

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 25 January 2011 at 15:00 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 25 January 2011 at 1500 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-20110125-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(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
Oliver Hope - Registrar SG
Rob Golding – Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Barbara Steele – Registries SG
Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Staff:

Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Paul Diaz - Registrar SG
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG
Anil George – IPC
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's IRTP call on Tuesday the 25th of January. We have Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, Ollie Hope, Barbara Steele, Matt Serlin, Bob Mountain, Berry Cobb.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Gery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

Apologies today made from Simonetta Batteiger, Anil George, and Mikey O'Connor.

Can I please just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes.

Thank you. Over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thank you ladies. As per usual, does anybody have an updated Statement of Interest or Declaration of Interest?

Any takers?

Going once.

Going twice.

Right then. On the agenda for today, first item on the agenda is with respect to San Francisco. Let's see then. Rather than asking who's going, I'll ask the question who is not planning to attend San Francisco at this juncture?

Are you all planning to attend San Francisco? Kevin, go ahead.

Kevin Erdman: I'm not planning.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Sorry. I thought (unintelligible). Okay, so you're not planning at the moment? Okay.

So the rest of you - Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to brief you - we could tell you how the discussion process is going to work. We need to submit out forms for meeting request by the 4th of February. The challenge is of course by that date, you know we might not have clear yet whether we're going to meet the 21st of February publication deadline, which of course we certainly (understand) will determine what kind of meeting we're planning there. But you know being optimistic, I'm really hopeful that we're going to meet the deadline.

I guess the idea would be to - in addition to an update to the GNSO Council, which always takes place on the weekend, to have a workshop where we would present the draft Final Report and the recommendations, and you know encourage people to submit comments. And then - but the question is if people also would like a separate working group meeting. Maybe just plan on how to handle the comments or you know, just to get together and maybe prepare for the workshop, for example.

So I guess those are the options, and I would like to get some input from the working group on that so I know what I need to request.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you Marika.

Barbara.

Barbara Steele: I just was following up to not certain if I'm attending. So - it depends on how much work we'll actually be doing there. I may be able to come in and leave, depending on what the schedule is looking like.

Michele Neylon: Right.

What do others think? Would you like to - okay, the GNSO update will probably be given by me, and - as I plan to be in San Francisco from the Friday, so I'll probably give the updates. But - I mean generally speaking, the

updates kind of gives a - you know, how did we end up in IRTP Part B? What have we done so far? Where are we at now?

And some of the time you get questions from the GNSO; other times, you don't. And some of the times you get questions about things that you weren't expecting at all. I mean things that aren't even actually really related to what you're talking about. So, the GNSO update can go any number of different ways.

Now, the next question after that is should we have some form of meeting where the public - which some of the public can attend? In other words, some form of open meeting or not?

Now, we didn't have one in Cartagena. We did have one in Brussels.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think just to note as well, you know we don't need to take a final decision because I guess you know, part of the usefulness of our public session will be whether we have a report ready and out for public comment or not. So you know to be on the safe side, the working group should request what it thinks it might need and then we can still -- closer to the date when we have a clearer view of where we're at -- we could still cancel that.

It's more difficult to add a meeting and - you know, following the deadline than taking out meeting because we don't need it or you know, maybe we didn't manage to get our report done.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Does anybody have any strong feelings either one way or the other?

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow here Michele. I don't think there was a -- on the practical level -- a great deal of difference was there, between the meeting in Brussels that was technically open and the meeting in Cartagena that was technically closed. To me, it was a working group session and it was good that we were there face-to-face as opposed to just on the phone. I think it's good that we can get together from time to time.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Chris Chaplow. Just as a matter of clarification, the meeting we had in Brussels wasn't a workshop. It was just a normal working group meeting which was open to the public.

Just to clarify - I mean, I don't think we've actually really had a workshop in this working group, or am I losing my mind? I think we've just had working group meetings so far.

Barbara, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Barbara Steele: Yes. I'm wondering if it makes sense, as Marika had mentioned, to go ahead and get something on the calendar if we're able to you know kind of designate it then as we get closer as being an open meeting or a closed meeting, depending on whether or not we do have the final report out there and we would be in a position to be able to I guess discuss some of the comments that people may have.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So, let's - so in other words, put it on - put it in. We can always cancel at leisure or change it if we need to.

Barbara Steele: Yes. Change the designation from open to closed, or what have you - vice versa.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

That's - this is Michele. I would tend to agree. I mean, it makes more sense to me to reserve a slot and then change what we're doing with this, or possibly free it up rather than ending up without a slot.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I don't want to be difficult, but one of the challenges is that the 21st February deadline also means the deadline for completing the description on the agenda. So if we really change the concept of the...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: What's (unintelligible) of the 21st of February.

Marika Konings: 21st of February. On the 1st of February, I need to submit my forms, and in that you know we normally could describe like what is the meeting about? Why should people attend? What is the agenda? That can still be changed up until the 21st of February. That's the rules that the Public Participation Committee has set. So normally beyond that date, it's impossible to change and saying, "Well you know, this was a workshop, but now we're suddenly making it a closed working group meeting."

So if the working group is going to explore the two options - and maybe also taking into account that for a workshop we probably would look for a higher profile slot than for you know a working group meeting, which could be you know somewhere - maybe a lunch time or in the morning which are normally when working groups meet, maybe the best approach would be just to request the two meeting slots.

Maybe - because I think for the workshops, it's normally Wednesday morning or Thursday morning, and then find another time maybe earlier in the week, maybe on Monday morning or Monday afternoon if there is any time

available, for a working group meeting. And then closer to the time, see if we need both, if we need one, or none.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks Marika.

