

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 19 October 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 19 October 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-20101012-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG Chair
Paul Diaz - Registrar SG
Robert Mountain - Registrar SG
Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG
Rob Golding – Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Barbara Steele – RySG
Oliver Hope - RrSG
Berry Cobb - CBUC
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Anil George – IPC

Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Mikey O'Connor – CBUC
James Bladel - Registrar SG
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

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

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good afternoon to everyone on today's IRTTP call on Tuesday, the 19th of October. We have Michele Neylon, Barbara Steele, Oliver Hope, Simonetta Batteiger, Rob Golding, Chris Chaplow, Anil George, Barry Cobb, Bob Mountain, Kevin Erdman, Paul Diaz. From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Gery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies today from James Bladel. Hope I haven't left anyone off the list,

and if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.

Thank you. Over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Good afternoon everybody. Hope you're all wide awake and happy to be here. Yeah! Woo!

Rob Golding said that he might drop off the call, so we'll forgive him this time. Now first things first. Before we actually move onto the main part of the agenda, I have to ask does anybody have any updates to their Declarations of Interest?

Any takers?

No? Fine.

One thing. I was just talking to Marika before the call in relation to Cartagena, which contrary to popular believe is not an excuse to drink lots of cocktails. It's a meeting. We're meant to work. How many of you are planning to attend Cartagena? I'll just go around. Well, I presume Gisella and Marika probably are, or at least somebody from there. Anil, yes or no?

Anil George: No.

Michele Neylon: Barbara?

Barbara Steele: Not at this time.

Michele Neylon: Barry?

Barry Cobb: Maybe.

Michele Neylon: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Me, yes. (Ollie)?

Oliver Hope: Yes. I'll be there.

Michele Neylon: Paul already put his hand up, so I presume he would.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Rob?

Rob Golding: Possibly not.

Michele Neylon: You're not fun. Simonetta?

Rob Golding: I'd like to, but other projects (unintelligible) that week, so I might have to stay in London.

Michele Neylon: It's all right. It's all right.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'll be there.

Michele Neylon: You'll be there. Bob Mountain?

Bob Mountain: I will be there.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So by the looks of things, most of you will be there. And, I know James Bladel is definitely going to be there. So, most of you are going to be there. Well with that in mind, we will probably be looking at trying to organize a face-to-face of some description in Cartagena, so I think - Marika, have they

started work on the timetable of things yet for Cartagena, or where are we at with that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We as staff have not received any forms yet. Normally the way it works is at a certain point of time we receive a request to fill in forms for the different meetings our respective working groups - our communities want to have. And those then we need to fill in and indicate when they would like to meet? What kind of meeting room it is? The description. But, I've heard that we're supposed to receive those sometime this week, but I don't know if that's indeed going to be the case.

So, that's where (I think it) stands, but it would be good to have indeed an indication of whether the group would like to meet and what they would like to do in the meeting. But, we have already tentatively scheduled is an update to the GNSO Council on the progress the group will have made by Cartagena, and you know hopefully, that might be a final report or a draft final report. So - and that's probably going to take place on Saturday afternoon.

Michele Neylon: Is there any way of making a note that - because I will not be making that update unless they're actually present.

Marika Konings: Well...

Michele Neylon: No. And, I'm actually quite - I'm quite serious. I'm not flying half way around the globe a couple days early to give an update to an empty room.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll pass that message on.

Michele Neylon: Good. Because I - and I don't think other people working with working groups particularly appreciate it when there's nobody there. It's kind of annoying.

Chris Chaplow: Chris speaking. There was one person there, wasn't there Michele? Chuck, no?

Michele Neylon: Yes. Chuck was there. I mean and Chuck's a lovely guy, and Chuck appreciated the fact that I was there and all that kind of thing, and a couple of you were there.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Michele Neylon: But, it's just...

Marika Konings: I mean as it looks now, I think the unfortunate thing was last time that something last minute got scheduled opposite that meeting, and I think it was the Vertical Integration meeting which suddenly draw a lot of attention, and you know people away from that meeting. But as it looks now, there's nothing opposite against this meeting. And if anything will be scheduled, I'll definitely make the point that it might not be appropriate and other time needs to be found so there's no conflict with other meetings.

