

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference
15 May, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference on 15 May 2008. 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-inter-Registrar-transfer-200515%20.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Present:

Mike O'Connor (CBUC) volunteered to be chair, Tim Ruiz, Paul Diaz, (Registrars) Barbara Steele, Pamela Miller, (Registry constituency) Michael Collins (CBUC)

Staff:

OLof Nordling, Robert Hoggarth, Glen de Saint Géry

Absent apologies:

Margie Milam

Wiki reference: <https://st.icann.org/irt-pdp>.

Coordinator: At this time, I would like to remind parties today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

Thank you. You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery: Olof would you like me to do a roll call?

Olof Yes, well let us start with opening the meeting. And now that is done. Let us – item 1 and well please do a roll call.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have Michael O'Conner from the Business Constituency. We have Pamela Miller from the Registry Constituency, Tim Ruiz from the Registrar Constituency, Paul Diaz from the Registrar Constituency, Michael Collins from the Business Constituency, is that correct Michael?

Michael Collins: Aye.

Glen DeSaintgery: And Barbara Steele from the Registry Constituency. Have I missed anybody? And then we have on – from staff we have (Rob Hoggarth, Olof and myself.

(Olof): Thanks very much Glen, and well, let us get going.

Well, just as an introduction, I would like to say that we will get to the time plan later on, but we have a prefix squeeze time frame I had about since the Vienna (sol) Council had decided to have this ready for voting upon in Paris, which means also that they would like to have public comments, opening for public comments in between, which gives us up till the very beginning of June effectively to time to take that.

So, well, we are bit in a rush to say the least. But could we perhaps proceed with what I hope will be a nice and easy appointment of Chair.

I have not seen any volunt – anybody volunteering on the list, but is there any volunteers and/or nominations by somebody or somebody, self some nations of course accepted.

While you are thinking about that, yes?

Man: No, I was just I am sorry, just humored by that.

Olof Oh well, I thought that was a volunteering voice, but maybe.

Man: Thank you.

Olof I think it is preferable to have one of constituency member chairing the meeting and me acting as scribe for the drafting that they are going to undertake, but...

Michael O'Connor Olofthis is Michael Connor in the business...

Olof Yes.

Michael O'Connor: I know you and Michael and some of the other folks on the call. I do not know everybody, but I was involved in the last round and pretty good at running the meeting.

Michael could cover for the business const – I could concentrate on sort of meeting logis.

Olof Oh well, that is a volunteering voice. And I think that would be, at least from my perspective, gladly accepted. Is there any objection to this?

Michael O'Connor For those of you who do not know me and are sitting at a computer, you can look at my bio while you are thinking about this. My domain is haven followed by the number 2 – dot com, and if you – at domain and slash bio – read a little bit about me.

Olof Mike, I think your line is cutting out a bit.

Michael O'Connor That makes for a bad – that makes for a bad meeting leader. People cannot hear very well. Is that better?

Olof Yes, well, could you please repeat what you said about the Web site?

Michael O'Connor Yes, I am sorry about that. My domain is haven followed by the number 2, so haven2 dot com and my bio is at that domain slash bio, haven 2 dot, or haven 2 slash bio.

I was once upon a time an ISP. I sold that in 1999. I was once upon a time contemplating being a Registry selling sub-domains under (court) dot com. And I am in the business constituency because I own several very good generic domain names including (bar) dot com, place dot com.

So I am mostly these days focusing on the business constituency point of view but I certainly understand Registry and Registrar concerns as well.

And again, I think that as Chair I would tend to let Michael Collins take the lead on the business constituency perspective and try and stay in sort of a neutral role as much as I could.

There is my statement of nomination.

Olof Okay, thank you very much Mike. First of all, well, procedure wise, we are free to organize our procedures as we like. And well, I just would like to know if there is any objections to Mike taking over the chairing of this meeting.

So not, well could I ask you Mike that you send this Web address to the list as well for the information of those who are not on this particular call, and with that I gladly hand over the chairing of the meeting to you.

Michael O'Connor Thanks (Olaf). I have got the agenda in front of us, and I see that the next item on the agenda is agenda bashing, which I thought sounded pretty intriguing and thought that maybe we could get on with that.

Olof Actually if I may just comment, agenda bashing is, well it is frequently used in the regional Internet registries environment, so that is – I think it sounds bit of nice, but well basically what I just proposed in this first draft agenda was to address the various reasons for denial in ascending order.

Maybe there is a better way to do that preference for addressing number seven first or whatever. But, that was essentially left up to the Chair and the group to decide upon.

Michael O'Connor I guess as Chair I have got a question for the group which is do we want to try during this call to work our way through language for all four of these or – I think my reaction to trying to do this on a phone call is that it might be easier to delegate some folks to write a first draft, either by themselves or in a smaller group and bring those drafts back to the group to discuss.

