

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Transcription Tuesday 08 November 2011 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C call on Tuesday 08 November 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-c-20111108-en.mp3>

On page : <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

Attendees:

James Bladel – Registrar SG
Avri Doria - NCSG & ALAC
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Anil George - IPC
Bob Mountain – Registrar SG
Rob Villeneuve – Registrar SG
Volker Greimann - Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Paul Diaz – Registrar SG
Chris Chaplow – CBUS
Allain Berranger - NPOC
Adam Eisner - Registrar SG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Erik Iriarte - ALAC
Jonathan Tennenbaum - IPC
Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG
Rob Golding - Registrar SG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Könings
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:

Barbara Steele – Registries SG
Matt Serlin - Registrar SG
Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair
Jacob Williams -

Glen DeSaintgery: That's how I'll do it for you, Marika. (Tonya), could you please start the recording for us?

Coordinator: You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is the IRTP-C call. I think it is the first call in this group of the C series, and on the call we have James Bladel, Mikey O'Connor, Alain Berranger, Avri Doria, Erick Iriarte, Rob Villeneuve, Chris Chaplow, Volker Greimann, Bob Mountain, Paul Diaz and Adam Eisner.

For staff we have Marika Konings; Nathalie Peregrine; myself, Glen DeSaintgery. And I see that Philip Corwin has just joined. We also have apologies from -- just let me pull them up. Sorry, I am taking a bit long with the apologies. I know there were quite a few. You perhaps have them at hand, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, I do. We have apologies from Barbara Steele, Matt Serlin, Jacob Williams and Michele Neylon.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks, Marika. Good. Over to you. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. So welcome, everyone, to this first IRTP Part C working group meeting. First of all, my name is Marika Konings. I'm on the staff that's supporting this working group, and I've taken the liberty to start up this call, but first of all maybe open it up if anyone else is willing to step up as an interim chair for this meeting.

We do have as an agenda item, Number 4, election of a working group leader. So maybe after that point, someone will be there. But maybe I'll first give you a minute to see if anyone else is willing to take over at this stage. I see people happy with me going forth, so on the first item, we did already to the roll call.

On the statements of interest, this is just a reminder that everyone is required to complete their statement of interest through the wiki. You should have received details of that when you received the confirmation from Glen that you have been subscribed to the mailing list.

If you have not received your login details yet for the wiki, please let Glen know and she'll send you the details. My intent is as well to link the statement of interest for each member of the working group on the members page which you see up on the screen now, so that it's easier to find for everyone.

If there are no questions on the statements of interest, I think we move straight into Item 2, which is introductions. You know, as per the new GNSO working group guidelines, members of the working group are invited to share information regarding their interest, background, skills, experience -- especially as related to any requirements in the charter -- with each other.

So if I can maybe just go through the list of people on the call today, and just invite you to maybe very briefly say something about, you know, who you are, what you do and your interest in this working group. And I'll just go through the list on Meeting View, starting with James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. So those of you who haven't met yet, I'm James. I'm the director of policy for GoDaddy.com, which is a registrar -- ICANN accredited as well as several country codes.

I've been involved in numerous PDPs as well as Affirmation of Commitments (unintelligible), and a couple of the previous instances of this series of PDPs, IRTP-A and IRTP-B.

As far as transfer experience, this is something that I work very closely with our transfer concierge, our domain services team and our team that facilitates and deals with transfer problems, which there are a lot.

I think if we ask ICANN staff, they will say that transfer issues generate somewhere in the neighborhood of two-thirds of, you know, complaints that come to ICANN. So it is an area that is ripe for improvement.

So that's me, and I think other folks will tell you I'm pretty easy to get along with, and very easy to contact if you need anything. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, James. Next is Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, all. This is Mikey O'Connor. I, like James, have been on a bunch of these IRTF things. And I am a small business owner, nearly retired -- not quite there yet.

My company started several companies that were eventually sold, and you have a choice between being really smart and being really lucky. Take lucky. We sold a couple of the companies at just the right time. So I've been retired since I was 50.

I'm really interested in ICANN primarily because my company still is the registrant for a handful of really, really old generic domain names like (bar.com) and (place.com), (court.com). And I'm especially interested in the security of the domain transfer process because, as James said, that process is far from perfect. And there's a fair amount of risk when transferring high-value names like mine from registrar to registrar.

So I, too, have a very strong interest in this from the standpoint of being a registrant. I think that's it for me.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. And next on the list is Alain.

Alain Berranger: Hi. My name is Alain Berranger. I'm (unintelligible) from International Development. That's a foreign aid program, so rich countries to poorer

countries. I've just recently taken interest in ICANN through its latest constituency, the non-commercial operational concern.

