

**GNSO**  
**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference**  
**26 August , 2008 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 26 August 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-pdp-20080826.mp3>  
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

**Present:**

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.  
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.  
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison  
Mike O'Connor - CBUC  
Michael Collins - CBUC  
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.  
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative  
Kevin R. Erdman - IPC  
Mark Trachtenberg - IPC

**Staff:**

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination  
Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director  
Marika Konings - Policy Director  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

**Absent - apologies:**

Adam Eisner - Tucows

Coordinator: The recording has started sir.

Paul Diaz: Very good, thank you. And Glen if you would please could you do the roll call?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, certainly I will. We have on the call Mike O'Connor, business constituency, Paul Diaz, yourself from the registrar constituency and leader of the group, James Bladel, registrar, Michael Collins, business constituency, Sébastien Bachollet, (ALAC), and Mike Rodenbaugh who is the liaison to the council from the business constituency.

And for staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings and myself.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Glen. Good morning everyone. I hope everyone's well, I also hope that you've all had opportunity to see the documents that were posted up on the Wiki.

I believe the focus of this call today we need to do a couple of thing, come to some consensus and approve the template for constituency statements, interrelated of course is to agree on the time table that's been posted.

And the third key issue will be to approve the draft text for the public comment period if we approve the statement we intend to leverage it into the public comment period and try and get that underway and begin soliciting inputs as soon as possible.

Does anybody have any questions or specific things they'd like to address before we launch into this? No, okay. Then perhaps it may be easiest if we - if you all can look at this, why don't we begin with the template, that's probably the largest amount of work we have for today.

If you can pull it up, if you recall on last week's call we were moving text around. We've made some changes already. In the interim I don't believe anybody during the week had additional adds or changes.

Perhaps there's something, we'll get to it at the end in the third issue. In any event, as you can see we've you know laid it out, we've tried to be as clear as possible, providing the question that was part of our charter.

And then you know the follow on, so if we could I assume there's no contention for the introduction so to speak. So if you would please we can go to issue number one.

You see as it's been laid out, it's been cleaned up nicely and open it to everyone for comments, suggested changes, inclusions, etcetera.

Mike O'Connor: Hi this is Mike O'Connor.

Paul Diaz: Please Mike, go ahead.

Mike O'Connor: In the second bullet, we might want to narrow that one to only talking about the email address stuff. The way that one reads right now it's the whole automation of approval.

It doesn't - you know it's pretty broad.

Paul Diaz: Okay, do you have any suggested text that we might throw in there so everyone can kind of get their head more clearly around what you're looking for?

Mike O'Connor: Something, maybe please identify examples or best practices of automated email exchange that are currently being used to facilitate or automate approval, blah, blah, blah. Something like that would get at what I'm thinking.

Paul Diaz: Question for the group and I think I have an answer if I put on my Network Solutions hat, but I think...

James Bladel: I'm sorry, this is James. Mike I would refer you to the - I guess the second sentence after the question mark. I felt that that second bullet point restated that first phrase.

I see a connection there and I guess I wouldn't want to narrow that bullet point without narrowing that initial question.

Mike O'Connor: The initial question being is there a way for registrars to make email address data one?

James Bladel: The second part, currently there is no way of automating approval from the registrant and then it lists as the registrant email address is not a required field in the registrar Whois.

So I think in that context the second bullet point is at least a little implicitly narrowed. That was just my interpretation.

Mike O'Connor: And I don't feel real strongly about this, I was just reading that, maybe out of context. Maybe that's the right approach is to say no, no Mikey you have to read the bold question first and then keep your response in there.

I just read it sort of on its own and you know that can get pretty broad, but...

James Bladel: Well I agree with you on its own it is very open ended.

Paul Diaz: I agree as well Mike, I think if any of us can misinterpret I think it will be very easily misinterpreted, especially when it gets out to the public comment. So that's the purpose of today's call, let's try to tighten the language.

I want to also note as James just did that you know right now there's no automated approval process in place. So if we add language or you know tweak it in any way, you know let's keep that in mind and be careful not to refocus on our use language, again focusing on automated means when in fact we recognize that there's no automated process in place.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Sébastien Bachollet: This is Sebastian, I suggest that we can see the sentence or equation a little bit stand alone because I'm sure I'm not native speaking English, you may forget what you read three sentences before.