And especially, I think if this working group you know, has it's - has a final report to present, it's key for Council members to you know, discuss with the working group what those recommendations are as they'll be the ones taking the next step and a vote on those recommendations.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Sorry. Just had to say that. You know, just get it off my chest.

We'll do - with respect to an actually public meeting face-to-face, so that - then that would be sometime during the main timetable, as we had last time in Brussels. So hopefully, we'll have something there. Marika has put together some bits and pieces which I meant to be reviewing to see what state they're in with respect to our current kind of status. And Marika gave me this homework - how long ago was it? Ten days ago or something?

Marika Konings: No, not that long ago. A couple of days ago.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, it feels like ten days ago. And needless to say, of course I haven't had a chance to look at it yet. So, I am publically admonishing myself in front of you, and - but this is something that we will get on to.

Now Bob and Simonetta, have you got any update for us?

Bob Mountain: I did - I'm at a conference this week, so I haven't gotten to everybody, but I have had some success (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Well look. (That's going to be at the) conference Bob. You're sitting there in South Beach. I know where you are as well.

Bob Mountain: But, it's still a (valid end-point)...

Michele Neylon: You're in South Beach, aren't you?

Bob Mountain: Yes, I am. And, I'm actually quite compromised this morning, because it is South Beach. But nonetheless, I have managed in between stuff to get to some of the portfolio owners as opposed to registrars. And, the feedback from the - and, I've spoken to like three portfolio owners, one who also happens to be a registrar, but it was the - you know, the portfolio aftermarket person as opposed to the person who's you know, working more on the registrar side in that case.

In all three cases, none of them had experienced a hijacking in - you know, in their you know, kind of - in their tenure there. And you know, they had been there you know probably two to three years. So, there was no - you know, no experience with hijacking. You know, and I'll write up the details, but the - when I went into the ETRP, they were you know, somewhat familiar with it. We talked a little bit more about it and you know, the kind of take away was you know this was you know a bit of overkill. They didn't see that it was a real

problem and felt that the ETRP itself was you know perhaps shifting the balance where there really wasn't a problem that was kind of driving it.

So you know, I'd say that the feedback I've gotten, it's preliminary in that I haven't talked with everyone, but that's directionally what I'm hearing so far. And I think I probably need another week to get to everybody on my list, and then I'll have a more complete response next week when we meet again you know.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Simonetta Batteiger: But from my end, I also still have a few people I need to get to. But of the ones that I have spoken to, they're - one of them had experience to hijacking, but it was something that could be resolved within the current framework of roles. So, they wouldn't have asked for something like the ETRP proposal.

And, the additional feedback I got was that - and this was from a registrar. They felt that whatever approach we take, there needs to have some kind of response mechanism for the losing side of this complaint so that there is at least some review of why this domain is being pulled away from you again. But again, I also haven't gotten to every one of my list yet, so this is very initial feedback only.

And from (unintelligible) point of view, I can say that we feel that we would like to have some kind of a response there as well, just to make sure that the other side is heard so you don't create a situation where it becomes possible and easy for someone to create this domain being pulled back without the new owner having any say or input in the process at all.

And I mean from my personal opinion, I kind of look at this a little bit similar like a credit card charge back. If someone's using your credit card elsewhere and pays what happens on the back end of this, and I'm sure you're familiar with this from running your own businesses, is that the merchant that has

fraudulent charge occur on they pay gets a notification and gets the chance to respond to it.

I mean, the money is pulled away from you right away, but you still have a opportunity to make your case. And for 90 days, that money is basically held with the credit card company. It's neither returned to the other party yet, nor given to the merchant. So, some process like that is where I get the feedback of what people would like to see.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody have any thoughts, comments, feedback?

Anybody?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead, Chris.

Chris Chaplow: In the merchant example, which sounds quite neat, I think it's just too add that I think that the fault does fall very much onto the consumer in the credit card scenario. And if nothing happens, as far as I'm aware, the money goes to the consumer not to the merchant. So I suppose in whatever system you have, in the event of no action at all, it does have to go one way or the other.

Simonetta Batteiger: Right.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else have any other thoughts?

Come on guys. Both Bob and Simonetta have went out there and got some you know, useful input for you, and nobody cares. Nobody wants to say anything. Are you all thinking absolutely perfect?