My statement of interest is up under the new format. I'm interested in learning about ICANN in terms of the bigger issues of the Internet governance and what it means for the civil society in general, and not-for-profits and NGOs in general. My objective is to make sure that know-how about transfer is disseminated enough by ICANN in general, disseminated to the not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations.

So I'm just that - although I'm relatively new, I insist on mentioning to you -- maybe it's not a surprise -- that ICANN is (unintelligible) complex. It is a complex world to a newcomer, and I feel right now that I've been in a permanent six months' learning curve, and I don't know when I will climb up that learning curve. But being on the working group is part of that process I'm attempting to master. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Alain. And next is Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. I'm Avri Doria. I've been - I claim myself as coming both from the non-commercial stakeholder group and from at-large, active in both of them at the moment.

I've been involved with ICANN, I guess, seven or eight years now; was a member of the GNSO, and have been a member of the NCSG for about, I guess, two years now or a little over two years. I've been a passive member of the previous IRTP groups, pretty much just as an observer.

And reading the mailing list, I've decided to be an active member of this group. And my only experience with transfers is as a registrant who has gone through the process a couple times with various degrees of ease or difficulty. And basically am involved in the group because I have become interested in all things registrar. Thanks.

Marika Konings: And thank you. Next is Erick.

Erick Iriarte: Thanks. My name is Erick Iriarte. (Unintelligible) for Latin America. Now I am (unintelligible) take some of my old (unintelligible)s in ICANN, especially in the security and privacy things. I am part of the non-commercial user constituency. So (unintelligible) with all of you.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Next on the list is Rob.

Rob Villeneuve: Hi. I'm Rob Villeneuve from Momentous. We're a domain registrar operating primarily in Canada, dealing with gTLDs and a few ccTLDs, including dot CA. So I've been attending ICANN, I think at about six meetings now, and decided it was time to get off the bench and into the game a little bit.

The transfer policy obviously relates directly to us being a registrar, and it seemed like a good group to kind of get our feet wet and actually start participating rather than just watching.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Rob. Next is Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Hello, Marika, and everybody. My name's Chris Chaplow, and I was previous to this on the IRTP-B working group. And the only other working group that I've been on before that was the CCT, the communications and coordination work team, part of the GNSO improvements.

I'm relatively new to ICANN, about three years of history. Paris was my first meeting. And I'm English, but live in Spain. I've lived down here in southern Spain for 20 years, and run two small businesses. One's Andalucia.com, which is a successful tourist and commercial tourist information portal, and the other is Andalucia Web Solutions, which is a Web design and development company.

And it's through that that we do manage a number of client domains, not obviously as a registrar or even as a re-seller, but we have a number of Web design clients and we give them the service of the domains and the hosting, and all those elements.

And it's through that that we often see the difficulties of transferring domains, and especially in the arena of small businesses where many clients or small businesses aren't educated on domains, and can have a lot of problems with those.

Being a small business, I'm mostly in the business constituency. And for the last year I was elected vice-chair of finance and operations for the business constituency. And it's nice to see such a large number of people on this work group. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chris. Next is Volker.

Volker Greimann: Hello. My name is Volker Greimann. I represent Key-Systems, a German registrar, as general counsel. I'm in the industry for about four years now, and I got my feet wet in the ICANN policy work in the infamous Vertical Integration working group.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Next is Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, good morning. I'm Bob Mountain, the vice president of business development for a NameMedia based in Boston. We are a registrar, but we specialize in the aftermarket. We own a portfolio of about 1 million domains, so we are a registrant as well.

We are heavily focused on the aftermarket. We have about 4 million domains that we are responsible for transferring to and from buyers and sellers, so the inter-registrar transfer process is crucial to our business. That's why I joined

IRTP-B about a year ago, and I've been involved with that group since then; also a member of the registrar stakeholder group as well.

Marika Konings: Up next is Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Marika. This is Paul Diaz. Please note for the record I am now with .Org, the public interest registry, former member of the registry stakeholder group.

I had previously been with Network Solutions for almost 13 years. It's still taking a while for everybody to get used to the new hat I wear. Been involved with IRTP from the start. I chaired the first group. Been involved in many, many other policy (unintelligible) processes as well.

I would note that my participation in Part C will probably be limited more as a back up to Barbara Steele from VeriSign, who has very ably served registry stakeholder group through the first two iterations. We'll basically back one another up, but she will most likely be the primary member on this particular working group.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Paul. Next is Adam.

Adam Eisner: Hey, everybody. My name is Adam Eisner. I'm from a registrar in Toronto, Canada called Tucows. We operate largely on a wholesale basis, so we have a network of about 12,000 resellers through which we have about 10 million domain names under management, and then manage another about million and a half for other registrars as well, using our systems.

And been around for a while on the policy side of things, but first time participating in a PDP. So please go easy on me. And, you know, as a large registrar, we're super interested in this because, you know, transfers are a big part of our business.