It may be better to be a little bit redundant but to be more accurate for the purpose we want to achieve.

Paul Diaz: Excellent point Sebastian. Okay in that case since three of you have essentially made the - raised the same concern, should we repeat the,

you know maybe the first clause in that second sentence, add it to the bullet so - or maybe we don't have to absolutely repeat it.

But the currently there's no way of automating approval from the registrant, perhaps adding something to the second bullet points, since there is currently no way of automating approval from the registrant, or as there is no way of automating, something to that effect.

Then say please identify examples or best practices.

James Bladel: Isn't that, I'm sorry, this is James again. Doesn't that somewhat become a contradictory sentence? Since there is no way to - there are no means to automate approval, please identify examples of automating approval?

Paul Diaz: Good point. As soon as I said it I realized what you meant.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, and I think the other thing is that actually broadens it more. You know what I was aiming for was to narrow it to the email address data. And what I guess I was thinking was that perhaps there are examples of ways that email addresses are being exchanged that people could point to.

And so what I would suggest is please identify examples or best practices of ways that email addresses are currently being used to facilitate or automate approval from a registrar.

Paul Diaz: Okay, how does that sound to the group?

Mike O'Connor: Do you want me to edit the...

Paul Diaz: I was going to ask you Mike, have you already logged in? Can you go ahead and throw that text in there so we can see it?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, hang on just a second. Okay, it's up there. So you should be able to refresh and see it.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Mike. Does everybody see it now? How do you all feel about it?

Man: I'm still getting the older version. Oh wait, now I see it.

Marc Trachtenberg: This is Marc Trachtenberg, I apologize for joining late.

Paul Diaz: No problem Marc. We are going through the draft template. We're focused on issue number one, the second bullet point. We're making some changes to the text.

If you can - you can see all this in the wiki if you can log in and by all means any changes you'd like to see please jump right on in.

Marc Trachtenberg: Okay, I will.

Sébastien Bachollet: It's Sebastian. It seems we can be a little bit less - currently being used, you can say are used to facilitate, even if it's not a pure English sentence currently being used seems to be very (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay Sebastian. How does everyone feel about that, perhaps there were methods that were used in the past, by striking the currently being from the sentence it may spark ideas that were used in the past and for whatever reason are no longer current.

Does anybody have a problem with that?

Man: That works for me.

(Barbara): I agree with that approach.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Are you still in it Mike?

Mike O'Connor: Yep, I'm saving that, hold on a second. Should be there now. Yep, there now.

Paul Diaz: Any other comments on this or certainly the other bullet points on issue one?

(Barbara): I think we may want to include, right now you have are used and so I don't think it gets us quite to where we want to be.

Maybe we could say are or have been used to facilitate just so we can encompass anything that may have been done in the past.

A little nit picky but I want to make sure we don't exclude anything that may be a good suggestion.

Olof Nordling: Olof here, could I perhaps save even more bits of ink as it were by just cutting it even shorter. So please identify examples of best practices



over, like before email address used to facilitate and/or automate approval from already sent for transfers.

Then we avoid the verb.

(Barbara):       Yep, I think that gets us there.

Mike O'Connor:   Okay, I'm fine with that.

Paul Diaz:        Can you do that Mike and Sebastian? How does that work for you?  
                      You bring a helpful perspective in.

Sébastien Bachollet:        It seems to be (unintelligible) really, sorry.

Paul Diaz:        Understood.

Mike O'Connor:   It's up there now, I saved it. No, it didn't work.

Man:             We got part of it, yeah.

Mike O'Connor:   Yeah, I didn't write it right. Help me out. What should it really be?

Paul Diaz:        Olof, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but get rid of ways,  
                      correct?

Mike O'Connor:   Yeah, I think getting rid of ways.

Olof Nordling:    The way (unintelligible).

Mike O'Connor:   Yeah. Let me save that. It's up there now, see if that's got it.

(Barbara): That does it.

Man: Works for me.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Anyone else? Everybody satisfied with this?

