

GNSO Council Working Session

Saturday 21 June 08

Agenda: https://st.icann.org/gnsocouncil/index.cgi?agenda_21_june_2008

Observers who joined after the roll call:

Britt Lysaa –Nokia, Cotonale L.G.-consultan-Benin, Fahd Batagneh – NITC Amman, Mariana Mansilla-Miyali SA-Uruguay, Javier Biptria Uruguay, Monika Ermert –Hese, Richard Tindal – Demand Media, Steinar Grutterud – CORE, Elmar Knipp-Knipp Hestien und Kommunikation GMBH, Gal Waran-Black Ice Domains, Francois Lamy, Shanaz Behnami –Filimage Sorbonne, Paul Stahura – Demand Media, Redouane Merrouch- responsable du Réseau Marwan Rabat Maroc, Philip Corwin – CBUC, Eric Brnner-Wiliams – CORE IRTP wg member, Khaled Koubaa - ISOC Tunisia, Thomas Rossler - W3C, Ignacio Amadoz Legal and Policies Directors – puntCat, Adam Palmer – PIR, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISP, Iren Borissova - Verisign
Ali Bouallou - Conseiller TIC ICT Adviser Maroc, Burn Henderson - .Travel, Patrick Vande Walle – ISOC, Zbynek Loebel - Czech Arbitration Court, Rodney Joffe - Neustar , Helen Laverty - dot alliance, Chuck Kisselburg - ICANN WIKI

Councillors who joined after the roll call:

Jordi Iparraguirre, Edmon Chung – Ry, Tom Keller – RR, Philip Sheppard, Bilal Beiram – CBUC, Ute Decker- IPC, Tony Harris, Greg Ruth – ISP, Robin Gross, Carlos Souza – NCUC,

1. Inter Registrar Transfer Policy PDP on Denial Definitions – Deliberations (9:00-9:30)

Final Draft Report Drafting Group for IRTP Issues PDP on Clarification of Denial Reasons
4 June, 2008

<http://gnsocouncil.org/issues/transfers/gnsoc-final-draft-denial-reasons-04jun08.pdf>

GNSO Final Report on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy: Clarification of Reasons for Denial

<http://gnsocouncil.org/drafts/final-report-irt-policy-09apr08.pdf>

WIKI link

https://st.icann.org/irt-pdp/index.cgi?final_draft

Presentations:

Clarification of Denial Reasons-Drafting group outcome

<http://www.gnsocouncil.org/correspondence/irt-denial-reasons-21jun08.pdf>

New IRTP Issues – Summary of Issues Report

<http://www.gnsocouncil.org/correspondence/new-irtp-issues-summary-21jun08.pdf>

>>AVRI DORIA: Good morning.

It looks like everything is set so it's time -- it looks like we're all set.

So I would like to start this first of our two days of meetings by welcoming everybody here, by basically doing the same thing we always do which is go around the room and get everybody's name.

So first we will go around the table, starting with -- you can use your own mics. The mics at the end were really for the people in the back row once we do the back row.

But if we can start from Dan and move around, and all introduce ourselves and give our affiliations and then we will go into looking at the agenda and what we have ahead of us.

>>DAN HALLORAN: Dan Halloran, ICANN staff.

>>JON NEVETT: Jon Nevett (inaudible).

>>JON BING: Jon Bing, NomCom appointee.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Kristina Rosette, IPC.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: J. Scott Evans, IPC (inaudible).

>>ROB HOGGARTH: Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: Mike O'Connor, interloper and presenter of the first report.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Olof Nordling, ICANN staff.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes, Verisign.

