

**ICANN  
Transcription  
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting  
Monday 03 February 2014 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 03 February 2014 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-20140203-en.mp3>  
On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Attendees:

Graeme Bunton - RrSG  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Rob Golding – RrSG  
Kristina Dorrain – NAF  
Volker Greimann – RrSG  
James Bladel - RrSG  
Angie Graves – BC  
Chris Chaplow – CBUC  
Bartlett Morgan – NCUC  
Kevin Erdman - IPC

Apologies:

Paul Diaz – RySG

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffmann  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody, this is the IRTPD Call on the 3rd of February 2014. On

the call today we have Volker Greimann, Mike O'Connor, Barbara Knight, James Bladel, Angie Graves, (Graham Bunton), and Avri Doria. We have an apology from Paul Diaz. And from staff we have Lars and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Nathalie and welcome everyone to IRTPD Working Group call for the 3rd of February, one day after Ground Hog Day and really an uneventful, anticlimactic Super Bowl, and I hope everyone is doing well.

As per our usual order of business does anyone have any updates to their statement of interests, if so, please indicate in the Adobe room. Okay, silence is golden so we will move on then to the draft agenda, which is posted on the right hand column on the Adobe chat room. Does anyone have any updates or comments to that agenda? All right, seeing none, then we will just consider that agenda adopted and we will proceed accordingly.

And when we last looked at our (unintelligible) last Monday, we were discussing the recommendations. And since that time, there has been some traffic on the list, which I think is awesome, and most recently, think earlier this morning or perhaps it was late last night, Mikey submitted a draft that I think we see a snippet of in our screen for Adobe who are on the Adobe chat room.

And Lars and Mikey I believe is it - would we be circling back if we revisit Charter Question A or should we proceed from here? Mikey you and I discussed we would just push off from this document, but we wanted to make sure if there were any other edits suggested outside of this draft, that those were captured as well. So Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. I think that what we could do is sort of - most of my edits are non-substantive. They are just changing the sentences around to make them a little bit easier to read, and so, I think that what we could do is sort of pick up with the - I think it's Charter Question B or C where we left off last time. And I think the goal could be to get through all of the stuff today, mostly focusing on recommendations.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And with the goal of making sure we haven't missed something really big or made some horrendous blunder, and then, I think once we've got the rough outline of the recommendations settled, then we can circle back and start fine tuning it a bit more, but that would be my thought for the day if it were up to me.

James Bladel: But in that case we would then just focus - and I can't tell if I have scroll control or not. It doesn't appear that I do. We would just focus maybe just looking at the charter question and then skipping the issue description and the working group deliberations and moving directly to the draft recommendation.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, sorry. I was muting myself. It's Mikey again. That's what I would do at least for this first pass.

James Bladel: All right.

Mikey O'Connor: I see Lars is trying to get in the queue too. He may have some thoughts on this as well.

James Bladel: Lars.

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks James and Mikey. Yeah, I think it's a good idea to focus on the recommendations. This is (unintelligible) very quickly on the different versions. I actually merged them up, and so this (unintelligible) in the Adobe

room right now should have the edits from last week as well as Mikey's edits just so you know.

James Bladel: Thank you. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Great job Lars. Did you send that to the list yet?

Lars Hoffmann: No, I have not. I've just led up to the Adobe room. So I thought when there are more edits during this call, I will then (turn) out the combined one on this (unintelligible) one.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, great.

James Bladel: Okay, awesome. Okay, well then I guess lets dive in. You know we've got about 52 minutes to see how far we can get through these recommendations. I don't know that I have scroll control; I don't think I need it to be honest. If we could just start with the recommendations for Charter Question A and just a reminder Charter Question A talks about reporting requirements for registries and (unintelligible) providers.

And if we go down to our preliminary recommendation, we are recommending that there should be reporting requirements. For example, the outcomes of rulings by both the registry operators and resolution providers. And that we cited the Asian domain name dispute resolution center as an example for how those should look, because we felt that those were a good model presenting the information that was relevant to any future cases or tabulating statistics on TDRP.

And then I think that we recommend some specific language down here modeling after the UDRP. So my open question on this recommendation is - and I'm just kind of putting this out to the group here. Do we need to account for whether or not we recommended removing gTLD registries and should it be directed solely at the dispute resolution folks?