Bob Mountain: While hung over I must add.

Michele Neylon: While hung over, okay. Yes. Bob was hung over when he did this, and he's admitting to it.

Nothing? Paul Diaz?

Paul Diaz: Nothing Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks a lot Paul.

Paul Diaz: Look Michele, one thing that I would ask is you know, what's spoken needs to be written up in some way so it's there for the record. There's my input.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That's a good thing. So Simonetta and Bob, could you actually do that when you've finished? Just put it down, even just in bullet points or something?

Simonetta Batteiger: Absolutely.

Bob Mountain: Yes. No problem. We'll compile both of our feedback and publish that to the group.

Michele Neylon: Perfect.

Okay, moving on. Right then, looking at the comments again. I think at this time, should we - oh, Marika has her hand up. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I just have a follow-up on some of the items we discussed at the last meeting. First of all in relation to our discussion on comments -- let me just check which one that was -- where there was a suggestion from the working group to possibly have information on the ICANN Web site in relation to status values. So, I discussed that with our communications team and they thought it was a really good idea. They just

noted that maybe the glossary isn't the appropriate place to that, as it's relatively hidden.

But, they did suggest that maybe a good home might be the new GNSO Web site that's currently under development. Because, the idea would be that every policy area will have a kind of basic description page where that kind of information could be provided. And then, that page can be linked from several other places, or also be found through searches. So, that might be a home.

Of course, still some work would need to be done then on the actual - you know, which status values do we want to define? Which are the different terms that should be included in such a page? And, I think input from the group would be appreciated on that. I don't know if there are any comments on that specific item?

Otherwise I'll move on to the next one, because there was also a request for - on Comment 43 for further clarification from Phil Corwin, so I reached out to him to ask if there was anything else he wanted to add to his comment. And, he basically stated - let me just try to find his email.

(He's saying) I'm not sure what further clarification I can provide. (ECA) generally supported the suggestion that where a registrar did not provide a means for the (RNH) to lift lock status on their own. That they be required to do so within five days of receiving a request from the (NRH) to do so. That we invited feedback from registrars as to whether five days was administratively feasible, particularly in regard to determining that the bona fide (RNH) had made the request, and that it did not originate from an illicit entity seeking to steal the domain.

He also pointed out that the main thrust of his comment was related to opposing the ETRP, and the specific comment that you know, we asked clarification about was a very secondary concern from his point of view.

Rob Golding: Marika, is there a defined best practice in validating the identity of registrant written up anywhere?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think I'm the right person to ask that question. Not - as far as I'm aware, not on the ICANN side of things. But, it might be something that certain registrars do or have.

Rob Golding: Yes. I mean from our point of view, we require something that validates their address, as something that validates them. So usually, via scan of a driving license and a copy of a utility bill is the details that they're asking to be changed or updated does match our records in any way, shape, or form. I was just wondering if there was a common document that we should all be adhering to.

Michele Neylon: Rob, this is Michele. I believe - this has come up I think in other discussions elsewhere. And as things stand at present, there is not - there are not guidelines or best practices that I am personally aware of. Maybe Paul Diaz or somebody else knows otherwise. But as far as I'm aware, they don't exist.

I think this is one of those areas where we as registrars are given as much rope as we want to use to hang ourselves. I can only speak to what we do, and I can only speak to the area - what we see happening with some of the ccTLD registries. I mean what we do, very similar to what you've just described, where we're asking people to validate themselves by - if we receive a request from a third party or somebody who appears to be a third party, in other words, that are not sending in the request in from their - something that we know or through some system that we recognize, we would ask them for scans of utility bills or photo ID, or something along those lines.

Some of the ccTLDs we deal with would be looking for similar types of things as well. And as a segue to that, for those who are fascinated by such things, the (.BE) registry is currently doing an audit on all of their registrants, and is

quite happily culling domains where they - where the registrant won't get - won't reply or update their details to something (sane).

So, you're pretty much allowed to do what you want, Rob, basically.

Rob Golding: Okay.

Michele Neylon: And, I presume the main thing is just to do it in such a manner that doesn't break the law.

