

**Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP WG
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 14 March 2013 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings meeting on Thursday 14 March 2013 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-locking-domain-name-20130314-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#mar>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Laurie Anderson - RrSG
Luc Seufer - RrSG
Ty Gray (for David Roache-Turner, WIPO)
Lisa Garono - IPC
Hago Dafalla - NCUC
Gabriela Szlak - CBUC

Apologies :

David Roache-Turner – WIPO
Kristine Dorrain - NAF
Michele Neylon - RrSG (Chair)
Alan Greenberg - ALAC (Vice Chair)
David Maher – RySG
Faisal Shah
Matt Schneller - IPC

ICANN staff:

Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffman
Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the UDRP Domain Name Lock Working Group call on the 14th of March, 2013.

On the call today we have Lisa Garono, Ty Gray in for David Roach-Turner, Laurie Anderson and Hago Dafalla.

We have apologies from David Maher, Faisal Shah, Michele Neylon, Kristine Dorrain and David Roach-Turner.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Nathalie. This is Marika. And I also believe we have apologies from Alan Greenberg or at least I know he's in another meeting and probably won't be able to attend this one.

So maybe the first agenda is basically are there any updates to statements of interest? And just for the record as well I don't know if you had a chance to see but Michele is not able to make this meeting because he also has another commitment that came up so he has asked me to step in of course unless anyone else is willing to take on that roll so if anyone else would like to chair I'm happy to hand that over to any other volunteers.

So maybe moving on to the next item I do notice that we have a very limited number of working group members on the call today so I don't think we're probably in a position to make any decisions or make any substantial changes unless of course we get some confirmation on the mailing list.

But for those of you that, you know, are here maybe we can briefly just go through the two items that we have on the agenda and just to see if there are any further comments or edits to the report because I think we're about to get ready to publish by tomorrow which is the publication deadline for Beijing.

So basically the first item on the agenda, the Number 2, is basically a review of the latest version of the initial report. I haven't received any edits or comments following the publication of the last draft last week.

There is one item that we did discuss on the mailing list basically - based on a suggestion or comment I think I made. Having reviewed the URS document and also reviewing, again, the discussion we had on this item I suggested that we should possibly consider adding something to our definition of locking which would basically clarify that the locking does not mean the locking of the name servers and that should be left open.

And then Luc, in response to that, suggested some new wording of that. And he suggested that maybe we should say that in this context the term lock means preventing any change of registrar and registrant without impairing the resolution of the domain name basically recognizing that it may not always be in the power of the registrar to do so.

And I think Luc has just joined and he's asking - there's no chair today. Luc, are you already on the call as well? I see you on the call. Michele...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...sent any email earlier today that he has a conflict and is not able to make this call unfortunately. So he has asked me to step in in the meantime. But as I've said before if anyone else is willing to volunteer to chair I'm happy to hand that over to someone else.

So basically the question is do people feel that is an addition we should consider making or also taking into account we have very few people on the call today. Is it a suggestion we should put out on the mailing list and know that if, of course, anyone objects we don't add that last part of the sentence to the definition but possibly leave that for the discussions as part of the final report.

Does anyone have any specific views on that? Do you think it's a helpful addition? Does that need further discussion? How do people feel?

Lisa Garono: This is Lisa Garono. I think it's a good idea to put it out but I would put it out as a, you know, object by a certain time or forever hold your peace.

Marika Konings: Okay thank you, Lisa. Any other thoughts?

Laurie Anderson: Yeah, this is Laurie. I agree with Lisa as well.

Marika Konings: Anyone object to that discussion? The idea would be then I can immediately when we finish this call basically put out the specific language on the mailing list and basically give people until the end of today - today, you know, wherever they are - to object to including that second part of the sentence in the report as well as the public comment forum text.

And then if there are no objections we can add that sentence. And again if, you know, in further discussions people, you know, raise issues or want to re-discuss this I think we still have opportunities before the final report. But I think at least in this way we do get it out for public consideration and, you know, gives us an opportunity to ask for feedback on that as well.

So are there any other comments or edits or suggestions with regards to the initial report? Going once, going twice. And if not then I'll make the update as suggested and I think the only thing we still need to add to the report is basically the date and the attendance information to make sure we include,

as well, the record of this meeting. And I think then we're basically ready to go.