Sébastien Bachollet: It's not, okay.

Paul Diaz: Good? How about the third bullet? We've had some discussion about this already and we've gone back and forth in the order of the text that we're presenting.

Is everybody comfortable with this current construction?

Mike O'Connor: It's fine for me.

Man: Fine for me.

Michael Collins: I missed the meeting that we talked about that but I agree.

(Barbara): I'm fine with it.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Sounds good then. All right. Seems like we have consensus on issue one so let's move into number two please. Are there problems with any of the bullets in folks' minds or are they again comfortable with the way it's currently constructed?

Mike O'Connor: I'm still reading.

Paul Diaz: Sorry.

Mike O'Connor: This looks fine to me.

James Bladel: This is James. Minor point but it seems that the - just a second, I'm rereading it here so I don't say something silly. But it seems that the third bullet is somewhat of a leading question.

I think if we would say do you know of any registrars and it shouldn't be possessive, it should be registrars using like using or offering electronic authorization.

And then just leave it at that without offering suggestions. There could be other things out there that maybe are not easily categorized. That's just a thought.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh, I like the way it is but I think it's phrased as a yes or no question right now, it needs to be broadened to also you know identify who and what.

(Barbara): If we were to change to say do you know of any registrars using additional means for electronic authorization? Would that get us where we want to be, where we would leave it open ended and they could devise the information or a yes or no?

Man: Well rereading the original bolded question now I'm starting to reverse myself a little bit because it specifically mentions a security token.

And I think that that's the only place that that comes up. So I'm going to withdraw my earlier question.

Paul Diaz: Okay, so how about (Barbara)'s proposed construction, does that work better for folks? (Barbara), could you say that again?

(Barbara): Maybe what we do is we go ahead and say do you know of any registrars using additional means for electronic authorization, and then maybe we go ahead and leave the you know for example security tokens still there but maybe toward the end of the sentence.

Man: Maybe add another sentence afterwards and say if so, what are they? Kind of like the second bullet point where it has that kind of explanatory additional sentence on the end.

Paul Diaz: Mike, can I call on you again to tweak the language or should I hop in and do it? Mike? Okay then I'll go in and do it.

Mike O'Connor: I'm sorry, I was sitting there talking to myself eloquently on mute. It's in there, it's...

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you.

Mike O'Connor: Sorry about that. Sitting there having this huge conversation with you and you were coming up with random replies. My apologies.

Paul Diaz: How does that look to folks?

Sébastien Bachollet: I have a general question on this issue. Do you think really that it's a question open to everybody explains that don't you think that it's really for some constituency or some group of people?

Because I am not sure that end user anything that we use on the choose EPP, even I don't know how to use, I heard about EPP but I can't tell you what the letters stand for.

And is this really an open question for everybody, or it's more for registrar, registry eventually.

Paul Diaz: For me Sebastian wearing my Network Solutions hat, I guess and as a chair as well I would argue that the questions are still appropriate for multiple inputs, multiple constituencies.

Yes registrars and registries will be more inclined to answer about EPP, but sometimes getting certain members, certain registrars in particular to respond can be problematic.

So for instance your user group the ALAC might be ones who help us identify some registrars who are offering this. You know I think there's more eyes and more inputs will be useful to the work of this particular group.

If it doesn't apply to you, you can simply pass it over. But it's probably worthwhile having a full scope of questions put out to everybody and you just answer those that are appropriate to your own experience.

Other thoughts?

Sebastian: Agree with you that, the reason I think that maybe we need to state somewhere that you can leave aside some question if they don't - but try to answer as much question.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, to amplify this conversation one of the things we probably want to let people know is this round is essentially an information gathering round. It's not so much a policy statement as it is a chance for people to offer ideas and that they shouldn't feel that they have to - they should not feel that they have to answer every single question.

And we might be able to do that up in the top somewhere. Yes, very good point.

Olof Nordling: Olof here. I've got a little comment. Perhaps it would be polite and a bit useful to spell it out as well EPP, and perhaps also to provide a link to Wikipedia or whatever because it is for those curious about what is - what kind of animal is this.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: Olof, I am sure that you have a place on the ICANN website where EPP is explained somewhere. You don't need Wikipedia for that.

