

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP  
Transcription  
Tuesday 3 May 2011 at 14:00 UTC

**Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 3 May 2011 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:**

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-b-20110503-en.mp3>

**On page:**

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

**(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)**

**Attendees:**

Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG

James Bladel – Registrar SG

Berry Cobb – CBUC

Paul Diaz – Registrar SG

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Rob Golding - RrSG

Bob Mountain – Registrar SG

Michele Neylon – RrSG Chair

Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Barbara Steele – Registries SG

**ICANN staff:**

Marika Könings

Kristina Nordström

**Apologies:**

Chris Chaplow – CBUS  
Anil George - IPC  
Oliver Hope – Registrar SG

Coordinator: (The guests) have not joined.

Kristina Nordström: Thank you. Okay. Hello.

Man: Hello.

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator. I'd like to remind all participants this call is being recorded. If you do have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

Man: Excuse me. Bob Mountain now joins.

Michele Neylon: Could somebody do a roll call please.

Kristina Nordström: Yes. I can do that. Hello everybody and welcome to the IRTP call today on the 3rd of May. On the call have Michele Neylon, Mike O'Connor, James Bladel, Barbara Steele, Kevin Erdman, Baudouin Schombe, Paul Diaz, Matt Serlin, Simonetta Batteiger and Bob Mountain. And from staff we Marika Konings and Kristina Nordstrom.

And apologies we have from Anil George, Oliver Hope and Chris Chaplow. And may I also remind you to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much.

Michele Neylon: All right. Good afternoon everybody. And as per usual, does anybody have an update to their statement of interest or declaration of interest? Have you all - have any of you become communists since we last spoke basically? No. Okay. Right.

Well welcome back Marika. I believe she was off gallivanting last week. So she wasn't with us. So Marika are you now all fresh and ready for action?

Marika Konings: Yes. Definitely.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Now we have to say that again with a bit of confidence now, come on. Yes. Definitely.

Marika Konings: Yes. Definitely.

Michele Neylon: That's better. That's better. Because you've got the fancy job title and everything so you don't need to be, you know. Okay then. On today's agenda we are going to have a quick look at the EAC just any revisions from last week and then we're going to move on to a couple of other items.

Mikey and James, do we have any revisions or changes to the EAC document since last week?

Coordinator: Excuse me, Berry Cobb now joined.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm going to actually throw the baton to James because I did not touch the document this week.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James.

James Bladel: This is James. Thanks Mikey. (I have) also not made any changes to the language of the EAC. I did post a note however and I think Mikey had a good follow up to the mailing list. And I apologize for the delay on that. I was waiting for some feedback.

But anyway, so that's out there relative to ensuring that both the -- what are the terms we're using -- the registrar raising the EAC and the registrar responding to the EAC message are copying some neutral third party, either the registry or ICANN or possibly both. Mikey suggested that a mailing list could service in the interim and then possibly we would look at this as an enhancement to radar.

But I think that the general point of my recommendation was that this cannot just be a conversation between two registrars who may or may not be involved in a dispute. There has to be an observer or referee or whatever we want to call this role to determine whether or not the EAC was, you know, raised within a certain timeframe and responded within a certain timeframe. And it cannot just be, you know, one registrar's word against the other registrar.

So that was my only concern. And it was not direct change in the language. So if there's some place that we can efficiently and cleanly shoehorn this into the existing document, I'm all for it.

Michele Neylon: Okay then. I've got see Bob. Anybody else want to throw their hat into the ring? Okay Bob, go ahead.

Bob Mountain: Yes. Thank you. This is Bob speaking. Yes James, I just - yes, just one question. Is email, you know, considered a secure enough, you know, method of communication to be used in this kind of - in this kind of application? I'm just concerned that, you know, people having the ability to say, you know, I sent it but it wasn't received or, you know, something along those lines. So I wondered if there's precedent for this type of thing elsewhere.

James Bladel: Well, I would say I wouldn't necessarily say email is always secure and reliable. However, I note that most of our relationships with the gTLD and ccTLD registries involve some sort of a normal and urgent communication channel. So I think it would be as secure and as vulnerable as those existing channels.

Michele Neylon: Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes. No, that's fine. I just - I know it's not perfect. I was just wondering if that's in practice elsewhere than that. You know, I'd say my guess is it's a step in the right direction.

Michele Neylon: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm sort of winging this. So this may not be the right thing to do. But one of the things that I did in a very early draft of this was to insert language in the TDRP. That was essentially a documentation step in the process. I called it. In the TDRP there are like three levels.

And I called the new level Level 0, which would be essentially exactly what James is describing here. It was simply the process of documenting the exchange between the registrars but there was no

other action or implication to that. And I just throw that back in the hopper. I'm not, you know, I have to look at it. Since James' note came right before the call, I'm not sure this is right, but that's at least a thought that we could throw into the pile on that one.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Bladel.

James Bladel: Hi Michele. Thanks. Just wanted to follow up a little bit on Bob's question and concern. Yes. I think that there's two questions here. One is relative to security and one is relative to reliability of email as the EAC channel.

My thinking was that for security that's easily address by not putting any sensitive information in the request for an EAC and just handling that was the communication that's established through other means whether that's telephone or something else.

So is it really just a reliability of delivery or the timeliness of delivery that we're concerned about with regard to using email for this channel?

Bob Mountain: Yes. That would be my concern and also, you know, the kind of - I guess the reliability and, you know, and in the case of, you know, some kind of fall out or dispute, is it, you know, is it sufficient enough to hold up I guess if there were an issue that were to, you know, come into play later on?

I don't have that - I'm just sort of, you know, just using just sort of common sense. I don't have any experience that it's not. I'm just wondering aloud if, you know, if that is sufficient, so.

James Bladel: Okay. Yes. And I think it's probably not - like you said, it's probably not perfect but it's being used now in other contexts so if we find a better method in the future for those contexts we can certainly extend it to (you as well).

Bob Mountain: Right.