Does anyone - Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James, it's Mikey. Yeah I snuck the remove the registry layer recommendation into - I don't know. I think it was Charter Question C. And so, we could indeed accommodate that.

James Bladel: Just strike that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, we could change this language to make it consistent.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And Lars are you taking us to - I'm not sure where we are headed. Anyway, so yeah, we had a bit of a conversation about where to put that, remove the registry layer, and I decided that since it came out of the conversation about Charter Question C, I sort of hacked it in. Let me get to it, so apologies for making your eyes water, but it is down at the bottom.

James Bladel: Mikey was up late.

Mikey O'Connor: So if you see this section right in the middle of the page, the working group recommends that the TDRP be modified to eliminate the first level registry layer. That's the new recommendation and then I hacked out a sentence or two, but it's at least in there now. And so to answer our question about this first one, yeah we could back out the reference to the registry layer.

James Bladel: And then do we want to maybe - well I will wait until we get to this one, but I think we should add something about the TDRP would become exclusively the purview of the dispute resolution (unintelligible). I saw Volker's hand go up and then come down. Volker, did you have - there you go.

Volker Greimann: Yes, just one question because if I remember correctly, the TDRP has certain cases that never reach the providers and are resolved on the registry level.

And for those, there would never be any reporting at all under this recommendation. Is that correct?

James Bladel: No, because we would be removing the recording requirement because we would be removing that registry layer entirely. So the reporting requirements and indeed all of the policy obligations would lie with the dispute resolution (rider).

Volker Greimann: Yes, so thank you.

James Bladel: Yeah, so they wouldn't in this case. They would not be off the hook.

Okay, so if we can strike with this all rulings. If we could strike both gTLD registry operators and then it would just say by dispute resolution providers and we can skip that whole section. And then, I think that should cover us and make us consistent with that other recommendation.

And Mikey agrees and I guess does anyone disagree. The board is clear. Okay, awesome. Can we then move to Charter Question B.? Charter Question B just to refresh, whether additional provisions should be included in TDRP on how to handle disputes from multiple transfers, deliberations, observations, down to preliminary recommendations.

Well we should make the title consistent with the above. I think we called it preliminary working group recommendations or something, so we should standardize that language, but here we go.

The working group recommends that the TDRP be amended as follows. Transfers from a gaining registrar to a third registrar and all other subsequent transfers are null and void if the gaining registrar requires sponsorship from the registrar of record. To (unintelligible) a transfer as determined through the dispute resolution process set forth in the transfer dispute resolution policy.

So what we are saying is that if a TDRP is initiated relevant domain names should be locked against future transfers, correct. And if anything - based on the implementation of that outcome, it could reverse all subsequent transfers. And then we established the statute of limitations to launch a TDRP. We extended it from 6 months to 12 months. Are there any concerns regarding that?

I think - I'm not saying I have any objections to this being a recommendation. I think that we need to editorialize here. Sorry folks if that is blurring the lines, but I just believe that that one may - we may be surprised. We could be caught off guard if we don't correctly anticipate some of the pushback we might receive on that 6 to 12 month change. So we should I believe make sure that we have all of our ducks in a row and substantiate that as much as possible in the deliberations.

So I just don't want it to just kind of drop in there, because for some slices of community, let's say a narrow but perhaps (unintelligible) slice of the community that could be interpreted as a very significant change and they will want to see the appropriate justification for that.

I will go with Mikey and then Volker. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: No let Volker go first. That's fine.

James Bladel: Okay, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thanks Mikey. One thing that is substantial here but I think the intention here that we are driving for is that the statute of limitations would be extended to 60 to 12 months from the (unintelligible) transfer and not from any (unintelligible) transfer. Is that correct? If so, we should probably make that clear in the language as well. Because if we are not making it clear, then somebody could think that each and every (unintelligible) transfer would then trigger the extension and therefore allow (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yeah, so good point. Subsequent transfers could keep this thing open to disputes almost indefinitely, so I think we could probably make that specific and ask that Lars capture that as the language we will need to insert here and perhaps it's as simple as at the end of that sentence (unintelligible) 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer. I think that would be the simplest fix.

Mikey you are up.

Mikey O'Connor: thanks James. I just wanted to chime in in support of your notion that our justification of this is fairly thin in this version of the report. And I noticed that as I was going through it, so we do need to be set up and you know have a good solid justification as to why we are proposing this. I don't think it's hard to do but we haven't done it yet.