James.

James Bladel: Yes. Just briefly, and my experience with workshops is that they're usefulness occurs at the beginning of a PDP lifecycle, not in the middle or at the end. So you know, I guess I'm just - I think we should get the slot and I think we should have a face-to-face meeting and it should be open, but I'm just - I think that we're past the point where a workshop does us a lot of good. And, that's just my opinion. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Well James, just following up on that input, which I thank you for, wouldn't it - what - how would one go about encouraging input on comments? And, what format would you use?

James Bladel: Well you know, I think an open meeting -- number one -- is a clear indication or an invitation to submit comments or to speak to the issues.

You know, I just - I believe that the line between a workshop and an open meeting is a little blurry, but I think that workshops -- at least in my mind -- have a perception of something that occurs at the beginning of the PDP. You know, some place in between the Issues Report and the working group forming. And you know, just around those times.

So maybe if we were going to have a workshop, we could include topics and issues that would be coming up in subsequent IRTP iterations. But I think to have a workshop on the Charter questions that we have in front of us seems like it would be kind of circling back to the beginning of the process, whereas an open meeting would I think get what we're after, which is some public feedback on these issues without reopening all the (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: So if we were to say - just to call it say the presentation of the IRTP report, would that be okay with you?

James Bladel: I think presentation and a discussion; sure, but you know I think - and I hate to sound cynical, but you know this has been going on now for over a year and you know if someone has a burning desire to get involved and speak to a particular issue, I believe that they've had ample opportunity to do so. And, we need to maybe focus on wrapping up (unintelligible) and moving on through the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: James, with all due respect, I'm not going to debate that with you. I totally agree.

No, but in terms of how we name the session - that meeting on - if we were to name it - put it on the agenda. I understand exactly what you're saying with respect to calling it a workshop, because obviously we don't want to have - we don't want people coming along now at this late in the game with a whole kind of - stuff that we've already discussed a year and a half ago, or whatever.

So I'm just saying would you be okay if we were to call it say a presentation - the IRTP B you know, draft Final Report presentation? Would that be okay for you?

James Bladel: Sure. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Berry?

Berry Cobb: Sorry, Michele. It's Berry. Yes, I agree with everything that you just said. If there's going to be a meeting in San Francisco at all, it should be exactly like the one that was conducted for RAP back in Nairobi. It was to present the final report, a/k/a, the Final Recommendations. And then at the very end, there was a public mic and they can ask questions about the final recommendations and then call it a wrap.

And I think we're at the position now, whether you know it's time to do one less poll on our recommendations and start to wrap this up. I don't think we're going to get much further. Really, the biggest one is ETRP, which we'll get to later. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Berry.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to clarify. You know when talking about workshops, I think it's a general term that we use in ICANN, you know for sessions that are not one of the big sessions or a public comment forum, or one of the SO/AC meetings. You know indeed, the idea -- the one I suggested -- would be to present the draft Final Report, encourage people to provide input as part of the public comment forum, or indeed ask clarifying questions, or make already comments on those specific recommendations, not to you know try to come up with completely new ideas or suggestions.

So - and, I'll think of a nice title and make sure that the description is clear on what the session would be about. And if it - if - and then you know closer to the date we see that you know we don't need that session - and we can always cancel it.

Michele Neylon: Just with respect to timelines on that, what is the last date at which we can cancel that and change the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I don't think...

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think there's a deadline. I think you know an hour before the meeting we can still cancel it. Of course, it's not you know nice, because people planned their agendas. Of course, one of the challenges we always have as well is that it will be important to see what other meetings have scheduled opposite, which sometimes result as well in cancellations because people see that there are meetings that - you know, will mean that none will come to the one meeting or the other.

So I think that we can see when the schedule comes out, and I don't think there's a deadline. And you know, at this (unintelligible) been punishment if you cancel a meeting at last minute.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Also, James has made it - has put into the chat there a possible title; Presentation and Discussion of IRTP Final Report, which I think is a pretty good working title. Does anybody have any strong feelings about a title for this? Are they okay with that? Just a very strong feeling to any other way?

Bob approves.

Barbara approves.

Okay, fine.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow here, Michele. Were we saying Draft Final just a little bit earlier? Otherwise, it sounds good.

Michele Neylon: Oh, no. Good point. Good point. Yes, maybe slipping in the word draft there would solve that problem.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. On that note - now we're talking about title, because I'm wondering if we maybe need to - I don't know if a better is for example Preliminary Final Report, because I'm not - I don't want to give the impression to people that - people think a draft means that we're still you know really actively drafting.

I don't know if preliminary would be a better word to signify like this is really almost it. You know, this is really the last chance. If there's nothing really major, this is going to be the final.

Would preliminary you know convey that message better than draft?

Michele Neylon: I don't know.

Marika Konings: Or any other term?

Michele Neylon: A preliminary - Barbara likes. I personally - I don't have any strong feeling one way or the other, but I would agree with Chris Chaplow that final by itself is misleading.

Matt, do you have any thoughts on this?

Matthew Serlin: I like preliminary.

Michele Neylon: You like preliminary?

Ollie, do you like preliminary?

Oliver Hope: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody dislike preliminary?

And James, I do love your suggestion that we...

James Bladel: That was a joke.

Michele Neylon: I think we'll reserve that for our private blogs or something. I don't think putting that on the ICANN meeting schedule would be welcomed, though I'm - I would love to be able to put that on an anonymous blog that nobody could link to me.

Okay then, moving on. Oh, I liked Bob's suggestion; Ultimate Draft Final Report, though I could see us getting crucified.

