

**ICANN  
Transcription  
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting  
Monday 16 December 2013 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 16 December 2013 at 16:00 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-d-20131216-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

James Bladel - RrSG  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Graeme Bunton - RrSG  
Kristine Dorrain – NAF  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Kevin Erdman - IPC  
Holly Raiche – ALAC  
Chris Chaplow – CBUC  
Bartlett Morgan – NCUC  
Chris Chaplow – CBUC  
Holly Raiche - ALAC

Apologies:

Paul Diaz – RySG  
Bob Mountain - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Lars Hoffmann  
Caitlin Tubergen  
Carlos Alvarez  
Maguy Serad  
Julia Charvolen

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone and welcome to the ROTPD Working Group call on Monday 16 December at 16 UTC.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Holly Raiche, Avri Doria, (Graham Bunton), James Bladel, Kristine Dorrain, Barbara Knight and Kevin Erdman.

We have apologies from Paul Diaz and Bob Mountain.

And from staff we have Lars Hoffman, (Caitlin Turisian), (Carlos Alvarez) and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and welcome all including (Carlos) Alvarez from compliance and maybe (Maggie) -- oh I just blanked on (Maggie)'s his last name -- may join us as well. So this is fabulous.

(Carlos Alvarez): (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Are you on (Maggie)?

(Carlos Alvarez): I don't think she's joined. Let's continue. If she joins we'll hear from her.

Mikey O'Connor: Anyway we'll sort of follow our usual routine. We've done the roll call. We'll take a moment but the agenda is short.

We're going to basically continue on with the scenarios that we started working on last week. And I'll take a minute before we dive into that sort of check signals with (Carlos) and (Maggie) as to how they want to participate in that. And I think that'll probably entertain us for the most of the day today.

So that's agenda. I'll take a pause to see if that's okay and also see if anybody needs to update their statement of interest.

Okay. So (Carlos) welcome. It is lovely to have you here. And let me just sort of give you a quick sketch of what we've got on the screen.

This is a mind map that we started last week that is this initial set of scenarios that you probably saw the email. And I basically just copied and pasted this chunk of the mind map into an email.

Our thought is that what we will do - let me show you the other part of what we did last week is what we want to do is get as many scenarios as we can, and evaluate them on several dimensions.

One dimension is how closely do those scenarios fit in the current policy structure? How might they fit in as yet undefined in a registrant transfer which is what came out of IRTPC?

Does it clearly fall outside of policy or is it a puzzler? So that's one dimension of the analysis.

Another is who are the parties in this scenario? Is it entirely between registrars? Is it entirely between registrants? Is it a little of both or is it a puzzler?

And this is a part where you and (Maggie) and anybody else will clearly want to participate, sort of the degree of compliance is participation in it.

Clearly you have a role, you might have a role under a new inner registrant policy if that shows up in IRTCP's implementation or compliance clearly does not have a role and sends people somewhere else or if it's a puzzler.

And then the fourth dimension that we will evaluate these on is how common are these? Some of these may be completely edge cases that are not very common. Others might be every day.

And so we're very much in the early part of this discussion. So this is highly malleable in two ways. One, if there are more dimensions, you know, if this analysis structure isn't right this is a good time to change it because it's, you know, we haven't started actually putting base scenarios into these buckets yet.

And then the other part and I think the part we'll probably focus on today is fleshing out this list of scenarios because I know James has gone back to his organization and collected a few more scenarios that he's keen to add.

And one of the points that I was making before we started the recording is that this list of scenarios right now is little bit light on the scenarios that are normal for the IRTP. And so we may want to build that part of the list a little bit more as well.

So with that sort of introduction this isn't the whole list. It keeps going, but I'm sort of limited on screen landscape in Adobe. So I have to sort of roll back and forth to show you the whole list. But it's - right now it's the same list that's in the email.

And so the question for you and (Maggie) is would you prefer to just ride along on this part of the conversation for a while to sort of get a feel? Do you already have comments that you want to make starting out?

(Carlos Alvarez): Yes, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Whatever we want to do this is fine. So, over to you, (Carl).

(Carlos Alvarez): Thank you. This is (Carlos) from the ICANN Compliance staff. We previewed from the end of the (unintelligible) short details how these tough scenarios or instances in which there would be disputes we have to start going to the details of the HFOs scenarios. We have two initial comments.