We represent customers that are both, say, on the domainer side where they, you know, they had some high-profile generic names; and also many, many small business and registrants who obviously have their names for a lot of different reasons.

And, you know, because of the sort of noise that transfers tend to cause, we have a pretty significant interest in this. So looking forward to working with all of you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Adam. And next on the list is Phil.

Philip Corwin: Yes, hello. Can you hear me okay?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Philip Corwin: Yes, I'm Phil Corwin. I'm an attorney and government relations specialist based in Washington, DC. Since the fall of 2006, I've been counsel to the Internet Commerce Association, which is a trade group of individuals and companies that invest in and monetize and develop domains.

Our member own and manage about 10% of all the domains in existence. We're an international member of the business constituency. I've been on several groups like this before; been involved in ICANN activities since late 2006, and I look forward to working with the rest of you.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Next we have Jonathan.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Yes, hi. This is Jonathan Tenenbaum. I'm with Register.com, and now Network Solutions and Web.com. Paul actually will have a lot more of a - not necessarily input, but obviously with his history and knowledge - for Network Solutions he would have a lot more knowledge than I will. But, you know, we'll be, you know, I'll be getting up to speed as we kind of work through some of these things.

For me personally, you know, I first started getting involved in the domain space a little over a year ago when we purchased Register.com. This is the first working group that I'm a part of. And, you know, I was out in Phoenix for the GoDaddy Registrar Summit, and that was a really great experience and it was really great meeting a lot of, you know, a lot of the different people and starting to get acclimated to the space and the industry.

And I'll be handling a lot of the legal and policy items with respect to our role as a registrar, and just looking forward to getting involved and getting up to speed on things, and helping to do what I can, you know, with all of you. So, yes, that's pretty much it for me.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Next on the list is Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Hi, my name is Simonetta Batteiger. I work with Sedo.com as a product manager, dealing mostly with our registrar channel clients. We are also a registrar ourselves, but we don't have a lot of names in our own accreditation, but we do have about 15 million domain names listed for sale with us, so our customers trade names every single day. So obviously the rules that govern how you trade a name and transfer a name are really interesting to us.

I've been part of the IRPT Part B group before. I've been around the domain space for about six years, but looking at ICANN-related items for about maybe a year and a half by now. And I'm looking forward to work with everyone on this one.

Marika Konings: Thanks. And last but not least, Kevin.

Kevin Erdman: I'm Kevin Erdman. I'm an attorney in private practice with Barnes & Thornburg in Indianapolis, Indiana. We represent a lot of, you know, larger companies in their domaining activities. I also personally deal with some members of the domainer community, all of which are interested in trying to

maintain a smooth flow of domain name-based commerce in the great Internet.

So that's why I'm here. I've been on the IRTP Part A, Part B, now Part C, and looking forward to hearing everybody's war stories as we discuss all these issues. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. I think that covers everyone that's on the call today. For everyone that's maybe listening to the recording of this, you're of course invited as well to share a little introduction about yourself with the mailing list, so people can read about it ahead of the next call.

The next agenda item relates to principles of transparency and openness. This is basically just to remind everyone that the mailing lists of this working group are publicly archived. The meetings are recorded and transcribed, and then publicly available. And everyone is required to complete a statement of interest, which will also be publicly posted.

So just take that into account when you post things on the mailing list, and make sure that you don't include any information that you don't want to have spread over the Internet.

And so the next item is election of working group leaders. And maybe just as a reminder for those of you that are new to Adobe Connect, if you want to speak up or raise an issue, at the top of the Adobe Connect window, you see a little man with his hand up.

If you click there and select the Raise Your Hand, basically a hand will be raised and it's an indication for whoever's chairing the meeting that you would like to speak up. So if someone wants to be in the queue, please go ahead and raise your hand there.

So the next item is the election of working group leaders. You know, according to the working group guidelines, a chair should normally be selected at the first meeting of the working group, and a working group may elect to have co-chairs or vice chairs. And once selected, the working group chair needs to be confirmed by the GNSO council.

As most of you have will have seen, there's already been some discussion on this on the mailing list, and as far as I'm aware, there are currently two candidates for the chair positions, which is James Bladel and Michele Neylon; and one candidate for the vice chair position, which is Avri Doria. I don't know if there are other people that would like to put themselves forward as a candidate for one or both positions.

As I don't hear anyone speaking up, I'm assuming that's a no. So then the next question would be for the working group to decide on how to move forward. There are two candidates. There's no prescribed process in the GNSO working group guidelines on how a working group should decide should there be more candidates. So I would open it up for discussion, noting that one of the candidates is actually on the call today due to travel.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: This is Jonathan. Can we have the two co-chairs and the vice chair? I mean is that something that we can do for the group?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's up to the working group to decide how you would like to organize. I think it's probably important then to clarify, you know, what the co-chairs means. Does it mean that, you know, they chair at the same time, they alternate, or how that would work.