Paul, go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Michele. It's Paul. I agree with everything you've said, and to the last point -- don't break the law, and/or don't break ICANN's rules -- you know, there are some ICANN recognized forms and documentation that can be used as they apply to gTLDs to authenticate or to identify somebody. Just for the group though, and it probably is so obvious but it needs to be stated, a sophisticated hijacker will have no hesitation to use a forged document...

Rob Golding: Yes.

Paul Diaz: ...and we have seen some absolutely brilliant forgeries. Anything that gets faxed into you - into your company, you know the - you'd better not be completely relying on just that alone, because you know, there are some just really, really devilish people out there. I can say within registrars, there's a group of us that -- across a number of registrars serving different models -- that share information. And some of the stuff we've seen from people who are known as basically professional scammers would - I challenge anybody to be able to pick these things out, fakes versus real. They're that good.

So just as a warning, yes. We use documentation like that. There's no set rule that we use the documentation that ICANN recognizes, things like driver's licenses, passports, et cetera, but don't take those things

automatically at face value, because the fraudsters, some of them are really, really slick.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Paul. This is Michele just speaking as Michele, an in registrar, as in me. I mean, thanks for that Paul. I mean, the only thing I would say is that you know, we have - we can have - we can only do so much. I mean in our case for example, we will do our best to try and validate somebody to the best of our ability.

But the kind of thing that we've had issues with in the past are things that are completely outside our arenas, where the customer account is in the name of - let's just say Widgets, not specifying anything further, and then it turns out that there are actually four or five separate corporate entities, and they're all having a massive dispute between each other, and they've got Widget Services, Limited, and you've got Widget Solutions, Limited, and you've got Widgets Whatever, Limited, and they all came from the same company and they're shared Directors, and that becomes an absolute nightmare, at which point I hand it over to my Solicitors.

So you know, I think we have to draw the line somewhere as well, though.

Go ahead, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Thanks, Michele. You make a very good point. And something that was stated earlier that - when you joked about registrars will give themselves enough rope, tying themselves - important to note that registrars have many different ways of validating. You know, that's a healthy function of the competitive marketplace that we're in. And, a number of registrars, ourselves included, will have multiple layers of depth of security for their validation process.

And to the point you've just said, I mean if you have very, very valuable domain names and you want to make sure that nobody can mess with it, you

can set up with registrars that you know, only certain people can do certain things, and you can work around that complex corporate structures and all the other things. Because sometimes, companies don't think about those things when they first do a registration, but there are business disputes, et cetera, and it becomes very, very messy very quickly.

There are registrars out there that are offering processes by which the true registrant - the person who has the registration rights can assure themselves that they are the only ones who are going to have the ability to transfer a name out, unlock it, do whatever. But again, it's a function of the corporate - the competitive market space. It's not anything that is applied uniformly across the industry.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other thoughts or comments?

Sorry, I can't at the moment - my browser has just decided to give up the (ghost), so I can't see anything.

Marika Konings: Simonetta has her hand up.

Michele Neylon: Please, Simonetta, go ahead. As I say, I would (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Simonetta Batteiger: Thanks for this (but) I'm not a registrar, but I wonder if it might be helpful as output from this group to compile some best practices? Not as a you need to do this, but just as a help to get people thinking. Because if you're a smaller registrar and you don't - you may not have faced some of these more sophisticated things, it might be helpful for you to even just get some best practices of what you could be doing.

And not that it needs to be a policy that you also implement this, otherwise you can't be a registrar, but just as a guideline of things that others have seen that you should be aware of.

Michele Neylon: Anybody have any thoughts on this?

Paul Diaz: Michele, it's Paul. Yes, I started typing into the box, but it's easier to say. I'm aware that the SSAC was working on exactly this sort of document. I know Ram Mohan basically wrote up the findings of the report. I'm not sure that the final report was published, but Ram certainly talked about it in (Circle ID). I'll try and get that for folks. But...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible)...

Paul Diaz: ...a long list of things. It was sort of like the follow-up to their original SSAC 040, but I'm not sure if they've got the more recent report done. But, it was exactly along these lines. Things registrants should do. Best practices registrants can take, and things registrants should look for in a registrar to protect their domain names. I'll try and find the links and put them in the chat.

Michele Neylon: I've got it here. Three Things Registrars Must Do to Enhance Security. That's his article from August 9th.