First, most of those fold outs had (unintelligible) policy. Basically those are related to disputes in private parties or and by that I mean either two people fighting over a trademark or competitors fighting among themselves or situations of this sort or a client fighting against a lawyer that didn't let go of data mining.

Of those are for the most part, either technical related or contractual disputes that are and should be (again) solved in the court system, the confidential restriction.

On the other hand, we found among those types of disputes between we think - or a simple entity like the instance that was mentioned in which the company was fighting its own employee. That should be dealt with according to the company's own internal policies.

It caught our attention. But that was included there as a (moderate) discussion under ICANN policy. So that's one part the sorts of disputes and these sorts of priorities that we (encounter).

And the other matter that we wanted to bring to the discussion is the fact that, as I said those are not currently at least within the scope of the ICANN policy.

Those are private disputes from non-ICANN contracted parties. And currently we have now they are not under our remit or our purview, except reports that those cases in which trademark slides or disputes better go the UDRP path.

But that's different. There's already policy for that. And the work that's been done under the (unintelligible) Part C that's so much (unintelligible) as well. So that at least I share with you all to start the discussion today.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific (Carlos), thank you. And one of the standing rules of this Working Group is if I misconstrue what you say in typing the notes you're welcome to either correct me now or correct me afterwards. There's no editorial pride in any of this. James go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi Mikey, James speaking transcript. And thank you (Carlos) for those comments. I think they were helpful in setting the stage, as far as what ICANN's perspective is with regard to those sort of private party disputes.

I did have a question and particularly because it is something I know that we have encountered as a registrar.

We've been working through various issues with compliance where occasionally someone will claim that they have lost control of the domain. And only - it's only through the investigation of ICANN compliance or through the registrar or both that it becomes apparent that this is a private party dispute.

So I guess what I'm saying is would you agree that it is not always apparently at the outset when you are starting to go down one of these paths that it is turning out to be a private property dispute or an internal dispute that at the beginning at least it may look and sound like it's a - some sort of a transfer problem?

(Carlos Alvarez): This is (Carlos) for the transcript. I'm going to word it differently. James, good morning. I'm going to say that to us it's not always clear up front whether some of the contents that they receive are (unintelligible) contents under the IRTP.

By this I mean that sometimes compliance on the tier in these statements that they make when they submit their (contents) in whether or not they feel that their registrars reached any of their obligations that they have to comply with under the policy.

Registrants of course some know and don't have to know the details of the policy. We take those contents. We analyze them. When we see that there's not enough information we ask the complainant to provide further details.

And it's - with what the complainant states we feel that there's enough to ask each of the two registrars losing and gaining we will ask for upgrade (scores) to show proof that they did comply with all their obligations and that they prorate and providing the outfit to the right person and all that.

So what we found after we sent those first notices to both registrars is that in some instances oftentimes a negative to support that's related to - to what you were mentioning, James, is that some of these complaints are related to instances of hijacked email addresses or access to (data source) to control panels rather than disputes between persons.

Of course there ends up being disputes, but that's a consequence of the initial fact that triggered the dispute that was the hijacking of the (unintelligible) or someone (unintelligible) control panel.

And that's what changes to the nature of the constant. When we find that then we stop. It's (unintelligible). There is no violation of the IRTP. That always requires a set of compliance matters. Both registrars keep what they had to. They (unintelligible) by person. The asset was sent to the right person.

The timelines for compliance, someone simply by hijacking an email address for example, was able to pose (unintelligible) to the registrant.

So that's different than and it keeps it at different (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay thank you. I think I got that. And I guess I was trying to help out compliance a little bit by stating that it's not always clear at the beginning because of the nature of the limited amount of information that ICANN has is how many sources like Whois, it's not always clear at the beginning who's telling the truth and who isn't and what sort of the dispute, it is.

And it's only through working with the registrars does that sort of thing come out. And it sounds like were saying the same thing. So I'll just (unintelligible).

(Carlos Alvarez): Yes, yes. It's not always easy to determine who's saying what's true. That's absolutely true James.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay let me just finish typing. Again, feel free to correct either now or later. Chris go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks. (Carlos) thank you. That was interesting. Just a follow-up question, Chris Chaplow here for the transcript.

So having investigate a little and identified that it's a private registrant dispute presumably you then write to the person that made the complaint with almost a standard letter that you have, advised them that in your belief it is a private dispute and you would need to settle up by judicial means.