James Bladel: Right and I agree completely. I think that you know given the amount of time that the working group spent on other charter questions we may have - maybe this conversation might not be as fresh in our minds. But I can assure you that for certain segments of the population this is the only recommendation that won't matter to them and they will zoom in on this immediately.

So I see (Rob) has posted something interesting in the chat about our obligations currently under WDRP to contact the registrant on an annual basis to update contact information. So having an annual contact is not unexpected at least for two years.

(Rob), I'm trying to read your chat into the record. I was wondering if you would maybe want to speak to these two points because I think they are important and we want to capture them. I hate to put you on the spot if you don't have audio or something like that. He is still typing, so he still waiting to get through to the operator.

Okay, well we will just hang on there, but for the record (Rob) has indicated that existing policy is already requires an annual contact by the registrar. So even though folks perhaps do not expect annual invoices if they register the domain name for more than one year.

Anything else relevant to this particular recommendation. I think that we've nailed it here. I think we just - as we said we need to clarify that little bit or qualify that recommendation a little bit as Volker pointed out so that it doesn't become a perpetual (unintelligible). And as Mikey and I discussed, I think we need to beef up our justifications and our rationalizations early in the report for the 6 to 12 month change. Any objections. Okay, I think we can move on. Thanks everyone for contributing to that.

Charter Question C is the big one. Should we go in order, out of order?  
(Rob), welcome to the phone bridge. Go ahead please.

(Rob): Yeah, it was simply in support of the changing the amount of time that it can be raised from 6 months to 12 months. That some registrars don't have very much contact with the registrants and our average number of years of registration is 2.7 in the majority of customers versus two, three, or more years.

And so, they wouldn't expect to get very many contacts from us. However, they are all told and therefore should all expect that at least once a year we're going to badger them about WDRP and things like that, so it may take them some time after a dodgy transfer has happened before they realize that the domain isn't with us unless they are sitting there pressing FI to refresh the Whols every five minutes.

Whereas if they don't get that WDRP reminder, that would trigger in their head hang on I haven't heard from (unintelligible) for a while and therefore that may make them come to us and ask or go and look it up themselves. So

that was sort of one of the things that I thought would support the migration from being a 6 month limit to a 12 month limit.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (Rob). I think that's an excellent point and something that we need to perhaps capture in our justification. That if a domain name were hijacked or involved in some sort of a disputed transfer we would want to make sure that we had at least that refresh period for WDRP for the registrants to become aware of that and to file the dispute.

(Rob): Yeah, because if the domain is hijacked it may not necessarily get new named servers or redirected somewhere or anything done to it at the time. It may get left for a while, so I think 12 months is an okay amount of time. I mean longer might be better, but you don't want it to be an indefinite amount of time. You do need cutoffs for these things and I think a year is long enough.

James Bladel: Okay, I think we are all in agreement here that it is a good - it helps us shore up our justification on that. Okay, issue C was a very lengthy discussion. I think it consumes probably 65% of the work of the working group thus far, because it's a very important issue with a number of dependencies and implications.

And the charter question was whether or not dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as a part of the policy as registrants are currently dependent upon registrars to initiate TDRP on their (task).

And so quite a bit of discussion here and I want to make sure, and this is really for Lars, that we capture everything we need there. Because to I think adequately reflect that the working group spent a significant amount of time on this particular question.

So here we go. The working group - and we would change the title again to make it consistent with the other preliminary working group

recommendations. The working group recommends that the registrants should not be able to directly initiate a TDRP. The working group recognizes the need that use cases identified as a result of its deliberations on this issue (unintelligible). That's excellent and are adequately addressed.

As most of the cases relate to inter registrant disputes the implementation of IRTPC Part C Recommendation Number 2 is relevant in this context. The working group recommends that upon implementation of IRTPC 2 the IRTPD Part - the implementation team and staff should determine whether the majority of the use cases have been addressed.

If there are significant use cases that have not been addressed by the implementation of IRTPC-2, that group should formulate a request for an issue report to review the remaining use cases and consider whether any additional dispute resolution mechanisms or changes to TDRP should be developed. That request should be forwarded to the GNSO Council for consideration.

The request for the issues report, correct? I kind of lost the handle on that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

James Bladel: We are not wordsmithing it, but that one needs some (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that paragraph still needs work. I will own that one.

James Bladel: Okay, sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: I was laughing while you were reading it. It was pretty rugged.