Paul Diaz: Yes. And I believe the report was going to be going to much more depth than that.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Well, I...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm happy to check on the status of that report and then provide feedback to the group.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Marika. Yes, this is kind of a (discretion) there between a couple of people. Yes, I didn't like that article, but that's just - speaking as a registrar, I did not like that article at all. I think people should - what registrars should do or could do is fine, but telling us what we must do is unreasonable.

Okay then, Marika I think you have another comment you wanted to go back to.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just going back to Comment 38, I was requested there to you know, look a bit further and detail what the context was for that comment, and I circulated that to the list, although I'm not really sure whether it provided much additional clarity on what was meant with ad hoc locks. I don't know if people have any further comments there on that particular comment. It was Number 38.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any other thoughts on this?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here. What's that then? A lock that a registrar just makes up in the moment? I don't remember ad hoc locks.

Michele Neylon: Chris, this is Michele. I think part of this comes back to the idea that a registrar would lock a domain and not allow a transfer for some - for a reason that was not clear to the registrant, and that Mr. Kirikos felt that the way some registrars implemented locks was in contravention of if not the policy, but then the spirit of the policy. That is my understanding.

Chris Chaplow: Just a comment. We don't want locks that for reasons that are not clear to the registrant. I think we're in agreement on that.

Michele Neylon: Maybe. Does anybody have any thoughts on this?

Bob Mountain: Yes, Michele. I raised my hand but I think your browser's actually still down.

Yes, I know George is very vocal about the 60 day transfer lock that was in - but I'm trying to get into the links that are on the - on the browser. But I can't seem to click through.

But I suspect that's what he's referring to here. And, you know, this sort of - I think his perception that there was some ambiguity in the rules on that.

So - but I'd like to somehow get into that - his links there. And I bet you we could ascertain what specifically he was referring to but I suspect it's that.

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to know that the links that are in there are basically direct to the public comment forum and the complete comment that he made. But I don't think you can click through the links but I can post them as well in the Chat.

Bob Mountain: Yes that would be good actually. I'll dig through a little bit if you want to do that Marika. Bob speaking.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Right, any other things there while we're waiting for various things? Oh, here we go, Form IRTP.

Marika Konings: So basically this link takes you to all the comments. That way you can see very easily which are the ones that George posted.

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Rob Golding: Are you referring to the first (unintelligible) to arrive on the 20th of July?

Chris Chaplow: I think it's this one here.

Rob Golding: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: It says the line here, registrars should be proactive about security rather than misusing the locks in order to prevent legitimate registrars - I presume that means registrants, that legitimate registrants from transferring to the registrar of their choice which might be a far more secure registrar then the losing registrar.

The desire for a new registrant to change to their own preferred registrar immediately should not be blocked by losing registrars that wish to hold a domain name hostage.

Okay. I think that this - I think this refers to a chain - this refers in some ways to the change of registrant prior to an inter-registrar transfer that some registrars may have - may implement some kind of lock on that.

Does anybody have any follow-up comments on this?

Bob Mountain: Yes Michele, this is Bob. I'm looking at July 20. And he does - you know, you see the statement again repeated here by George which is ad hoc locks but no - I can't really (determine) any further, you know, detail about that, who he's referring to.

So...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: Have you had a look at - if you have a look at the second one.

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: ...here. It will post paste the link.

Bob Mountain: Part 2?

Chris Chaplow: Oh, damn it, yes Part 2.

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: I ended up with a V in that box instead of the (thing). He cites - he seems to have an issue primarily with GoDaddy I think. I could be wrong.

Bob Mountain: Yes, I see it now. And yes, you're right, in that second link, yes.

Chris Chaplow: It's a very, very long email. Okay. I think this is something we've discussed already anyway.

Does anybody have any other thoughts on this? Unfortunately James isn't on the call so we can't speak directly about this.

(Winetta): I'm not sure.

Bob Mountain: Yes I think...

(Winetta): This is (Winetta). I'm not sure if he's thinking about just wanting to transfer his name from Register A to Registrar B or if he's actually speaking about this in the context of a registrant change at the same time.

So I - if it's about him just wanting to change from Register A to Registrar B and no other changes are there then I could see him being upset with the losing registrar basically putting some kind of last-minute lock in place that prevents them from transferring domain - the domain elsewhere.