But it's really up to the working group to decide what they feel would work best and most efficiently. So I have Bob in the queue.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks, Marika. This is Bob Mountain. I think on IRTP-B with Michele chairing, we certainly had numerous instances where, due to travel or what have you, he was unavailable.

I think the co-chair might actually work well just because of that -- having two people available to run the meeting, rather than - well I think James actually shared as effectively co-chair, since he ran often the meetings when Michele was not available. So I think the co-chair approach would be, you know, very viable based on the experience we had in IRTP-B. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks. James?

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. James speaking. Yes, I think that was the case, to echo Bob's statements. Although I should point out I was very undemocratically selected as the vice chair. It was usually just Michele saying he was going to be unable to attend, and ask me if I would cover.

So ad hoc stuff. It seemed to work out fairly well. And I thought he did a fantastic job as our chair for IRTP-B, and that's certainly not a takeaway from Paul on IRTP-A.

Just wanted to point folks to some of my thoughts and actually kind of strong opinion about the length or the duration of PDPs, and potentially what that means to commitment of volunteers, and volunteer exhaustion is something, I think, that we're talking about within the community; and also faith and confidence in the PDP as a viable process to make improvements and solve problems to get things done.

So, you know, I just kind of throw that out there. It certainly is, I think, articulated much more thoroughly in that message. I would say that if we're going to have co-chairs, then we probably don't need a vice chair. If we're going to have a chair and a vice chair, we probably don't need co-chairs.

I guess what I'm saying is we probably need two. I can see that from our previous experience. I'm not sure we need three.

Marika Konings: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. I'll follow right along behind James on this, and agree that length of time we took on IRTP-B was pretty hard on people on the working group, and we had a lot of attrition by the end. I think the whole thing took almost two years. And that's pretty rough on volunteers for an hour a week.

I also want to raise the point that I raised on this list, which is that I would like to see a balance between the registrars and the non-contracted parties in the leadership. Another thing that concerned me a little bit about the last one is that the whole leadership chain, all the way from the chair up through the chair of the GNSO council, the GNSO council liaison, et cetera, et cetera, were registrars.

And so I would like to sort of echo James' notion that let's have two, not three. Let's have them co-chairs so they're equals, rather than chair and vice chair. And let's have just one registrar in that pile, not two.

So, you know, my preference right now would be to see James and Avri as our two co-chairs. I think that would be a fantastic team for a couple of reasons. One, I'm sure that James has a lot more details that he'd be interested in sharing about moving this along.

But I think the other thing is that Avri was deeply involved in the process of developing this new working group PDP process, and I think this is a huge opportunity to take a couple of our strongest leaders and, as a group, maybe do a working group that can be looked at as a sort of model for best practices on how to run working groups in the future.

So I'm pretty perky about the James/Avri co-chair ticket. There's what I've got.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, Marika. Just a couple of - a few quick points. I don't think the attrition on the IRTP-B was any worse than on any of the other working groups. And we do very much see three-thirds -- a third of the people that are on almost every call; a third of the people on quite a few calls; and a third of the people aren't on any of the calls.

Having said that, I think we're all in agreement. I haven't heard anybody say that on IRTP-C - there's a feeling we do want to go faster than we did on IRTP-B. And I also like the idea of two chairs, whether that be a chair and vice chair or two co-chairs. I don't think it's any different. I think two probably better than three.

And if two people are absent, then there always would be somebody who could step in on a piecemeal, call-by-call basis. Again, I like the idea of contracted parties' house and a non-contracted parties' house on this.

And I think the group - an actual decision we're probably going to have to put back until next week, and just discuss it now and talk about some principles and things, then actually wait until next week, see what drops out on the mailing list in the week. And if we need to go for a vote, then do that next week. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. This is Avri. I wanted to mention that first of all I appreciated it very much when Mikey put me forward. I hadn't actually thought about getting involved at the level of either a co-chair or a vice chair.

I think James and I were actually both on the PDP, and I think James and I had interesting complementary views occasionally on issues. I tend to agree that we have to have a working group and a PDP go at a good rate. But I'm also very nervous about rushing anything.

And not to say that James intends to rush anything, but to make sure that we find the balance to make sure that things don't take too long, but that also there's a chance to fully explore all the positions on everything. And given some of the new PDP processes that allow a group to go out for more intermediate commentary from the community I think can sometimes be a very strong aid to getting the work done well but also would have the side effect of perhaps lengthening things a little.

So I think there's a balance that we have yet to learn. And in terms of things whether it's me or someone else I do believe there needs to be someone from both contracted party and non-contracted.