Michele Neylon: I just put myself in the queue. With respect to - I mean what James is saying about email and ccTLDs I mean actually a lot of the registries out there experience as well would be the loss of our communications with them are a hell of a lot more efficiently done via email especially when you have some of the registries who are in totally different time zones.

So you might send them an email during office hours and you might not get an answer until sometime in the middle of the night. In terms of tracking and logging, well push come to shove, you'd have a log on your mail server. So even if it was received on the other - on the far side, there still would be a log.

And Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh, I didn't even raise my hand. I just put a question in the chat and I - because I missed the last two calls and I was wondering is this about this initial contact from one registrar to another or is this about once you have come to a conclusion and you want to inform the registry of (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay. The entire thing with EAC is establishing the contact. And while the phone call idea I believe is still there, the point being that because

we need to make sure the thing is tracked but an email would also need to be sent. But I will let Mikey explain that.

Simonetta Batteiger: My only concern with the email would be that I don't know how the email would like wake somebody up in the middle of the night and establish a quick contact because I mean I know myself I wouldn't read my emails at night.

And if I'm on emergency call, I would still want to sleep that night and not just stay up in case someone hijacks the domain name of my registrar and I need to watch my email queue all night. So I wonder how this like prompts to actually wake up and do something would happen if the thing just comes in through email.

Michele Neylon: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. The way the language reads right now, the goal of the EAC is to establish a telephone conversation. And I'm speaking a little bit hesitantly because I think you raise a good point that I probably need to think about more.

I guess in - at least in my own experience if I had one kind of email that I had to wake up for, if I - this is again I'm going a lot of on the fly thinking today. But, you know, what I would do is build a filter in my email system that alerted me 24/7 and I would turn off alerts on my email - all other email so that it would wake me up.

But I'm pretty sure I don't want to write that into the policy. So I guess the question is - I mean, you know, the email conversation that we've been having up until now, as Michele pointed out, is primarily a

documentation step. And I don't think that language is necessarily explicit about what the actual channel mechanism is. I think we leave that up to the registrars. But we could get more explicit if you guys want.

Michele Neylon: Just - let's just kind of make this kind of - to summarize a little bit about what we have discussed previously and just if somebody could please jump in if I've completely misremembered things.

We want the email in order for tracking, logging and compliance. Correct? And the idea of the phone call is to wake somebody up in the middle of the night if required. But the two - but both actions need to be dealt with. Is that right? Am I missing something? Somebody.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm quickly opening up the document so that I can respond. Sorry.

Michele Neylon: Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering if it might be sufficient to just mention that you should call and email. And I mean then the contacts that would have to be in some kind of list for the emergency channel would have to be both an email address as well as the phone number.

And I mean it's in the interest of the registrar who's domain name got hijacked and the screaming client on the phone that they do whatever they can to actually get in touch with the other side and they would probably want to place the phone call and then they should also email the document that they have sort of an attempt to contact the other side.

So it's probably - maybe we're over thinking this. And if you just put in there you should do both and make sure that the list for the contact contains both the phone number as well as an email number are probably fine.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes. Actually I just saw Berry's comment below. But we have that set up as well on some of our emails for service where if it's to a specific address, it drives a page to somebody who's on call. And I wonder if that would be an approach that would work for in this case where if it's an emergency action channel email, it drives a page to whoever happens to be on call. And that way, you know, it's actually another way to log the (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm going to cut this off here I think. This is a policy development process, not a process development process. So I mean the technical specifics of how any registrar wants to implement this is something which is up to the registrar.

You're not - in order for you to be an ICANN accredited registrar, you need to meet a certain technical criteria. So either you have the skills in house to do this or not. But we know - I don't want to - for us to go down this route of getting into specifics of specific technologies that should not be part of the policy. James.

James Bladel: Agree Michele. The main point here is that there should be a third party witnessing the exchange. That's it.

Michele Neylon: Yes. I mean ultimately look, if you want to have a second carrier pigeon to send the thing through to you, so be it if that works for you. But the thing is that we're not going to be - we hopefully will not be kind of revisiting this in, you know, six months time. So, you know, we don't want to be specifying too much. And yes Bob, we do use carrier pigeons sometimes but only in jest.

Anyway, can we all - we kind of all more or less agree of that - on that. Well there's also RFCs related to pigeons which I think is pertinent. Okay. Moving on beyond this. Is there anything else related to the EAC that anybody wants to raise at this time? No. Okay. Ah, James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes. Just real quickly, we did have a suggestion last week to include some sort of a follow up in (IRTPE), whichever one is last to see how this is going and to adjust if necessary so that we can get some - we can get some trial on this program.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any issues with that concept? Okay. Moving - Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I'm wondering if it makes more sense to put actually a timeline in - instead of saying review it in (ERTPE) and just say you have no idea when that might happen. But basically say something more like, you know, one year after implementation or six years after implementation this should be reviewed so there's a - I think a more concrete timeline for when this would be reviewed instead of the right uncertain timeline.

I see James assuming either be in 12 to 24 months. Just like to point out that I think this one is almost going on for two years now. So we still have D and E, which would take to four years from now if we would continue on the same rate. So that's why I'm saying maybe it's better to pinpoint a timeline saying X amount of time after implementation if the idea would be that you want to review it within your 12 month or 24 month after you start using the EAC.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey's supportive of that. Is there anybody who is not supportive of the idea of setting some kind of fixed time? All right. We'll take it as - we'll take it then that everybody likes the idea of setting a fixed time to see how this is going and then to adjust as people see fit.

Okay. Anything further on the EAC at this time? Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes. I just wasn't sure - we had talked last week about inserting some language about reasonableness around a length of time of which could be invoked. I just wasn't sure if that was - if that was put it or not or if that was something we were gong to do later on.

Michele Neylon: Well what kind of language were you - were we meant to be putting in?

Bob Mountain: Remember that was the discussion we said around infinity versus sometime less and James' suggestion was we'd put some wording in there that it had to be a reasonable amount of time so we would avoid that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any thoughts on that? Barbara.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I actually had a different comment.

