adopt these recommendations and I think task further work. So I think we should be careful in taking on that role ourselves as a working group and asking people to do certain things while we, you know, haven't received yet the endorsement from the council for these recommendations. So just...

Michele Neylon: Well, can we make a recommendation to council that those stakeholder groups follow through on something?

Marika Konings: Yes, absolutely.

Michele Neylon: Well, I don't know how you want to capture that, you know, but that's - maybe that's the solution there. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi, this is Simonetta. Maybe we could come up with a couple of ideas as (as far as) the stakeholder groups and then just bounce them over to them and ask them for feedback. And if they're saying, "Yes, this goes along the way that - what we were thinking," or maybe they come back to us and tell us, "No, we were thinking this," so that we could have one or two items that we could recommend to the council to say we spoke to these groups. We both think this would be a good way to go about this. How about you think - or you formally approve this and we're moving forward?

Michele Neylon: Simonetta, just - I mean, I get exactly what you're saying but I think one of the problems we would have with that is that based - like I know that the ALAC has already asked for extensions on several comment periods due to the number of comment periods and papers that they have to submit comments on. So I'm not sure if we were to ask them for some input specifically that might push it out for weeks and weeks and weeks. That's just my one fear with it. But apart - Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering though - so if this was really short. This is basically not more than a half page of content as a follow up to their comments. To just ask them you mentioned you support this and you think that you would want to be considered as one of the possible channels for the implementation of this recommendation. Would these two items be kind of what you are thinking about? And if there is no pushback and now this goes in the completely wrong way, then we could just put this there as an idea for the council to say, "Hey, (this might be something there we'd like to do)."

Michele Neylon: Okay, right. Okay then moving on to Charter Question B, Recommendation 3. "The Registry Stakeholder Group notes that all but one registry agreed with this recommendation. The one registry that did not agree with this recommendation noted that ICANN staff and GNSO volunteers are overloaded at this time. INTA expresses its support for the recommendation. GoDaddy recognizes the benefits of Thick Whois in the context of transfers, but recommends that unintended consequences of requiring this change particularly with large incumbent registries should also be considered." And by large incumbent registries I assume that we could just replace that with VeriSign.

Man: (Unintelligible) too.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. We've discussed this in the past so that's okay. "The ICA makes no objections to this recommendation - notes not objection to this recommendation. The BC also notes its support for this recommendation, but also suggests that an alternative approach that could be explored will be direct conversations with incumbent thin registries about a possible change to Thick Whois."

Is there anybody from the BC on this - wait a second. We have Chris. Chris.

Mikey O'Connor: Hey I resemble that remark. I'm a part of BC.

Michele Neylon: Are you. I thought you were a part of ALAC. Okay Chris or Mikey since Mikey has now got his nose out of joint.

Chris Chaplow: (Forgot to tell you that) Mikey.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible). And Berry are you BC as well or are you something else?

Mikey O'Connor: He's a BC.

Berry Cobb: Well I'm actually an individual on the working group, but I am a member of the BC yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay, we will lump you in with BC then for laughs and giggles. Are there any other BC people I've forgotten about on this call? No, okay.

Gentlemen, what is the difference in your own words or between having direct conversations with incumbent thin registries and an issues report suggestion?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey and let me take that because this is something that was suggested during the council meeting where we were discussing this and it seemed like a good idea. I can't remember who suggested it right offhand, but the point was raised you know do we really need a full blown issues report, PDP, blah, blah, blah process when in fact all that's really required is a direct conversation with one registry.

So I threw it in there as an alternative to the full blown (unintelligible) policy.

Michele Neylon: Okay, okay, okay. All right, so basically what you are suggesting isn't a case of you disagree with the idea of what was being talked about.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no.

Michele Neylon: But it was more a case of this would be a hell of a lot faster.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and a lot less work.

Michele Neylon: That's fine. That's fine. That's fine. I know I was probably sitting there when this suggestion was made and I was probably the person chairing the meeting at the time, but...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you were busy.

Michele Neylon: Probably brain elsewhere, but that's okay. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Probably the person that made that comment is the same one registry that did not agree with the recommendation on you know the notion that the ICANN staff and that GNSO volunteers are overloaded. But I just wanted to comment that of course direct discussions presume probably that there is some kind of benefit when we talk about a certain switch. While I think the objective of the PDP is also recognizes and the comments from GoDaddy as well is I think the way the working group has written the recommendation itself is that a PDP would actually look at you know positive as well as negative effects of a possible change.

And you know the recommendation is not necessarily recommending a change to Thick Whois, but I think the PDP would have as an additional benefit (and be) explored from all different angles before you actually make that recommendation to switch from while a presumably direct conversation. Start off on the basis you know that a switch should be done and one looks at the practical issues that are maybe involved in that. So that might be one of the differences in the two approaches that are on the table.