And I think whether its co-Chairs or Chair and Vice Chair it tends to end up as co-Chairs except in one situation; one has a particular responsibility that the other one doesn't have. But by and large as it seems in most of the things there really ends at being a sharing.

So whether it's - whether the group decides that it wants a Vice Chair or a co-Chair I think is pretty much not too big of a problem.

So, you know, and perhaps someone else so that there's more choices, if there are others from non-contracted parties that are willing to take on the effort that's good so the people would have a choice but also going forward if the two people who from the registrars could sort of discuss among themselves which one really wanted to be on the hook for it for the next period would also be good. Thanks.

Marika Konings: James.

James Bladel: Probably just a follow-up with a couple of Avri's last points. Yes, I think that (Kelly) and I should have a chat, (a slight) chat and figure out that last issue.

And then, you know, I was just kind of echoing what (Chris) was suggesting and just that perhaps we can accumulate all the folks who are interested. I think we seem to have a consensus that there be two Chairs or co-Chairs or Vice Chair, whatever, and that they be one registrar and one non-contracted individual.

And then if we could put that to the list and see what sort of a response we get for next time. That seems like a reasonable path forward.

Marika Konings: Thanks James. And (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Also, you know...

Marika Konings: And put it to the list basically that there's agreement from those on the call to have two leadership persons either, you know, two co-Chairs or Chair and then a Vice Chair and maybe that can be preceded by you and (Michele) having a call to see maybe if you could first work out between the two of you who we would prefer whether the contracted party person and take it from there hopefully in time for the next call.

Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering if anyone on the list has a strong feeling about co-Chair versus Vice Chair. And if so if they could speak up and say why and otherwise I would suggest that maybe the three candidates that we've identified so far speak about this amongst them selves and also come up with a proposal that they bring back to the group for next week.

Marika Konings: Okay, I've noted that down as well. And we can include that in the email with the notes of this call.

And so we'll leave this item then for now and hopefully have an (overall) resolution by the next meeting.

And Item 5 is just to briefly go over the different items that need to be reviewed by the Working Group.

And Avri you have something on the previous point?

Avri Doria: Yes. I just wanted to ask. Do we have any indication from (Virginia)? If so, when they plan to pick a liaison for this group?

Marika Konings: This is where I raised the issue in the car but at that point no one stepped forward. I'll bring it again to the attention of the Leadership Team in preparation for the next Council Meeting which is I think takes place next Thursday. So hopefully then it can be raised again and then someone hopefully will step up and fill that position.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Jonathan.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: No. Just one last thing on the co-Chair versus the Vice Chair, I - and, you know, I'm not so totally familiar with, you know, a lot of how this works.

But I would think that if a key point here is to have, you know, a registrar representative and then, you know, a non-registrar representative I would think the co-Chair to me I think makes more sense to kind of put them on equal footing; just my two cents there.

Marika Konings: Thanks Jonathan. If I could maybe just add, you know, a maybe a staff perspective, I think the most important thing is that the two Chairs whether it's co-Chairs or a Chair and Vice Chair basically agree between themselves what the division of roles is, whether that's, you know, jointly sharing chairing a meeting or alternating or one chairing and the other one jumping in when needed, that it is really clear from the outset what the different roles and expectations are.

And I guess you can title that either way.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Sure, and...

Marika Konings: And so then we move into Item Number 5, items to review. Just want to briefly cover and I'll post all these items that I'll go through now as well on the - on our wiki so people can review them in more detail. I mean the Working Group charter that's up here is already posted there and it's fairly straightforward. It just basically asks the three basic questions that are also covered in the issue report.

And note that, you know, the Working Group should operate under the GNSO Working Group guideline.

I'll go into more detail on each of these questions and an overview of the issue report that I prepared.

Then very briefly on the GNSO Working Group guidelines, these were adopted not too long ago and basically really describe the process in which Working Groups are expected to operate.

Posted here in Adobe Connect and it's also included in the materials that are posted on the wiki, a summary of those Working Group guidelines and noting that, you know, you're actually expected to review them in full detail but also

be aware that a large part of that is actually dedicated on, you know, development of the charter.

So it's really important to just review the parts that relate to how Working Groups operate.

I think point one and two are very self explanatory and then Item 2 you see that most of the items that are listed there are also part of our agenda.

Item 3 I just mention that as well, you know, it's very important for the Working Group to, you know, clarify the responsibilities of the different leadership positions and some details on those is also provided in the Working Group guidelines themselves.

And Item 4 talks about the use of sub-teams. Down the road the Working Group may decide to employ sub-teams noting that anything that a sub-team develops or decides needs to be vetted and approved by the entire Working Group.

Item on participation and representativeness, members of Working Group are expected to be active members either on the list or Working Group Meetings although, you know, it's also noted that some might take an observer approach and monitor the many lists and meetings.