Moving on. In terms of meet ups and everything else, and just you know when people are looking at arriving, would it be fair to say that most of you will be in - well actually, I can't even say judging by the group. Are many of you arriving at the weekend, or are you all leaving it until the Sunday night last minute to arrive in San Francisco?

Oliver Hope: Ollie here. I'm not quite decided yet, so if it helps for me to get there you know Saturday, early Sunday; whatever, then I can probably play around with that.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Who else is around - okay, so Chris Chaplow is arriving Thursday. Bob is arriving Saturday. James is arriving on Friday. I'm arriving on Friday. I mean if nothing else - what I was going to say is that if nothing else, we could always meet up informally for a chat or whatever.

When we met up in - several of us met in Cartagena kind of informally to kind of go through a few bits and pieces and it was relatively productive. I mean, as productive as anything which involves me and alcohol I supposed. But, it wasn't totally unproductive.

Anyway, we can always thrash out some of these details. I'm just thinking in terms of getting stuff onto schedules that if we were just arranging all to kind of meet in Hotel X's bar or Café, or whatever, to have like a half an hour discussion, then you don't need to put anything on a timetable, if it's just a matter of you know prepping stuff.

Anyway, moving on.

Okay then, moving on to the Item Number 3 in our agenda. Now, there's been - the Recommendation 2 was we discussed that myself, Matt, James, and Mikey would draw from SAC -- oh, a second -- would look at SD/SAC 044, relevant to Charter Question A - how I'm actually reading that, that doesn't make much sense, but kind of - I think that's what we're talking about.

Okay - no. Matt, could you walk us through what - this please? Or, James has got his hand up already. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Matt, do you mind if I go, or...

Matthew Serlin: No, you have a better voice for these kinds of things than I do I think.

James Bladel: Oh, no.

So, my initial concern with this recommendation Michele was that it said - the original language said the working group recommends the promotion and adoption of the measures outlined in the recent report. And, I think it was the word adoption that got my attention.

So, I wanted us to go back and just make sure that we weren't issuing a blanket recommendation for everything that was in the SSAC report that should become consensus policy. And what I did is I went back through it, and the title of the report is actually something about you know, Domain Name Security for Registrants. So, I don't really think that we can or should recommend that anything in here become consensus policy, because it's not really aimed at contracted parties. It seems to be the target audiences of registrants.

So, what I would like to do is just change the recommendation of Number 2 to drop the word adoption, and just say something like we strongly encourage the promotion of this report. Or, we could be more specific and say we strongly encourage the promotion - or support the promotion of this report to registrants.

So, that was just my feeling on this. I think it was the word adoption that kind of raised a red flag, and then I went back and looked at the report and realized that it's not really a laundry list of consensus policy ideas. It's mainly good security practices for registrants.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Does anybody else want to add in anything here on this?

No comments?

Okay, now I would - just adding in my own voice on this, I can fully see exactly where James was coming from. I mean, the document is titled A Registrant's Guide to Protecting Domain Name Registration Accounts. So there's lots, and lots, and lots of things in the report - I mean, there's a bunch of questions and you know why - questions you could/should ask yourself,

you should ask a registrar, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Why you should ask them? Possible reasons, et cetera, et cetera.

So I think you know raising awareness, promoting the report is a good thing, but you can't really expect people to adopt this, because that would be a - that's a totally different kettle of fish entirely. So, I would strongly support James' view on this.

Matt, do you agree or disagree?

Matthew Serlin: Nope. I agree.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

We didn't have any input from Mikey, I believe. Did we, or did we?

Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Michele. This is Berry. I support the removal of the word adoption. I mean, I don't think there was consensus policy anywhere in that recommendation, so I don't think that was the intent of the recommendation to begin with.

In terms of keying in on the word promotion though, you know we're making this recommendation that you know the working group recommends the promotion of it.

Well, what does that really mean? Does that mean the contracted parties are going to take this SSAC report and make it their own kind of marketing materials, and I guess evangelize these great ideas out to the world? Or, is this recommendation mean that you know - you know, what does promotion really mean, and what actions would the GNSO Council take on this recommendation after we said that? Thank you.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Michele. This is James speaking, and that's an excellent point Berry. What do we do with this? When we say promote it, you know do we plaster it to the doorways in San Francisco and hope that people pick up a copy on their out?

My feeling is - and we had a bit of discussion about this in the meeting with - between registrars and the ALAC. My feeling is, is that this is a perfect example of an ALAC outreach type of an issue, or it can form the foundation of an ALAC outreach campaign where they can take this to their regional at large organizations and help disseminate this through the ranks of their membership.

I think that as I said in Cartagena, if you ask for registrars to take this message, we will certainly deliver this message to our customers and explain to them why they should choose my registrar over Michele's or Matt's, for example.

You know, it will become a marketing piece, as it should. We're a competitive branch of the ICANN community and that's what we do. If we're going to educate someone on how to be a good registrant, we're going to educate them on how to be our good registrant. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Does that kind of answer your question Berry?

Berry Cobb: Perfectly. Yes. I just point out that - you know, I guess maybe we should append a couple of bullets or something to the recommendation to inform the GNSO Council what - you know, what promotion is. And if it's those two things that James mentioned, I'm perfectly happy by it. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, no problem.

I mean, I actually - I mean the question you raised Berry I think is a very valid one. I mean, promotion is a kind of meaningless word in many respects. I don't know, maybe the kind of thing that we should say is that we would encourage the ALAC and other ICANN structures to -- how would I put this -- to circulate and promote the report amongst their members, or something. I don't know. I'm just flailing around here looking for something a little bit more specific.

Berry?