Michele Neylon: That's okay.

Barbara Steele: Are you ready for me now?

Michele Neylon: Well go on. Go on.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Michele Neylon: We'll come back to the other thing. It's all right.

Barbara Steele: Well basically I'd had the opportunity to talk to some of the other registries regarding the timing of registries taking action to undo transfers in the event that the other registrar does not respond.

And just as I suspected, some of the smaller registries who may not have large staffs or maybe even use other operators to perform their backend services did have some concerns about the timing with which - within which they were expected or would be expected under EAC to undo a transfer.

So I just wanted to go on the record that there are some concerns there and that would be something that we would need to work through and, you know, perhaps recognize that a one size fits all model may not be appropriate.

I think some of the larger registries are a little more comfortable with it because, you know, they tend to have probably more of likelihood that there would be a hijacking that would occur within their zone anyways.

So I just think we need to be conscious of that when we're drafting out language here.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika and then Mikey. Sorry Mikey, I always give preference to ladies, you know that.

Mikey O'Connor: That's no problem.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. And probably just from missing last week's call but I'm also wondering whether you addressed the question of what, you know, what consists of urgent communications or what is - because I think it's a discussion we had - have had in relation to other issues where a definition or some kind of examples will be helpful I think especially from a compliance perspective where they could refer to if someone says well, I use it for this situation to think well, that is not considered urgent.

Look at these kind of examples. These are the kind of situations we would consider urgent. So I don't know if that was further discussed or whether that needs to be further discussed.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And Mikey, are you speaking to this point or to another point?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm actually multitasking and so if you want, you can just drop me out of the queue and I'll sort of pick it up again. I was in the queue for Bob's point.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well let's try to be a little bit more logical. I'll skip you and I'll come back to you in a moment. James, I think you're dealing - you probably put your hand up in relation to Marika. So go ahead.

James Bladel: Marika and Bob's comments if I can take a swing at both those. You're absolutely right Bob. I apologize. We did say that we wanted to include some concept of reasonable and practical or something like that language and limiting the timeframe.

And I think that this also goes to somewhat of what Marika was saying is the definition of what constitutes urgent; if it's beyond a couple of years old then really stretching the definition of urgent or emergency.

I guess, you know, I think from where I'm standing here, I would really hope that this is at or very close to the last draft of this language and that we could put a bow on this topic and all of the discussions that came before it and move on.

I think Marika I don't know that we can define in advance what urgent looks like. I think that we'll know it when we see it. We'll certainly know when someone is abusing it for non-urgent issues. And I think that those are types of things that we're going to have to rely a little bit on mob justice for things like that because the registrars certainly know who the good guys are and who the bad guys are and I'm sure that will extend to use of EAC as well.

So, you know, I kind of would like to see if we can put - Bob's concern reasonable and practical back in here where it is appropriate and then sort of begin to drive this for completion.

I was reading the draft. I don't see a quick place to insert that. I think it's going to be a separate sentence. So, you know, I don't see where this cleanly drops in. But otherwise...

Michele Neylon: Bob was the person suggesting it. So how about Bob sees if he can come up with some wording and he can follow up on the list and let's drive this home. Bob, you okay with that?

Bob Mountain: I'm totally happy to do that.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Okay. Moving on. Anything further on the EAC? This is the last call so we can move onto the next item on the agenda. Fine. We're there. Sorry, the screen's going mad here. Okay then. The next item we were looking at is - yes. Sorry, things getting uploaded very quickly. My screen changes, I get quickly confused.

This is in relation to James' email. There's a couple of things to do with 60-day locks. Okay. As discussed, you can read there on the screen. One of these was 60-day lock following a previous transfer. We know through the problem of domain transfer hopping between registrars is a known issue and could be used to thwart anti-hijacking issues as well as create other enforcements/take down problems.

We noted that the 60 day post transfer lock is optional, which is the current IRTP is reason (unintelligible) Number 9. And the most large registrars follow this practice but is not mandatory. In other words, even though it is optional, most of the large registrars enforce that. So it's more a case of the exception being - (way around) or you know what I mean.

Okay. So there are three - what he's suggestion are three options. One, leave this topic untouched in our recommendations. Two, create some language that indicates this is a voluntary best practice. Or three,

create some language for inclusion in the IRTP that makes this mandatory for all registrars. Having discussed this internally, I can report (perhaps) the option Number 3, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Now, what do other people feel about this? Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I don't want to be difficult but this is one of the ones where I feel the aftermarket players would think it is kind of overdoing it a little bit. And I...

Michele Neylon: Can I counter that by - can I counter that by just asking one simple thing? If you would recognize the fact that the largest registrars already do this...

Simonetta Batteiger: Right.

Michele Neylon: ...then how can you say that the aftermarket has a problem with this?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, it's - it is one piece that aspect of aftermarket use in certain cases to facilitate some of our processes like for example, when you think about options for expiring names and items like this where the customer who acquires a name would like to be able to move this name at some point.

I don't think people - people I know dislike that the name is stuck with which I've (unintelligible) as far as at this point in time and would like to be able to move this name into wherever they hold the rest of their portfolio at that point in time.

So at the moment it is possible to work out agreements with certain registrars to facilitate (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay. Can I just - just one second there Simonetta. You're talking about - you're saying this lock is only referring to - a domain that has transferred within the last 60 days. So how does that affect expiring names? Is that - they (unintelligible) be transferred.

Simonetta Batteiger: (Unintelligible). Well if you do purchase a domain through (set) names or names (at) for example and you would like to consolidate your portfolio all in one place, you cannot do that when this thing is locked down. You could be having an agreement with the registrars which you do expiring options with to say okay, all the ones that you have within your accreditation once we sell a name for you like that, we want to be able to - remove them on behalf of our client to elsewhere.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Simonetta. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: ...possible if you can do this and if - but if there is a - if there is an ICANN policy that says this is not permitted, then that goes away.