Olof Nordling: Oh well maybe so. I do my best but I take that off line later on.

Paul Diaz: Okay, and Olof could I ask you to find a link? I think that's an excellent idea. Could you insert - spell out EPP? Exception provision protocol and then a link to a source, an explanatory source that you know people feel comfortable with, whether it's wiki, that or something on ICANN etcetera.

Olof Nordling: I must say I feel a bit embarrassed by Sebastian's comment because I recognize that I did put a link in the (ISIS) report to explain EPP and I

think I did draw that to Wikipedia. Too lazy definitely, but okay, I'll look into it then.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, maybe something we can do as well is in the introduction clearly refer people as well to the issues report to make sure the people have read the relevant background documentation on these issues.

So it makes it easier as well I guess to understand the questions and you know provide the information that we're trying to get through these questions.

Paul Diaz: Very good point Marika. Yes, please. How would folks like to proceed, shall we save this and come back to it at the end? Do we want to move through the issues or should we try and insert this language now while the thoughts fresh in our minds? Is there a preference on way or the other?

Mike O'Connor: I think we could probably insert this afterwards.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, that would be my preference if it's all the same to everybody. Let's make sure we're comfortable with the text we have for the three issues and then we'll circle back and work on the introductory language, again recognizing that there will be different readerships so that you know the language isn't so specific to, okay this is just for constituencies.

We also have to keep in mind this language is going to be morphed and used for the public comment period, call for public comments as well.

Okay, all excellent points so we will come back to that. For now are there other bullets here on issue two that folks would like to modify in any way?

James Bladel: Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: Yes James.

James Bladel: Visiting back to the third bullet point, I liked (Barbara)'s, I think it was (Barbara)'s suggestion that we retain the security token mention and I think we may have lost that at least in the version that I have.

Can we reinstall that?

Paul Diaz: Sure, would that go before the first question mark then? So you say you have electronic authorization, parentheses, e.g. security token for you?

James Bladel: Yeah.

(Barbara): That's what I had indicated originally so I think it would go there.

Paul Diaz: Can you do that for us Mike, just copy and paste that parenthetical e.g. security token FOA and paste it in after electronic authorization on our bullet.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I didn't get the FOA part. It's up there now, see if that's enough or do we want to have FOA in there too?



(Barbara): I would prefer to leave it a little more open and not exclusively tied to the FOA.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: So it's changed.

Paul Diaz: How does that look to folks? Thank you Mike.

Michael Collins: Should we also include digital signatures along with security token?

Paul Diaz: Sure.

Man: We could say something like examples include...

Paul Diaz: Either that or the e.g. security token, digital signatures, etcetera, just leave it open ended. Either or.

Mike O'Connor: No that's fine, let's do that. Digital....okay, that's up there. Now to get to Mike Rodenbaugh's point, one more thing, if so, what are they? Are we asking which registrars or are we asking which mechanisms to authenticate or both?

Should we make that clear? Now if I read that sentence and I was pounding my way through, my answer would probably be no, I don't know any registrars and that would be that.

And maybe what we want to do is make it more inviting for people to give examples of registrars and techniques.

Paul Diaz: That was your initial though, right Mike Rodenbaugh?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes it was.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So what - if so what are they and who offers them? Would that capture it?

Mike O'Connor: Oh yeah, that's good.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Works for me.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: It's debating - it's up.

Paul Diaz: Okay. If that's looking good to folks are there any other bullets here on issue two that we need to further address?

Sébastien Bachollet: Just we need really to explain all the acronyms. I tried to find on internet what is FOA, and I find some really interesting things, fine office architects for example.

Paul Diaz: Fair enough. Form of authorization in this context, but yeah, let's...

Sébastien Bachollet: That will be done at the end, but for the rest here I am okay.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Man: For the last bullet point number two, should we add another little sentence just like in the third bullet point, if so what are they (aphorism), the fourth point?

Man: Which bullet was that?

Man: The final bullet in issue two. I mean wanting to be consistent but to elicit the information that we're looking for. I mean you would hope people would not just say yes and leave it at that but...

Paul Diaz: No, again let's try to be as clear and as obvious almost to the point of painful.