Unless Olof there is a piece of the document that essentially has first drafts already developed.

Olof Well I would as some suggestion, you may have seen the little overview of text suggestions that I sent around. Well, taking them one at a time with the current text and a suggested clarification from the point of clarification document that the working group, the (transis) working group elaborated.

Also next column is the text proposed by the IPC which is actually proposed text for all four provisions, and also in the case of deny reason number 5, the ISPCP text. So a question is for example, is there preference or some kind of unlimited on which one to use as a starting point for any drafting.

So that was my simple thought at the very beginning.

Michael O'Connor For those of us who either missed that or cannot find it in their email, can you point – did you send that as email Olofor?

Olof Yes I did send the email to the first as an annex (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Michael O'Connor What was the...

Olof first email. Actually I did annex it to the second email. I annexed my whole first email to my second email and the attachment to that one is in that envelope.

So I can certainly send it again if you like.

Michael O'Connor I think that would be wonderful.

Michael Collins: Mike I can, this is Michael Collins, I can send you a copy right now if you want, if you will accept one with my notes on it. They are in bold so they should be clear.

Michael O'Connor That would be great. Thank you Michael.

Michael Collins: I will do it.

Michael O'Connor Does everybody else have that or should Michael bounce that off the discussion group? Is anybody else as out of it as me?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I do have it.

Michael O'Connor Okay. So for the most part folks have this document? Anybody not have it that needs a copy? Okay. So I am the only clueless one. That is good. I like that. Michael if you could send that to me that would be great.

Let me go then to the question that I posed before. Do we feel like that document is close enough to a draft that we could during this call work through those four which would be I think fabulous in terms of timing.

If people are comfortable with that, then in terms of agenda bashing, at least my thought would be to try and skim through all four of these today and see to what extent we have any major disagreements, maybe we will not, and perhaps Olofwe can do this in one or two calls and move very quickly to the public comment period.

Anybody uncomfortable with that idea, going ahead and trying to work through the actual substantive discussions today?

I am not hearing anybody saying...

Paul Diaz: You mean – could you explain this a little bit more, what you mean Mike?

Michael O'Connor Well I was thinking that we did not have drafts and that we would have to essentially write a draft as a group and that sounded hard to me on the phone. If on the other hand we have got drafts that we could work off of

today, then perhaps we could actually go through and mark up the drafts today.

Olof I think we have, this is Olof again, I think what we need in the first instance is to a little round table on if we start looking at that paper to whether we have preference from which of these suggestions we should start.

How is the starting point for the drafting? I mean, the general assumption on that we can agree on something is of course that we have the current text.

We also have I think most of the constituencies have been rather explicit in expressing appreciation of the point of clarification document and the clarification suggestions included there. So that may play a role as well.

But then we have full text proposals from the IPC and the ISPCP, and you know what I suppose that we need some kind of general views and whether this is the best thing ever, either the one or the other or would we rather go back to the current text and work from there?

Michael O'Connor Yes, and Michael has gotten the document to me so I am now on the same page. The document that I am looking at is Trans PDP text table four dot doc, as a way to keep everybody on the same version.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olof (Unintelligible) Yes they have to look in one version at the end of that one.

Michael Collins: I apologize that the one I sent you is marked up a little bit, maybe confusing to you Mike, I apologize. We will work through it.

Michael O'Connor Yes. Is that the latest version? Olof I heard you saying that maybe that is not quite the latest?

Olof Oh I said I will only send one, one, one single version of it so if there is a...

Michael O'Connor Oh okay.

Olof ...version out there, well that must be it.

Michael O'Connor Okay. What are people's thoughts at this point? How do we want to proceed?

((Crosstalk))

Michael O'Connor (Unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: (Shawn) this is Tim.

Michael O'Connor Go ahead Tim.

Tim Ruiz: (Unintelligible) okay. Just, I have read through that. I think the concern that I have, and I just want to make sure we have – we are able to take the time to do, because there is so much been going on here recently with, you know, the tasting and comments on, you know, travel expenses and I – you just, half a dozen different things.

No, I would like to get – have a little more feedback and focus on this subject from our constituency. The one thing I would like to do is to be able to, you know, specifically present, you know, some of this – some of these suggestions because I doubt highly that the majority of our constituency has really thought through these or read them very carefully.

The suggestions from IP IPC and that. And then get some feedback from the constituency as a whole and be able to come back to this group with that.

Or, you know, and not what we are – that we wait for that but that would be an ongoing process I think.

But that there at least be some time allowed for that to take place. I do not want to try to just speak for the constituency on this completely without getting some of their feedback.