So that's the first part of my question which I assume the answer is yes.

And the second part is, is that, from your side is that normally or in almost all cases the end of it or then do you have come back and further discussions with people not understanding this or accepting this and having strange - to us, strange expectations? Thanks.

(Carlos Alvarez): Okay this is (Carlos) again. Regarding the first part of your question, yes, this is the next step for our team. We communicate that to the registrant to the complainant better letting the person know that the matter is a dispute with someone else.

We suggest paths of action that they can take either take the election or retain legal counsel, et cetera. Usually that's the end of its content.

There are some case in which complainants write back asking some further questions. We provide the necessary explanation. But usually, those are very simple after-the-fact questions just trying to understand more details on what they should do. But that's usually the end of it.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Any other questions about that? Holly go ahead, Holly Raiche.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Holly Riache for the record. On the call in I think it was last week when James gave an instance where there was a dispute it was clear finally, not initially but finally that the - it was in fact the company's domain name, not the claimant that had managed to get the domain name.

And the response of James was to transfer the name back to the company because it was the company's name.

Now is that a presumption that goes in the mind map that it's always the company's domain names? And if it's clear that the claimant doesn't have a right it's transferred back?

Because otherwise the company is without a domain name for whatever length of time it takes to sort it. And it - that, you know, I'm just wondering if that's something that, maybe if you want to talk about that instance that'd be really useful. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Holly I don't know if James is going to do this. But what I want to do is sort of hold that question...

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...I think unless James really wants to dive right in. I think that's a substantially different topic then...

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...than what we're zeroed in on today. A good one, but James?

James Bladel: Well just very quickly. My understanding is that for us if there is ever any discrepancy between the organization let's say that the registrant and the first name, last name listed as the registrant we believe that the organization field prevails.

That may - that is certainly that is, you know, our position. That may not be a universal position and perhaps that is something that either (Carlos) could clarify or perhaps if ICANN believes that it is up to the discretion of the registrar and it's the will of this particular policy Working Group we could set that standard. But as of my understanding that's currently our practice.

Mikey O'Connor: (Carlos) you want to take that one and sort of give us a reading on what expectation for that situation is from your perspective? If you like, we could restate it since I sort of surprised you with that question.

James Bladel: Can I just add one bit before - I'm sorry to interrupt.

The reasoning behind that is that we sort of treated the - if you look at the who was almost like a contract, service contract the, you know, or any other contract here, you know, you enter into a contract with a organization but you

are signing on behalf of an authorized individual. And so the author's actual could change without breaking the contract to some extent.

(Carlos Alvarez): Yes. Yes. This is (Carlos). I would...

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

(Carlos Alvarez): ...prefer to get back to the Working Group later on the - with the answer to that question.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes if I were you I would say exactly the same thing. And I think one of the things I would ask is that we rewrite. My notes are pretty jumbled on that one. I think we need to frame that question a little bit more clearly. So maybe we could take that as an action.

James, do you want to sort of restate that scenario and question an email and push it along to the (unintelligible) and (Carlos)?

James Bladel: Sure. I could actually put it in the chat as well if you'd like.

Mikey O'Connor: Chat's good. I like chat.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: But I- at the same time I think I'm going to leave it, give (Carlos) the opportunity to take some time to think about that one, because that's not really what we brought him here to talk about. And so if I were him I'd be saying let me get back to you on that.

Okay anything else before sort of reacting to (Carlos)' his opening comments the scenarios falling outside of the current policy and the fact that most of these represent private disputes between non-contracted ICANN parties I think is the word I wanted in there?

Not seeing any I think what I would do is note that James has got his little question in the chat. And would take us then back to our list of scenarios. And I think what I'll do is just really quickly review them with you all, not take very long.

But my observation is the same as (Carlos)' was which is that most of these to me look like they fall outside of IRTP policy.

And I would be really interested in hearing about scenarios that fall outside, clearly inside IRTP along with any other scenarios that people want to add.

But let me just give you a quick tour of the scenarios we've got so far.

The first one is when where the administrative contact transfers the name, but the registrant is challenging that transfer.

The next one is the case of the recalcitrant registrar who simply is not returning phone calls.

You know, now we've got the emergency action channel contact. That's not working.

The next two are - is two registrants. After an inter-registrar transfer has happened and the case we were describing here is the registrars is saying, you know, look, we've done all - we hit all the bases, but we don't really have any. And I think this is one of the ones that tends to slide into the probably outside the policy zone.