>>AVRI DORIA: Avri Doria, NomCom appointee.
>>DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel ICANN staff.
>>TIM RUIZ: Tim Ruiz, registrars constituency
>>ALAIN BIDRON: Alain Bidron (inaudible).
>>TONY HOLMES: Tony Holmes (inaudible).
>>ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, liaison from the ALAC.
>>OLGA CAVALLI. Olga Cavalli, NomCom.
>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Adrian Kinderis, ICANN -- sorry, registrar constituency.
>>CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Craig Schwartz, ICANN staff.
>>Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, ICANN staff.
>>MARIKA KONINGS: Marika Konings, soon to be ICANN staff, and I am here as an observer.
>>PENELOPE WRENN: Penelope Wrenn, ICANN staff.
>>BRUCE TONKIN: Bruce Tonkin, Melbourne IT, and also a member of the ICANN board.
>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. And if somebody could pass the microphone to the people --
>>CLAUDIO DIGANGI: Claudio DiGangi, International Trademark Association.
>>MICHAEL COLLINS: Michael Collins, Internet Commerce Association.
>>MARCIE O'CONNOR: Marcie O'Connor, Mike O'Connor's wife.
>>SUSAN CRAWFORD: Susan Crawford, ICANN board.
>>AVRI DORIA: On the other side.
>>JIM BASKIN: Jim Baskin, Verizon.
>> (Saying name) from (saying name).
>>AHMEDOU OULD HAUBA: Ahmedou Ould Haouba, Mauritania.
>>ADAMOU IRO: Adamou Iro, Niger.
>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I would like to know who do we have on the telephone?
Do we have anyone on the telephone?
>> No, just (inaudible) the audio.
>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you very much.
So I guess there's a sheet up -- I mean a Web page up somewhere so that we can see people as they come on; correct?
>>GLEN DE SAINT GERY: Yes.
>>AVRI DORIA: Yes? Okay. You have given me the number, I can check on.
Okay, thanks.
So welcome.
We have a lot of agendas ahead of us for this week.
Just to show, basically, and on our Web site you can find them all and if we can change them as time goes on. But basically this is the agenda for today, for tomorrow, for Wednesday, and for the Thursday meeting.
On today's meeting, and we're a little late, but, you know, we're already at the end of the first part, so - but we will have the report and move on from there. But first we are doing the inter-registrar transfer policy PDP on denial definitions, and basically we are going to get a report on where it's at and talk about where we go from there.
This is one of the things that's on the agenda.
For Wednesday for us to take a vote on how we proceed. But we need to sort of discuss beforehand to see where we're at.
Then there's the inter-registrar -- yeah -- transfer policy PDP A, which is the new IRTP issues. And just a discussion on that.
Then the WHOIS study proposals. We have given some time to that.
Basically we will get an overview of the report, and then we have a break. And then we basically talk about that. One of the things we do have on the agenda for Wednesday is to try and make a decision on which way forward.
We then have a fast flux discussion on getting started, basically putting together the work group.
We have basically got the working group together. I would like to get to us the point of having a Chair and having a council liaison, and if we have those sort of in planning at the end of today, then we can vote on those and approve those at the Wednesday meeting. That's also listed on the agenda.
And we have a lunch break where there will have a Fast Flux present presentation from Kevin Silva of VeriSign and they are kindly giving us lunch during that so we will be able to have a lunch break and listen to that talk. And in the afternoon we move to GNSO improvements.
By the way, I'm hoping we have all these coffee breaks and that we don't have to keep working, but we must have the coffee breaks.

And then we have a discussion on front running. And then the last thing of the afternoon is a session on talking about -- basically one of the requirements for the future is that we start doing a little bit of strategic planning of what policy issues are going to be dealt with over the next, is it longer? Is it longer? Whatever.

So we're basically going to have sort of a blue-sky discussion on what policy issues we should talk about.

And Olof will facilitate that open session to not obviously solve anything but sort of talk about what issues we think should be on the table over the next years.

So that's it for today, and did anyone want to comment on that proposed schedule before we proceed on it?

No? In which case, Mike, as the -- you were the chair of that little group; right? So if you could start us off. Thank you. >>MIKE O'CONNOR: Mike O'Connor, interloper and Chair.

Thanks, Avri. I thought what I would do is just frame the document today. Olof has graciously prepared a little presentation to summarize it.

We could also frame the decision that needs to be made on Wednesday and sort of handle any questions from the group.

Just a little bit of history. This is a PDP that addresses four clarifications to the existing policy on transferring domains between registries -- registrars.

And our group was the group charged with drafting the final wording of those policies. We were essentially a subsequent group to a much longer running working group.

And just at the highest level, to give you a sense of what's in front of you, we have four -- four policies, two of which we have recommended language, two of which we don't. And so before we go through the actual policies themselves, I thought I would tell you a little bit about why.

Basically, we were a drafting group. We were charged with a very, very narrow mission to come up with final language. And as we started our conversations, we realized we really only had about three weeks to do that.

We hustled along pretty fast, but we basically ran out of time.

And so what we have suggested for you is that we have -- we did get through two of them. We have two suggested changes to policies. And then we didn't get through two of them. And we have a choice for you. Being a good working group, we always want to provide our policymakers with choices. And so we have a recommended choice that the two that we didn't define get included in the subsequent PDPs.