Michael O'Connor Other thoughts? Thanks Tim. I think that is a good point.

Could we...

Paul Diaz: Hi this is Paul. I share Tim's concerns and really would like to get the constituency's feedback. You know, it would appear at least from the report that was drafted showing the comments that were submitted previously that perhaps the last two issues were not as controversial.

So in the interest of time, it may be easier to put them at the top of the list, sort of go for the low hanging proof. But certainly on issues five and seven on the non-payment and the domain log that there are a variety of opinions and we really will need to poll constituency to get a clearer sense, because as Tim says we do not want to speak for everyone else.

Michael O'Connor Any other comments from folks?

One thought that crosses my mind is that we did poll the constituencies during the drafting of the last round of documents. Do you think that opinions of the constituency A, has changed a lot since then, or B, are not well reflected in this summary that Olofput together, that – and that that is the

reason that we need to go back to them, or is it more the just a lot going on point that Tim made at the top of this conversation?

Olof May I, well just sorry for interrupting. This is Olof again. I think, well actually what we need to have it looked at. Of course, this – these are the actual text proposals. Then we have the full constituency statements and the summary of the constituency statements and the conclusions which I have drawn very rapidly from those which are in the final report.

And that we need to have a side reading in order to be fully informed for this work. So, I mean...

Michael O'Connor Thank you.

Olof ...the constituents' statements have been produced and well those are the obvious pillars that we should work from, together with that single public comment that was actually of both on substance and well, out of some ten in four to five public comment period to the initial report.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. The – let me just try to be a little bit clearer. The constituency statements have been done is true, but if I recall correctly, the IPC text and the ISP – ISPCP text was not, did not exist at that time. It was – those statements were made based on the text suggested by the report.

So and even in (unintelligible) as Paul pointed out, you know, there are within our constituency there seem to be, you know, not a lot of concern with a couple of them, the first two, five and seven. You know, some concerns were raised, but I do not think, you know, the text from the other recommendations from the IPC and ISPCP have...

Olof (Unintelligible) I have...

Tim Ruiz: ...they have not had a chance to really absorb that or comment back on that. But, you know, it is hard to – I could not sit here and say oh yes well we would support, you know, either of those versions. No, there is nothing for us to base that on.

Michael O'Connor The, you know, now I will jump in just a little bit, and Olof your summary sort of plays into that a little bit too in that it seems to me that what we have is sort of a pile of document components, but that what needs to happen is that at least a proposed draft for each of these needs to get pulled together...

Olof Exactly.

Michael O'Connor ...perhaps with alternative wordings.

Olof And that is where we come into play. That is where we are thought that, okay, we have this talking point, we have a number of components, we indeed the have to say that the text provided by the IPC and the ISPCP, they were

included in their constituency statements so they are – do feature in the final report.

Michael O'Connor Right.

Olof So, they are all there. Now the question is what do we do with them? Do we...

Michael O'Connor Right.

Olof ...try to merge them into something – a consolidated draft with a number of clearer records of this, that and the other, which is one way of doing it, or do we select one text to start from and see if we – which is the most agreeable and try to modify that one?

Michael O'Connor Folks, what do we think? Any thoughts one way or the other?

Olof Also, I must say that I tend to share if it was, I think it was Paul's concern that maybe the agenda bashing order should be shifted slightly because that is – I think it appears that it would be easier for some of us to address number eight and nine presumably, then to start with number five, could be.

Michael O'Connor You know, I think that, and I am going to read something into what Tim said, and if I am putting words in your mouth forgive me Tim, but at least for me, I

am sort of just coming back up to speed on all this stuff and do not, you know, I do not have real strong opinions right now because I cannot really remember the context or the controversy.

And it may be that part of the hesitancy in this call is that we are all sort of in that same boat, that we have put this aside, we have gone out to do other things, we are all sort of coming back to it now.

In a way, it is sounding like what we all need to do is review all this material and perhaps what we could do during this call is sort of an informal review of each of the issues, try to draw out some of the more difficult bits, but mostly bring ourselves back up to speed, try to move a process forward fairly quickly to come to sort of – to some sort of agreement on a draft, but not try to do substantive stuff today, more sort of catch up, education, informing conversation with the hope that we can get together fairly soon around some sort of draft.

I have not lost that thread yet, but you know, I am feeling a little uneasy about trying to pick an order because I simply cannot remember which the hard ones were and which they were not. Anybody else in that boat?

Tim Ruiz: I know I am.

Michael O'Connor Well why don't – are there any others?

Tim Ruiz: I have, you know, I am very clear on the issues that I am concerned about or that I have raised, but, you know, I do not want to just focus on that because other registrars had concerns and I want to make sure and understand those after we discuss, you know, what a draft of this would look like.