Berry Cobb: Unfortunately, I don't think I have an exact answer, but this is probably a more curious question for the veterans. Does the ALAC have an inbox, so to speak, to take these requests and take action on them? Have we done any recommendations kind of like this in the near past that we can leverage to make sure that that gets thrown over the fence a little bit smoother?

Michele Neylon: Berry, this is Michele. There's been - well, the ALAC - ALAC people are usually involved in a lot of the working groups. This is one of the few working groups where they don't really have any representation that I'm aware of. Baudoin is ALAC, but he's not actually on the call today as far as I know - or is he? Well, he doesn't seem to be.

There is always the option - and I think the ALAC leadership will follow GNSO deliberations, and the new head of the ALAC I know has been on several of the working groups, and there's also meetings now between ALAC and - I think just the registrars. I'm not too sure about the other ICANN structures. I don't know. Somebody else could speak to that.

So then, there definitely is better opportunities for communication and sharing, that I'm aware of anyway. And the worse comes to worse Berry, we can always send an email to Cheryl.

Berry Cobb: The formal method. All right. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. No problem.

Marika you might know this, because you know a lot of things. Marika or Gisella, or somebody. Is - do ALAC have meetings with other groups beyond...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We don't have - on the GNSO, there's not a formal meeting with the ALAC, but we do have an ALAC liaison that participates in GNSO Council meetings. So, I'm sure if this recommendation gets passed on to the GNSO Council and gets adopted, it would be channeled through the ALAC liaison at that stage.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does that kind of answer the question Berry?

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible) it did.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

James is suggesting language - maybe looking at adding in the words - wording of like advocate or evangelize - or advocate, or evangelize the report. I mean, there's lots of things one could do.

Rob, just as you joined a bit late, we're currently looking at the recommendations about the SSAC report. I tried to think of some wording.

Matt, go ahead.

Matthew Serlin: Thanks, Michele. You know, I don't know that we should make it ALAC specific, frankly. I mean, I think if we - you know, I think ICANN itself should have a role in disseminating and promoting the report too. So, I don't know if we you know just specifically call out, "Hey. You know, here you go ALAC," or you know make it a little more broad and say you know, the greater ICANN community, or whatever sort of language we come up with. But, that's my input.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Anybody else?

Berry Cobb: Michele, this is Berry. Just to respond to that. I mean, I agree I don't want to - I wouldn't want to nail down a recommendation like this to just silo it on one course or path. My - I guess we just need to find a balance.

Because the recommendation in its current form, based on just what happened with the RAP exercise, we need to have some sort of actionable content in a recommendation; otherwise, the GNSO will kick it back to us and say, "Well, what priority do you want us to do?" Or, what - you know, they're going to probably want more information.

So the more actionable we make a recommendation the less work we'll have to do on the back end or pass them on to anybody else.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Hi, so I just wanted to go and agree with Matt, we don't need to necessarily call out one specific group but we should say for example I mean the at large, I think if I'm understanding that distinction correctly. But certainly other groups are welcome to promote and relay this information. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Marika if Marika and I were also discussing the possibility and reaching out and maybe just asking the SSAC what they intend to do themselves which might give us some kind of help so that maybe we could - well support whatever they're doing. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I want to suggest that I wasn't thinking about making a formal request to the SSAC but I wanted to check with my colleague Dave Piscitello who supports the SSAC to see you know what they've planned with regard to that specific advisory.

And what kind of recommendation they would consider helpful. I think more could be done to promote this report so that might provide some actual actionable input on our specific recommendations if the working group thinks that's helpful.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Marika. Well I for one think it's a good idea. Right then, moving on now unfortunately Paul Diaz isn't on the call today but he did leave us a message to pass on.

Sort of bringing up the email he sent us and - hold on. Where is it, give me two seconds.

Marika Konings: Michele can I maybe in the meantime explain some of the other changes that people need to have a look at before we get to Paul's point?

Michele Neylon: Sorry, I found Paul's point.

Marika Konings: You want me to go first or you go first?

Michele Neylon: Ladies first, come on, you're a lady, I'm an ugly Irishman, come on.

Marika Konings: So just to note that there were two changes that were discussed in the previous call and agreed by the working group so it was adding incumbents

to gTLD that you see highlighted in red and changes to unanimous consent to rough consensus and noting that not everyone voted in favor of this recommendation.

Although there was no one saying now but I think the working group agreed that it would only take unanimous consensus in those cases where everyone affirmatively voted in favor.

Also to address some of the concerns that people expressed on that call, I think especially noting that this is not a recommendation for (unintelligible) this is merely a recommendation to initiate or request an issue report that would need to look at the different elements, you know positive as well as negative of a potential WHOIS model for all TLDs.

I've added a language or a sentence at the end of the recommendation that tries to capture that. So basically it reads such an issue report and possibly subsequent policy development process should not only consider a possible requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs in the context of IRTP which is also consider any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur outside of IRTP that would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs would be desirable or not.

So trying to capture that concern and making sure that ht's represented in the recommendations. So I guess my question is if there's any objection to that specific addition?

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Just with iteration to this to kind of pass on the message from Paul Diaz or try to at least, Paul thinks that either myself or James understand his point of view and asked that one of us was to speak on his behalf.

Now Berry I see you, I'll get you in just two seconds. It's captured in the notes but just if anybody has any issue with it, it's just the idea being - it's to deal with your capture versus display and you know there are possible concerns with displaying every single contact at this sort of unclear where you're coming from.

Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Michele. I'd just like to - I posted this out to the list and I never got a response. I'm still uncomfortable with this whole rough consensus assignment but I'd just as soon move on from it.

My question to the working group is once we've gone through this exercise where we review the final recommendations will we be polling amongst the stakeholders of this working group for final determination of these recommendations?

Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Berry do you mean polling each of us - polling the work group as in all of us or polling us so that we can get a feedback from our stakeholder groups?

Berry Cobb: I think Marika will answer it specifically for me but just us that are working on the final report for submission to the GNSO. As I pointed out on to the list this recommendation is a pretty important one.

And I still am having difficulty understanding why we don't have full consensus especially with the comments that Marika has posted on the bottom about just initiating the PDP, not saying whether one needs to be done or not.

And so if we're not going to get unanimous consensus on this I think that that sends a mixed message back to the council and therefore I think it's very

important that amongst the primary stakeholders of the working group that we all poll again so that we get final determination of where everybody stands on this.

And so if for example this recommendation doesn't maintain the support that it originally started out with I'd just like to have that documented.

And as I alluded to in my note I think the RAP went through this same exercise and it was pretty valuable to the final report. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Berry, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I mean the two options here, you know you could go through another poll like we did before where everyone just basically votes yes, no, or no strong view either way.

Another way would be to you know once we have all the recommendations together each of them would have a designation and you know hopefully most of them will have unanimous consensus.

The idea could be then as well that we actually send it out to the mailing list and then encourage everyone that you know hasn't been on calls or someone to speak up and disagree with the designation.

And I think the idea would be as well and that's actually one of the recommendation in the new working group guidelines although you know this working group is not required to work under those guidelines as they haven't been inducted yet.

But they actually indicated those that didn't vote in favor so that there's as well as record of members of the working group that actually expressed that you know for example in this one it would indicate I think - and I would need

to look back but you know Paul for example prefers that this is rough consensus.

And I think James for similar reasons so it would include then the names of those people that basically said you know no strong feeling either way which makes this recommendation a non-unanimous one and I guess that will be an option for them as well to submit a minority statement if they would like to explain why they feel this shouldn't be a unanimous consensus position.

So that's something for the working group to consider if they prefer to do another poll like we did before so you know we do a Zoomerang poll and people do that on line and we look at the results.

Or whether you know on the calls we come to agreement on what we believe is the designation based on our discussion and then ask for on the mailing list to make sure that those that are not on the call if they agree or whether they want to express disagreement with you know the designation of these recommendations.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Just so that we can - so we can just move forward with this, does anybody have an issue with some kind of simple poll just to help us drive this forward to conclusion?

James?

James Bladel: Yeah, I don't have an issue with that, I would just recommend that this is going to be a binary question, do you support this or do you not support this, you know if we leave out the no strong opinion, abstain, you know the sort of responses then we'll get some clarity on this.

And I think we're going to find that we have less at rough consensus, that's just my opinion, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you James, anybody else? Okay simple question for you all, does anybody have a serious issue, serious concern, I totally hate, do not want to object to a poll?

Okay I'll take that silence as meaning no objection. Okay, James?

James Bladel: Yeah, you're a little too quick there Michele. It's not that I object, it's just I don't object, I just feel like it's maybe a bit unnecessary.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: One thing to point out as well is that if you want to do a poll we really need to get through these recommendations and add final language.

Because you know it takes some time to set up the poll, we need to give people a little bit of time to conduct the poll, we need some time to actually review the results of the poll and see if there's anything else that needs to be done to modify or make sure people get closer together.

So that would mean that if we want to make a deadline that maybe we need an additional call or do more on the mailing list. Because before we can actually conduct the poll we need to get on - you know get final agreement on the language of the different recommendations.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Marika. Right, well like in terms of timelines you were saying Marika that we only have - what is it, three more meetings left before the deadline? Is that right?

Marika Konings: Following this meeting we'll have three more if we continue meeting on a weekly basis, three more meetings.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Yeah, I mean there's no reason why we can't do this just by the mailing list and try and push forward that way. Okay then, recommendation four, sorry, Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, just one more if we can just hear out as well on recommendation three, there are no objections to removing that stance as Paul suggested. He suggested removing the last sentences before the red new bit.

It should be noted that this recommendation does not apply to additional information collected under our thick WHOIS model needs to be publicly displayed.

And that's his proposal and I would have opposition.

Michele Neylon: I would actually support his proposal because in terms of privacy and everything else I'd have to support that proposal. So I would support it, his proposed wording.

Did anybody disagree? Fine. Move on, okay, Paul Diaz's point is taken and we agree. Recommendation four, sorry I'm just moving on on the screen so I can actually see it.

Now the square is the language from Barbara?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I actually haven't added that here yet because it was just put out on the mailing list, I haven't added it here to the table yet, as well part of the discussion.

So I think Barbara just...

Michele Neylon: It's that link there. I'm actually losing my mind, it looks like it's a blank email is the link you sent. Hold on. Barbara is still here or is she gone?

Barbara Steele: I'm here. I thought it was relating to item three or I shouldn't say that, to question B. It kind of fell within that group I think.

Michele Neylon: Well you know it's the recommendation numbers, not the charter questions.

Barbara Steele: Right.

Michele Neylon: So it's charter - you know it's recommendation 1, 2, 3, 4, whatever and then the charter questions are A, B, C, D.

Barbara Steele: It may have been more of an additional recommendation to address this, the trumping of the registrar - or sorry the added contact by the registrant.

Michele Neylon: Right. I mean we have a bit of - go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, so for the question would be for me as well then so the - Barbara your recommendation is an additional one to three and four under charter question B, so it wouldn't be to replace the current proposal for recommendation four.

Barbara Steele: That's correct.

Marika Konings: Okay so I'll update that in the next table then that it comes out as a separate recommendation so maybe we first want to tell them about what to do with four.