Michele Neylon: And okay - Simonetta, the lock at present is to do with transfers. It's to do with the domain that was previously transferred. So if a domain is expiring with Registrar A and you acquire the domain on the drop through Registrar, where's the transfer?

Simonetta Batteiger: The transfer happens after the acquisition. And then (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: No. No. But - no, but hold on. No. But it hasn't been transferred to the previous 60 days.

Simonetta Batteiger: Right. Let me (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: So what's the problem?

Simonetta Batteiger: There's - the problem is that the new owner cannot do anything with this domain for 60 days. They cannot really list it for sale because they cannot transfer it to the next person for example.

((Crosstalk))

Simonetta Batteiger: ...and that's true for any one domain transfer, anyone who is purchasing and selling names for a living they - this is what they do it's - the expiring thing was one example but any one domain transfer you do - you would like to be able to transfer the name and immediately be able to list it for sale again and then transfer it out to whoever the new buyer is.

And some of our clients have agreements with their registrars that I can call up my rep at whoever registrar and tell them I've just sold this name and they'll make it happen for me that I can move it back out. And if you make this a rule that this is in general principal never possible anymore than this disturbing the aftermarket. So I don't know if we - if we have enough of an issue with hijacking to mandate this in the policy.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Okay so very quickly I want to be certain that we're not confusing different types of locks - transfer locks. You know, we're speaking specifically here as the second transfer not the first; not the original transfer after an expiration or an auction or a sale but we're talking specifically about a transfer after a transfer so we're trying to prevent a name hopping.

And, you know, rather than revisit the endless discussion of whether or not domain name hijacking is important enough to change policy I think that, you know, emphatically we would say yes it is. But, you know, I just want to be certain that we're talking about the right lot.

Now we discussed this very early on and I think that every registrar that we've spoken to not only did this but assumed that the post-transfer 60-day lock and the post-create 60-day lock - so you, you know, after you've created the brand new name you can't move it for 60 days and after you transfer you can't move it for 60 days.

A lot of registrars thought that this was mandatory already; didn't realize that this was optional because it was such a prevalent practice. What we're saying here is, you know, since everyone's kind of already operating on the basis that it is required, you know, and only those fringe cases where it's being abusive is it actually becoming an issue then maybe, you know, making it mandatory would close that last loophole.

Michele Neylon: Paul Diaz.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele, it's Paul. I just wanted to ask the question of Simonetta that I posted in the list. The scenario, the - let's call it a

domain consolidator - somebody who is trying to move domains around via a transfer to consolidate in one account.

Realistically do you have any sense of how often this happens that somebody wants to move a name between registrars multiple times so that if we made a mandatory 60-day lock period that would really be a burden on them because, as James has already noted, it seems to me that large registrars who account for the majority of the market are already prohibiting such practice and we're really talking about one-offs in those few circumstances where somebody can provide although it'd been a few days and, you know, have a special relationship to allow it to go through.

So I'm just trying to get a sense of are we now potentially undermining the greater good for the broader public by saying you can't move after your first transfer for 60 days for the benefit of basically the long tail of the marketplace?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, you know, I don't have a perfect response to you. I can just tell you that it is an issue that our transfer team deals with all the time. We have people registering domain names for a living and they list them for sale in our marketplace and in other marketplaces so I would assume the same issue pops up at (unintelligible) pops up at - not names pops up at all these places that allow people to transfer domain names.

And my operations team tells me it happens over and over that someone has just registered a name, started to list it for sale, does not wait for the 60 days before they start listing their domain names for sale. We find a buyer, that buyer needs to wait a long time before they

can acquire - before they can get control of this name because this has just been created.

Or someone is flipping a name, has acquired a name, would like to relist it for sale and it's locked down for 60 days. And with some partners we have agreements that we can call them up, we can fix it for the new buyer but it does happen all the time.

And I really wonder if basically making it impossible for the aftermarket players to help their clients with these acquisitions because there is no more you can call up your registrar partner and explain to them that this lock is optional and explain who you are, explain who the seller was, have them call in and say I'm okay, I'm fine with this domain name transferring out right away.

If this is a lockdown policy where this is - where that registrar will just say no period I wonder if the cases of someone hijacking a domain name justify taking this away from all the legitimate transfers that are going through because this is currently optional?

Michele Neylon: (Rob), you had your hand up?

(Rob): Yes, it was - don't forget we're not to lose sight of this is transferring between registrars not taking control and potential ownership of it from the secondary market. You can still use a domain - theoretically use a domain irrespective of which registrar it's by changing the name service; you can still take ownership by updating the contacts.

And people like Sedo and stuff are registrars of domains in certain TLDs can presumably just hold it in a different account for the 60 days.

I think the potential for saving people confusion by saying well it might be 60 days, it might not be 60 days, 60 days in .org but it's not 60 days in .net I think the confusion there is outweighed by any potential disruption to the secondary market. And I say this as somebody who does buy and sell domains.

Michele Neylon: Matt and then Bob and then Mikey.

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele. Yes, just to sort of add some color here. I actually had a registrar reach out to me yesterday that voiced their concern with the proposal and they were quote, unquote, corporate domain name registrar like (Barth) Monitor and they were looking to get my opinion on it.

And what I said to them frankly was well it may create some additional operational hurdles that we have to manage, you know, kind of similar to what Simonetta says, you know, like if we have a client that bought a name and it transferred and hey want to retransfer it, you know, we'll have to, you know, calendar that for 60 days or whatever.

So it does create some inefficiencies there for us. But at the end of the day I think the larger picture is more important to me, you know, because we do know that multiple registrar hops are part of a hijacking but if we just cut out that loophole altogether then all of us will learn to live with the, you know, additional hoops that we have to jump through. So I'm completely supportive of it.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Bob then Mikey.

Bob Mountain: Yes, this is Bob. Yes, two things; I think we will get pushback from domainers because they're the ones who are flipping it. The, you know, and all these aftermarket sites, you know, the other contingent obviously is the, you know, the end user themselves.