Michael O'Connor Well what if we did it in the following way? What if we essentially turned on brainstorming rules for this call which says anything is okay to say. Let us go easy on the criticism. Let us try and get as many issues out on the table as we can. Get sort of an informal sense by the end of the call as to which the hard ones look to be. Use that as the mechanism to perhaps pick the order because I like Paul's idea a lot of doing the easy ones first.

And perhaps by the end of that conversation, we will have a better feel for how to approach the drafting. Does that seem like a reasonable approach?

Paul Diaz: Mike it does seem reasonable. It is Paul again. Could I just ask, can we skip ahead just a little bit to the next point on the agenda the time plan?

Michael O'Connor Yes.

Paul Diaz: Just to help us understand because I am looking at my calendar and if I understood Olof correctly at the beginning, we are going to have like literally two weeks in which to do this or...

Michael O'Connor Yes.

Paul Diaz: ...barely three? I just need a little clarity on what the timeline is?

Michael O'Connor Well I think that is absolutely right. And to get real meeting oriented for just a second, what time are we ending this meeting? Is it top of the hour? For seventeen hundred EDT.

Olof It is foreseen for a meeting, a one hour meeting.

Michael O'Connor Yes.

Olof So, I mean, we...

Michael O'Connor Well we...

Olof ...have used thirty minutes of it.

Michael O'Connor Yes. We do not have a lot of time to even have that brainstorming conversation. So perhaps...

Olof (Unintelligible).

Michael O'Connor ...we should jump forward to the point that Paul just raised which is, is it – do we think it is feasible to get through all this in three weeks given that we want to get back to our respective constituencies? And if so, how are we going to get that done? Shall we do that first and then do brainstorming for whatever is left of the hour?

Paul Diaz: Yes, please.

Tim Ruiz: Just, you know, this might be just maybe too many bold assumptions, but I just wonder if we couldn't, you know, focus on maybe on eight or nine here for a few minutes, and you know, just get a feel for majority on the call if there is any issues with, you know, the text as recommended by the group that worked on this.

And of course then there is text that the IPC generated, and maybe as Paul said, well we will find out quickly that, you know, we are pretty comfortable with what was originally recommended for eight and nine, and, you know, is there anything from what the IPC suggested that might make it better.

And then we have a couple we could just pretty much almost wrap up. The other two that I know, you know, I have issues and concerns and between now and the next call I could certainly put those together. We could put out some questions to the constituency and maybe gather some other information concerns and that kind of thing so that we have those, you know, to the list before by the next time we meet.

And again, I am speaking just from a Registrar's perspective, so.

Michael O'Connor I know that we could probably do that with the BC as well. I think, I am presuming that our meeting schedule has not yet been determined? Is that correct or are we presuming to meet once a week?

Olof We are presumed to meet once a week, which means we have all in all three calls. Before we reach, now let us see, where are we time wise. Well, so it is today, next Thursday and the Thursday after that on the 29th. Actually after the DNSL Council call.

We would have to have something ready immediately after that meeting in order to expose it to public comment and be able to deliver it to the council for their vote in Paris.

So, to meet their requirements, we have got, that is the timeline which means that we would have to do quite a few things on the mailing list.

Michael O'Connor Yes, and it sounds to me like next week's call would be the super substantive call with the following call being the final resolution call to really get through all this. Is that feasible? I am pretty new to this process folks, so I am kind of relying on you and your reactions.

I know that in terms of my reaction as a BC kind of guy, I think I could get that done. But, I think the BC is perhaps an easier constituency to work with than the Registry Registrar groups because it is much smaller. So...

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I do not think it is impossible. I think I could be – I have no problem with that being our goal. But what I would not want to do is if two weeks from now, you know, there are serious issues on certain constituency's part or party's part that we do not, you know, come to some – try to generate a conclusion that this does not really exist and we just have to be realistic with the DNSL that well, here is where we are, this is how far we have got.

Michael O'Connor Right.

Tim Ruiz: I am hopeful that we could do it in that timeframe, but we have to be realistic that we are not going to just, you know, it is not going to be do or die kind of thing.

Michael O'Connor Yes. I agree.

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

Paul Diaz: I totally agree with Tim. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Michael O'Connor Yes, we will think that (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: ...we will think we will be very hopeful but we cannot force the issue if there is still issues.

Olof Could we perhaps, this is Olof again, I mean I pretty much in favor of the idea. Let us take one test case and probably the easiest one would be eight and see how far we can get in substance on that one, because I believe that one to be comparatively easy.

Michael O'Connor Olof one last thing before we jump into that. One of the things that went by in the email was that we were going to have a little wiki.

Olof Yes. And...