James Bladel: Yeah and I am doing my best here but (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that was - you did good. You made it all the way through, but that was a rough script to follow for sure.

James Bladel: Down to the second one then. The information on the (ITM) Web site describing registrant options. With regard to inter registrar and inter registrant transfers does not include (unintelligible) as it should be. So we are asking them to change that, right. Maybe we should add something there as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's the next paragraph.

James Bladel: I see. Okay, the working group recommends that visibility and content of the (ITM) Web site devoted to offering guidance to registrants with transfer issues ought to be improved. Special attention should be devoted to these pages.

And that's just customer service 101. I mean we saw the statistics. We know the transfers are the bulk of the problem so I think this is - this should be fairly self-evident.

The working group appreciates that the TDRP is designed for registrars. The registrants are also involved and (unintelligible) clear guidance on the ICANN Web site as to whom they can go to for assistance and under what circumstance. The working group recommends that the TDRP be modified to eliminate the first level registry layer of the TDRP, and then this is - I like Mikey's side bar comments here.

The working group notes that the number of TDRP disputes is very small and that the number of registries is increasing dramatically with the arrival of the new gTLD program or the expansion I guess or whatever we want to say there. This is a very low volume of requests for a process that requires substantial registry resources to properly support, resulting in high costs for registries and low quality registrars.

I would like to recommend that we add something here and I think it's something that we discussed in this context, but I don't think its captured. Not in the recommendation, but maybe its captured somewhere else. It's the idea that it will become - as a number of registries proliferate, it will become harder and harder to enforce any kind of consistency on these outcomes.

So I think maybe if we could capture that in there that would be good as well. And I think Mikey is giving that thumbs up, so Mikey can I ask you to take the wheel for just a moment here as we go through this here. I need to step aside for just two minutes here.

Mikey O'Connor: No problem.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: So that's where we are and so are people comfortable with this series of recommendations pending a substantial rewrite of one paragraph that was eye watering? I really was laughing out loud while James was reading it, but I'm just curious if there is any strong objection or any objection to any of this. Again, not at the wordsmithing level. One of the things that I am going to - and I thought that I had that in here.

James Bladel: I'm back Mikey. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: That was quick. Anyway, one of things that I...

James Bladel: We just got notification that a neighbor was in a car accident so we are just rushing around a little bit, so sorry about that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, so one of the things I am working on here. Lars, did you take out my little rant about specifying that these links to this material be placed above the fold or is that somewhere else.

Lars Hoffmann: I don't think I've taken anything out that you put in there.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, well then I just hallucinated that I put it in. Anyway, one of the things that I am involved with as some of the rest of you are is this redesign of the ICANN Web page. And it has occurred to me that we need to get the essentially registrant help links prominently displayed on the Web site in policy so that the 19th subsequent redesign of the Web page doesn't design that's not friendly enough, that's not cool enough, it's got to go.

And so, I'm just making a note for you Lars that we need language in there that you and I can figure out and I thought I wrote that this should be above the fold on the main ICANN Web page and write it in such a way that it forces the ICANN Web maintainers to put it there forever.

Back to you James.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey. Lars, is that a new hand?

Lars Hoffmann: Yeah, just very briefly, Mikey I think you put it into Charter Question C actually on Page 32.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Lars Hoffmann: That's where you put it so it's in there; it's just not under C. It is under D.

Mikey O'Connor: Good. Okay, well so that's an editing note for you and me then Lars. We should pull this paragraph out of this recommendation. You know we should put all of that stuff in one place. Either all of it in here or all of it down there and not split it the way it is now. That was a goof. Sorry.

James Bladel: Okay, so let's see here. Where are we on Charter Question C and did we reach the end of the recommendations?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah that's it for the recommendations.

James Bladel: Can I ask that we - okay can I ask to scroll up just a little bit here.

Mikey O'Connor: I will give you back scroll. There you go.

James Bladel: Okay, there we go. Yeah, that's fine. I just wanted to make sure we were up front with the direct answer to the charter question, which we are. Okay, so does anyone have any objections to where we landed on this? I think that we still have a ways to go I think in flushing this out a little bit and making sure that our recommendations are crisp and capture the use cases and I think address all of the items that we discussed and identified in Annex C. I think that we wrestled with this one for quite some time so I want to make sure that when we send around another draft that everyone takes a close look.