And I don't think they care, right, because they're just going to buy it and probably for the most part leave it, you know, at the site where they bought it. So - but I agree with you, I mean, I think we probably will get pushback so we just - I think if we agree we just need to be prepared for that.

The other thing to James' point we have about, you know, probably 50 registrar partners in our network. I was amazed at the disparity in the lock policy for each one. They're all different from 60 days to no lock at all for any period.

I don't have a list, you know, that I could share and I probably shouldn't, you know, disclose that information but I think there is today, you know, a wide, wide range of implementation, you know, the standards on how that is implemented. So, you know, a policy like this, you know, would certainly change - change the way a lot of people do it today based on our experience.

That's all.

Michele Neylon: Mikey then Simonetta.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Cheerfully venturing into an area that he has no direct knowledge of but it seems to me that the following approach would work. If we had a 60-day lock like the one that James is proposing

which, by the way, I support emphatically, so that everybody knew that this was going to happen.

And now if I put myself in the shoes of an aftermarket provider like Bob's gang or Simonetta's what if you changed your process so that the first transfer was to you, to Sedo or whatever, and that used up the number one transfer and thus there was a 60-day lock.

And then you said to your customers if you've bought a domain you can do anything you want with that domain including selling it right away. But the domain has to stay in our registrar for 60 days after which you or whoever has bought the name is free to then transfer it to their portfolio and we'll even automate that for you if you want like what Matt was describing.

It seems to me that there are - I'm not sure this is right but what I guess I'm saying is that the operational hurdles don't sound that high in this particular case.

And so I would hope that people would do a really good job of describing operational workarounds that could be put in place to solve those problems rather than using those operational hurdles to essentially stir up opposition to a policy which I think is a dramatic improvement to the safety of domain name transfers for everybody.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Mikey and James, I don't disagree with the idea that this is going to increase security in the case of hijacking; I completely support that idea. I'm also not saying that we shouldn't make any

recommendation but I am tending to say let's make this a voluntary (unintelligible) so you leave the door open to be able to help somebody in a case where you want to and you still have the ability to do that.

You currently have this ability because the policy is a - you can but you don't have to. So I would just - and it's true that a lot of registrars already put the locks there so making it a best practice I haven't - I have no issue with that but I don't see - when I compare the number of domain name transfers that go through legitimately where this is - it's creating an additional hurdle versus the number of hijacked cases I think there's just a lot more legitimate transfers going through that we would create an additional hurdle for in order to make a size-wise smaller problem a little more secure.

So I just really wonder if it's necessary to be that strict to make this completely mandatory or if it's good enough to say it's a voluntary best practice and you still have the ability to have a contact with a registrar to help someone move a name quicker.

Michele Neylon: Mikey then Matt.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm going to respond both to Simonetta's point and the point that Bob made in the comment with this, which is, if I were a big time domain name investor, which I'm not by the way, I'm a little time domain name investor, and I was dealing with Sedo, to pick on Simonetta, it would seem to me that what I could do is say dear Sedo, all of my names have to go to Black Knight because that's where I maintain all my names.

And so 60 days after I buy it I want that name at Black Knight. If I want to sell it before the 60 days is up I know that the domain name is safe with you, my trusted partner in buying and flipping domain names.

And essentially you have to help me manage that. It seems like this is an opportunity for value-added services; it's a, you know, it's a whole bunch of things that you could do to help your customers and it would be a way for you to distinguish your own services rather than imposing essentially a flood policy on everybody else who uses domain names who has I think very legitimate rights and concerns about the security of their names.

And so I would push back to the aftermarket community and say look this is an innovative community that's done a lot of things with very interesting technology and this does not strike me as a huge burden on you which you're placing conversely on everybody else. End of rant; sorry.

Michele Neylon: Matt and then Simonetta.

Matt Serlin: Yes, I'd just like to first off agree with what Mikey said. I think he put that very eloquently so agree with him on that point. The other thing that I was going to just pick up on what Simonetta had said was I generally am a fan of best practices; I think they're usually a pretty good way forward.

My concern in this case is that the folks that are on the phone and the larger registrars, the more reputable, well known registrars will of course - if they haven't already will most likely implement something

that's a best practice like that. The folks where the problem exists today will not so therefore the problem will still exist.

So that's why I wouldn't be supportive of recommending this as a best practice. I do think that, you know, like I said earlier it may present operational hurdles for any number of different parties but I think at the end of the day it's worth it for us to, like Mikey said, make the ecosystem safer for everyone.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I completely agree with what everyone has said. And I'm not trying to be difficult here I'm trying to bring in a perspective that might be a little unique to this group. And Bob may have similar experiences in dealing with people who buy and sell domain names.

And this is not just the professional domainer; this is also the person who just purchased the first name ever in the secondary market. Their expectation coming to our Website or coming to anyplace where they see a name advertised is that like any other purchase online this purchase finishes with them placing a payment.

Now it's already more complicated with a domain name because usually a domain name doesn't just transfer instantly when you've made a payment. So it's already a longer process; people are getting very concerned along the process that this is taking so long so explaining to them that purchasing a domain name is going to take 60 days until it's complete in certain cases and in others it won't is going to be a hard sell to these clients.

I also know from our professional domain investors that this is one of the main reasons they are upset with their registrars about. So I agree with you. Just want to make sure that when we make a recommendation like this that this perspective is taken into account and we don't create a new issue with new constituency groups being upset around a policy here for the sake of making a hijacked domain name situation a little easier to fix./

Because, I mean, what happens if a domain name gets hijacked and gets taken from A to B to C to D is - you still have the initial problem the domain got hijacked in the first place. So yes it is difficult - more difficult to fix the situation when it keeps hopping between registrars but it doesn't prevent the hijacking to happen in the first place.

So I really wonder if placing this additional burden on the one side of the legitimate use of domain name transfers is justified by being able to prevent the hopping after a hijacking has already happened anyway?

Michele Neylon: Mikey and then James.

Mikey O'Connor: I think expectations is the key word in what you said, Simonetta. And I'm going to push back again and say that I think that in some cases the expectations are begin set incorrectly by participants in the aftermarket.