Michael O'Connor (Unintelligible) have that. And if so, could somebody splash the draft of eight up into the wiki so that we could perhaps actually edit it as we have the rest of this conversation?

Olof And which we have, and Glen I think we would most definitely need that bicky wiki for next call. We have not got it up...

Michael O'Connor Okay.

Olof ...right now.

Michael O'Connor All right.

Olof I am sorry to say.

Glen DeSaintgery:I can see that it gets up (Olaf).

Michael O'Connor I think that we need it not by next call. I think we...

Glen DeSaintgery:But I...

Michael O'Connor ...need it by close of business tomorrow.

Glen DeSaintgery:Yes.

Michael O'Connor (unintelligible)soon, because clearly we are going to have to push pretty hard to get this done. And so, Glen, if I could leave you with the action item to get that up by end of day tomorrow.

Glen DeSaintgery:I will do that Mike.

Michael O'Connor And then Olof could I leave with you the action item, I know this is unreasonable because it is going to be the weekend for you, but once the wiki is up, could you get these drafts up on the wiki in a form that is relatively easy to follow?

Olof Perhaps. I have to – that is (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: If you can send them to me I will do that (Olof).

Olof Oh yes, well we give it a try. How, now it is in table format. And that is, yes well, if we put it up in table format and see how that works and...

Michael O'Connor And I am not sure that the format matters as much as the words.

Olof Well yes.

Michael O'Connor As long as it is clear, you know, sort of what is related to what. I know that it will be very helpful at least to me to just be able to look at one place, see the words, perhaps see the commentary developing.

I think it would be great to have a way to have the words up there relatively undisturbable and then a place for people to do commentary, to raise some of the issues that Tim and Paul and I and others will have really quickly so that

when we get together on the call next week, we are all feeling a little bit more in touch with these.

And then the last little action item would be that what we will do is for the rest of this call, we will bash away on whatever one people want to pick, eight is fine with me.

And if the notes from that conversation could get captured and put up on the wiki on some form as well, that would be another very helpful thing.

The advantage of the wiki as opposed to emails is that then we are all looking at the same draft.

So could I leave...

Michael Collins: (Fluid) draft.

Michael O'Connor Go ahead.

Michael Collins: Okay this is Michael. I said and not only the same draft but a fluid draft that can change as we discuss it.

Michael O'Connor Yes. Yes. So Olof could I leave you those two actions after Glen gets the wiki going?

Olof Yes, sure.

Michael O'Connor Terrific. I think what would be, let me just take a look at our agenda. If we devoted the rest of the call to whichever one people want to pick...

Michael Collins: Eight.

Michael O'Connor Eight?

Barbara Steele: I agree with eight.

Michael O'Connor Eight is gaining momentum. Anybody opposed to eight? Okay. The final agenda item is AOB. And I do not know what AOB stands for.

Olof Any other...

Michael Collins: Any other business.

Michael O'Connor Oh okay. Thanks very much. So let us presume that there is not much else. If there is something else, speak now because I think what we should do is spend the rest of the call on eight, see where we wind up, see how confident we are that we can get through this stuff and then dive in.

Is that okay with folks? Going once. Okay.

Let us hit number eight and we will go – I will keep an eye on the time. Olof if you could take notes.

Olof Yes and I could perhaps make a short introduction. I mean, we do have the document in front of us, but I think the essential, the crux of the matter is what is in initial registration period. That, since it is worded today, the (unintelligible) wording is the main name is in the first 60 days of an initial registration period.

And what that means as apparently where we will – did some – does it mean the current registration period or does it mean the creation date? The original creation date as it comes from the Who Is for example. Paul did the main name.

And, well, if we go back to the point of clarification document, a clarification suggested that at the time by the working group last summer, late, are pretty clear on saying that this is the creation date.

The transfer was requested within 60 days of the creation date as shown in the Registry – Registrar who is record for the domain name. That is their proposed clarification.

And it seems like most constituencies have a similar view on it. Though I think that is so essentially the clarification which is needed is the initial registration period, should we replace that expression with something else, and is everybody agreeing on as a matter of the creation date rather than anything else.

I draw that conclusion from the constituents' statement, but I may be wrong.

Michael O'Connor Great job (Olaf). Thanks for the intro.

Tim Ruiz: And would like in the queue when – if you are taking one.

Michael O'Connor I will do that. Anybody else want to get in the queue?

Michael Collins: Oh this is Michael, I will.

Michael O'Connor Okay, anybody else? There are none? Go ahead Tim.

Tim Ruiz: On the – yes, this just kind of give an example of how that gets a little bit confusing and voice my support here for one than any other. The initial registration period, from my understanding with some Registrars and I am not inputting motive good or bad one way or the other.