You know, if you're only going to read one recommendation out of this Working Group please make it Recommendation C, but all of them are important of course.

It's just that want to make sure this one - we identified all the complexities and want to make sure we got them all and didn't leave anything on the floor. Okay so let's then move to Charter Question D.

And we'll start the reading with the charter question. "Whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for Registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to Registrants."

And then we have our description and our deliberations, and then we have our preliminary Working Group recommendations. "The Working Group recommends that the improvements to the ICANN Web site -- it's referenced above -- regarding the display of information on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy and transfer dispute resolution policy is regularly updated.

The Working Group further recommends that links to this information are always prominently displayed above the fold on the ICANN home page.” I hope that’s understood, right, above the fold.

Or we can just say prominently displayed. Either one is fine. Lars got it. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O’Connor: Yes. I - mostly what I was trying to do there James was force the language in a way that reminded the Web designers, because the Web designers sort of went, “Oh that stuff about help - we don’t want that on the new version of the Web page.”

I was sort of going, “No man. This is the most important part of the Web page.” “But it’s not friendly to newcomers.” Well that’s too bad, you know.

James Bladel: You know, it’s like if you go to the Apple site and the first thing you see is the iTunes agreement that everybody’s eyes glaze over but it is important.

Mikey O’Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: And I just want to make sure above the fold is understood, because I’ve seen more and more of these Web sites adopting what I would call a continuous scroll format. You know...

Mikey O’Connor: Right.

James Bladel: ...there’s plenty of examples of I think newer Web sites where they just scroll on and on forever so...

Mikey O’Connor: Right.

James Bladel: Okay. "As a matter of best practice the Working Group recommends further that all ICANN certified - and I say ICANN accredited Registrars prominently display a link on their home page to this on the ICANN Web site."

So first I would recommend that we suggest accredited rather than certified and there - the language in the RAA about displaying items on the Web site. And I would suggest that we conform to that, which is I think something reasonably accessible and visible on the Web site, which basically gives the Registrars the flexibility to include this information in relevant sections where they have already linked to for example the Registrar Rights and Responsibilities and, you know, WHOIS lookup and all other ICANN required links and information.

So I think that if we can borrow from that language Lars we can, you know, put this - we're basically telling Registrars, "Put this link with the other links that you're required to display."

And that way compliance can find them all in one spot. Basically don't bury it. And with the goal, you know, with the goal of Registrants having ready access to a centralized up-to-date source of this important information.

Okay so we did some wordsmithing. Sorry Mikey. But hopefully that was fairly non-controversial. Anyone have any comments or edits to this preliminary recommendation?

A really healthy debate, kind of more of a sidebar conversation going on in the chat, but not really - you guys should be careful showing the statistics like that. Rob you're up next. Go ahead.

Rob Golding: Yes. It's the question of sticking it on their home page to ICANN. I'm not entirely sure we should be as a group dictating what people should stick on their Web site and where.

The - they have to have it. I agree with that. It should be where the other information about the domains or about domain transfers are. I also agree with saying it's got to be on the home page I think is a step too far, particularly as you say we've - there are lots of people moving towards the sort of slide it, swipe it.

It's only got one page. They would obviously get it on the home page because it's only one page. But those with a more defined structure - it wouldn't make sense to put it there.

It would make sense to put it where the rest of the information about the transfers is.

James Bladel: Thanks Rob. And yes I agree and that was sort of along the same lines as what I was recommending as well, which is if we borrow language from the RAA we can keep it either appropriately with the transfers or appropriately with other ICANN required links like to the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities document mainly because, you know, and it makes compliance's life easier as well.

They don't have to hunt around all the Registrar Web pages. They can find them all in one spot. Mikey you're up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey. I agree with Rob and James. You know, that sentence getting modified the way James has described. Lifting language out of the RAA sounds like a great plan.

And then the sentence above it I'm actually going to not back off on. I think on that one we really do want to instruct ICANN. You know, this is sort of the shoe on the other foot in a way.

I think we do want to instruct ICANN to have this really prominent on their Web site, because for a very large proportion of the people that come to the ICANN Web site they don't care about how cool we are.

They care about finding a ready answer to a serious problem. So I, you know, Rob I'm with you on your point but I'm going to - I'm also going to amplify the point that I made about the ICANN page. Thanks.