This one is interesting that in this case both registrants have been in the Whois at one point or another. But they now disagree. Again this probably falls outside of policy but I'd be interested to hear.

The next one is where the - it's a subset in a way of the administrative contact and the registrant are in two parts of an organization and there's a disagreement between them in - inside the organization. And we sort of describe that in a little more detail there.

The next one is a registrant who's claiming that he's a registrant and they are in conflict with their proxy service provider. And we were thinking this might be an edge case.

We don't exactly know - we started talking about the role of the proxy. And it could - and we concluded that this might be a subset of the confusion within roles case or are within an organization case.

This is one where we actually have lots of anecdotal examples. And from the registrar standpoint they've never heard of this registrant.

This is the case in one case, a friend of mine had a Web site designer build them a site and then the Web site designer went out of business. And the registrant didn't really find out that the name was getting ready to transfer until it was an auction. I guess that's this one.

This one's where they're in this dispute with their Web site designer. This one's where, you know, in many cases these are sort of repetitive because we were brainstorming this list.

From the - and most of these are from the registrar's point of view. Here a registrant comes to them and says I am the owner but I don't control the name and gives them a list and asks the registrar to get it back, help them get it back.

We came up with some sub cases there of business partners or contract disputes or an interesting one where a company goes through an ownership or structure change and the original owner is trying to retain the name.

I think this too tends to fall on the point there (Carlos) was making earlier that these are disputes between registrants.

This is a case where from the standpoint of the losing registrar - I'm sorry, from the gaining registrar standpoint, the privacy service has not been removed from the name. And so the gaining registrar can't validate that the registrant is truly the registrant because there's a privacy service in the way.

And we expanded this so that it's not just the losing registrar's privacy service. It could be any other privacy service, resellers or third parties that are in that.

Here's one where the domain is registered by a person as part of their job, but they do it in their own personal name or under their own account at a registrar.

They then depart from the company and in a way this is an edge of the point that James was raising in the chat. You know, who drops the company or the employee?

Here's another person working at the company and they - this isn't malicious. This is just they've left. You know, I used to work for ICANN. I registered the name for ICANN. My name and email are all over the contact information. There's no other email and I leave. I go get another job and the email is deleted and there's no way for ICANN to reclaim this name if their - because the linkage there is broken.

And then finally there's the one where we were talking earlier on this call where a claim gets made and facts emerge during the process of describing the dispute. And we took some notes about that so I won't repeat all that.

I see James my co-chairs hand up. I always pay special attention to that. Go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. And I don't know if you're indulgence is worthwhile in this case. But really quickly here I just wanted to point out the scenario- and then perhaps we need to break it out here a little bit.

But when we say something about an individual who registers a domain name as part of their job and then they and the company part ways which trumps (you) right there.

I think there's, you know, we need to bear in mind as a working group that there are two ends of the spectrum here.

One is, you know, if you can imagine someone is working for a major automotive manufacturer about to launch a new car and they register the domain name for the new car and then, you know, they put in their own name and then they want to leave you, but the car is a hit and obviously they do not own the domain name, but brand of the trademark I think those are fairly clear-cut cases.

I think where it gets a little fuzzier is that the entire workforce of a company consists of two people.

You know, at a certain point we cross over this fuzzy logic boundary where it's no longer a dispute between an employee and an employer but really between two business partners or two maybe investors that are having a dispute.

So it, I guess, you know, some cases on one end of the spectrum are clearer and then as it trends toward the smaller side of the scale I think becomes much more muddy. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm just going to capture that.

James Bladel: Yes I think you did very succinctly there. At the low end this looks and acts and feels just like a prior party dispute...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: ...as opposed to at the high end when it's clearly an employee, employer issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, that's a good one. I'm not seeing anybody in the queue. So James I know at least you had some more use cases you wanted to throw into the pile. So I think at this point...

James Bladel: That was mainly the main one Mikey...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, all right.

James Bladel: ...was just to describe that spectrum.

I think that, you know, what we could also point out here and I think that - the more I think about my additional scenarios the more I believe that they are variations of the last scenario where this is a private party dispute between competing claims for registrant status.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh this one that we just add?