It can be taken to state of (Dominguez) renewed for example. You know, is that an initial registration period, or the main name changes hands from one Registrar or another, could that be interpreted as an initial registration period are a couple of examples.

We are trying to clarify, you know, what was meant there, that it was 60 days from the creation date as shown in the Who Is. So I think the clarification that the group had proposed works fine. I also think the first part of what the IPC suggested could also work other – except and qualify perhaps Who Is with the – that is the Registry Registrar Who Is, but I would end it there.

Neither of those would work for me. The reason I would not support the additional text from the IPC is that it – not that I do not personally – that I personally disagree with it, it is just that it raises some other policy issues that we might get into, and so I think, you know, it just complicates the situation.

I do not think it is a bad idea. I think there is just issues with it and we can get into that if necessary, but I think there is some policy implications there that would confuse the situation.

So, if it is just to clarify what a initial registration period is then I sense the text that is proposed by the working group works well, but could live with that first sentence up to the comma that the IPC proposed.

Michael O'Connor Terrific. Thanks Tim. Michael?

Michael Collins: I think that I was going to say not much different than Tim, although maybe go a little further and say that it looks like the IPC suggested text almost gets in, you know, we have been assigned I think to review just four reasons for rejection of transfer and there were nine I – originally.

And I think some of the dispute issues are better handled or better discussed in some of the other reasons. For example, one and two I think. So I am not sure that putting the dispute issues in eight or nine, or eight as we are discussing this time, is not the proper place.

And again, like Tim, I am not necessarily suggesting that there, that the text is wrong, maybe just is not relevant to this issue.

Michael O'Connor Anybody else want to jump into the queue before I comment as Chair?

Olof Just note that well, that nobody from the IPC is attending the call, so, that is a pity.

Michael O'Connor That is a pity.

Michael Collins: Flip the (unintelligible).

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I would like to jump into the queue please.

Michael O'Connor Go ahead Barbara.

Barbara Steele: Okay, I mean I think that it is important that we do clarify this, and it seems that everybody is on board with defining the initial registration period as, you know, a few days from the create date.

I know that they are a side of the Registry and I suspect that the other Registries also have a systematic restriction in place that would prevent a transfer from occurring within that period as well.

So, you know, just by virtue of the fact that even if a transfer was initiated, it would be very difficult. I do not know that a Registrar could, at least within our Registry, be able to even max that because it would – I believe an error code would be returned indicating that it – that the transfer was rejected or errored out anyway.

Tim Ruiz: Yes exactly. That was one of the points I was thinking of was that at least one Registry I am aware of would be an issue here because they automatically

reject transfers that were – are within 60 days of the creation date. So, anyway, that is – there is really some issues there that we have to work out before we could conclude something like this.

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: Right, and I think...

Michael O'Connor Yes, and go ahead Barbara, sorry.

Barbara Steele: ...I was just thinking that, you know, obviously if not all Registries have that, you know, restriction in place, then we do need to have some clarification here. So, generally, it seems like, you know, from what I read and the documentation here is that everybody seems to be, you know, pretty much on board with using the creation date.

Michael O'Connor Thanks. Anybody else want to comment? Going once?

I am recalling when I was writing the response for the business constituency and would stand in line with Tim and Mike and Barbara on these that clarification that was proposed by the group is fine and that the expansion or the additional issues that is raised by the IPC constituency.

Perhaps in the notes what we could do is carve that issue out so as not to lose it, but to defer it to either another part of this conversation or the much broader set of PDPs that is coming right behind this one, but not included in the proposal.

Does that seem like a reasonable summary of where we are at?

Paul Diaz: Yes I agree with that Mike. It is Paul. And I do think, you know, notes should be made that this is – the additional text is issued to be addressed in those future PDPs are mandated. It seems to me as extremely limited here and we should not be deviating from the form very specific issues at hand.

Michael O'Connor Oh I like that a lot Paul. Olof hopefully you have captured that because I think that is the sentiment that I was trying to express.

Olof Oh well, I hope I captured that. Well you agree to start with.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Michael O'Connor Yes. Anybody disagree with that? If not, I think we can claim at least on eight that we as a group have arrived at agreement and that we could proceed to put this one in the drafts that we take back to our – I guess our constituencies.

Wow, we are going to have to get these drafts done by the end of the next call if we are going to get anything back from our constituencies by the final call. Correct?

Olof May I just (dreadly) a little into this again. Do we then say that we use – for example, the IPC text up until the comma replace comma with full (stop) and add perhaps in line with the working group recommendation in the reflected in the Registry/Registrar Who Is record. Is that, well, that is just to settle which of the text we use.

Michael O'Connor I was leaning towards the one to the left of that (Olaf). The one that is...