Chris Chaplow: Rob?

Rob Golding: This is specifically in relation to the GoDaddy lock when you change some of the registrant information prior to transferring to another registrar, specifically if you change the company name.

For example it pops up a warning and (unintelligible) made it bloody clear and in front of you now that doing this will mean you cannot transfer it to 60 days. And George takes offense of that.

Whilst I don't necessary necessarily agree with the policy of locking a domain just because some details have been updated, particularly in the light of us being told that we have to mandate sending out emails to tell people to update their details, it is bloody clear that he is going to get stuck there for another 60 days if you do it.

And you can always back the change out and hit the Cancel button. I've even tested this in conjunction with ICANN's compliance before (David) left.

And you can just hit Cancel and you can just transfer the domain away. I think it's a hell of a lot of storm in a teacup. And fluff about nothing.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you. Anybody else have any other thoughts or comments?

Okay. I think - okay, so what - just in summary then the ad hoc locks then could possibly be put as locks that the - that certain registrants may not have explicitly set?

Rob Golding: Yes, I mean if they're not explicitly set or been told how to remove them. I think that's a procedure that needs to be addressed.

But where they are clearly being told what will happen if they do something, I can't see that as a problem. That's done to the specific business practices of the registrar surely.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Anybody else have any other thoughts or comments on this?

No? Okay then. That's fine. Are there any other comments that needed any clarification, Marika, that you can remember?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I don't think so.

Chris Chaplow: Okay then. And we got some clarification from Philip Corwin on - with respect to 43 did we?

Marika Konings: Right. That's what we just discussed now.

Chris Chaplow: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm just loading up - looking at these in sequential order. So I know that my memory is bad but it's not that bad. It's just - it's more (clued) sequential order and everything else.

Okay then. I think dealing with the ETRP thing is probably something that we - is best done once we have the feedback from Simonetta and Bob which we hope to have next week.

So rather than diving into the - into that now I would suggest we leave that. Okay, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. If I maybe make a - if I may make a suggestion because the potential to review of the comments relating to the ETRP should be seen in the context of what the working group would like to do with that specific item.

Because I think we've discussed in the past where there are, you know, there are several options.

One of course working group could say look, we don't think it's needed, we don't want to pursue this, this avenue.

A second avenue would be for the working group to further work out the ETRP to address all the different angles and, you know, put it maybe out again for public comment, review it again and come to a final proposal.

Another avenue might be to basically say yes, in principle we think there should be a procedure that allows for an expedited return.

These are the principles we think such a policy should fulfill. But now we pass it on either to another drafting team or to ICANN staff to come up with a proposal that's -, you know, then also put out for community comment and further discussion for of course being adopted.

So if that third approach would be an approach to follow the group might want to consider the comment in that line and saying look, we want to pick out those elements that we see here in the comments as being important to be addressed in the context of potential further discussions.

So maybe, I don't know what the feedback is on that. But it might facilitate the review of those different comments in relation to the ETRP.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thank you. Does anybody have any comments or thoughts?

Nothing. Anybody? Going once, going twice, sold to the guy in the red hat.

Thank you Marika. Unfortunately nobody has any comments on this at this time. Personally yes, that there is a sort of logic in that.

Okay then are there any other - is there anything else that we need to discuss today?

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika again. And probably not a very popular topic, but just to make people aware that the deadline for publication of documents for discussion in Cartagena is the 15th of November. So it means that after this meeting there are three more meetings left.

As Michele mentioned, I've already started redrafting the initial report to get into shape to become the final report. So that includes more cosmetic changes, you know, changing the titles and the dates and then some of the process stuff, incorporating the summary of the public comments.

But I've also started inserting some of the items that we've discussed on the basis of our review of the public comments because we, you know, we and some of the items we did have further discussion also related to the feedback we got from ICANN compliance and legal on some of the items, so already tried to work that in.

And for some of the draft recommendations have tried to, you know, take into account what we've discussed, come up with some draft language that the working group might want to consider.

And, you know, if, you know, Michele's going to have a look to see if that makes any sense and then hopefully can be shared and - to the broader group because the idea would be if that document would be in a shape to get us to meet the deadline of the 15th of November.