Your alternative choice, which we don't recommend, is that you charter us to finish our job. But we would prefer to roll the two policies that we didn't finish into the subsequent PDPs because we saw all sorts of connections between the two remaining ones and issues that are to be raised in those PDPs and felt really uncomfortable going out on our own and developing policy there.

We really felt like that was outside of our brief.

So that's sort of the high-level overview. I will hand it over to my able compatriot, Olof, to take us through the details and then perhaps we can do some question-and-answer and Avri maybe we will get you a little closer to on schedule. I don't think we will take the whole time to do this.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Mike. And thank you very much for chairing the group. We did achieve, I would say, some amazing results.

Anyway, I think the overview has already been provided.

We have prepared proposed new texts for two items, denial reasons 8 and 9, and suggested ways forward for reasons 5 and 7.

And perhaps a few words about the drafting group.

We had quite a participation on the mailing list, subscribers to the mailing list, counting up to 17 plus staff. Participation in the calls, we had four conference calls. It was, well, five, six, maximum seven. Well, a good drafting group, I'd say.

If we go into some detail on the matters and taking the easy ones first. And denial reason 8, well, the matter there was rather to clarify the initial registration date, which had been interpreted in various ways. And I think we came up with a pretty clear and rapid solution that the creation date is what is actually meant. The creation date for the domain name, as shown in the registry WHOIS record. So that's the proposed text.

For denial reason 9, well, the key issue there was the expression "transferred." And there we agreed upon a proposed text, adding an explanation on what's meant by "transferred." Transferred shall only mean that an inter-registrar transfer, or transfer to the registrar of record, has occurred in accordance with the procedures of this policy.

So these two were agreed upon.

Then -- And this is actually the order in which we addressed them, realizing already from the outset that 5 and 7 would be a bit more of a mouthful.

And so it turned out that the current text, well, it's a pretty lengthy one. The core issue there is perhaps the two things. The registration, the current registration periods, and, well, the connection to the registrar hold status.

And the concerns that were brought up in the conference calls was, as Mike has mentioned, that the text is connected to other provisions in the transfer policy and that adds some complexity. We have to keep that in mind, whatever we proceed to do, to realize that this is connected to other provisions as well.

And that registration period had not a clear linkage to the registration agreement.

And there was also an uncertainty regarding the add/renew grace period. Did I say that correctly?

Well, all these four-letter words, yeah.

In relation to the posted advisory from the ICANN staff as well.

And of course we had very limited time to settle this.

And did not prefer to -- try to rush some kind of solution, but, rather, to bring it back to the council for your judgment on how to proceed with, as Mike has already said, a choice to be made between including this issue. For example, or as a preference in the PDP set C, which is in -- well, among the five PDPs that are in the pipeline, in order to ensure consistency with the provisions in the rest of the transfer policy. Or, if the council so prefers, to extend the charter and the scope to a working group in the current PDP.

The outcome regarding number 7 was fairly similar. There, the key issue was what was called readily accessible and reasonable means to remove lock status.

And this, when we start to chew on that, prompted a few concerns.

Of course, if we tried to compare it and say it shouldn't be more difficult than this to make any other change, well, that may prompt some registrars to raise the bar a bit. And that would be an undesirable outcome.

So to avoid the risk of increased difficulties with other changes, and also realizing that the registrars have various solutions and there are quite a few opt-in, well, to serve the customers, there are opt-in solutions with higher security. And how could they be kept if there is a "must" provision here.

And also, recognizing that the registrant's choice of the correct balance between security and convenience is respected.

And, of course, that we still had very little time to sort it all out.

The group's recommendation was essentially similar to denial reason 5 in the sense that the recommended choice is to draft this into PDP C, in particular since that one addresses the various provisions regarding registrar lock status.

Or commercially extend the charter and scope within the current PDP to some kind of working group to sort it all out.

And some conclusions on that would be we do have issues for discussion in the council both regarding substance and procedure, perhaps primarily procedure.

And we should perhaps also notify that it was the intention or, rather, the task of the drafting group to produce draft texts and to post them for public comment and have that ready in time for the meeting here in Paris.

We did not opt to post a partial result for public comments, rather preferring unanimously from the drafting group side to present the situation for the council, for the council's deliberation and decision on what -- how to proceed.