Barbara Steele: The middle one.

Michael O'Connor The middle one.

Olof Going to clarification, okay.

Michael O'Connor The simple one.

Paul Diaz: I would agree.

Barbara Steele: Yes, I agree.

Michael O'Connor Is that where everybody is at? Yes. I think that is where we are all headed.

Olof Kay. That is fine. That is fine.

Michael O'Connor And then what we need to do is carve out that part of the IPC response that does not get addressed by what we have just agreed to and just remember it for future PDPs. But view it as out of scope for what we are charter to do here.

Pamela Miller: And, this is Pam, just point of note, I had myself on mute earlier when I was trying to agree with Barbara and net dot org does, has the same operations with the 60 days stopping the transfer.

Michael O'Connor Thanks Pam. I think that one of the things that we will probably want to distinguish in our conversation is the difference between policy and operational issues.

Presumably one of the reasons that a Registry has that hard stop in there is because of the original policy. The policy then got embedded in their system.

Barbara Steele: Yes, that is exactly right on our part.

Pamela Miller: Yes, and it is the pilot over here.

Michael O'Connor Yes. And so it might be that we will come to a place in this conversation where the policy will require changes in your systems, and I think it is legitimate to raise those issues if they are insurmountable.

Barbara Steele: But we definitely need to take that into consideration because just the development and testing time that would be required to make a system change like that...

Michael O'Connor Right.

Pamela Miller: Yes.

Barbara Steele: ...could obviously impact how quickly we would be able to implement any changes.

Michael O'Connor Right. And I think that that is a very important distinction to make, is that if policy changes are hard to implement, then we need to cut the Registry some slack in the timing. But at the same times, we may wind up saying that is nevertheless, we still feel that this is the right direction to take the policy.

Olof And I, if I understand it right both from Pam and Barbara, it is – this matches perfectly with what you have hardwired so to speak today in the operations.

Pamela Miller: Correct.

Barbara Steele: That is correct.

Olof Yes, so, but should we have said 45, well then it is much too hard.

Barbara Steele: That is exactly right (Olof).

Pamela Miller: Yes.

Michael O'Connor Yes. Or if we had said, well never mind. I do not even want to create that strong end. Okay. I am going to be paying attention to meeting logistics. We have got about five minutes until the end of the call.

Olof Yes, but Mike, I think we have made our first queue.

Michael O'Connor Yes. I think we did good. I just want to check and see if we have got action items to hand out.

What – let me ask this question of the group. What do we all think we are going to do between now and our next call? And what are we going to try and get done on the next call? Do not be shy.

Tim Ruiz: Well this is Tim. I think, I think Paul and I, if he is – if he agrees, will probably try to put some of this out, circulate some of this to – especially the first two issues to our constituents and just try to get some fresh feedback in particular on the proposals from the IPC and the ISP – ISPPB – whatever it is. Does that make sense Paul?

Paul Diaz: Definitely Tim.

Michael O'Connor Let us all take that action. It seems to me that is a reasonable thing for all of us to do. And I think that a vehicle to do that might be – here is a question for Glen and (Olaf).

When the wiki cage is up, is that going to be visible to everybody in the world? Or is that only visible to people on this email list? Because if it was world visible, it might be useful to just point everybody at that page and say here is what we are working off of. Our agenda for the next meeting is to try and get through these.

If you have any issues that you want to remind us of, make sure you contact your respective representative so that everybody is looking at the same stuff. Is that a reasonable approach?

Olof Well, I must ask Glen what will it be like? Will it be an open access or will we have an access code for it. You know.

Glen DeSaintgery: Well I would suggest that I can ask (Yen) to set it up in the way that everybody can read it, but only those on the list can edit it. Would that be all right?

Michael O'Connor: That sounds great. Is that – is there any super secret stuff in here that people are uncomfortable having the world be able to read?

I am not aware of any. I am really asking that not rhetorically but for real because I think that would be the best way to get this done quickly is to just throw our work out into the harsh light of day, but restrict the editing to just our group. I agree with that Glen. That is a great idea.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, well I will come of this. I will work on that.

Michael O'Connor: Terrific. That sounds like a plan folks for our next call? I am seeing the time run down to zero.

Olof: Could we just a slight suggestion since we have made way on eight. Maybe I could also vocalize a little on nine if five and seven are more of the nature that needs to be checked – double checked with the constituency. Perhaps nine would be the next work item on the wiki if we can make some headway until the next call that would be great.

Michael O'Connor Yes, let us do that. Let us try and make progress on the wiki, see how we do because clearly time is of the essence here and if we could get through one of these and leave just the two hard ones for the final – or for the really heavy working call, I think we would be well served.

Does that seem...