You know, if the analogy that domain names are the real estate of the Internet is really true - and we could debate that over beer - but let's presume it's true for at least some - the analogy would be frustration that it takes a while to transfer the title on your building when you buy it.

And yet there are good reasons why it's a good idea to have checks and balances in the process of transferring titles of very valuable assets. And I think that if the expectation was set that way that, A, yes you can still use your building immediately after you buy it; you can immediately control the DNS, you can immediately sell it to someone else, you have complete control over what you do with this asset.

However there is one thing that you cannot do for 60 days and that is if the domain has been transferred - if we stick with the scenario that I described before where you've used up the first transfer to get it into the Sedo registrar - there's one expectation you can't set and that is that you can immediately transfer it to your registrar of choice.

But rather than making that expectation a bad thing make it a good thing and just say look this is a very valuable asset; you still have complete control over what happens to it but there's this one thing that we do to increase the security around these things which we feel is important because these things are very valuable.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Hi, no I thought that was very well put by Mikey. And, you know, I think it goes to the heart of the supportability versus security debate which I don't know that we're ever going to philosophically be able to step out of that.

I would say that, you know, very fortunate that I work with both one of the largest auction platforms in, you know, in the industry as well as

one of the largest anti-hijacking teams in the industry and so I get - I believe try to get a balanced perspective.

And so when I weigh in on these topics I hope that that's kept in mind that I'm not - I'm trying not to have tunnel vision on these issues although - discuss whether or not I'm successful at that.

But, you know, stepping back a little bit from this issue I wanted to point out that I think that this working group kind of dropped the ball on this issue because I'm hearing a lot of discussion, a lot of good points are being raised. We touched on it briefly. We put in our final report that we would like the community to weigh in on this issue. From my review of the comments they did not.

So I guess my question is where do we go with this, folks? If we put this in our recommendations now - I think this goes to Bob's point - you know, there's going to be a lot of, you know, folks in the aftermarket community are going to raise their hands and cry foul that it wasn't in earlier drafts.

It's something that we talked about but I think that we've - I think that we dropped the ball a little bit. And I'm wondering where do we go - where do we put this in here so that it doesn't look like it's, you know, I mean, those folks are kind of a little - I don't want to say the word paranoid - a little touchy already so, you know, I don't want to look like it's a deliberate ambush.

I really do think that we have a whole in our report that we need to close in such a way that it doesn't look like we're springing this on people.

Michele Neylon: Just before I go to Mikey would it help if we were to poll the group to get an idea of where people would like this go? In other words whether they want to go with Option 1, Option 2 or Option 3? Would people find that helpful or unhelpful?

James Bladel: I'm fine with that.

Michele Neylon: So Berry and - well okay everybody - okay I'm getting quite a few people thinking that's not a bad idea. All right, fine. Marika, I hate giving you work but - well actually no I don't really - I kind of don't like giving you work but I know you're better at doing these things than I am.

Could you prepare a very, very simple poll to be sent to the group just to see what people's preferences are in terms of those Options 1, 2 or 3? We'll keep this very, very simple. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think that's not too difficult to do. I can probably use a Doodle poll to get that going. The other question I have...

Michele Neylon: Perfect, perfect.

Marika Konings: ...I have on that one, you know, when we get to our final report I think we need to do a poll in any event also to determine the level of consensus because for example in the case of this and, you know, if everyone agrees on, you know, Option 3 that one person feels very strongly about Option 2, you know, you can always file a minority viewpoint.

There is, you know, different options outlined I think in the GNSO Working Group guidelines that I've circulated to the group that allow for, you know, expressions of different viewpoints in certain items even if the rest of the group, you know, feels a certain way.

So - but I'll set up a poll for this question and then we probably should discuss at some point as well, you know, when and how we're going to do the consensus call on the other recommendations once we've, you know, finalized them.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Thank you Marika. Mikey and please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Are we on a 90-minute call or a 60-minute call today?

Michele Neylon: Well I thought there were 90 until somebody - unless somebody told me otherwise.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay.

Michele Neylon: I was working on that basis. I - Marika, have we been culled back without anybody telling me?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm not aware; I'm also operating under the assumption that we have 90 minutes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Paul Diaz is...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry, just one second. Paul Diaz has left - has left the room. Is there anybody else who needs to drop off now? Okay, go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm back to James' sort of question to the group about process. And I think that, you know, I need to go back and reread our draft and see what the language in the draft was.

If indeed we hinted that we were thinking about this and asked for comments from the community and the community did not respond all of which is a series of ifs I don't know the answers to because I can't get those documents open that fast.

But I am concerned that we get - if we punt on this that we get into the same sort of situation that we got into with the EAC which is a recommendation that was made six years ago that we've finally gotten around to addressing in policy.

And I'm sort of voicing, you know, sort of take off my Mikey individual hat and sort of put on the BC position type hat and say that corporate domain owners have a lot of concerns about the vulnerability of the current domain name systems. And I think it's a huge opportunity missed if we just punt because it was a process error.

I don't know how to fix it right off the top of my head but surely there's a way to get that fixed. And I think it would be a travesty if we got right up to the brink and then said oh we didn't do the process right so we can't fix this. I think that might be my first circle ID article ever.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any comments? Okay Simonetta, do we know the reason why these two were so far a may and not a shall? Which ones are you referring to, Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh I'm still thinking about these lock things and wondering...

Michele Neylon: Oh where...

Simonetta Batteiger: ...the current policy...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...the history of them is it?

Simonetta Batteiger: ...versus - this has to be done this way. And also on Mikey's point I don't know why this question would have any affect on the EAC idea. I kind of see them different but maybe...

Mikey O'Connor: No, no...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...to clarify I'm saying - I'm only drawing the parallel between this question and the EAC. I think they're equally important.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And I think they're equally problematic if they are deferred indefinitely.

Michele Neylon: Okay, James?