James Bladel: Hey thanks Mikey. And I notice that your comments received a green checkmark of agreement and endorsement from Avri so thanks for that. I put myself in the queue because I just had a thought here reading these last two recommendations and listening to the I think very reasonable suggestion from Mikey, which would be that, you know, the statistics that we've seen in this Working Group and other Working Groups indicate that transfer problems, the transfer disputes are far and away the biggest problem or the - let's say the most common reason that someone off the streets would pick up the phone or fire off an email to contact ICANN.

And it may even be their first exposure to the idea that an organization like ICANN even exists is, "I've lost my domain name. What do I do?" This recommendation in the context of the previous recommendation that's requiring different links and then this asking ICANN to feature them prominently on their Web site - starting to feel like we should make a recommendation that ICANN should have a single page or a single landing spot on their Web site for transfer problems if they don't already, but a one stop clearinghouse for resources, advice, help, you know, what ICANN can do, what ICANN can't do, when to contact the Registry, when to contact the Registrars.

It seems like if we can get all of that wisdom and guidance into one place that - and this is - and we're really kind of making a recommendation over to Staff at this point and it feels like we could maybe really start to tackle that transfer issue head on.

And it still might be the largest - by percentage the largest issue that drives customer service tickets for ICANN, but maybe the overall volume could be cut down.

So I'm going to lower my hand but I think that - maybe that we could get something like that captured in here. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I just want to chime in in full support of that. I think that what we've got right now is something that, you know, this is a best practice recommendation.

It's not a policy recommendation. But I think one of the things that we want to do as a policy group is make sure that this recommendation is enforceable into the future, that when ICANN hires its next sexy Web designer page person that they run into a rock that says, "You can do anything you want to make the Web page completely consistent with the standards of 2097, but one of - which is a clear way to get to that set of resources and a very well designed page that provides answers for people in that circumstance." And then I think we've done a great good for a lot of people.

James Bladel: Right. Right Mikey. I think it's definitely within the purview of this group, especially as the last transfer group to note that we've just - we keep coming up - we keep bumping into this reality that transfers are, you know, that there's a dump truck on ICANN's doorstep every week or every month of transfer problems and that - and it really should be a better resource on their Web site to highlight that.

And, you know, maybe even to the point - they've created subsites and minisites for things such as the new gTLD programs or the AoC reviews and maybe transfer problems warrant a similar treatment.

So okay, well let's move into then Charter Question E. Does anyone have any further statements about this? I think we've come to a good place on B, so we're now going to Charter Question E.

And I think these last two are kind of slam-dunks here. "Whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provisions/penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy.

Observations/Deliberations/Recommendations. The Working Group concludes that the new policy - sorry, the new penalty structures..." I see a double that there.

"The new penalty structures which has come into place with the 2009 RAA and the 2013 RAA are sufficiently nuanced to deal with IRTP violations, therefore the Working Group recommends no additional penalty provisions need to be added to the policy.

The Working Group emphasizes that as a matter of principle GNSO policy - consensus policy should not have individualized sanction structures. Rather it is desirable that the overarching RAA, and I'm assuming RA penalty structures be sufficiently detailed to assure uniformity and consistency of policy violation penalties whenever necessary."

We need to wordsmith that clearly but I think it gets the point across that we don't think that each policy deserves its own penalty structure. I did find an exception to that though Mikey, which is the anti-tasting thing.

So just for trivia night at one of these ICANN meetings there's your example of a policy that does have its own sanctions structure built in. So any thoughts?

I mean, I think this one was fairly non-controversial. I think certainly makes the life of Contracted Parties and compliance and all folks a little bit simpler. "You violate this policy.

It's a violation. You don't fix it. It's a breach. You have a breach. You don't fix the breach. You're de-accredited." It's really the same disciplinary structure as it would be for any other contract or agreement.

So I'm reading here Rob. And that's a - still the part of a sidebar conversation so any other thoughts on this?

Mikey O'Connor: James this is Mikey. Actually that last bit isn't.

James Bladel: Oh it isn't? Okay. Sorry I missed...

Mikey O'Connor: No. They're - I think it's Rob brought up the point that we made about the ICANN Web site also needs to roll over to the internic.net Web site, which is another site that ICANN runs and I agree with that. It should be added to the list so...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Well that's going back to Charter Question B, a recommendation...