Michele Neylon: Okay. All right then so what is - okay so let's see. What is our action item here then? Should we recommend that we have a formal discussion with the registry operator who is most impacted by this or what should we do? Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's worth at least talking to Barbara about it. It's too bad she is not on the call today, but maybe.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so how about we just follow up with Barbara via email. I don't know why - did she - is she away this week, or is she just missing this meeting, or what's the story? Does anybody know? Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering about one thing. There is this GoDaddy comment on this whole issue that says we should be looking at unintended consequences of this change. And if I recall our conversation right, the reason why we didn't just say we want to do this is because there are people in this group that think this needs to be weighed. There is pros and cons to this approach.

If you just go to the registry and ask them why don't you change, then there is the possibility that they just do it and this conversation will not happen. So our conversation about the pros and cons will not happen, but I really wonder if this is what we want. Because if we want this direct implementation regardless of the consequences, we (could threaten that), but we didn't do that. We said we really wanted this to be explored before making a change.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Paul Diaz and then James.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Michele. Beyond what Simonetta said and I think I was the one previously - unintended consequences almost assured rate hike. So everybody let's carefully weigh whatever costs you think you will incur supporting transfers in a thin registry model as opposed to another 7% increase or a 10% in dot NET. I sincerely doubt that the scales tip in favor of the transfers.

But the other thing is remember that dot NET is currently up for renewal. I know that VeriSign is negotiating with ICANN right now, and my understanding is they are very close to having a draft renewal registry agreement ready for community review. The bottom line is that we are probably far too late to get them to change dot NET outside of or within the contract renewal discussions, and that likely will serve as a template for all incumbent gTLD renewals.

So you know if we are going to have any discussions -- if you are thinking about it - focused on dot COM, you know that's due no later than November of next year, 2012. Realistically an ask like this is a pretty enormous undertaking. And so if this is really what the working group thinks we should be doing, time is of the essence. We should not delay at all because inserting ourselves into - or starting a conversation and then having that factored into registry agreement contract negotiations. Believe it or not, the timing is working against us. There's really not that much time.

Michele Neylon: Okay, James and then Bob then Simonetta.

James Bladel: Hi Michele. Thanks. James speaking. And I agree with Paul as well as Simonetta that you know there is a discussion or there were several discussions about not rushing into this as a requirement headlong or just asking them to do this, but really just getting a better sense of what all the benefits and costs would be.

And I think that possibly one approach might be a hybrid approach, which is to request the Issues Report, but specifically state in there that you know we would like some you know direct input into that issues report on some basic questions from COM and dot NET operator that you know might help inform this discussion and get those pros and cons out where folks can discuss them. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Rob.

Bob Mountain: Currently it's only COM and NET that operate the SIM registry module - model rather within the ICANN domain. And with NET being up for review, are they not being asked to bring their terms, conditions, and policies in line with all what new gTLDs are being expected and therefore move to Thick Whois anyway?

Michele Neylon: I don't think we know that Rob unless somebody else knows something. Does anybody know anything?

James Bladel: I don't think we know that.

Michele Neylon: I don't think we know that. Rob, as the dot NET contract is a contract between ICANN and VeriSign, until such time as it goes out for public comment and feedback as part of the - I think it's probably a part of the (RSTEP) system isn't it guys or Marika would know? We wouldn't have any visibility on it as far as I know, so the answer is at the moment we don't know and our VeriSign person isn't on the call. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I was just thinking along the same lines with what Paul was also saying with the timeline (offices), and obviously - and also what Bob was saying. If those folks are negotiating this right now, there's two people at the table. There is obviously the registry at the table that is trying to negotiate and then there is someone from ICANN at the table as well.

So I think it would be - if we are going down this road of just having or recommending to have a conversation about these things, then we should maybe also recommend that the people on the ICANN side who negotiate with the thin registries should take into consideration what effects it has to with thin registry in relation to transfers, and high jacking, and all these things. to take this into consideration when they negotiate the dot NET and then also when they renegotiate the dot Com down the road.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anybody else. No, okay. I think we're going to have to - I'm going to have to have a chat with Marika after this call just to see in terms of process what we're allowed to do, but I think there's some very valid points that have been raised, so we shouldn't just kind of rush into this.

Chris Chaplow: Michele, Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Yes, go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Can we not at least send a copy of our draft final report to the unnamed person deep in ICANN that is negotiating the contract?

Michele Neylon: Well we could do Chris, but there's one thing that - the question has been raised do we even want to do that. Is it in our interest to wake that beast?

Chris Chaplow: But dot NET is a better test bed beast isn't it? A more manageable beast than the dot COM.

Michele Neylon: Yes, but the point that Paul and a couple of others have raised is that if VeriSign were to go thick, then they would probably impose a fee increase and there might be other complications as well. Simonetta is that a new hand?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I was thinking along the same lines again and I was wondering I do believe our main concern was an increase in rates. If that's true and we don't have any other main concerns around this and there is a broad support of if they do not increase the fees because we really all want this, the perfect person to negotiate that they are required to do this without increasing the rates beyond whatever others think they are is the person within ICANN that's

currently negotiating this stuff. So making them aware of this would be desirable to have for the whole community. Everyone supports this.