And that the Working Group Chair is expected to make an assessment at the start of every meeting whether a sufficient number of Working Group members are present to proceed with the meetings and discussions.

And we have faced situations in previous Working Groups where we have the Council calls just because we didn't have sufficient representation on the call.

Also representativeness an important item, I think we currently have already good group, very diverse group of people together. But again it's, you know,

it's the task of the Chair in cooperation with its Secretary and staff to assess on a continuous basis whether a sufficiently broad representation.

And if this is not the case whether certain groups should be approached to make sure that they have representatives and participants in this group.

There's an item on process integrity. This is really further outlined as well in the Working Group guidelines to really make sure that people participate and not reopen discussions that have already been closed unless there's agreement from the group as well as an expectation that people will withdraw if they cannot participate anymore, review of common - public comments, very important, needs to be carefully considered and analyzed and also explaining rationale for agreeing or disagreeing with the different comments.

For the (pieces) on individual group behaviors and norms is also included there. So if you have any questions on that I would just refer you to the Working Group guidelines.

And I think very important especially when we get further into the Working Group and discussions is the standard methodology for making decisions. I don't think I need to go into detail now. I think we'll probably come back to that once we get to the point of developing recommendations and deciding what level of consensus they have.

But the Working Group guidelines quite clearly prescribe how you can designate the different levels of support for recommendations. And also describes the process for appealing such designation if members feel that the designation which is applied by the Chair is not accurate or misses consistency. So there are certain ways in which an appeal can be made.

And then just briefly talks about communication and collaboration tools that are available. I think you've already all seen that there is a dedicated mailing list which is publicly archived.

We do have a wiki where everyone can review materials but also the idea that going forward that there might be opportunities where certain documents need to be reviewed or certain elements need to be written up and the wiki is a tool where everyone can collaborate and work together jointly on the materials.

If - on Item 12 briefly this is subject matter experts. If the Working Group sees there's a need for additional educational briefings or experts are required (to this), identify those specific requests to - and make those through the GNSO Council especially if there are additional costs that are involved.

And then products and output and we come to that in actually the next item talking about the PDP basically talks about which products this Working Group is expected to put forward.

On this item, so you still see - Jonathan are you still in the queue or your hand is still up?

Jonathan Tenenbaum: Oh no, sorry. That's (over here).

Marika Konings: That's okay.

Jonathan Tenenbaum: (Time).

Marika Konings: (Patrick).

(Patrick): Yes Marika. Yes, just a quick question about the wiki. Do you happen to know whether we have an individual password for this particular wiki or is it a general one across the community wikis?

Marika Konings: I believe that you should have a specific one for the (RSTEP) Part C one. But I think we might still need to set that up. We're actually in the moment

reviewing about how the different permissions are set up. And they're trying to find a consistent way of doing that.

But it looks like we'll need to get permissions on a wiki-per-wiki basis to make sure that it's, you know, it's limited to - the Working Group members actually make changes and edit and add the (bar) community just, you know, few items or make comments and such.

So I'm seeing that (Mike) says, I think general password works now wiki.

So that might change in the near future but as I said we're working on this and hope to have a consistent approach of that shortly.

(Patrick): Okay, thank you.

Marika Konings: So if we're done briefly look at the (RSTEP) Part C Issue Report. I just put a couple of points together in a short presentation.

Unless everyone tells me here that they already read the issue report and then of course there's no need to going into this.

But maybe just as a little reminder, as I said, you know, there are three questions that this Working Group is tasked to address. The first one dealing with the change of control function, second on time limiting in the form of authorization and third question relates to the use of IANA IDs.

So on the first one, the change of control function. This was actually an issue that was raised by the previous IRTP Working Group. And they had quite extensive discussions on this issue which is also covered in the issue report itself. And they basically recommended that consideration of this issue should include an investigation of how this function is currently achieved.

And I think as you will find in the notes from the IRTP Part B Working Group it's clear that the change of control function is currently achieved by using the IRTP.

And I think several people noted that that's not the primary intent of the IRTP; hence the question whether there should be a separate change of control function.

The question was also raised whether possibly any applicable models in the country coach space that might be used as a best practice. But also take into account any security concerns related to that.

The Working Group also noted that it would be important to review the locking procedures as described in reasons for denial 8 and number 9 in relation to this question of change of control to really make sure that there's a balance between the (limit) transfer activity and security.

The issue report already highlights a couple of models that are being used for example in .UK and .EU and .IE but further data gathering might be required and there might be other examples that the Working Group might need to review.

And the issue report also notes that in this context consideration will need to be given to the change of control in relation to transfers as a result of eTRP proceedings.

James I presume you have a comment on this specific topic.

James Bladel: Well I just wanted to provide a little background but I think you've actually done that fairly well.