Mikey O'Connor: Well it's the newly combined BC business about ICANN having this information prominently displayed. I don't care who runs it. It's got to be on there.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Barry is saying the IATF runs it. I'm not sure that's true but, you know, whatever it is it's got to be in both...

James Bladel: What about iana.org who should have it?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And I think that we need to at a minimum InterNIC because that's another place that people go. And if we cause a constitutional crisis by that so be it.

James Bladel: Yes. Okay I see that we're now getting a flurry of chat responses so I think let's capture that idea Mikey. We may need to find out where it goes, but let's capture that on ICANN's Web site and any other applicable or appropriate Web sites that are operated by ICANN, something like that.

And then we can say, "For example, internic.net, im.org," that sort of thing because they may launch new ones in the future as well and we want to make sure we're going forward.

So okay good catch everyone. And did anyone - did we want to revisit Charter Question E? I think everyone was kind of in agreement there. Any other thoughts on Charter Question E?

Okay. Finally, Charter Question F. "Whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AUTH-INFO codes has eliminated the need for FOAs."

And we're scrolling through deliberations to our recommendation. "The Working Group does not recommend the elimination of FOAs. However the Working Group notes that future technological advances may make some aspects of the current transfer process redundant and will need reconsideration by a future Working Group."

I think that last paragraph is nice but maybe not necessary. Future Working Groups - the future always has the right to come and undo anything we do here, right. So Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I changed to just agreeing in the chat.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I was deep into the end of the editing cycle and I was tired of slashing and burning so I fully support that idea, you know.

James Bladel: No problem. Okay. So that brings us I think to the end of our recommendations. What are folks thinking here? I mean, clearly there's a light at the end of the tunnel.

Is it daylight or is it a train coming to smack us? I think we're getting close to the end here. I think we've still got some untangling to do with Charter Question C, and we've got some wordsmithing to do all around.

But overall I think we're starting to land someplace acceptable. So what would be our next steps then? Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that the question of the day today is now that you've all had a chance to really look hard at all these recommendations, sort of file this away and carry around the following question for the next week, which is have we missed anything that we thought we had discussed and agreed to?

You know, and I may go back and dig through the mind maps and, you know, just some of the notes from all of the previous calls and stuff as a refresher.

I think this is the best time to find those, because if indeed we've hit all the recommendations we want to make then we're in a pretty good position to polish this up for Singapore and carry on from there.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. I agree. That's really key. Now that we're seeing the initial report and the preliminary recommendations start to take shape, it's really important to make sure that we haven't forgotten anything.

I'd go even a step further and say that if you see anything in here that even though, you know, we believe everything has been installed into these preliminary recommendations has at least rough consensus, you know, wordsmithing pending and some of the consensus TBDs.

But I don't see anything in here that's really got the Working Group divided right down the middle. If anything did not enjoy at least some healthy level of support it's not in there.

However that doesn't mean that something when it goes outside to the wider world it might not generate some controversy. I think we identified for example the - increasing the 6-month statute of limitations to 12 months.

So we should probably look for other, you know, tidbits like that that are in this report and keep an eye out for anything that could generate significant pushback or controversy or even just questioning discussions.

"How did you guys get to this?" You know, another one might be eliminating the Registry layer. I think we've substantiated it fairly well in our report.

But others might say, "Hey, you know, it costs about half as much to initiate at the gTLD than it does at the dispute resolution provider. Why did you remove that more economical option from it meanwhile?"

You know, I'm just playing hypotheticals now but that's one possibility. So identifying those things, making sure that we are covered and that kind of segues fairly nicely into Agenda Item 3, which is the face-to-face meeting in Singapore.

The Singapore meeting believe it or not is going to be coming here at some point and we will need to get some time on the calendar for this Working Group.

You know, rather than have it be a working session or even a workshop, I feel like we're getting to the point where we can present these recommendations to a community workshop and then accept questions and feedback during that time.

And I think hopefully the report might even be open for public comment during the Singapore meeting and I may be optimistic. I'll have to check the calendar but that may be one possibility as well.

Does anyone have anything that they would - or does anyone have any opposition to the idea of the Singapore session being an open forum on these recommendations? Well I see Lars has his hand up so we'll go with him first.  
Lars?

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks James. It's just an administrative mess as it were. So if anybody's got some substantive comments that might come in first. But I just wanted to say that I spoke to Glen already who's coordinating the timetable for the various groups - the various GNSO groups that meet in Singapore, and I suggested a humane meeting time of 10:30 to 12:00 noon on Wednesdays.