Mike O'Connor: Well I know that when I have been writing these it's been useful to have them as self contained as possible so that you're constantly reminded what your correct response should be.

Paul Diaz: So that's a good point, can you just copy that?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I pushed it in, it's up on the wiki now.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Mike. Okay, any other issues here with our issue number two?

Mike O'Connor: Looks good to me.

Paul Diaz: Okay and again to Sebastian's point we'll go back before this is pushed out and make sure that any acronyms are clearly spelled out and/or links are provided like we had discussed like with EPP.

And we say that the SSAC is identified we can even link SSAC and link it to that particular report. It's there, never mind. I don't think anybody will be confused about SSAC, that's well understood.

Okay then, if there are no other concerns, let's move on to issue three. So I would ask - let's break this into two parts if we will. Let's just first focus on the first two bullet points.

Let me move to the third I'd like to refer back to some discussion we've had on the email list, make sure that we address everybody's issues and concerns.

So on the first two, are they clear and reasonably stated for everyone?

(Barbara): I think for the first one I would add through the second sentence there asking for clarification is please state the reasons and use cases for your answer or something along that line.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And last week, excuse me, last week's call even the use of the term partial bulk transfer, are we comfortable with the way we've defined it above? Is that capturing it clearly enough for everyone?

In particular I'm making reference to what we're going to be bringing up in bullet three and again the discussions we've had in email about what appeared to be the nexus of this question in the previous work.

Previous efforts to identify the issues and it seemed that folks in the past were focused on a particular shape, NeuStar's service and rather than having a one off registry service, partial bulk transfer is (vacant centralizing) at being the focus of the work of this particular group.

If we want it that narrowly focused, fine, or do we want to - my only concern is that we would need to make certain that the definition that we use for partial bulk transfer is clearly understood by folks both within the constituencies and the public at large.

Man: Should we make clear that we're talking about transfers and not at the behest of the registrants?

(Barbara): I think we need that clarification.

Man: Because that's not clear in the way that it's written right now.

Paul Diaz: That's - thank you.

Michael Collins: I think that's bullet three though, is it not?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah but I think Mike that one of the things that when I was on one of the previous iterations of this PDP, I interpreted it the other way when I wrote our response.

And so I think it's important to clarify that definition up in the bolded part of the thing as well as down in bullet three.

Paul Diaz: We probably need to do it in both places. Perhaps it's easier to go, if everybody's comfortable with what we have, I'm sorry, do we make the change per (Barbara)'s request in number one?

Mike O'Connor: Which one?

Paul Diaz: There was going to be state the reasons and use cases? You got it in, thank you.

Mike O'Connor: I pushed that in there.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel: Hi Paul this is James.

Paul Diaz: Yes James.

James Bladel: One other just recommendation is that we insert into the first bullet point the word voluntary or discretionary. I'm trying to draw a distinction between a business arrangement, a merger or acquisition versus a registrar failure and it is involuntarily having some or all of it domain port - registration portfolio transferred to another registrar.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel: I don't know if that's a wild goose in this particular bullet point but I just wanted to put that on the table for discussion.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, I think you're right in clarifying that although a bulk transfer, this is what would happen in case of failure and fail over. So then it's called bulk transfer and that - there are all provisions for that as you know.

But - so maybe just be very, very clear to those responding to it. I think that's a good point. And now I have to leave, bye bye all of you.

Man: Bye Olof.

James Bladel: I think that what Olof just said is very useful and if nothing else it helps to lend support to the definition of partial.

Paul Diaz: Okay James so where would you want it to - for handling voluntary partial bulk transfers is that where you would insert the word?

James Bladel: Well based on Olof's comment I think anywhere where we define partial bulk transfer we'll want to distinguish it from a bulk transfer that's occurring due to the case of a registrar failure.

Mike O'Connor: So would we say partial or voluntary bulk transfer?

(Barbara): I think voluntary has to be associated with the partial bulk transfer. Because I think otherwise it almost sounds as though a registrar could go to a registry and simply request a bulk transfer without ICANN authorization.

Paul Diaz: I agree with (Barbara), I don't think it becomes an or situation. They need to be linked, otherwise I also see this opening up into, you know, folks moving portfolios around and that's not what we have in mind with this issue three.