I've started to touch in my notes because we have further discussion on Simonetta's proposal and there seemed to be glowing support I had the feeling on the last call for her proposal which basically instead of you know making any recommendations on the how to change the effective control of registration actually ask for new working group to be created to actually look at that issue in further detail.

Michele Neylon: Right.

Marika Konings: So where does the working group stand on that one? So we have recommendations for and we have the alternative language proposed by Simonetta.

Michele Neylon: I don't really know, what do people feel? Anybody have any strong feelings about this? Okay Simonetta's suggestion, you've also got the idea of this - another work group possibly looking at the change of control concept.

And we also have Barbara's suggestion, is that right Marika? Three things there, or am I missing something?

Marika Konings: Well Barbara's suggestion is going to be a separate recommendation basically, not intended to replace either of these two so I think we need to do that separately and then look at Barbara's recommendation as an additional one to address this charter question.

Michele Neylon: Okay then. So we've got this Simonetta language is here saying the working group knows that the IRTP is widely use to affect the change of control and it goes through all that.

James go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi, sorry for this, I know we're approaching the end of this first session. But I would like to spend a little bit more time you know looking into Barbara's recommendation.

I just don't feel like I'm real comfortable right now saying I support or oppose it, I'd like to talk to some folks internally.

And perhaps if we can defer that until our next call I would very much appreciate that.

Michele Neylon: James can I just instead of deferring it to a call because I think you know we can do a lot of this stuff...

James Bladel: Or the list, I'm sorry.

Michele Neylon: No, it's just if anybody wants to check internally, ask a friend or whatever with respect to Barbara's suggestions, and see if there's any issues they may have with it or if they need any clarification.

If we could try and do that through the list I think that would be a bit more economical use of time. I'm not saying that it has to be done today or tomorrow but other than the kind of let's wait for a week.

James Bladel: Michele my main point was I just didn't feel like I was put on a spot right now on this call to weigh in on that.

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's no problem, that makes perfect sense. Now with respect to the change of control concept the suggested wording from Simonetta which is up there on the Adobe Connect room, Simonetta isn't actually on the call today.

And what this possibility is looking at the change of wording that Simonetta has there or maybe bumping this to another working group to look at this a little bit more closely.

So the alternative language for Simonetta is as follows, the work group knows that the IRTP is widely used to affect the change of control over a given registration as opposed to simply moving the registration of a new sponsor and registrar with all contacts unchanged.

While the IRTP lists both a registrants the admin contact is authorized transfer contacts to change registrars. The change of control function is not defined. Therefore the working group recommends that a policy addressing

the details of a change of control mechanism in conjunction with the domain transfer should be worked out.

The work group addressing this issue should draw on specialists from the registries, the registrars, the secretary of market domain portfolio holders and ICANN policy staff.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah, I support Simonetta's general idea, I have a couple of tweaks with her language. I mean first off I don't think that we should recommend that a policy be worked out.

I think appropriate response is to recommend an issues report setting the potential for a change of control consensus policy for recommending an issues report on you know something like what could be done in terms of setting up a separate change control function.

I think that the other - that this recommendation probably you know understood by most of the community that experts will be drawn upon and I don't think that that's ever been a problem. I think they will show up.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any strong feelings on this Barbara?

Barbara Steele: I actually agree with James' assessment of that. I don't know that it necessarily belongs as a part of the IRTP just by virtue of the fact that it's inter registrar transfer policy.

But I do think that it would be worthy of having an issues report drafted and another look at it, for perhaps a second or another policy relating specifically to change of registrant.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect, thank you. My own personal view and this is me Michele speaking as myself not as anything else, I'd agree as well with what the last two people have said, that yeah.

I mean an issues report type thing if nothing else can't do any harm and also as well based on my own experience and our experience as a company dealing with domains and registrants and everything else, there are issues that we see.

So if something was there that people could actually look at in terms of you know best practices, policy, call it what you like, this would make life a lot easier for a lot of people.

Okay then, moving on, Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes?

Michele Neylon: There's a note here saying draft additional language for inclusion on the notes on the different scenarios and issues discussed by the working group in relation to charter question B without resolution and then your name is beside it.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, this is the one where we were looking at the different scenarios or the different roles actually between the registrant and the admin contact where we could see the different - the companies, we could have partners, directors, employees, ex employees, man and wife, webmaster and all these.

So I've been sort of sketching out what's becoming of the more complex - and it gets bigger and bigger when it starts to become tabulated.

Michele Neylon: It's a work in progress.

Chris Chaplow: It's a work in progress. The one question I did have though is when we say notes, I was wondering where this would fit into the report into which chapter of the report?

Is it approach taken by the working group? I don't know whether this is - if somebody could orientate me on that.

Michele Neylon: Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I think the appropriate section would be working group deliberations. While we cover basically the items we've discussed and you know basically that's refrain as well what has lead us to the different recommendations that we make.

So (unintelligible).

Chris Chaplow: So it might be a chat to some part of that section.

Marika Konings: Right, if you look in that section in the draft that has circulated that's for each of the charter questions, there's a separate section in which bullet points I tried to highlight the main point that the working group has discussed in relation to that issue. So maybe there you might want to suggest something specifically in that section on, you know, charter question B relating to, you know, the points you just mentioned.

Man: Yes, okay, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, then, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to wrap on the recommendation 4, the language. James, did I understand you correctly that you're going to make some changes and suggestions to the list on that one based on (unintelligible) language? Just want to get my action items...

James Bladel: Sure, I could do that, you bet.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Michele Neylon: I mean, Chris, if you also - even if you've got a rough draft of what you're doing at the moment, if you want to share with us or even some of us and get some feedback or suggestions, you know, please...