Of course if the working group feels that, you know, more discussion is needed and we're not going to meet the 15th, the November deadline, you know, nothing serious is going to happen. It just means that we'll move into Cartagena, might have further discussions there and just provide the counsel with a status update.

But I just want to put in people's heads that if - there is that aim to, you know, wrap it up by Cartagena and have a final report we're looking at 15 November as a publication deadline.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thank you.

Anybody else have any thoughts, queries, questions, feedback?

Rob Golding: Does that mean we need to have discussed then, (flushed) out all of the charter question A ETRP issues before then or going with Marika's other suggestion that perhaps either a second working group or splitting this to a second job?

Chris Chaplow: Exactly, exactly. I mean ultimately Rob the thing is that we may - it may be saner for everybody involved for us to sit for the outcome for -of some of this to be, you know, we feel that this is - that something is required here. We've evaluated this. We've discussed this. But we can't, you know, we can't reach a conclusion as to what is required...

Rob Golding: Right.

Chris Chaplow: ...which is an acceptable outcome. So otherwise we could be having this conversation in 12 months time...

Rob Golding: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...which I don't think you want to have really.

You'll have to find yourself a new chair because I'm not sitting - I'm not going to stay on IRTP Part B for another 12 months, thank you very much.

Barry Cobb: Michele, this is Barry. You know, another notion about the whole ETRP is, you know, and I think George offered up an alternative solution or an amendment to that solution that we could consider.

Chris Chaplow: Right, which was?

Barry Cobb: I don't remember the exact details but it was something along the lines of validating the persons - or I don't remember the details so I won't try to - I'll mischaracterize it if I come up with it.

But I do know that he offered up a solution that seemed worthy of consideration.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thank you. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Because indeed I mean I think all the work that the group has done and the draft proposal that is there, that's all information that can be passed on to, you know, a second initiative either if it's a drafting team or if ICANN staff is requested to come up with a proposal.

So I think, you know, the group should consider as well that all that has been done is not lost or wasted.

And also the review of the comments hopefully will come out with additional elements that the group might want to identify in saying look, if any policy is developed in this area these are the kind of things that we think should be required.

And, you know, the first one I mentioned earlier that there should be a way to, you know, contest if a certain decision has been made and, you know, have a kind of hold period potentially that in which the domain name is not - you know, either with the losing or the gaining registrar.

So there are certain elements that the group might want to identify but then indeed have another group or staff, you know, work around the different items and, you know, go through the motions of coming up with a proposal that might address all those different concerns.

And indeed on the point of George's proposal I think that's highlighted in the comment 2080, called it an irrevocable transfer procedure.

I think that talked about the fact that basically before you make the transfer you do all the due diligence. And basically the person transferring the domain name basically verifies that this is an irrevocable transfer that, you know, couldn't be undone in any shape or form. And I think he did provide some further details on how that might work in some of his comments.

Chris Chaplow: Well wouldn't that - well just with respect to the entire irrevocable transfer thing, wouldn't that break the aftermarket completely as well?

Well never mind, just a thing I'll throw out there. Yes (Samantha). Go ahead.

(Samantha): I think so. I mean it's - to make a transfer truly irrevocable you'd have to have a lot of security in place up front to make sure that this piece isn't socially engineered or - I mean you just have to - if you think about the guys who are really sophisticated in defrauding and hijacking domain names today, they're going to have - or they're going to find ways to provide a lot of additional detail to identify themselves and make you think that they have actually authorized the transfer.

And it would - if you want to do this properly it would probably mean that you cannot transfer a domain name quickly at all because you'd have to give time for responses and all this stuff.

So I'm not sure how this proposal would look like. But I think having a secondary market that makes domain names transfers in generally easy and

then have something in place that deals with at this (feud) situation is reasonable. And making it so hard to transfer a domain name in the first place might not be in the best interests of anyone either, not in the interest of the secondary market and also not in the interest of the registrars who would have to of implement a huge set of rules of what you need to check before you can transfer a domain name.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thank you. Anybody else?

Barry Cobb: Michele, this is very Barry again. And I just - thank you Marika for reminding us what George have offered up.

Something else that we can maybe consider and I haven't put much thought in that is, you know, maybe there's tiered offerings of transfers.

You know, it seems to me most of our - most of these issues that we've been discussing are for high-value domain names.

