

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference**  
**6 January, 2009 at 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 6 January 2009. 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:  
teleconference on Monday, 6 January 2009 at 15:00 UTC at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-irtp-20090106.mp3>  
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.  
Barbara Steele - Registry c.  
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison  
Michael Collins - CBUC  
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC  
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC  
James Bladel - Godaddy  
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC  
Kevin Erdman - IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office  
Marika Konings - Policy Director  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: (Unintelligible) recorded and now begin. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Glen, if you could do the roll please.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, certainly Paul. We have on the call (Mikey O'Connor), Paul Diaz. (Mikey O'Connor) from Business Constituency. Paul Diaz, Registrar and chair. Mike Rodenbaugh, Business Constituency, Sebastian Bachollet from ALAC.

Barbara Steele, Registry, Michael Collins, Business Constituency and Kevin Erdman, IPC. And from staff Marika Konings and myself, Glen.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Glen. Hello everyone and happy New Year. Welcome back to our wonderful little project here. Where I think we're very much in the home stretch and we'll make every effort to actually wrap up our draft today. Try and get this out for comments and take it to the next stage.

I hope you've all had the opportunity to review the revised draft Marika provided us, posted up to the Wiki on the 23 of December. That's the version that we're working off of today.

Don't have it in front of you, please pull it up on the wiki as we get underway. What I'd like to do is try to finish going through the report. We got through about 90% of it - 95% of it on our last call but just want to make sure that we get through, you know, first a good full review.

We also will need to go over the proposed text for the opening of the public comment period. Marika provided us and (James) and Barbara, Sebastian have all commented on it already, other thoughts.

And of course we'll need sort of a final run through of the draft but why don't we just immediately start with the sections that we didn't get through on our previous call before the holidays.

So if my notes are correct, we were looking at section - well let's just go out to Page - I guess it's 24. (Unintelligible) remembered as well, I believe we were up to Line 571. This is text that had been inserted. We simply didn't get - have enough time on our last call to get to it.

If I've glossed over anything, please somebody remind me but I think that's as far as we got last time. Okay. So, beginning with Line 571

then. Does anybody have concerns or problems with the text that we've suggested here? Okay.

I think the partial book transfer stuff, you know, we've given a lot of very good debate in previous calls and...

Sébastien Bachollet: I just have one question, Sebastian, on I guess, its next page, it's Line 5 Page 6. It says a registrant decides to either the main part of (unintelligible) to a new registrar but not all.

Why we add but not all? I understand for a registrar but for a registrant, why it couldn't transfer all.

It will be seen as a book, partial book transfer for the registrar but for himself he could decide to have a (unintelligible) change and I don't see why we need to put that but not all.

Paul Diaz: I believe Sebastian it might be a condition of the way we phrased it but you're thinking that it would be the registrant's choice to not move it is the scenario that we have in mind.

It's not that he or she is being restricted from doing so, it is a conscious choice on the part of the portfolio holder.

Man: I think Sebastian's point though which I agree with, is that the registrant may well want to move all of their domains.

(Olof): And (Olof) here. I think basically whether or it's all or not is not really material. It would still be partial bulk transfer from a registrar

perspective. And I also think there's a typo here because we're lacking a verb. To transfer is her domain name.

Paul Diaz: Okay, good catch there. As we originally crafted these scenarios, team - are we overlooking something? Was there a particular thought that we were trying to caption the scenario for?

Sébastien Bachollet: My question is why we need to say but not all? That means that we - if a registrant decide to move all it's not included in this and I don't understand why because it's not for registrants it will be - it could be all and not all. But I don't know why it couldn't be all also.

(Mikey O'Connor): (Mikey) here.

Paul Diaz: Hello (Mikey).

(Mikey O'Connor): I wish (James) was on the call. (James) and I were...

(James): (James) is here.

Paul Diaz: Yes, (James) made it here.

(Mikey O'Connor): (James) is here. Good, good.

(James): But I think I see the issue of - Sebastian is raising is that the registrant decides to move all of the domains within their portfolio, it still only represents a partial transfer from the perspective of the registrar.

(Mikey O'Connor): I think that's right.

(James): So why is that qualifier present in that description? And I don't remember how that - those three words were inserted.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes, I was hoping you would remember. I was thinking that that came out of the conversation that you and I had. But maybe it got a little garbled but I would agree that probably we could drop the - but not all and still retain the...