And one could say that our two main overall options would be to either post now, for example, number 8 and 9 for public comments, finalize this PDP, and include 5 and 7 in PDP C. Or, which is the alternative, to pursue the work in the current PDP, and expand to working group for 5 and 7. And once it's finalized post all four texts for public comments, and finalize the PDP for all four.

So I would say that that's, in conclusion, the outcome and the choice. I hope it's not too stark a one for the council to debate on.

Thank you.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you.

I wanted to check one thing to make sure I understood, is -- okay, no, actually, it says that.

So it wasn't just a personal preference from the chair that option A is -- it was a unanimous preference of the working group that you've posted two of them, but you prefer "A"?

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: Yeah. The working group worked pretty hard on all of those. And I'm -- I'm not the lion, I'm just giving the roar.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay.

And so if it was "B," they're already letting us know that there would be issues or difficulties, perhaps, in --

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: If it was "B," I don't believe there would be huge difficulties. We just felt it was a better way to handle it.

One of the things that we concluded was that there are implications that are quite broad in these last two, and they are, indeed, connected to some of the things in those subsequent PDPs. But if you would like us to take that on, we would simply request a charter that let us take on the full breadth of that. And that, in turn, would complicate the subsequent PDPs.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to comment, ask questions, explore this further?

Yes.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I just have a just point of clarification, I think.

The definition of transfer that you guys insert as proposed text in reason number 9, it says, "Shall mean that an interregistrar transfer or transfer to the registrar of record." Are those intended to be two different things or is the latter intended to just explain what an interregistrar transfer is?

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: I'm going to do a dreadful thing to Tim, because Tim's working on something else. So I'm giving you lots of heads-up time.

>>TIM RUIZ: (inaudible).

>>AVRI DORIA: Microphone.

Microphone, if you're going to speak.

And also, do give your name ahead so that we make sure that the transcription has names and that the recording has names.

Thanks.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: Tim was one of our sort of core participants on the calls. This kind of question I always defer to Tim, so I'm going to do it again.

>>TIM RUIZ: I'm not sure I have a real good answer for you, Mike, except that I -- the intent was that it would just refer to an interregistrar transfer. In other words, it wouldn't include, you know, a transfer from one registrant to another or, you know, perhaps other ways you might look at transfer. But this would be from one registrar to another.

So I don't have a clear answer as to why we included that -- the second part of that sentence.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: Could we view it as a clarification and then rejigger the sentence to be once that makes that a little bit clearer? Because now I'm looking over Rodenbaugh's shoulder and I'm seeing that he's got a proposed way to clarify that.

Do you want --

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Do you just mean that transfer shall only mean that an interregistrar transfer, meaning a transfer to the registrar of record, has occurred in accordance with the procedures of the policy?

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah, I think that's exactly what we meant.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: I think that's where we were headed, too.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: All right. Thanks.

>>AVRI DORIA: Chuck.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I think one of the things that would help here -- and correct me if I'm wrong, especially the registrars that are here -- but sometimes there is confusion of an interregistrar transfer, which was original intended in this policy, and the change of a registrant. And that can be, in essence, a transfer from one registrant to another for the domain name. So that's one area, I think, that there was point of confusion. And I think possibly another one is that sometimes registrars were doing some transfers, kind of it was more of an internal move rather than from one registrar to a different registrar.

>>TIM RUIZ: I think the other example was -- that was fairly common was between resellers. But it might be resellers within a particular registrar. So it didn't really involve an actual change of registrar of record, it just involved a change of who was managing it on the --

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Okay. So it is intended to mean two different things, then, both an interregistrar transfer and a change to the registrant?

>>CHUCK GOMES: No.

>>TIM RUIZ: No. It's intended to exclude changes of registrant or transfers between resellers within a registrar's network, a single registrar network.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: In general, I think the way that you can view all of the changes that we made was, we were trying to narrow and clarify rather than broaden the definitions of these reasons.

Other questions from the group?

>>AVRI DORIA: I guess, so, at the moment, one of the things that I would feel a little bit uncomfortable with is going with option A but saying "but we need to quickly rejigger some of the clarifying language that the group came up with." And so I'm not -- I'm not sure how much we would want to sort of say, if the question -- if the language is still problematic or confusing, that it really should go back to the group to sort of fix up the language. But I'm not sure, Mike, whether -- you're looking like that might be a weird way to look at it.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: If it's just a simple clarification like we've discussed, then, hopefully, we can just change it.