Assuming that we might have a preliminary report out for public comment and initial report out for public comment, we at least even if that is not going to happen have a report that we still want to present and take questions of - on it in the forum when we come back so that will give us a one and a half hour time slot on the Wednesday.

But, I mean, nothing is set in stone and I'm happy to adjust the time if people think otherwise might suit better.

James Bladel: Thanks Lars. No it's a dramatic improvement over the time slot that we are traditionally assigned to, which is very early in the morning. So I think, you

know, the Singapore schedule is still very much out over the horizon but I think that sounds like a good time. Chris you're up next.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks. No I was more or less going to say the same comment in the, you know, can we have a reasonable time slot and so 10:30 on Wednesday does sound reasonable because we have had some pretty early ones haven't we, you know, 8 o'clock after the gala and things like that.

And it's been naturally those sort of time slots had pretty sort of poor turnout so - and when the overall community just sort of think, "Oh it's only IRTTP doing one of their workshops again and no need to attend." You know, so we'll need to push it and get the word out that it is a presentation. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Chris. Yes I agree. Better this than the crack of dawn. Lars?

Lars Hoffmann: Sorry James, it's an old hand.

James Bladel: Okay. All right thanks. So I think that is our target then that we would be - Wednesday in Singapore at 10:30 in the morning we would have an open mic session with the community to discuss the preliminary recommendations from our initial report, which in a perfect world and I think that we can probably set this as a goal would be open for comment as well during the Singapore meeting.

So it might be perhaps Lars one of the takeaways would be to find out, you know, when we would have to have this published for - and what sort of deadlines we would be up against to have this initial report either introduced at the Singapore meeting or open for comment by publishing it prior to the Singapore meeting or something like that.

If you can maybe just get our calendar expectations synchronized that'd be great. Okay.

Lars Hoffmann: James just very quickly I think it's...

James Bladel: Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: I have to double check and I'm happy to send it out by the list but I'm pretty sure it's the 3rd of March that's the - that will be our deadline to open to public - to submit - the public forum we can open later, but to submit a document - an official document to be considered at the Singapore meeting that would've been - that one needs to be I think the 3rd of March.

James Bladel: Which is fairly doable I think given where we are today, so I think we can keep that as a - in mind as a goal. But to get there that means we need to continue to sand the rough edges off of this particular report and include some of the changes that we've identified in this.

So I think perhaps the next steps would be to look for an updated draft on the list this week. Does that sound reasonable? Maybe by Wednesday or Thursday?

And I got a green check from Lars. Excellent. And then would ask everyone to take a look at it and then I guess Mikey would be - beginning next Monday we would then start a more comprehensive read-through, particularly of the recommendation language and the executive summary language with an eye towards readability and wordsmithing a little bit on those but having, you know, the bulk of the heavy lifting occurring on the mailing list wherever possible. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's exactly right James. I think the other thing that we'll want to do in this next pass through is make sure that our justifications are really solid.

I didn't spend as much time on those and there are a whole sort of - there's a whole section - I'm going to make your eyeballs water just a little bit. But if we

go back there's this Deliberations of the Working Group section, which I didn't touch and I think there's a fair amount of aligning to be done between this section and the section that I did chew through with a little more detail.

So there's plenty left to do but I think the thing that we can do is keep refining, refining, refining with the goal that if it's got a few rough edges we'll go ahead and publish it anyway, because we'll have plenty of time to keep filing those off.

And I think you're right. We're close enough that we should definitely set the goal of getting this in in time for consideration at the Singapore meeting and work hard to meet that.

James Bladel: Right. Okay so that gives us one, two, three full sessions then to review this and I think that that can be done. So at the top of the hour here I think we are doing very well.

And certainly thank everyone who's contributed on the list as well and ask that that continue as - and for folks who are maybe saying, "Well, you know, I'll pick up the pen when I get closer to the end," well I think now's the time.

So looking forward to hashing out some of these final sections here on the list. When we get the recommendations in place we'll do exactly what Mikey suggested and go back and double check our justifications to make sure we're on solid ground there.

And then I also do believe that we need to take an eye towards readability with the simplest language being the best, because it's not easily translatable to other folks and particularly non-English members of the community.

So thanks everyone. Great session today and I'll see you at the same time, same channel next Monday.

Woman: Thanks.

END