(James): Yes, I would agree that we can probably remove the phrase but not all.

Kevin Erdman: Well, this is Kevin. I think that was added in from the perspective of a large portfolio holder that might sell a portion of its business and therefore have a portion of its portfolio that it wants to move. And that was what - I think that language was specifically intended to address.

Paul Diaz: Or is that scenario three, Kevin? No, I guess you're right.

(Olof): (Olof) here and I think that's probably the typical case when for example the registrant sells part of his business to somebody else including the related domain names, but not everything.

The (unintelligible) full portfolio might be a change of - well, a full takeover and a change of identity of the registrant. But so that may have been the reasoning, I'm just thinking aloud here.

(Mikey O'Connor): (Mikey) here.

Paul Diaz: Sure (Mikey).

(Mikey O'Connor): What about if we said a registrant decides to transfer all or a portion of his or her domain portfolio to a new registrant? To a new registrar so we cover both possibilities rather than - and I think the key issue that Sebastian raises is we don't want to exclude the possibility of all.

We want to allow the registrant the option of either all of their portfolio or a portion of their portfolio.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead Barbara.

Barbara Steele: I just - from my perspective regardless unless the registrar is handling only domain for one registrant portfolio holder, I would think that it still would be a partial transfer if not all of the domain names under the registrar's management.

So I'm not really sure if I understand completely why we wouldn't want to include but not all in this particular perspective since in the first sentence of that particular item, you know, scenario three, it does indicate a merger or acquisition between registrars or partial transfer in the case of a merger or acquisition.

(Mikey O'Connor): Barbara, I think that's the - this is (Mikey). This is the - this is a different scenario. This is scenario four rather than...

Barbara Steele: Okay, I'm sorry.

Paul Diaz: Sure. But to your point and following with what (Mikey) said, how does everybody feel with changing the text to read a registrant decides to transfer all or a portion of his/her domain name portfolio to a new registrar, e.g., as a consequence of a merger/acquisition?

Sébastien Bachollet: I agree with that.

Paul Diaz: That's good Sebastian? Everybody else?

(James): Yes, I'm in agreement with that.

Man: Yes, I think that makes sense.

Woman: I'm fine with it.

Paul Diaz: Okay, good. Okay, you got that one Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, I do.

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right. So anything else in this section spelling out the scenarios? Five looks good. (Unintelligible) five. All right, then we just have - and these are in quotations so I'm going to assume it was accurately copied.

You know, we have the actual provisions of the transfer policy being presented. You drop down now to Line 608. Is everybody comfortable with the new text that we've inserted here that are findings and thinking of the group.

Man: It's okay.

(Mikey O'Connor): (Mikey) here, I'm okay with it.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Barbara Steele: I'm fine with it.

Paul Diaz: So is that good through the end of the section or how about Line 617, our preliminary conclusion?

Sébastien Bachollet: We already discussed, the decision/conclusion in the business scenario.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes, I think this is fine. This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right then. Looking ahead to Section 6. You know, we've added initial everywhere, constantly trying to reinforce that we're speaking, looking for additional inputs to help our thinking, 647 thru 649 we had some new text, more clarification.

Does anybody have any trouble with that? Okay. We jump out to 662, of course we are noting as business constituency, also provided formal comment...

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes, I have just one question. I guess as we add the business constituency we need to change three to four at the beginning of the paragraph where we say the three comments responding to the question of line. Now we have four comments.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Good catch Sebastian.



Marika Konings: This is Marika. I probably need to rewrite it in a little bit because I think the comments relate to the ones that were submitted in the public comment period. But I'll rewrite it so it's clear that there were four comments received in total.

Paul Diaz: Yes, all right. And it's probably fair to make that distinction. We see it as very valuable input but it did come in after the deadline. And that might also serve as a signal as we open up the next round for comments, whatever deadline we set as a group, you know, those of us when we go back to our constituencies let's push them to try and meet that deadline.

I think as we look at the calendar and we'll discuss this more at the end of the call, it's tight but it's possible we might be able to wrap this all up, have the report ready for Council by the next (unintelligible) meeting.

But if there's any chance of really doing that, it's going to require all inputs being received by whatever the deadline is, that we as a group can incorporate all of that into the final report.

Okay and for the remainder of this section it's, you know, there was no new text. Is there anything that anybody in reviewing it might have felt uncomfortable about or want to see any change?