So is there a possibility of coming up with tiered offerings that, you know, if you believe your domain name is - or is valued at X or greater then maybe there's this platinum level transfer service that has all the security features -- that kind of stuff -- whereas, you know, just a normal the name domain name like I own that's worth pennies I would - you know, I need that instant because I want to just consolidate to my one registrar or something along those lines.

And I think there's other options there so I don't want to - I would hate for us to lose the momentum and some of the effort with ETRP. Thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Okay thank you.

Just something there on that Chat just for the record Paul Diaz, an irrevocable transfer proposal also does not scale. It may work for very high

value domains transferring between parties who want to wait and pay for the process but not for the vast majority of transfers which basically echoes Barry's point.

And as a register I can see it - I mean the problems we see already with transfers between consenting parties, oh this sounds like I'm talking about something other than domain names.

There's enough problems as it is between people, you know, not clicking on validation links, ignoring them and then moaning about things and not doing this and not doing that, making it more complicated for your average Joe registrant, he's probably going to cause more problems than anything else and will actually remove competition from the marketplace.

Any other thoughts, queries, comments at this juncture in time? Anybody?

(Chris): Michele, Chris here.

Chris Chaplow: Go ahead Chris. Go ahead. Go ahead.

(Chris): More a procedural thing.

Chris Chaplow: Yes?

(Chris): It sounds like at some point soon we've got to make a decision whether to go for a final report by the 15th of November.

And my question was I seem to remember when we started this exercise in our charter or in other documents there was talk of about six or eight months or something. And now we're far in excess of that.

Has there been some external communique to give us more time or is there external pressure at the moment to hurry us up or slow us down question?

Chris Chaplow: Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean the council receives ahead of every council meeting an update on the status of each working group so they can see there where the working groups are and as well those updates are provided during ICANN meetings. So they are aware what is. And indeed it doesn't meet I think the initial schedules we set out.

But as far as I'm aware there is no pressure, external pressure of these two, you know, to finish the work.

It's more for the working group to decide if they would like to present this in Cartagena or whether they feel more time is needed to really work through it and present it at a later date.

Chris Chaplow: And (Chris) and as working group chair it personally think that we have a - if we give ourselves a deadline then we're more likely to get something done rather than it kind of flopping about and moving forward and not moving forward if at the same time.

Remember that the IRT - this is IRTPB. And they - there are already an IRTP Cs Ds and, I don't know, possibly even Es on the schedule to be done at some point. So we need to think of some kind of...

(Chris): Yes.

Chris Chaplow: We need to make some kind of progress even if the progress is simply to say well look, you know, we looked at this. We couldn't really make a huge amount of progress in all areas, other areas here, here, here and here. We think this is okay or it's broken or it needs to be changed slightly. And then, you know, we move on.

Sorry, I'm just distracted by the fact that there's - (Carlo) has just - he's in the middle of a monsoon and I'm waiting for the ceiling in my office to come in on top of my head. And you think I'm joking.

Rob Golding: Hey I made it to my bus stop about three or four minutes ago. So I'm on my way to (Caningtal).

Chris Chaplow: Excellent. Excellent. Well I'm sitting here and if you hear a banging noise followed by a thud it's probably just the ceiling landing on my head.

Okay then, as it's five minutes to the hour I would suggest that we adjourn and we all speak again next week.

And if there's anything anybody wants to raise to do so via the list.

On my end I will try to have a look over the documents that Marika has sent me through just to see if they make any sense.

And if they make any sense then we can circulate them and start to work from them. If I feel that they don't make any sense then I'll - I can argue with Marika about that.

But knowing how - the wonderful work that Marika does and we know that that's not going to be the case but I am covering myself just in case it is.

For those of you in South Beach, enjoy the rest of the conference. We're not at all jealous here in Ireland where it's pouring rain and looks like a monsoon.

Hope you all have a pleasant week and I'll speak to some of you probably later this evening. I think we have another wonderful conference call of some description. And for the rest of you, speak to you next week. Bye.

Man: Thanks Michele.

Man: Thanks Michele. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye now.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Louise).

(Louise): Thanks Gisella. I hope you feel better soon. Take care.

Gisella Gruber-White: Have a good day. Bye.

(Louise): You too. Bye.

END