Mike O'Connor: And see the trick with voluntary is that doesn't exclude the move portfolios around case.

Paul Diaz: Yes, I...

James Bladel: No, this only excludes the involuntary. I'm looking for that to be covered in bullet point number three.

Paul Diaz: Why don't we jump to bullet three, I mean in addressing it, it may become clearer and we might get some ideas for the language that we're all seeking right now.

I guess fundamentally and Michael Collins I know you're on the call so please weigh in for the statement you've already made to the list. I mean we have as it's currently structured here you know two scenarios.

The fundamental question is should we really be offering two scenarios, was that the intention, is that what we're really looking for.

Michael Collins: It seems to me in early discussions and what was written in the charter was that we were considering two scenarios, but when I went back and talked to Tim Ruiz and some other registrars, I kind of think that was what was intended for us to be considering.

I think it was not intended for registrants to consider this as a means for registrants to move portfolios.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

(Barbara): I would agree with that.

Paul Diaz: I agree as well, looking at the path, scenario B I don't believe does apply based on any of the historical things I've seen. But leave it open,



is there anybody who feels that scenario B really should be part of the mandate of this particular working group and should be included?

Mike O'Connor: I'm going to chime in. Certainly when I wrote (DC) response that was one of the things that I was supporting as a kind of consumer capability saying, you know, I would like to move a boatload of names from one registrar to another.

And I saw this as the mechanism to do that. Is there another mechanism that could do that instead so that we could clarify this one the way that we wanted? You know I don't really want to throw my body on the tracks in front of this one, but it would be nice to have a mechanism for being able to move a group of names all at once.

James Bladel: Mike this is James Bladel. One of the earlier conversations we had revolved around some of the registrars out there who have developed - who are targeting the market of large portfolio holders and who are developing commercial services to do that.

Mike O'Connor: Oh, okay.

James Bladel: And we were just discussing whether that was in scope of ICANN to create a - or to recommend consensus policy for everyone to follow or whether we should allow those registrars who are serving that market segment to innovate and differentiate different services to those registrants who have that need.

And going through some of our customer data I think even with our large customer data we're looking at less than 1% of our customer base could possibly make use of something like that.

So that was just some of our earlier conversation and just to give you some background on why we feel pretty strongly about leaving scenario B out of the equation.

Mike O'Connor: Well I'm a pretty small portfolio holder I think. I think in total I have something like 100 names. And they're such powerful names as geezercast.com, etcetera. And that is pretty key to moving a bunch of names, you know 50 names from one registrar to another.

I'm not sure that I would - you know it certainly wouldn't kill me to do it, but you know as I think about the sort of unsophisticated domain portfolio holder which is basically what I am, it would be nice to have a mechanism that I could do bulk stuff against more than one name.

Paul Diaz: Mike just...I'm sorry.

Mike O'Connor: Go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Well just by way of example we recently helped someone move over 10,000 names through our domain concierge transfer service. So that - there are offerings out there.

Man: (Unintelligible) to get the names from the existing registrar to you could be a pain.

Michael Collins: This is where I was going to agree with - it's not the difficulty finding a registrar that will help you on you know the new registrar end, it's hard getting sometimes registrars to help and cooperate on the losing end.

Mike O'Connor: Right, exactly. And so you know that's where really where I was getting perky about this is that one way to make it difficult is to say sure, you can - the losing registrar can say sure you can leave, but you have to go through nine steps per domain.

And if you have 100 domains it's going to take you all day. And that's just a disincentive. You know the sort of overall thread of what I was writing for the (DC) was saying anything that makes it easier and yet more secure to manage domains is a good thing from the business constituency point of view.

Irrespective of scale, you know ranging from 50 names to 10,000 to 100,000. Clearly those are different kinds of customers, but the point that I was trying to make at that time was...

Paul Diaz: Okay. Folks, just because we have only about 10 minutes left on time so I'm going to ask that we try and get through this one.

I also want to ask fundamentally, and (Barbara) if you can weigh in here, when we're dealing with the bulk transfer process, there is a significant difference in that under this process there's a flat fee and then there are no - a year is not added, correct?