So only one other item we had on the agenda for today, if Adobe Connect allows me to close this. For some reason I think I need to log in. And, Berry, if you can help me a second in the Adobe Connect and actually maybe pull up the text of the public comment forum. For some reason it doesn't allow me to do so.

But basically I circulated as well earlier this week the language for the proposed public comment forum that's based on the - let me see - I haven't - oh hold on. I think I may need to - I think it's coming up. There we go. Thanks, Berry.

Which basically follows the format that we have for opening public comment forums and that basically in the public comment forum I've tried to outline some of the main issues or the main recommendations of the report and point to some of the items where we're specifically looking for input on.

So the question here is, again, you know, do people have any comments or any issues they think should be added or changed? I said one of the changes we'll need to make if there are no objections expressed in relation to the definition of locking that will need to be updated. But are there other points that people feel should be called out or changed in the proposed text?

Everyone's very silent. I don't know if that means that everyone's really, really happy with the way it currently looks or you just need a couple of moments to read through it.

Lisa Garono: Again, this is Lisa Garono. I'm fine with it.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks, Lisa. Anyone else? I see Laurie has put a green checkmark. So I'm guessing that means that everyone is basically happy with the initial report as well as the public comment forum as it currently stands.

Obviously we'll have opportunities as well in Beijing to raise certain issues as part of the discussion there or working group members talking to their constituencies or respective groups can also highlight these questions or any other ones that they think are important to consider when people are preparing their responses to the report.

And so I believe that actually takes us down to the last item of the agenda which is the next steps and confirm the next meeting. So the next step is basically for me to finalize the report and make, you know, the final edits, I said, adding the date and adding the attendance sheet.

There's the one item on the definition that we'll put out on the mailing list now immediately following this call to ask whether anyone has any objections to adding that, you know, second part of the sentence to the definition as it currently stands.

And then we should be ready to publish by tomorrow so then at that point we'll open the public comment forum and announcements will go out. So then the next step will be for the working group at least to present the report in Beijing to the community and following that review the comments received and work on finalizing the report.

I think the next meeting we'll go back to our usual UTC time for next week. And I think next week's meeting will basically just be dedicated to preparing for the session in Beijing. I'll talk to Alan and Michele because we can see, as well, whether we actually need a conference call or whether it's something we can actually do via the mailing list the planning for that.

So I would suggest that we'll confirm to you by email whether we're actually having a meeting next week or prior to Beijing or not if that's okay for everyone.

Are there any other comments or questions that people would like to raise? Because if not I think we can basically wrap up early and give people 45 minutes of their hour back.

Laurie Anderson: You're very efficient, Marika. This is Laurie.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Laurie. You're indeed the audience to be efficient so.

Gabriella Szlak: Hello, everyone.

Marika Konings: If there's nothing else? Hi, Gabriella. We're actually just wrapping up the call. But as you just joined I'll give you an opportunity to share any thoughts or comments you may have on the initial report as well as the public comment forum text.

I can just briefly recap what we've discussed so far. With regard to the initial report the only item that we discussed on the mailing list or comment that was received is in relation to the definition of locking.

And as you may have seen I suggested some language then subsequently Luc suggested a modification of that. Those on the call agreed that it would be useful to actually add that to the initial report as that would allow for public comments and review of that revised definition.

But as we are missing quite a few people on the call today the idea would be to put that language out on the mailing list and basically ask anyone that doesn't agree with including that to share their objections on the mailing list and if so we will just take that second part of the definition out and leave that for further discussion after we've published the initial report.

With regard to the public comment forum the only thing there to update then is the actual language of the definition and I didn't receive any further comments or suggestions. I don't know if there's anything in particular you would like to share or any edits you want to suggest for those documents or whether you're also happy with them as they are.

Gabriella Szlak: Excellent. Thank you, Marika. I just wanted to thank everyone for their work. And I'll - if I have some edits I'll do them in the email and send them.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks, Gabriella. So basically that took us to the end of our meeting. And as I just said I'll talk to Alan and Michele to see whether we actually need a meeting next week or the week after before Beijing because I think some of the planning for our session there we can probably also cover by email and I'm not really sure if it needs an actual conference call. But we'll confirm that to you on the mailing list.

Gabriella Szlak: Excellent. Thank you.

Marika Konings: So that's - I just would like to thank everyone for their participation. And looking forward to seeing you in Beijing or otherwise on the mailing list or on our next call. So thank you very much.

Laurie Anderson: Thank you.

END