James Bladel: Right. And I guess there are almost - there's a full universe of routes by which someone could bring a case to your doorstep. But they almost all would fall under that bucket.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well then let's go back to my question which is what are the scenarios that are clearly within the IRTTP that for which the IRTTP was clearly intended?

Because on this list right now the two that are clearly in my mind inside of this are the first two. And that seems like a very small group of scenarios for a policy that we've labored over for five years.

So I'd like a longer list so that we could point to that. James go ahead.

James Bladel: I think that - and I believe Christine raised this on the last call, the scenario where a registrar is not authorizing a transfer out or is not providing an off info code within the required time period.

I think those are clear cases where they are falling within the policy and we have clear precedent from ICANN compliance on how they could proceed to make inquiries and possibly sanctions against that registrar.

(Carlos Alvarez): (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: So not just the transfers that happened, but the transfers that didn't happen that were requested.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

(Carlos Alvarez): This is (Carlos). It's something else to add also on the (unintelligible) the one contact or it sends to the account holder that may be not even listed in the list output been also on the (unintelligible) the transfer contacts those are also moderate steps for (unintelligible) under the ITRP.

Mikey O'Connor: Say that one again (Carlos). Your - the connection you got is just ever so slightly blurring what you're saying and so it's hard for me to follow. And so I just want to do that one over again and I'll capture it. Sorry to be so dense.

(Carlos Alvarez): Two instances. Can you understand me better?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's great.

(Carlos Alvarez): Okay two instances to add. First when the (unintelligible) send to either a wrong Whois context or to the account holder that may not even be deleted as a Whois context and second when the FOAs are not sent to either the two transferred contacts. Those fall strictly under the IRTP.

Mikey O'Connor: And first one you had a - and I wasn't typing fast enough. So it was one the off code was sent to the wrong Whois contact or and then something.

(Carlos Alvarez): Or to the account holder that sometime is not even listed as a contact in the Whois information.

Mikey O'Connor: That sometimes...

(Carlos Alvarez): Is not listed in the Whois.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. All right, sorry I am so halting on that. It's probably my phone line that's doing it.

Those are good. How about some more? This is so far the universe. This isn't what I was intending to do. This is the universe of things that so far fall within the IRTP in our use cases.

(Carlos Alvarez): (Unintelligible). This is (Carlos) again. I would think that one James mentioned registrars not allowing the transfers he was referring to not unlocking the domains or allow the registrants to unlock the domains themselves.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Anymore?

This is better. I like this better. I'm going to leave it as sort of an action for us all to flesh out the list of things that fall within the IRTP as it stands today.

Now one of the things...

(Carlos Alvarez): Mikey if I may because we can provide further clarification to the Working Group to us in compliance -- and this is (Carlos) again -- to us in compliance a valid IRTP complaint is that in which the ideal something - that is, it's wanting the complainant states that either the registrant was not able to retrieve he also from the control panel for the registrant did not provide the output within the five states or the registrant did not have domains provided by the registrar to unlock the domain name for the registrant request that the registrar to unlock the domains and the registrar did not unlock them within the five days.

Then as I was saying on the original registrar since does not send the FOA or sends it to someone who is not a transfer contact or sends the (unintelligible) to someone who is not the registered name holder or is the intended or the instances in which they get a new registrar would not send the FOA or would send it to someone's who's not listed as a transfer contact or the instance in which the gaining new registrar would allow the transfer with the preceding information after sending the FOA or would allow the transfer with (unintelligible) which should be technically possible for theoretical purposes at least.

Those would be probably all the cases that we would consider strictly IRTP related.

Mikey O'Connor: You'll notice I stopped typing because I wanted to listen and also because it seemed to me that that was a list that maybe I can drop an action item on Lars to capture out of the transcript.

Lars are you okay with doing that because I think that would be hugely helpful to capture carefully as well.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, no problem at all.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Because I think that's precisely what I was looking for. And I didn't want to let my not so great note taking skills get in the way of you running through that list (Carlos). So that's wonderful. Thank you.

And what we'll do is Lars can capture that list. We'll send it to the email list, make sure it's right with you (Carlos). And then I'll just strip it into this pile. That's great.

Okay, so that's at least cheered me up enough that I'm going to move on then to the next thing that I'm really interested in which is that we have sort of a moving target in the inter-registrant transfer part of IRTPC which is right now in implementation.

And what I'm curious about is whether we could go through the remaining ones on this list. I'm not sure we can do this effectively on the call. But I want to plant this idea in your minds.