(Barbara): That's correct, and the fee only applies if there are more than 50,000 names.

Paul Diaz: Only 50,000. So if we start opening this up and redefining or creating a partial bulk transfer, we've now sort of fundamentally changed the way the system for transfers is going to work.

Because anything under 50,000 all the sudden we'd be saying what, they don't have to pay the fee?

(Barbara): Well I believe in the solution that's out there that one of the other registries has actually rolled out, the (D-Kappa) solution I believe that they have come up with additional fees.

It's not the full registration fee. I don't know - and I don't believe that they rolled the date forward but I believe that there is a nominal fee that they are charging per domain name.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Michael Collins: Is this to registrars or registrants? So I mean it's still something that's - is this so they're able to register...

(Barbara): It's for registrars.

Michael Collins: Okay.

Man: When would a registrar do a partial bulk transfer?

(Barbara): We've actually had people approach us which is not spelled out here as a scenario but perhaps it should be if the reseller of a - an ICANN accredited registrar becomes accredited they may wish to move their portfolio means that we're being managed by the accredited registrar to their own accreditation.

Man: Okay.

Michael Collins: And I suppose that if there are reasons allowed other than just what's stated here, I think - what was stated in the new level one was just mergers and acquisitions, (ISO) purpose, if the purpose is broadened, I suppose the registrants still could take advantage of this through cooperating registrars.

Man: How would this apply in mergers and acquisitions?

Michael Collins: If you purchase the registrar...

Man: Then wouldn't you take all their domain names?

Michael Collins: You could take all their domain names and move them to your existing registrar if you already had a registrar and you just wanted to consolidate, not maintain two accreditations.

Man: But wouldn't that be a full bulk transfer?

(Barbara): I mean that's - we've actually seen those being processed.

Michael Collins: That would be a full bulk transfer, yes.

Man: I mean I guess I just don't see a need, it may not be clear to me why there's a need for us to draft a partial bulk transfer. I mean the scenario you described where a reseller becomes a registrar, becomes accredited, is that really a consensus problem?

That's a business decision that particular entity made to become a reseller first and then become accredited.

I don't know that it's wise or necessary for us to consider that scenario. I'm just having difficulty under - like thinking of other scenarios that are public problems.

Michael Collins: It would seem to me that you could presume other cases. I don't know if there's actually a business case for it in the past but you could presume that there would be cases where a registrar might sell like customer to a different registrar.

Man: It seems to me that that's a business problem for that registrar. That's their cost of doing business. I don't know why we need a public consensus - to make that a public consensus issue.

It doesn't seem like it affects that many people and you know I don't think the purpose of what we're doing is to make it cost free for all types of different entities to do business.

(Barbara): I mean I think that it's a question that is worth asking and getting feedback from each of the constituencies regarding it. Because I mean it has been raised as an issue for us as the registry operator and it obviously warranted a fair amount of discussion in the previous working group (unintelligible) original issues with.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's certainly worth asking the questions, there's really no harm in doing that while we're on this topic and the beast at least gets on record (unintelligible) interested in the issue.

(Barbara): And it may be that we come back you know as the working group to recommend based on the feedback that we get that the policy shouldn't incorporate a means for affecting a partial bulk transfer.

Paul Diaz: Okay this is Paul again. I guess the question then is do we - in the first bullet the way it's broadly stated now, do we capture all that, do we need the third bullet? Then state reasons and use cases, use cases could be very open ended as it's currently drafted.

Is that good enough, can we - you know do people want to weigh in, they can and if not why create a scenario A, scenario B and heck there could be C, D and E as well.

Mike O'Connor: Right, I agree with you.

Paul Diaz: Let people define their use case and we'll see what comes back.

(Barbara): I would agree with that approach.

Mike O'Connor: I think that's fine as long as we leave the definition pretty broad. Because then what I would probably do at least from my perspective is rumble my registrant use case into this.

And you know get it injected into the discussion that way.

Paul Diaz: As we've currently defined, is this broad enough? So the proposal on the table is to strike the third bullet, allow the first bullet to capture all these use cases that we've just been discussing.