Simonetta Batteiger: Does someone on the group know why so far the denial Number 8 and 9 were listed as may versus shall? Does someone know?

James Bladel: I was actually going to take a swing at that. I don't know for a fact, but I do note the construction of the IRTP policy is that there is a list of things that require us - there are a list of reasons for which a registrar may never deny a transfer, and there are a list of reasons for a - justifications for which a registrar may deny a transfer. But there is no section for situations or reasons for a registrar must deny a transfer. That entire concept seems to be absent from the policy.

So that was my take on how to fix this was to create a new section as, you know, "Here are some situations where the transfers must be rejected." Or we can probably even take them out of the idea that they would be rejected and just talk to the registries about whether they would even accept transfer requests during those periods.

So that was my - just my wild swing at Simonetta's question. So I think it's a good observation.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Right then, okay, then Marika, could you load up the proposed language that we have in relation to Denial Reason 6?

Marika Konings: Give me a few seconds, please.

Michele Neylon: This is the thing we were discussing yesterday via email.

Marika Konings: Yes, I'm looking that up. I've placed that on top of the AdobeConnect window.

Michele Neylon: Oh, right, oh, okay, sorry. Right then, so the proposed language in the report, this is going back to Denial Reason 6. So in the report at present we have proposed the following language, "Express objections to the transfer by the transfer contact: Objection could take the form of a specific request, either by paper or electronic means, by the transfer contact to deny a particular transfer request, or a general objection to all transfers - all transfer requests received by the registrar either temporarily or indefinitely.

In all cases the objection must be provided with the express and re-informed consent of the transfer contact on an opt-in basis and upon request by the transfer contact the registrar must remove the lock or provide a reasonably accessible method for the transfer contact to remove the lock within five calendar days."

And I think one of the things that, James, what - and I were talking about off-line on this was - I think it was adding the word "authorized" or something like that. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, that's correct, Michele. Just for the group, the background of my concern on this is I received some feedback from other registrars and other folks in the community that, "Hey, does this mean Product X is going to be going away?" Or, "Does this mean Product Y is no longer allowed under ICANN policy?" or something like that.

But wanted to make it clearer from this proposed language that we were not aiming this at any one business model or service offering, that this was to clarify previous language.

So we often talk about in these policy circles that we need to be aware of side effects. And I think that we're getting some hints that there could be side effects from this that we had not anticipated.

So one possibility would be to say "authorized transfer contact." And what "authorized" does in my opinion is insures that whatever process or product is already in place that is reserved for the exclusive use of the, you know, to authorize the person who's authorized to transfer the name will still be in place and is not changing that power dynamic between the transfer contact, the registrar and the person who may or may not be claiming to be the transfer contact.

So I'm just really trying to clarify or just reestablish the status quo with the addition of the word authorized. You know, it looks like we put a lot of "authorized" in there. Thank you, Marika; we can probably pare that down a little bit. But I think you've got the idea.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anybody have any thoughts on this? Mikey, please?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor. This is one of those ones that I tend to defer to the registrars on. The idea is great, and I support it, but in terms of the specifics to avoid the problem that you and James were discussing I have to defer to people who are closer to the actual processes. And if this fixes the problem then I'm fine with it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any thoughts on this? Does anybody violently disagree with the concept of adding the word "authorized" more than once to the text? Maybe not one, two, three, four, five, six - is it five times or six times? Does anybody have any issue with making that small change to the thing? Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I don't have an issue; I just wonder why this would be any different than the current wording? Because (unintelligible)...

Michele Neylon: Okay, the current wording is...

Simonetta Batteiger: ...says - it's just saying, "Transfer contact," because you - I mean, this doesn't go into detail what makes someone an authorized versus just a transfer contact. I mean, it's kind of implied. I don't have an issue, put it in if you'd like to, but I don't see the difference. And being able to enforce this against any kind of situation, I don't know how this would help you.

But I'm completely fine to...

Michele Neylon: James?

Simonetta Batteiger: ...put that in there if you think this is a good change.

Michele Neylon: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Just to be clear, and I don't want to give away anyone's secret recipes, but if there was a - for example, a special sort of number or PIN number or security process that one would go through and that there was some dispute over who the transfer contact was that whatever

process the registrar or other business had in place to validate, verify or authorize the transfer contact would not be prohibited by this.

So I guess I did - Simonetta, I agree with you, I didn't see that this would necessarily prohibit those, but I think some people were reading into the proposed language something that may or may not have been there, as to say that certain products or services would have to go away or be changed. And I'm just trying to emphasize that with the word "authorized" that we wouldn't. Those products that currently exist would be untouched.

Simonetta Batteiger:           Okay.

Michele Neylon: The current wording in the current policy is much shorter. It just says, "Denial Reason 6: Express written objection to the transfer from the transfer contact, e.g. email, fax, paper document or other processes by which the transfer contact is expressly and voluntarily objected through opt-in means." Just so we remember what the actual original wording was.

I think part of the thing is it was more to kind of clarify the language a little bit that we suggested the wording there. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just looking at the IRTP on other sections, because the transfer contact is defined further up in 2.1 saying, "Either the register name holder or the administrative contact, hereafter transfer contact." So I'm not really clear either on how to authorize changes but I'm just wondering if that would then be in conflict, it's still the transfer contact is in principle limited according to the definition in

2.1 as I read it, to either the register name holder or the administrative contact. So does adding "authorized" achieve what you're trying to do?

James Bladel: Real quickly, this is James, if I could respond. I think so, Marika. I think that the scenarios that I was discussing is when the identity of one of those contacts is in doubt or if there's, you know, claims between - you know, competing claims between the registrant and the administrative contact.

So I guess I don't really know what I'm trying to fix here, it's just that what we want to do for certain is to insure that people don't take the wrong impression from this language as that their security product, their security service, or their, you know, super cool vault lockdown super, you know, non-transferable system that they have paid big dollars for is now going to be worthless.