But just coming out of IRTP (B) we just - we encountered this issue again and again which was that the transfer policy was designed as a competitive tool

so that if you didn't like your (Mad at Go Daddy) for one reason you could go over to your network solutions or to (Two Cows) and you can vote with your feet and I think that that was the original intent.

And in the interim this very dynamic and innovative aftermarket has arisen where domain names are transacted.

And I think that what we encountered in IRTP B and what is at the heart of this discussion between security and portability of domain names is this change of control function.

So I think this is a really important and a fundamental or egg essential question that this Working Group will have to address. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks James and I'm sure we'll have further discussions on this issue going forward.

The next question related to time limiting the form of authorization. And before I answer, Simonetta presume your comment is as well on the previous item?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Just (and so) many of the people on the call, maybe to add to what James has just been saying. Really the main issue why we put this forward into the IRTP Part C part was that the current policy does not take into account a transfer (of that). At the same time let the domain name go to a new owner because all the existing policies that are designed for the transfer happens from the same owner to the same owner.

And that really is what the first item is trying to get at is to find what do we maybe have to add to the policy or what do we have to change so that the policy covers both the transfer where someone is just moving their domain from one registrar to another as well as a transfer situation where the owner changes at the same time which is that change of control.

I just wanted to make sure that everyone really knows that's what that meant.

Marika Konings: Thank you Simonetta. So next issue related to time limiting the form of authorization. And they said an example is that if a gaming registrar sends and receives a form of authorization back from the transfer contact but a name is locked, the registrar may hold the FOA pending adjustment to the domain name status during which time the registrant or other registration information may have changed and this causes potential issues.

It points out in the issue report that there are no specifications currently in the IRTP to time limiting or limits of use of the initial authorization for registrar's transfer FOA because there's actually another FOA which does have a specific time limit associated with it.

And, you know, the question here is, you know, is there need for researching additional data on how prevalent this issue is or how big of a problem this causes. And, you know, hopefully we'll inform what the potential outcome might be to address this issue.

And the last issue related to IANA IDs for registrars. So currently when a registrar credits with ICANN, IANA assigns an ID to the registrar in order to identify it. And registry does that same thing but it's a proprietary ID that's assigned to a registrar when credits with that particular registry.

From an ICANN perspective I think we've insisted on the consistent use of IANA IDs for all registrars and from our point of view using a common unchanging number assigned by IANA could prevent issues for - with - for

example confusion or, you know, I think the registry stakeholder group pointed out in the comments they submitted on the preliminary issue report that, you know, registrar name changes might make it difficult to ensure the correct registrar's identified.

And they also know that, you know, based on data that registries submit to ICANN that all registries actually do maintain the IANA IDs or information on IANA IDs in their registration systems.

So that is the third issue the Working Group needs to look at.

And as I said, you know, I'm not sure whether we actually have time now to go in further detail but I'm sure each of these issues are going to be covered in-depth in the following calls.

And I briefly wanted to show you as well because there have been some comments on the mailing list on the new PDP process. And, you know, how this group might be more efficient or, you know, move forward on some of the items.

And I just wanted to highlight that actually the - although the new PDP has been approved by the GNSO Council it hasn't been approved yet by the ICANN Board.

So currently the - this Working Group is required to operate under the existing PDP rules noting that, you know, once the Board adopts it there might be a transition. As you see here, basically the GNSO Council recommended that, you know, upon the time that the ICANN Board adopts the new PDP it will be decided for each PDP that is ongoing whether it should be transitioned to the new rules or not and how easy that will be.

So what I've basically done in this is basically highlight some of the main differences or comparison between the current PDP and the new PDP basically on the elements that relate to a Working Group.

And I think you'll see that there is actually quite a lot of consistency and some of the elements that are highlighted in new PDP, you know, are - it wouldn't be difficult for this Working Group to actually incorporate those. They don't conflict with what is in the bylaws.

I think it is also important to know that some of the elements that you see on the left hand side especially when it comes to timing are not really followed at the moment or have been found very impractical in practice. So but we, you know, try to follow with all the Working Groups like the intent of the bylaws making sure that the different steps are respected especially when it comes to public comment and input.

And I think there, first item that this Working Group will need to look at is probably the - what you see in the first box, the public comment (form) upon initiation of a PDP. This is a required step in the current PDP process and even though, you know, we haven't really followed as it is stated here where the principal requirement is to post a public comment (form) upon the initiation of the PDP.

And in past PDPs what we've done is actually post this public comment (form) upon information of a Working Group to allow the Working Group to ask specific questions that might help inform the deliberations at the start of the Working Group.

And another element the Working Group will need to look at is, you know, requesting constituency and stakeholder group statements. So I think this is something I'll just, you know, leave you with to think about and review. And it probably links together with Item 6, the development of the Work Plan as we

go forward to basically, you know, identify which are the next steps and the timing of those.