But it turns importantly on the definition of partial bulk transfer. What we currently have in the bolded text, is that good enough or do we need to tweak that language still?

Man: I think if it just applies to transfers at the behest of registrars we should make that clear, otherwise we're going to get a lot of clutter here and we're going to have too much information that's not really applicable.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: I like the definition right the way it is, is that that leaves me room for my registrant wanting to move a group of names, use case and (unintelligible).

Michael Collins: Yes, but you don't restrict the use cases. All registrants have to work through registrars anyway, so they're going to have to use a registrar to accomplish this.

Man: Isn't a partial bulk transfer a transfer where there's no extension of a year? Isn't that the transfer? So you know why should registrants be able to transfer the domain name for free because they have more of them?

Michael Collins: If they have a registrar that's willing to do that for them in order to acquire that portfolio, I don't see a problem with it.

Mike O'Connor: Can I take a personal privilege here, somebody that's got like a vacuum cleaner going in the background or a jet plane or something, it's really...

Paul Diaz: Or a convertible. If you can guys mute on the line. Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: There it went, that was wonderful.



Paul Diaz: Hopefully we've all heard that. I'm just sensitive to the time and I realize folks have things after this call at the top of the hour, so this is obviously very important and I don't want to gloss over it.

In the same way I am sensitive to our timeline and broader commitments as part of the working group. I think what I'm going to ask is that we - we don't have enough time to hit all the things that were on our agenda today.

But next week's call we really must wrap this up, agree to the text for the public comment period and we also need what I'd ask the last thing right now, please just give me a place holder for that one.

For now can we put this - table this until next Tuesday? We'll strike the third bullet, let people look at this, you know think about the implications, you know how wide ranging or how narrowly focused in needs to be.

And we'll go right to issue three at the beginning of our call next week, try and tie this up. Give us all a week as well to talk to colleagues and others to you know come back with any specific recommendations.

Unfortunately we're running out of time so I don't think there's a whole lot of choice here but I mean does that seem reasonable to folks?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, that's fine with me.

Paul Diaz: One basic question for the group today though is we have through (Barbara) the GNSO council and Mike Rodenbaugh's court has asked

if we would like time to update the council or speak to the council at the Cairo meeting about the work of this group.

I think given how our timeline is sliding a little bit it's increasingly obvious that we will not have a final report by Cairo. But at a minimum you know we probably will be well along our process.

And I was going to recommend that we do ask for some time before council to at least provide them a face to face update on the status of our work at that time.

Does that seem reasonable to folks?

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: And out of curiosity, how many folks on the call plan to be in Cairo and would be there on the weekend before, a Saturday or Sunday because that's when the GNSO will be meeting and will be able to pencil us in.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor, I'll be there.

Man: I'll be there.

Man: I'm going to be there.

Man: I'll be there.

Man: I'm there.

Paul Diaz: Okay, a number of us. We can coordinate, I will be there as well and obviously as chair I'm perfectly content to represent the group. And if more of us can coordinate and be there at the same time I think the council would probably like to hear additional perspectives.

That being the case, Mike Rodenbaugh can I ask that you go back to the council and let them know that yes this working group would like a small amount of their time at their convenience that weekend just to provide a substantive update on the status of our work?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure. I think that that will work and then the council would have questions for you on that working session day. And then probably would want to give a brief public update during the public session on Wednesday or Thursday whenever that is.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So what do you think half an hour, 45 minutes on the working session day, something like that?

Paul Diaz: I would think yeah, a half hour because again since our work is on the wiki and the public comment period most of the information will be available to people.

I think it will be more summarization than substantive discussion at that point. So half hour will probably be fine.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, (unintelligible) answer - ask questions, so okay no problem.

Paul Diaz: All right? Thank you. All right everyone, very much appreciate the time. I think this is - this has been great, I'm glad we've moved to issues one and two. We will begin with issue three next Tuesday the same time.

And you know would ask that please come ready to hammer this one out. We will also update our time line, polish off the text for the solicitation of public comments and you know get all those things done in next week's call.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sounds good.

Paul Diaz: Very good, thank you once again and see you all next week.

Man: Thanks Paul.

Woman: Thanks.

Man: Very good, bye bye.

END