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Michele Neylon: ...feel free to (unintelligible)...

Chris Chaplow: Put it on the list, yes.

Michele Neylon: Or put it - yes, put it on the list. Maybe other people have a look at this, they might kind of go, "Hey, that's fantastic -- can't think of anything else." They might go, "Oh, my God. Are you on drugs?" Who knows? You know what I mean. It's always a good idea to kind of share these things.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. As we're reaching the end of the call, maybe (unintelligible) I could make is to try from the - because I think we've, you know, completed a lot already on the things we've discussed, but we haven't really gone to the other recommendations in the last few calls.

If I can maybe, you know, start some separate threads on each of these items with the different comments that have been made so far or any other considerations and try to get people to discuss on the list so that maybe we can work our way through the remaining items. And I think especially the one on recommendation 5, it had some, you know, (strong) language proposed by James and Barbara proposed a modification.

I actually have some items that I, you know, got from internally and on the proposed language and so I'll add those as well to it. So maybe we can have some further discussion on the (unintelligible) and there try to come to some kind of closure on these different items, you know, in between calls as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. It's two minutes to the hour, so I think some people have to drop off, including myself. Does anybody have any final parting words of wisdom? I'll take that silence to mean no and I will now hand you over to Berry who will look after you for the next whatever length of time it takes. He's saying less than an hour. So Berry, all yours.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Michele. Okay, I don't think we're having too many peeps that are staying on for the second hour, and as I mentioned in the chat, I don't think we'll need all of the second hour.

In recap from the last several second-hour sessions, one way or another, although it hasn't been officially polled, the old idea of ETRP is dead. I think there was very significant support for that.

As a last-ditch effort, we're hoping that we can modify the concept and the support that we had with the ETRP and maybe just fold it within the existing policies that we have today and therefore not necessarily create a separate policy called ETRP.

As I alluded to on the last call, I found, what is in essence, the procedure for restoring a domain name. I think what needs to - what kind of icing on that cake needs to be added is the scope and timeframe in which an urgent restore could be performed.

So with that idea, we haven't really kind of thrown it out to the group and there's not too much of a group to throw it out to today. I sent out three

attachments last night and I can't believe I don't have feedback on it. Don't people not sleep around here? No.

Anyway, I don't expect any feedback on what I sent out last night because it was so - it was just before this call. And so I'll just quickly run through the three attachments and what was trying to be achieved there and then we can take the rest of the discussion to the list. And I've also asked Michele to make sure that we have a ETRP line item for the full hour next week.

The attachments I sent I don't think we're going to share in Adobe because they're pretty big. But the first one is a PDF and it is labeled irtpb_swimlane_current_v0.2. So the whole concept behind what I'm labeling as current -- make sure there's no questions or comments. Oh, there it is. Thank you, Marika.

On page 2, there's basically several pages within this attachment. The first second page - first page is the process legend. Second page is my interpretation of the IRTP policy as we see it today.

There's several key takeaways about this swim lane. The first and foremost is you're going to see a lot of text in there which is cut and paste from the actual policy itself. And that text that is included in the swim lanes have direct bearing on the task and/or procedures or sub-processes that are indicated in the swim lane.

So I felt it as important to put both those together because a single activity box may not necessarily describe the complexity of that particular task. And therefore the text from the policy was pretty relevant sitting right next to it.

At any rate, so what you're looking at is the current IRTP process. When I created this, I first started with what you'll find on page 5, which is the IRTP part A processes that were developed under the working group A.

There were basically five different or six different diagrams that were pulled from that working group and I've tried to incorporate the colored and black-and-white flow charts into my swim lane model. So for the most part, I think I've got those covered.

And then my second exercise, I basically went line by line through the IRTP policy to try to validate my process logic in the swim lane. While I think I'm pretty close, I won't ever claim that I'm 100% accurate. I'm a human. Humans do make mistakes. So part of the homework assignment for the group is to review through these swim lanes and help me validate whether I missed some logic steps -- especially those that are more familiar with the operational components of IRTP.

Chris Chaplow: This is Chris here.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Chris.

Chris Chaplow: The one that you released a week ago, that's now - am I understanding that's now being split into two -- the current and the proposed?

Berry Cobb: That is correct. Yes, I should do a better job explaining the difference.

So one file is labeled as "Current" and it includes the IRTP, my interpretation of the dispute procedure before you get to TDRP and then it also includes the - what I interpret to be the current state of TDRP as it exists today and that's page 4 -- the really big swim lane that goes from left to right forever and a lifetime.

And then I also included the legacy documents on pages 5 and 6, the old IRTP process models, and then the last page, which was the ETRP as it was proposed in our interim report -- that is no longer being considered, at least not formally.

The second file or the other PDF, which is labeled as "Proposed" -- that file basically took the current swim lanes and then within there there's four pages on the proposed file. Everywhere there is a procedure or an activity - a new procedure or activity to accommodate an urgent restore in the case of hijacking, those activity boxes and subsequent lines are all highlighted in red.

And so the idea here is that if you could put up on one screen all of the current state and then on your other screen put up the proposed state, you can identify the gaps of what we're proposing in terms of policy updates.

And then, lastly, there was a third PDF, which is a cut-and-paste of the existing or current IRTP and TDRP policy documents. And the idea for this third document was to highlight the areas where we believe there would need to be additional text or content -- our actual policy content -- to accommodate some sort of urgent restore.

The text that you see in those documents is only a first run suggestion. Now Mikey had helped me out and he cut some text from previous SSAC reports. But what you'll see in there is any place that is highlighted in yellow with red text is an area that we think that we'll - we would need to add policy content to accommodate for this urgent return.