And it seems to me that one of the things that would help the Implementation Review Team for this IRTPC policy would be some use cases of things that fall clearly within the inter-registrant transfer that we described in IRTPC and things that clearly do not.

And since this is coming as a little bit of a surprise to you all including me in a way -- I wasn't expecting us to get through this other stuff as fast -- maybe we can just sort of brainstorm our way through it for now and think about this over the next few days on the list.

Because one of the things that I think we, especially James and I need to do is go back to the RTPC language and see to what extent we intended contract disputes between registrants to be included in that policy.

And I think that gets us squarely into the question of, you know, is it the same dispute - you know, what started all of this is the access of the registrant to the TDRP and whether the TDRP is a big enough mechanism to resolve such a broad set of disputes. So anyway that's introducing a ball, a tangled ball of yarn. And I'll hand it over to James for a minute.

James Bladel: Hi Mikey. Thanks. James speaking for the transcript.

I just wanted to point out that what we could do, one possible way to untangle the ball of yarn would be to go back because if memory serves IRTPC what we really were creating was a way to handshake authorizations between two parties to affect a change of registrant and the registrars will in doing so.

So once we, you know, once Lars has graciously re-created the list that (Carlos) stated a few minutes ago I think we can probably take that and start to look at how we are modeling IRTPC and those requests for and granting of authorizations on that list.

And then I think that then the dispute or a change of registrar policy looks a lot like the current dispute for a change of registrar and that, you know, did the authorizations occurs they were, you know, prescribed to do and where they legitimate?

And then you could sort of maybe I'm being optimistic here, but sort of kind of hold up your hands and say without diving into the substance of the claim, you know, just checking the, you know, the paint by numbers occurred in the right order and that the colors match that's just one thought on how we could maybe approach these two.

Mikey O'Connor: It's a really intriguing thought. Because, you know, I think that one of the things that this conversation has clearly identified for me is that there is a very large body of disputes which don't really belong in ICANN's agreement. They aren't now and they probably should never be.

And the nice thing about going through that list and then mapping it over to the inter-registrant transfer is that that would I think sharpen up that distinction a bit. So I'm keen on that idea.

What's people's reactions to that strategy? Because if you - the rest are you like that approach to the next step I would be inclined to just end the conversation today. We're only ten minutes from the top of the hour, give you a few minutes back in your day and pick it up from there. Holly's okay with it.

Anybody - I think maybe another way to ask that question is anybody got a serious reservation about that approach as our next step? James go ahead.

James Bladel: Actually Mikey just wanted to say I have no problems with that. I do want to perhaps I guess this goes to Item Number 4 in our agenda -- and I don't know if I'm skipping ahead -- but just looking at the calendar wondering if we're going to start seeing folks, members of the Working Group taking, you know, sort of prolonged vacations or expecting, anticipating absences between beginning on the, I believe it's the 23rd and then the 30th? And then I'm just wondering if that's everybody, you know, what everyone's schedules working looking out like?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I'm looking - you are looking at my calendar. Sorry about that. And...

James Bladel: I'm sorry. And with that I just got a (Steve) here and I do have to drop. And I apologize. Thank you very much, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay see you around James.

James is like many of my colleagues in the Working Group world has gotten really busy and so this happens to both of us a lot. And so thanks for hanging in this long James.

I think I'm going to take a sort of unilateral approach to this and say that the odds that we would be able to do a meeting on the 23rd of the 30th are essentially zero.

Woman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So that would get us out to the 6th which seems comfortably after the holiday season.

And so why don't we skip the next two calls and pick it up again on the 6th is a plan? And Julia and Lars if you all could sort of push the word out about that that would be great.

Lars Hoffman: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Pardon me?

Lars Hoffman: Just saying no problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well I really want to thank (Carlos) and (Maggie) for joining us. This is hugely helpful.

And you (Carlos) in one list have advanced the ball quite far for us. And I just want to - I'm sure James will share this sentiment, express my appreciation for you joining us and extend an invitation for you to join us anytime you want, especially when we're in the very core of the policymaking cycle.

It's hugely helpful to have involved while we're formulating some of this. And so just a personal note of thanks on that.

I think what that we'll call it a day. Thanks everybody, have wonderful holidays. And we'll see you in a couple weeks with the lists and ideas for the future.

And with that Julie I think you can end the recording and we'll call it a day.  
Thanks.

END