The one concern the community also has tied to this is that they do not want to have the rates increase. They would be the ones who could negotiate this in their renewal of the contract right now. So if there is other big concerns, then maybe we should make a list of what these are and just inform the parties negotiating that this is something you should consider.

Michele Neylon: I can see that some of the guys are talking about this in the chat here and maybe they don't want - Paul and James. Are either of you going to specifically state what you think might be unintended consequences of this beyond the fee change? Or should I just be the bull in the china shop who might bring - who can come up with all sorts of crazy nasty things that could happen? Paul go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Michele. One quick one. One, I want to say for the record I want to get off the fee increase discussions. With anti-trust, it starts getting very, very weird in the ICANN environment for contracted parties to be talking about fees, and rates, and things like that. So okay it's on the record, but let's move along.

Another potential unintended consequence guys is if VeriSign can now see all the customer data, there is the possibility that they will start directly marketing to clients - to registrants. Pardon. And...

Michele Neylon: A question on that. Are they - you probably know the answer to this better than I do. Under the current contracts that they have with ICANN, are they restricted from doing that or not?

Paul Diaz: I'm not a lawyer; I'm not going to try to give legal advice on that. But I think that there is enough wiggle room that the argument could be made that that is a valid potential unintended consequence to switching to thick registry.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anything else. I think we're going to have to come back on this. Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Just a little short one and that is that you know given that the negotiation is going on, it seems like another facet of the negotiation you know kind of carrying on Simonetta that this is a better time to be having this pretty thing of the unnamed ICANN person. Then after these contracts have been negotiated, then maybe the point that Paul and James are raising should be included in our punch list for that group.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay, I'm getting a bit kind of confused here. I'm actually scratching my head. Okay, we can't talk about fee - we can't talk about fees because people get concerned that that moves into anti-trust territory.

Mikey O'Connor: Well non-contracted parties can talk about fees. We will carry that ball for you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so you can talk about fees, but I can't.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so basically yourself, Berry, and Chris can talk about it and the other contracted parties feel that they can't continue to be - okay, this is hurting my head. Okay, right.

Chris Chaplow: Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Moving on. My poor head is hurting now.

Chris Chaplow: There's not - Michele there's not a lot to talk about the fees, is there. it's just an item on the list.

Michele Neylon: No the thing I'm trying to get my head around is do we want to talk to VeriSign/ICANN about this now or do we want to just include something in our final report stating something else? This is the thing I'm kind of struggling with in terms of where do we go with this? Because remember I'm seeing kind of nasty side effects from doing various different things that I really don't want to pursue unless I have to. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe here's a way forward. I think you know we've got people that we're sort of talking about who aren't on the call. I think we need to get Barbara on the call, and I think we also need Marika for you to reach out into the ICANN crowd and find out where the key dates are in this process. If it turns out a key date is coming up inside 30 days, I think we have different options in front of us than if the negotiation isn't scheduled to be completed for another six months let's say.

So maybe what we do is we break off from this for a week, reach out to some of these folks who have more information than we do. And then if it turns out that we are going to communicate with ICANN negotiators and VeriSign directly, then we will segregate the conversation about fees to non-contracted parties. How about that?

Michele Neylon: Well the other thing though in terms of - with respect to actual process. can we as a working group working on a report that hasn't been signed off on by council take that upon ourselves or not?

Mikey O'Connor: I think it depends on the dates. I think if the dates are far enough out and that we have time, the right approach is to run it up through the council.

Michele Neylon: Right. Okay. Okay, so then we can continue this discussion possibly next week when Barbara is on the call. And then in the interim, we can tentatively very carefully put out feelers to find out with respect to process and find where exactly this thing is in terms of dates.

Okay then - right then. We're running short. We're running up to seven minutes to the top of the hour, so I don't really want to start getting into another bit of - question of feedback because we're not actually going to get through it. so I think what I will do is Paul go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. I agree it's hard to start. Not that I'm looking to lose more time in my busy days, but if we have this target deadline in mind, does the working group need to think about perhaps stretching these meetings to 90 minutes a week? Because I don't see us getting through all of these various things, especially the details on the emergency action channel once we come back with a proposal.

The 60 minutes a week is just not going to cut it. can people commit to a 90 minute? Does that work for ICANN staffing, and scheduling, et cetera?

Michele Neylon: Let's rephrase. Does anybody on the call have a serious issue or impediment with us pushing to 90 minutes? I will take that silence to mean no. okay, so Marika or Gisella could you have a look at the schedule to see about extending this to 90 minutes starting next week?

Marika Konings: Okay.

Michele Neylon: And let's see where we are - how we are fixed schedule wise. And if that is not feasible, then maybe look at finding another slot somewhere on the timetable for say 45 minutes, one hour, or something for a second call or something like that.

Okay then it's now six minutes to the top of the hour. Does anybody have any other matters that they wish to raise today? Okay, if nobody has anything else, then I will speak to you all next week. Enjoy the rest of your week.

James Bladel: Thank you Michele.

Man: Thanks Michele.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Thanks Michele. Bye-bye.

Michele Neylon: Bye.

END