Okay. Section 7 is, you know, just what you would expect for the initial report that we are, you know, what you can see there on Line 766, you know...

Man: Just a formatting question Paul, should it read conclusions? Or should it just be the title, Next Steps? Where not all...

Paul Diaz: Yes, what does everybody think? That's a good point, a good...

Man: And we could say the working group aims to offer conclusions once the second phase of the PDP following second public comments period, et cetera.

Paul Diaz: How does everybody feel about...

Man: Not a critical change by any means.

Paul Diaz: What's typically done in other - with other working groups when they're providing the initial report? How do they frame this section because it would appear in anybody's work. Do they talk about completing a section? They talk about working towards providing conclusions and recommendations?

(Olof): This is (Olof) here. I think this follows a bit of a traditional pattern that we usually come up with conclusion and next steps and as a heading, it doesn't hurt as long as we describe what we intend to do.

And say that this is to be completed later but - so it's rather - this heading is more indicating an intention at this point in time when we have this draft initial report. So I would suggest we keep it, the heading as is.

Man: That's fair. We're working from a formula, then let's leave it alone.

(Olof): A little bit like that.

Paul Diaz: Okay everybody else comfortable with that?

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes.

Paul Diaz: Great, all right. Then let's leave it as we have it. Just scanning through the remainder. I mean, since it's just cut and pasting, some minor formatting or numbering, I am just scanning through.

Okay, so we've now gone through our first review of the draft. Question, how would the group like to proceed? Do you have people - are you comfortable with the text that's in front of you now?

Would you like to as a group go back through, you know, from the top, do a quick scan through, make sure that conclusions, text, whatever we have in here is acceptable?

Or is everybody comfortable with what we have and of course the changes that we've just discussed on this call will be made before the report is posted. Not all of us were on the call last time and I just want to make sure that folks are comfortable with what's here, give everybody an opportunity to make any changes they feel necessary. Let's do this.

We'll give everybody time on the remainder of the call to kind of pick through this on the side. If there are additional things, we can come back to it. What I'd like to do is just make sure that we're all comfortable with the proposed text for opening the public comment

period. This is the text Marika provided us and a number of you have already commented on the list.

Mike Rodenbaugh: On that - it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I just had a question on the process here. Aren't we also putting this out for constituency statements at the same time?

Paul Diaz: Yes, that's correct Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, so should we mention that somewhere as well? So it's - there's not confusion about that.

Paul Diaz: Okay. How - Marika, (Olof) or others, when we open the public comment period, it's traditionally understood that that is an invitation to the broader ICANN community and the constituencies as well, correct?

(Olof): Yes, well, the constituencies are free to respond to that on public comment as public (unintelligible). I'd like, some do, traditionally.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Olof), don't we specifically ask the constituencies for a constituency statement?

(Olof): Yes we do but that's usually done by direct request to the constituencies.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I see, okay, okay.

(Olof): We need to do that as well.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right, basically we just - we'll just tweak this text a little bit and send those each to the constituencies.

(Olof): Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: All right.

Paul Diaz: Yes I mean that's the way I was thinking of doing it Mike but, you know, we could just change it.

You for (BC), me for the registrars, you know, others or various constituencies, we just make sure that our colleagues are aware that the comments are being solicited and that, you know, it's time for the constituencies to consider and hopefully submit their own statements. Okay, so with that...

(Olof): I would suggest that when we do send it in some appropriate manner to the (unintelligible) to the constituencies - well, in their official capacities, so sending it to secretary of the constituencies.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And as a point of process, is that something that typically I would do as Chair? Or you guys would do as staff? How does - what's the best way to work that?

(Olof): I think that it's frequently done by staff.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

(Olof): Glen, can you recall how we usually do that? Isn't that something we usually do from the staff side?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, that is. It's usually a notice that I send out.

(Olof): Okay.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Well then let's go through the announcement that Marika's drafted, others have had some suggestions for changes and then, you know, keep in mind of course, Glen or whomever, you know, you can just tweak - lift from this language that we'll agree upon and use that for the announcement for the constituencies.

All right so with that, if you all have that email available. The - most everybody was very comfortable with the text. (James) had requested an addition when we're discussing issue one.

Michael Collins: This is Michael. I support (James)' suggestion.

Paul Diaz: You like that as well Michael? Okay, so a change that we'll need to make then is on issue one to wait for registrars to make registrar email address data available to one another. And now we're going to add two facilitate transfers.