I just don't want it to be ambiguous still after this work.

>>AVRI DORIA: That's just it. If it was still ambiguous at this point, then, you know, I thought maybe we still had an issue.

Anyone else want to comment at this point?

Is there any -- and we're not voting on it at the moment. This is something we'll -- you know, the option "A" versus option "B" is something that we'll look at at the Wednesday meeting. But did anyone else want to comment on this before we moved on? Yes, Chuck.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I'd like to suggest that we prepare for following the recommendation of the working group, we had gone back to them and suggested that they consider the possibility of continuing to work on it, and they obviously chose the other direction. I think we should respect that, because they did diligently look at that.

So what I would like to suggest is that maybe Olof could prepare a motion in that regard that, then, we could consider in the meeting on Wednesday.

>>MIKE O'CONNOR: If I could add one more thing. If that motion were to prevail, one of the other parts of our charter that we didn't get finished is that we were supposed to go out to public comment on these two -- on these four suggestions, but we didn't get them all done.

So in addition to ratifying our option "A" choice, if we could also be instructed to go out to public comment and finish those two, that would be helpful.

>>AVRI DORIA: Right. Well, I think that the going out to public comment is something that the council would do. And then what the council would probably do -- and this is -- it's sort of a normal thing -- is when those comments came back, ask the working group to consider those comments and recommend any changes that would need to be made.

But the going out to comment would probably be done by the council as opposed to the working group.

I think asking for a motion to be prepared, whether it's Olof wants to work -- and -- but I think that Mike's changed language would have to be available at the time that the council voted on going out with 8 and 9, that the language of 8 and 9 would be included and would be included as sort of your recommending, as long as others were in agreement with it.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Question in that regard. What are you referring to when you say Mike's changed language?

>>AVRI DORIA: Mike was referring --

>>CHUCK GOMES: Which Mike?

>>AVRI DORIA: Mike Rodenbaugh had suggested a clarification, I didn't catch it, exactly what the wording change was, so that transferred, the meaning was not ambiguous.

>>TIM RUIZ: I think it was just changing -- removing the word "or" and replacing it with "meaning," which we all pretty much agreed what was intended anyway.

>>AVRI DORIA: So that that wording would be included in the motion, as opposed to the original wording, is what I'm trying to say, awkwardly.

Okay. Does anyone else want to comment on this before moving on to the next?

So it's fairly clear that we'll have a motion that recommends that 8 and 9 go out for -- 8 and 9, with the small change, go out for public comment, and then when it comes back from public comment, the working group would reconsider any of the comments and send a recommendation to the council for approval and sending on to the board?

Okay. Thank you. So we've caught up by four minutes.

The next item on the agenda -- and I don't have the thing at the moment -- is the interregister -- interregistrar transfer policy PDP "A," the new IRTP issues.

2. Inter Registrar Transfer Policy PDP A - New IRTP Issues (9:30-10:00)

GNSO Issues Report: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy: Set A; "New IRTP Issues"
<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/transfer-issues-report-set-a-23may08.pdf>

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Issues - PDP Recommendations - 19 Mar 08
<http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/transfer-wg-recommendations-pdp-groupings-19mar08.pdf>

Now, we had an issues report, and we've talked about it some. I think there was an overview given in a meeting. And there's -- the recommendations. I'm not sure where we are on it at the moment. And as we were putting together a group -- were we not?

>>OLOF NORDLING: No.

>>AVRI DORIA: No, we were not?

>>OLOF NORDLING: No, we were not.

>>AVRI DORIA: So can you please catch me up with where we are.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay. Thank you, Avri. Olof Nordling again.

So new IRTP issues. Well, this is a summary of the issues report. And, basically, where we are is that this is one of the set of five proposed PDPs that were decided upon at the conference call on 8 May. And this happens to be set "A," which has the catchy title of "new IRTP issues," covering three issues. And this is essentially, just to make it perfectly clear, this is the first time we will try to address it in the council context, really.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you for clearing my confusion.

>>OLOF NORDLING: That's to jog our memories, that there's nothing to remember.

>>AVRI DORIA: That's probably why I didn't remember anything.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay. Well, there are three issues covered. And one is, should registrant e-mail address data be made available between registrars one way or another? And we go into some detail on each of them.

Second, is there a need for other options for electronic authentication, for example, for a form of authorization?

And, thirdly, should provisions for partial bulk transfers be introduced?