Michael Collins: Well this is Mike again. I think that is reasonable. I think it is a good idea. Without discussing number nine, I think nine is kind of probably be about as easy as number eight, to me, in appearance.

Michael O'Connor I think that is right.

Michael Collins: And for that matter, I think the same – I think the same solution is very likely to appear.

Barbara Steele: I agree with that.

Michael O'Connor Do we want to take two more minutes and just check that because maybe we can knock down two today and accomplish Paul's whole deal.

Paul Diaz: I was just about to suggest on Mike for the extra five minutes.

Barbara Steele: I agree.

Paul Diaz: And I am fine with the points version, I do not know, that second column if you will. You know, feel the same kind of arguments about the IPC suggested that it is addressing things beyond the scope of our mandate, so I am okay with that second column, and, you know, would move to put that out as the proposed amended text.

Olof Hey Mike, I just – there is slight difference though. Olofhere. In eight, you can actually replace the current text with the point of clarification text. In nine, it does not really work.

Michael O'Connor Right.

Olof You have to add the point of clarification text after the – well in addition to the current text to make some sense out of it.

Paul Diaz: I agree.

Olof Um-hmm.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Barbara Steele: Excuse me, this is Barbara. I actually have a hard stop date today because I am chairing another meeting and need to open up the bridge. So I am going to have to jump off at this point, so if you can just provide in an email at the close, you know, where we go for the wiki and all of that that would be great.

Michael O'Connor Oh wonderful. Now, given that we have just lost one of our folks, I am just want to check with the group and see do we want to proceed without Barbara. Barbara are you okay if we go without you?

Barbara Steele: Yes that is fine so long as I can – you know, it is being recorded so I can also catch up with that.

Michael O'Connor I am just wondering if you, Barbara, would like to be able to influence the decision, we could wait for you, if you would rather.

Barbara Steele: It would probably be good so if I do have some comments that, you know, maybe impacting to Registry I can make you all aware of them.

Michael O'Connor I tell you what gang. Let us not do this one today too fast. Let us tee it up as number 1 on our call next week so that Barbara can be with us, and we do not lose our fabric as a decision making group.

I know it is really tempting to go quickly, but I am also conscious of the point that I think Tim raised right at the top of the call which is sometimes when we get in a rush we get a little too in a rush.

And I would hate to lose somebody just because you have a hard stop
Barbara.

Barbara Steele: Yes, I apologize.

Michael O'Connor That is all right. I, you know, I...

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: Probably (unintelligible) I have.

Michael O'Connor For the next call, is it possible that we can schedule it for an hour and a half?

Glen DeSaintgery: Absolutely no problem Mike.

Michael O'Connor Glen why don't you add that to the list. Barbara we will let you go. We will not finish this one today. We will pick it up first thing next week so that you can take your call, and if we can expand the time of next week's call, I think we probably can get quite a bit done both on the wiki and then during that call.

So I would really rather not drive quite that fast on number nine.

Olof On the other hand, what I could do is actually put it up on the wiki with square brackets and the sort of the international way saying that this is not agreed, but this is sort of a first little working assumption...

Michael O'Connor Right.

Olof ...which we can further address next week.

Michael O'Connor Right. And people can comment I think on all four of them on the wiki and I...

Olof Absolutely.

Michael O'Connor ...think that would be a great thing to do as well.

Barbara Steele: I think that would really be great because it will get us so much further along for next meeting.

Michael O'Connor Yes. Um-hmm, and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: Okay, I am sorry, but I do have to run.

Michael O'Connor Okay thanks Barbara.

Barbara Steele: Thank you.

Michael O'Connor Take care.

Barbara Steele: You too, bye.

Michael O'Connor I think with that, except for sort of logistical things, I would like to draw this to a close. We are right at the top of the hour, and actually beyond a couple of minutes. Dang we came close, but I think we can tie this one off pretty quickly next week.

Is there anything else? AOB, whatever it is? Any other stuff that we need to cover? Any feedback to me as a brand new Chair about things I could better or different that would make the call more productive? Anything like that.

Olof A heartfelt thanks from staff to you Mike for...

Glen DeSaintgery:Mike it is Glen. Just one comment I have received what is an email from (Margie Minum) on the list to say that she will not be able to make the call today. She away from the office, but she will join the next one.

Paul Diaz: Oh terrific.

Michael O'Connor Okay?

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you.

Michael O'Connor Any other parting comments, thoughts? I think we did really well today. And I think we will have one heck of a call in a week, hopefully.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Yes, great.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Olof Thanks everybody.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Michael O'Connor Thanks gang.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Mike.

((Crosstalk))

Man: All right see you then.

Olof Bye-bye.

Michael O'Connor Bye.

END