(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey). I'm okay with that.

(James): In fact the...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Excuse me.

(James): ...after the following sentence.

Paul Diaz: The following sentence, pardon me. I'm getting ahead of myself here.

(James): The working group noted that who is was not designed to support many of the ways in which it is currently used to facilitate...

Paul Diaz: To facilitate transfers. Everybody is comfortable with that? Trying to keep the focus on what we're here for, transfer policy, not open it up to anything about who is.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Should we then make the same change as well in the initial report where we have the same sentence?

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes.

Paul Diaz: Sure.

(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey). I think that's a good idea because this is cut and paste right out of the report so we should change the report as well.

Paul Diaz: Yes I can't find it right in front of me right now Marika but wherever that is, please let's make it consistent.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes it's Line 90...

(Olof): It's actually summary somewhere.

Paul Diaz: Yes that's what I'm thinking.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes, 93.

Paul Diaz: Yes, 90, 90, 91.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Any other changes, additions, deletions...

(Mikey O'Connor): (Mikey). I have a very minor change.

Paul Diaz: Sure (Mikey).

(Mikey O'Connor): In the announcement, if you go to the paragraph just before the bolded issue one, one of the things that I missed the first time I read it was the bulk of that paragraph.

So what if we put a carriage return? What if we made the first sentence its own paragraph and then started a new paragraph with it should be noted that the working group will not make a final decision, just to highlight that point because the first time I read it, I was reading it fast.

And I did the thing that I usually do when I'm reading fast, I just read the first sentence in the paragraph.

Paul Diaz: Sure.

(Mikey O'Connor): And so I missed that point and I think it might help to amplify it a little bit just by making it a paragraph by itself.



Paul Diaz: Everybody good with that? Seems to echo the point we've been trying to make throughout the report that we're - no final decisions have been made, we're seeking additional inputs.

Man: That's fine.

Paul Diaz: Sure, then let's add that. Anything else?

(Mark): This is (Mark). You didn't even want to bold it? Or somehow other highlight - or some other way highlight it? I'm concerned that people are going to miss it instead of making it a separate paragraph?

(Mikey O'Connor): I think, you know, amplifying that within reasonable limits is a good idea. It's a - we really want to make it clear to people that we're looking for their input.

Paul Diaz: Okay so we'll make it...

Marika Konings: How about underlining it? Does that work?

(Mikey O'Connor): Sure. Whatever looks good in the email is fine with me. But I agree with (Mark) that to the extent that we can make that sort of leap out at people, that'd be a great thing.

Paul Diaz: Yes and at a minimum put in the - a separate - make it a separate paragraph. I'm just thinking when emails sometimes (unintelligible), for instance on the - on our list, if you do not use html you won't see things like bolding and underlining.

So we can do everything we can but at a minimum let's put it in a separate paragraph so it'll stand out and hopefully, you know, really catch the eye of folks reading.

(Mark): I suppose -- this is (Mark) -- I suppose we could put it in caps...

Paul Diaz: That's another thought, yes. Could be...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: ...all caps although a lot of people always complain, hey stop shouting at me. And that would be a fair amount of text to have all in caps.

(Mikey O'Connor): Well what if we started it off in caps, something like please note and then a colon and then everything else in lowercase or bolded or something?

(Mark): Yes I like that idea.

Paul Diaz: How does that work? Yes, that sounds like a good idea.

(Mark): I think it might yield more productive responses to us, maybe less hostile responses.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes and it's true that the technical folks very often don't do html email and won't see the formatting at all.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Okay. So we'll do that Marika. If you can make it a new paragraph, add in all caps, please note, colon and then we're good to go with the remaining text. Any other thoughts?

(Mikey O'Connor): Looks good here. (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Okay. Then the question to the group is the length of time - the time frame that the periods will be open. What the deadline should be?

Woman: Six months?

Paul Diaz: According to the rules, it's what, a minimum of 20 days? Is that correct, (Olof)? Marika?

(Olof): Actually, it is 20 days.

Paul Diaz: Twenty?

(Olof): Yes, well let's sort of not state that that's the minimum or maximum but if you go by the bylaws, well it says full 20 days. We have at times used longer periods but if you want to go by the book, it's 20 days full (stop).

Paul Diaz: All right.

(Olof): (Unintelligible).

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't see any reason to make it longer here. Does anybody else?

(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey).

Mike Rodenbaugh: No.