So, you know, I think that what we're trying to say here is status quo, reemphasize no one's products or service or security tools are going away. And I think that also I put in the chat that really what we're looking at is the folks who can remove the lock. So really it's just the last one or two instances of the word "authorized" that are needed, and then the rest are probably superfluous.

But no, I don't think we're trying to change the definition of "transfer contact" or tweak this in any way. I think quite the opposite; we're trying to emphasize the status quo.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks, James. I mean, just putting myself slightly kind of in queue here. I mean, one of the problems that we currently have as a

weakness within the system, and I mean - by "the system" I mean the kind of - the entire ICANN policy and everything else.

We've said this in the past is that there is no concept of a change of control. The other thing, as well, is if, for example, let us say that - I mean, the kind of thing I suppose is this, is that the entire idea that the contact be authorized, so if as the losing registrar I was to feel that the contact wasn't authorized for some reason then I should have the ability to block that until I'm sure that that contact is authorized.

Right. Moving on. So anything else further on this? James, you still have your hand up, is that an old one?

James Bladel: Yes, that's coming down, sorry.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. I mean, you can put it up again if you want, I don't mind. Okay then, as we're kind of coming up to - we've got about 15 minutes left. Right? Denial Reason 6 we've kind of - we've dealt with that. If there's nothing further on that we'll move on. Going once, going twice, okay, fine.

Right, the public comments, do you have those there, Marika? Where - actually I've moved stuff away again.

Marika Konings: Oh, no, no, give me one second.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: So just a note, I actually looked for the transcript of last week's call, so I've tried to capture the discussion on those items that you covered

which is - I don't propose to go through all of them now, as you already discussed them. But if people could take the opportunity, maybe between now and the next call, to look through this document I'll post it to the list later today, and make sure that your different responses that we've put in there match our discussions.

Because the idea would be that this document is incorporated into the final report, or linked to the final report, so those that have provided comments can actually see how these were addressed by the working group.

So we're really appreciate it if you could just have a look and make sure that I didn't miss anything or, you know, got anything wrong on the - based on what you discussed last week and in previous calls.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So if everybody could actually take the time to go through this. There were a couple of items - I don't have - do I? Oh, I do. Do I have access to move this thing? I do, do I? Yes, I do.

Okay, there were a couple of items that we still need to address. The - a couple of examples of emergencies. This has come up more than once in the past. So if people have specific examples of what would qualify as an emergency, this would be helpful. Also case examples of what would not qualify as an emergency, this would be helpful.

Now, just a second. There's one or two things here I think that we just said we needed to follow-up on. I also - if you look under Section - under 27 I think the term "seller" has been used quite a few times. I think if we're dealing with domain aftermarket I think using the term "traders" might be a little bit clearer, because I suspect there might be

confusion between, you know, selling versus reselling versus selling in an aftermarket scenario. That's why I just made the suggestion that we just change that to "traders."

Marika, can you - there was one or two things that we needed to follow-up on today but where have they gone to?

Marika Konings: They were - I think one of the items were already discussed. I think that was Item - let me get you where that is, on 56. I think that's the item that we just discussed, a 60 day lock following a transfer, the reason (why) (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay, that was it. Okay, fine, sorry. Yes, I'm looking at this thing and for some reason I could see it on the version that I had in Word and then I couldn't find it when I was looking on the screen for some stupid reason.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. If I can ask another question on Item 64? Is this something that - I understood from the transcript that you discussed that maybe staff could provide further feedback on, you know, the inconsistencies between, you know, WHOIS and what is called out in the policy.

My question is, is that something that you want to incorporate in the recommendation, sort of sacrifice further clarity, or is the idea that I take this question back to, you know, the responsible staff or whoever and get an answer to this - to that - to try to come up with that as part of the working deliberations? I'm just trying to get some clarity on what the - on what the intent was of that - of that comment.

Michele Neylon: Well, okay. I suppose the thing is that ICANN staff raised an issue so if ICANN staff are the ones raising the issue, maybe they could give more, you know, tangible examples of where they consider this to be - to be an issue. So we'll take it back to the staff member who is in charge of this.

Marika Konings: I think there's only one example given. So, I mean, do you want to have the whole list? Or I think our, you know, as I interpret the comment as meaning like, when you need the recommendation to clarify to a status messages, the working group might also want to consider making sure that there's consistency between, you know, those terms that are defined and those that are not.

So I don't know if it's more part of the implementation work to also address this issue and sort of now, you know, getting that list.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any thoughts on this? Nobody? Okay. Right then, any other issues related to the public comments? Because I think we've pretty much gone through all of them.

Does anybody have any last, final words? One thing, in just - when going through these we also noted that a couple of the references we made to the 24 hours has been updated to 4 hours.

I think there were a couple of other minor consistency things that need to be checked, but if everybody could just go over this between now and next - the next meeting. Are there any other matters anybody wants to raise at this time? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'll start as well as soon as I get a chance to update the proposed final report with, you know, some of the changes based on, you know, the public comments that we've discussed, incorporating the latest draft of the EAT.

I understand that there's, I think two more changes, one to the timeframe and one simply needs to add a, I think, Bob was going to make a suggestion where it should be added. And then I presume as well that FAQ that Mikey prepared would be added there.

So hopefully I can get it out as well relatively soon for review and then we probably need to discuss in the next call as well how we go about, you know, (polling) of the recommendations and finalizing the report for submission.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I think in that case, let's call it a day unless anybody has any other matters they want to raise immediately? Okay then, thanks everybody. Oh, wait a second, Mikey has a hand up. Go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Just one point, and that is that I have invoked the - this working group's name in vain in our BC comments regarding the .net contract renewal. And the part of our comments where we are, as a constituency, assuming this gets through the review process, going to support (THIKOO) is - as a part of the contract for .net.

And I just throw that out there for others to consider for their constituencies if they feel like making similar comments. That's all.

Michele Neylon: Okay. All right then, anybody else have any thoughts at this time? Okay. In that case, wrap it up; speak to you all next week. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Michele.

Man: Thanks, Michele.

Man: Thanks, Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right. Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

END