Okay. So, there's only very few of us on the call. I don't want to take much more of people's time unless they have specific questions about anything that we've tried to put forward here.

So, just real quick again, in a nutshell, the three PDFs -- one is current. If anything that we can get from - garner from this is at least a better picture that subsequent use and policy development and that kind of stuff can take it to the next level for IRTP.

Again, the other document is the proposed which is to replace the original ETRP with this new urgent or - I don't know what we want to title it, but...

Chris Chaplow: Forcible rather than urgent, perhaps.

Berry Cobb: Correct, yes. So, well, what we'd like to maybe suggest, again, it's really leveraging what already exists in the policy today, what we're really trying to accomplish here, is to put a framework around that, in a nutshell, within the current ETRP there has to be a mechanism that invokes action to perform an urgent restore of a transferred domain. And then the second component of it is I think what was missing in the past from ETRP is that it wasn't really tied to anything that kept everyone honest.

And so the idea here in general is if a registrant fears that his domain was hijacked, he calls up his registrar record, "My - you know, red alert, my name's been hijacked." The registrar record would work behind the scenes as they do today with the gaining registrar.

If the registrar record and/or the registrant thinks that it's important enough, they can invoke the urgent restore, and if that happens, whatever timeframe that is -- what's included in this documentation is 72 hours, you know, but none of that's written in stone. But if the restore - if the urgent restore is invoked, then it automatically invokes the TDRP.

And what we didn't want to do was destroy what already works today and that's how two registrars can work together to resolve an issue on their own. So essentially, what we decided to do was to create a level zero within TDRP meaning...

Woman: Hello?

Berry Cobb: Hello? What we wanted to do was create a level zero that would merely document the fact that this is a suspected hijacking case, that it has been restored to its original state, that the domain is locked until some sort of dispute is resolved whether it be level zero, one, or two. And then the

outcome of that is whether the restore was justified, whether the restore needs to be undone, or whether we need to undo the undo restore, or that there's no decision and everything stays at current state. And then depending on where you are in that chain of custody is how much you pay for invoking those procedures and dispute resolution.

So without going through the swim lanes activity by activity, the - everybody's homework assignment tonight is to review through these three documents. If you see any gaps in my logic from what I've documented, please e-mail me and I'll make those updates accordingly. If you have any questions about the concept of the urgent return, then definitely please pass them out to the list.

And then I'll just close by stating that I hope that we make this the first or second meeting action item for next week so that we can take this back to the larger working group. I think we're at a point here though is there was already considerable support to drop ERTTP in its present form. So that's done. I think when we take this to the larger working group, that can get voted down and we can move on.

Then the second is this new concept and whether we want to - if there is support for it, then the primary task from there would be to update policy -- you know, I guess some rough idea of what the policy text would be within the current policy documents. And if we get support that we think we can get this done in time for San Francisco, then we'll move forward with it. If not, then vote it down and then we move forward.

Any questions, gripes, complaints, concerns, comments?

Chris Chaplow: No.

Berry Cobb: All right. Well, thank you everyone. Take this to the list and we'll talk next week.

And Marika, if you are - if you can listen to me, you know, let's still keep the second hour going, but as I mentioned before, I don't know that there'll be a formal second hour just for ETRP. It's time to take this to the bigger group.

Chris Chaplow: Marika (unintelligible) I've got a quick question.

Berry Cobb: Sure, Chris.

Chris Chaplow: And, you know, obviously, thanks for doing this. You've obviously put a lot of work into this and I see support has changed from the ETRP to doing it this way and I see you've obviously put a lot of work in and thought it through. Is there anything that you feel is a big gap or a disadvantage in doing it this way as opposed to the ETRP -- that you feel is a hole there that you've not plugged or you want to mention?

Berry Cobb: Not yet anyway. I think this revision - this revised approach does squash the concerns that were raised by the original ETRP meaning that, you know, I think that there - by leveraging what already exists out there today should certainly put to rest the issue of using the ETRP for - abusing the ETRP in what its current form is today.

By - while not the urgent return itself is not a dispute resolution mechanism or it lacks something to dispute it, by tying it to existing dispute resolution I think mitigates the chance for it being abused because it certainly seems like once you decide to enter into the TDRP land it's not a cheap endeavor.

And certainly which reminds me of a question for anybody on the phone and/or Marika or anybody else, do we know who the dispute resolution providers are for TDRP? You know, like for example, with UDRP, it's pretty clear who those dispute resolution providers are. I'm just curious if we know who they are for TDRP and I'm wondering if there's not other information from those groups that we can leverage.

The - you know, in terms of trying to address the other gaps, I think what is important about this second proposal -- and I do need to correct one thing you said, Chris. There - I wouldn't say that there is support for this second proposal. So far, nobody has mentioned support one way or another for it. So I would - use of the word "support" is wrong -- merely that it's just a proposal at this point.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. (Unintelligible). It was drop the ETRP not support yours, yes?

Berry Cobb: Correct. But I think what is really nice about this second proposal is the creation of this level zero within TDRP because I think what this will allow it to do is for the industry to gain better visibility at least on the reactive components of hijacking.

So if there ever is a request out there to - you know, for a hijacking domain and it ever gets invoked to undo that hijack, if they follow or traverse the process through level zero, we at least get to document that that instance happened. And I think over time that could be pretty valuable information.

Okay. So any other questions, post them onto the list. Thank you, everyone, for your time and we'll talk next week.

Man: Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Man: Thanks, Berry. Bye.

Berry Cobb: Take care, everyone.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Bye.

Woman: Bye everyone.

END