(Mikey O'Connor): I'm thinking that longer might be better in this case because there is enough going on in here that people might need some time to think about it, talk to people and so on. So I would be okay with going longer. I'm not feeling real strongly about that.

Paul Diaz: Okay, folks can look at a calendar.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean, I'm generally okay with it too, (Mikey). I just don't necessarily - given that this is what, number one in five...

Paul Diaz: Five.

Mike Rodenbaugh: ...six parts on this?

Paul Diaz: Yes, I share the same concern Mike. I would like to try and - especially it seems that, you know, the positions are known, I'll assume that it's unlikely that any of the constituencies are dramatically going to change their views in the next round.

Let's get this written up and to the Council so that we can, you know, do our job and then start thinking about (EDP)'s B, C, D and E. Okay so if we look at the calendar, today's the 6, I mean, let's assume that everything can be cleaned up and posted by staff, what at the end of the week is the best-case scenario?

Please weigh in Marika, (Olof), others, let me know if this is totally unrealistic.

Marika Konings: No I think that's realistic.

Paul Diaz: All right. That being the case, then what sounds good? Have the period open thru, what, 20 days from the ninth? Should we round off and say the 30 maybe?

That gives three full working weeks. I'm open for this one folks, you know, what do you all think? Is that fair? We'll run it through the end of January?

(Mark): This is (Mark). I think that should be fine especially since as you noted, I mean, the positions aren't going to change. They're already known.

Michael Collins: This is Michael. I agree.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Then why don't we shoot for that then Marika. You know, hope to have this posted and open the comment period beginning on Friday the 9 and then the deadline for comments, submissions will be the 30 of January.

Marika Konings: I am to post then the final version of the initial report later today on the Wiki so people can still have a look at probably the course of tomorrow before I send it off to our posting people. So to (think) about some last minute things that they still, you know, added or things like that, if that's okay.

Paul Diaz: Sure. And we're doing well with time. So we can use that time now to go back through and make sure that folks are comfortable with what we have. I still think it's a great idea Marika to post the cleaned up version people can look at.

Let's do that but - okay, so everybody's happy with the time frames?  
We'll be shooting to open on the 9, close it on the 30.

And then if we stick to our - I just finished re-reading Tuesdays with (Morrie), if we stick with our Tuesday meeting schedules, that flows nicely because we have a couple days to - if we haven't monitored the list already, review the comments that are made and then pick it up on the 3 of February as a group.

Okay. All right we'll do that and as I've just said then, you know, rather than going through section by section, I just kind of leave it open to the group. Are there any changes that have been made or ways that we phrased things in the draft that you have in front of you now, things that you want to see changed or is everybody comfortable with this initial report as it stands?

(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey).

Man: Comfortable.

Paul Diaz: Sure (Mikey).

(Mikey O'Connor): I'm thinking we should reopen the who is issue. Just kidding.

Paul Diaz: We're going to cut you off (Mikey).

Man: You have a (macaud) sense of humor (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: I know it's kind of weird putting folks on the spot like that. I was hoping that if maybe if you had gone through the report previously, something

may have stood out. I - actually I have one for the group. If we - just clarification please, if we go out to Line 433 on Page 19.

Line 433 reads registrant emails collected and maintained by all registrars and submitted to all (unintelligible) registry. A check of (GTLD) who has data shows that registrant email is also displayed for all (thick) registries.

No problem, 436 and says thin registries do not maintain any registrant information. Okay. My question is in 437. It should be noted in thick registries are not obliged to include the registrant address and who is data.

We're requiring all thin registries to become thick but not change anything for the particular issue at hand unless the inclusion of the registrant email address would be mandated.

My question is, is 437, that first part, thick registries are not obliged, is that really an accurate statement? And in particular since we've just said in 433 that, that information is collected by registrars, submitted to thick registries and displayed, it might be a semantic issue.

They may not be obliged to display it but in fact it is there. Is there an inconsistency? Or am I just misreading this somehow?

Michael Collins: I do not believe they're obliged to - is my understanding, I think that part is accurate. This is Michael.

Paul Diaz: Sure Michael. Okay so it's an accurate statement as we have it even though the registrars collect it, they submit it to the thick registries and those thick registries displayed in their who is output.

Michael Collins: Can you read that part again?

Paul Diaz: Four thirty three it begins, registrant email is collected and maintained by all registrars and submitted to all thick registries. A check of (GTLD) who is data shows that the registrant email is also displayed for all thick registries.