And there's some people in the queue that want to comment as well so first I have James.

James Bladel: Thanks Marika. And James speaking. Mike I think points out this is a great compare and contrast document. Could you point that - put that on the list?

I think that's a great idea.

And secondly, I know that we've just kicked off the public comment was it yesterday or Friday or something like that for this?

So what do you think is the fastest that these new rules could come into play?

And if they, you know, given that we've already kind of thrown out this idea of an accelerated PDP for this group but I mean are they going to - are we going to be halfway through this effort before the new rules hit or is it going to be closer to early (implement)?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean if you look at the public comment (form) it closes on the 6th of December. The next Board Meeting is on the 8th of December. So, you know, there might be very small chance all of the panel and the comments that are received that it might be considered in December. But, you know, as I said that's...

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...really a question mark. And I haven't actually seen the new schedule. But I'm assuming that there's going to be a next Board Meeting in January or February. So that might be the more likely adoption date.

But as I said, I mean if you compared the two, you know, I think there are several steps, additional steps that the new PDP provides that, you know, example specifically requesting SOs and ACs to provide input.

I think those are very important elements that, you know, just because they're currently not specifically spelled out in the old PDP doesn't mean that this Working Group, you know, cannot already apply those kind of, you know, measures and really make sure that there's broad input.

I think on, you know, many of the other elements you see there's a lot of crossover. I mean there's still the requirement to have initial report, have a final report, to have, you know, constituency statements. I think what you'll see in the new PDP a lot of it is more spelled out, you know, practices that were already being applied in, you know, past PDPs as well.

There's more detail for example in the new PDP on what should be covered in an initial report. Again I think it would be good practice for this Working Group probably to, you know, try to complete or provide as much information as possible that is listed there as, you know, there might be an expectation or there might be a transition at some point that would even require having, you know, those different elements as part of the initial report.

So again it's difficult to predict at this stage, you know, when it will be adopted. You know there are - there is of course always the possibility that substantial comments are raised, you know, through public comments or possibly, you know, through Board discussion that, you know, might delay or might require further discussion.

You know earliest adoption would be December, January or February, that time span, but again, you know, I can't - unfortunately I can't see in the future.

But I'll definitely keep you posted on what's happening there.

James Bladel: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thanks. I reiterate what others said about the comparison charts.

I would tend to support what you are recommending that unless something is disagreed with by the current PDP which is very rare that this group as much as possible follow the new PDP structure. I think that, you know, it's been well thought out. It builds upon many of the things that has become common practice.

And, you know, I just believe that what you're recommending is really the optimum path that insofar is it possible. Obviously if something contradicts which I think is very rare then we have to go with whatever is currently bylaw mandated.

But in all other occasion I would recommend that we follow the new PDP both in practice and in spirit. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks Avri. As we're, you know, coming close to the top of the hour I think that the best way forward would be to encourage everyone to review this document and the comparison and start thinking about Item C, the development of a Work Plan and, you know, that's possibly as well a task that, you know, once we start out the election of the Working Group leaders that they - something they will take to task and I'm happy to provide support there as needed to develop a Work Plan and really outline the different milestones and timeframes.

And I'm very supportive of the ambitious goal the Working Group seems to have set itself. But I think indeed it will require as well an aggressive timeline and making sure that work is divided and, you know, people know what is expected of them in order to meet the different deadlines.

So then just probably on Item 7, the confirmation of next meeting and next steps, as agreed I think and (Michele) and James will have a discussion first and then we'll send out a note to the mailing list on the election of Working Group Chairs. I already just sent out this document that's online here and post the other items that are not on the mailing list yet.

You're all encouraged to review those documents ahead of the next call.

And then would like to suggest if everyone supports it just to schedule the same call in the - for the next week at the same time and probably foresee for the moment to continue on a weekly basis as I think there's a very aggressive timeline ahead of us.

Would that work for everyone?

James, do you have your hand raised?

James Bladel: I'm sorry. That was in agreement.

Marika Konings: Okay. And again I think, you know, with this - with the previous Working Group at some point, you know, we changed the timing. I think for now we can probably continue on the 60 minutes. But, you know, if there's a need at some point there's also the possibility to extend or other Working Groups have at some point opted as well on, you know, two weeks - two calls a week so I think that's something that the Working Group can review as that time goes ahead.

So James do you have your hand up now or are you still agreeing?

James Bladel: No, I don't know what's going on. Sorry. There we go.

Marika Konings: Okay. Well with that, you know, we're just one minute past the hour. I, you know, thank you all for joining and hope to see everyone next week.

Man: Great job Marika. Thank you much.

Woman: Thank you for Chairing.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes. Thank you.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END