That's the bundle we're dealing with. And the issues report was delivered on 23rd of May. And, basically, it confirms that the issues are within scope and recommends a PDP.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Can I jump in?

It may be helpful for some people in the room that aren't very familiar with the registrar transfer policy to just share a little bit of background on some of that.

For example, the registrant e-mail address, those of you that are familiar with WHOIS realize that, oftentimes, there's not a requirement for an e-mail address there. And so that's not something that's always readily available. And the -- when a transfer is occurring, that's something that can be needed because of the fact that the registrant is the ultimate authority in terms of a transfer.

On the -- Can you back up that slide for me.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I just want to say that you're already into my second slide.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Oh, I'm sorry? You're going to give the background on that?

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yes.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Oh, okay. Go for it.

>>OLOF NORDLING: All right. Well, it's already been given. But both the registrant and the admin contact can sort of order a transfer. But in case there is any difference between the two, well, the registrant trumps the admin contact.

And also, as Chuck said, well, the registrant e-mail address is not a compulsory or required field in the WHOIS, in contrast to the admin contact, which is almost always there, or should be there.

So there is currently no way to automate a transfer approval by the registrant. And that sets the -- complicates the process for the registrant in case he wants to trump or isn't fully aware of what's happening or whatever.

So, also -- well, this is -- the scope that we're looking at is sort of the transfer policy. Of course, this is something that potentially could be addressed by the change in the WHOIS policy. But that would basically be outside the scope of a PDP focused on a transfer policy. So that brings us to a need for finding other means of keeping and maintaining and exchanging registrant e-mail address data between registrars, because that's the key here.

And, of course, as a consequence -- well, this brings up a lot of administrative, procedural, and also security issues that need to be resolved. So it's not an immediate and easy answer to be found on this, I think.

Now, options for electronic authentication, the gaining registrar should receive a form of authorization from the registrant or admin contact. And now the question is -- the corollary question is, is there a need to have a security token or some other authentication method for the form of authorization to prevent any spoofing occurring.

We don't know the extent of any spoofing. There is no data on that.

But also looking into, well, the background, new IRTP issues, actually, this was already considered, to some extent, by the original Transfers Task Force that produced the text which became the transfer policy. They mentioned electronic signature, for instance, in line with the U.S.e-Sign Act. So it was there. It's not part of the transfer policy as such. And, well, voluntary use and current use of digital signatures for transfers, we don't have any data on that. I just want to signal that.

Another piece of background information is that the SSAC hijacking report from 2005 recommends, in general, the strengthening of identity verification for electronic communications, not specifically for this case, but, well, I would say this is a case in point.

However, since then, EPP has been widely deployed by, if not all, the majority. And there you have the authinfo code. And that may have had an impact on security concerns. So another check to be made, really, how important is -- would an addition of electronic authentication by some other means be.

Also, looking beyond the "G" space, it so happens that some ccTLDs use electronic authentication for transfers, haven't looked wide and far, but at least seen that Nominet, they have PGP, pretty good privacy, for electronic authentication, and IIS, or .SE, they have a certificate-based interface for the registrant for making their changes.

So that's on the second issue. The third issue is partial bulk transfers. And that's, indeed, a new issue or a new potential provision. There are already provisions in place for total bulk transfers. So bringing the whole package, all the main names that are with one registrar, over to another. And that's a rather special case, in practice. It doesn't happen very often. And -- but the provisions are there for that.

Partial bulk transfers would then mean not the totality of a registrar's package of domain names, but a piece of it, a slice of the pizza. And that may have various rationales, like agreements between registrars and registrars. For example, if one is discontinuing doing, well, the registration service for a particular gTLD, want to shift that to another registrar, there is some kind of merging or acquisition of a part of a registrar activity by another registrar. There may also be rationales on the registrant side that -- following a merger, an acquisition, between two registrants, while the merged party would like to transfer all of their domain name portfolios into one registrar.

So the reasons may be manifold, and there are no provisions for it today. There're voluntary measures allegedly in place that some registrars do accept sending fax lists of domain names that you want to transfer. But, still, the formal requirements, according to the policy, they still have to be fulfilled so there will be a -- as a consequence, a flurry of e-mails to -- for each and every domain name that will be issued.

There is also, which is not the case, really, in a total bulk transfer, because then it's the whole business that there's no registrant approval in the total bulk transfers, but that is, of course, one issue, or an aspect, that needs consideration. For example, if an interregistrar agreement calls for a partial bulk transfer, well, yeah -- well, does the registrant have a say in that? And -- well, so it's an auxiliary issue to be considered.