Michael Collins: I wasn't aware of that but if it's accurate - I mean, it's not contradictory I suppose.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I recall (unintelligible) is like that that basically it's not obliged but in practice all of them do show the registrant email data. So there's no contradiction but in practice they all do.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I am not certain if it's obliged or not. I can say that it seems like the conversations that I had with the other registry constituency members was that, you know, they do all provide it and I thought that some of them had indicated that it was provided as a required field in their who is spec but I can't say that with 100% certainty.

Paul Diaz: Okay. No problem though but for the sake of our initial report and running down this extra detail, I don't think is really a deal breaker.

Michael Collins: And I was just working from my recollections of conversations that we've had. I'm not an expert either but didn't mean to suggest that.



(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey).

Paul Diaz: Sure (Mikey).

(Mikey O'Connor): So maybe what we do is we take an action item to run that one down while the initial report is out. It would be nice to have that a little bit clear.

Paul Diaz: And that might be worth - yes, a good point (Mikey) while the report's out. Honestly since this is the initial report, if it turns out that's a factual error in some way, I don't have a problem with it because it's initial.

You know, it can fixed up later on and maybe that will be clarified for us by registry constituency if they submit a, you know, another constituency statement. Yes let's just take that as sort of an action item.

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes I think we might want to actively research that rather than leaving it.

Barbara Steele: I'll query the registry (unintelligible).

(Mikey O'Connor): Yes, I think that'd be great. Thanks Barbara.

Paul Diaz: Sure Barbara. And again it doesn't need to be done in the next 24 hours.

Barbara Steele: Sure.

Paul Diaz: You know, we all seem to think that this is good as it is, let's just make sure for our final draft that we are as accurate as possible. Okay is there any other text in the body of the report that folks are - have questions about or uncomfortable with?

Okay then per Marika's offer she will clean up the draft, post a final version to our Wiki, everybody will have, you know, say another 24 hours or so, you know, for other thoughts come in to mind.

Please bring it up on the list, ask everybody to keep an eye on the list so that, you know, we can respond if necessary. Assuming that there are no issues then the goal is to have the report posted and the public comment period opened this Friday, the 9 with it running through the 30.

And staff will also communicate that the comment period is open to the constituencies speaking their statements. Of course we should all take it back to our constituencies and in fact we're the ones that are probably draft up any sort of response that is submitted by the deadline by the 30. Any other questions or issues?

(Mark): Just as a note I just checked the registry accreditation agreement lease for dot com and the registry is not obligated to display registrant email address.

Paul Diaz: Yes and (unintelligible) (Mark) that's a thin registry model. The thick one says better the focus here. We know the thin is - does not have the requirement. Good, okay. Fantastic.

First meeting of the year super productive and we're finishing ahead of time. So with that again take a final look at the draft. It'll be posted up on the wiki. Any comments please raise them on the list.

And, you know, we will get the public comment period underway. And if everybody is of the same mind as I - I don't think we have a need for our Tuesday meetings until probably that first Tuesday in February.

Once the comment period's closed we can take up (unintelligible) whatever inputs have been provided and then we can start the process of drafting the final report for Council. Does anybody think differently? Do you think we need a meeting in between somewhere?

(Mikey O'Connor): This is (Mikey). I'm biting my tongue.

Paul Diaz: Okay, great. Then, you know, let's do that. We will...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Set the meeting for February 3 then or February 10?

Paul Diaz: Why don't we start with the 3? Right? I mean, is everybody in agreement? Is this as straight forward as we expect in terms of the positions that are expressed, I just assume and try to work through and pull together the final report as quickly as possible.

Again with a goal ideally of having the report ready for Council by next (unintelligible). Does the 3 not work for you Mike? Is that why you're asking?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, no. Just wanted to get it on my calendar.

Paul Diaz: Yes and of course as we get closer to it, you know, we'll ask Glen to send a reminder to everyone. But at this point let's have that as our goal. We'll reconvene the same time on Tuesday the 3 of February and obviously if any issues come up, use the list or reach out directly to myself or Marika.

And with that, I will say thank you everyone for your time. And at the very least we'll be talking again in just about a month.

Man: Thanks Paul.

Man: Thank you Paul.

Paul Diaz: Everybody take care. Bye-bye now.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks Paul. Bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: Marika?

END