Also here had a quick look outside the "G" space. And it turns out that Nominet, they have a provision for mass transfer on the registrant level and for PGP-signed bulk transfer at the registrar level.

So that's a bit of the substance of the matter. And as I said initially, the PDP on the issues has been found to be clearly within the scope for the GNSO and for PDP, and is also recommended step forward.

There are areas already alluded to where additional information could be useful when it comes to voluntary solutions and to what extent they are used today, and also some, perhaps, interesting approaches by various ccTLDs. Haven't polled all of those.

So bringing to some kind of conclusions on topics for discussion and decisions.

So is there a need for additional information to -- for example, about, well, is the security -- current EPP security, is that regarded as sufficient?

So maybe the whole second issues would be dropped, and so on.

I mean, is there a need to have that? And if so, should that be rather collected within the scope of a PDP or as a preparatory step?

And, of course, whether we should launch a PDP or not.

That's it. Thank you.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you.

I'd like to basically -- would anyone like to comment, question? Express an opinion?

Absolutely no one.

I guess one of the things we need to figure out is whether we feel ready to vote for a PDP. At the moment, we have listed on the agenda for Wednesday a discussion which would include a brief overview by Olof, and then an open floor discussion, and then a discussion within the coun- -- you know, on the council whether to start a PDP or not, which is our next step.

Now, as recommended, we could say, "No, we're not ready to make that decision. We want more info."

But I need to get some clue from the council members on which way we think we want to go.

I guess the automatic step would be, we have an issues report. We vote on a PDP. That would be the automatic, if no one believes there's something else we should do first, we take the vote on the PDP. And then if we get that threshold, we figure out, are we doing task force? Are we doing something else? If we're doing the something else in terms of a working group, then we put together for a -- a charter for a working group, vote on that, et cetera.

But I need to sort of understand if we're ready to take that vote on a PDP.

I have Chuck. Anyone else want to speak?

All right, Chuck.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I'd like to suggest that we go ahead and proceed with a vote on a PDP, that this transfers policy review was supposed to help several years ago, and we've got quite a few more issues to handle on it.

I think we should just get moving on it, form a PDP. And would suggest, like I did on the previous topic, that motions be prepared for initiating a PDP, and then the subsequent motion be prepared for the council as a whole versus working group-type issue that we always have to follow that with.

>>AVRI DORIA: Well, if we're going to take that second vote, we need to have some idea, and perhaps somebody needs to put together a charter for us to speak to.

Because if we're going to do a working group, then we need a charter.

Now, the normal vote is just, do we start a task force. If the answer to a task force is, "No," then usually we stop to create the charter for the working group.

Okay. So we can basically take the two sort of automatic votes of starting a PDP, which is the one-third threshold, and then do we do a task force, which is the 50% threshold. And then if the answer to task force is no, then we're in the committee of the whole. How do we do that? And then we come back at our next meeting with a charter for the working group.

Is that -- is that an acceptable process to follow? Or does someone want to suggest something else? Which would be having a charter ready to vote on at that point?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I support that, that we go ahead and draft up a charter, if we can, in the next couple of days, and just get this moving forward.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Yeah --

>>AVRI DORIA: Do I have volunteers for helping to draft up a charter in the next day or so so people have time to read it and to get it posted?

No. Mike, you thought it was a good idea to have a charter. So you seem to be a natural volunteer.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I'm glad to review Olof's draft and provide comments.

>>AVRI DORIA: And I'll certainly work with Olof on a charter. I mean, it's sort of -- and, Chuck, will you help?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Sure, if I can find time.

>>AVRI DORIA: Well, that's kind of the case for, I think, all of us at this point.

Is there anyone else that is interested in being part of putting together this charter?

Okay, Mike.

>>CHUCK GOMES: And if we don't get the charter done by -- I mean, we could, in a subsequent meeting, take care of the charter part, as long as we make the decisions.

>>AVRI DORIA: Well, we have to go through the first two steps, anyhow, to get to the charter. And we'll see where we're at on the charter.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Exactly.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Any other comment on this at this point?

Any other questions for -- as I say, there will be lots of time to talk about it. The "will be," we have about an hour, I guess, scheduled for talking about it during the open meeting, so I'm assuming there will be questions from the floor also.