

**GNSO**  
**Inter-registrar Transfer Working Group teleconference**  
**January 30, 2008 at 15:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-registrar Working Group teleconference on 30 January 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/irt-wg-20080130.mp3>

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

Draft notes from the call:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-trans-wg/msg00057.html>

**Participants on the call:**

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency

Mike O'Connor - CBUC

Tom Keller - Registrar c.

**Absent apologies**

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

**ICANN Staff:**

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development

Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: You may go ahead. This recording has started.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. All right, so how - what people like to proceed? I sense some questions around that I certainly would like to get some responses on. Is it possible to just go through those or does somebody have a different suggestion?

(Mike o'Connor): I'd like - I think those are great. I'd like to add a couple. I'm a little bewildered by the various lists and conversion that's happened that's on the list that I'm on. So...

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we start off with yours, (Mike)?

(Mike): I just realized that there seem to be two docs. There's a (PDP) that's underway, and then there's another conversation about the 19 policy points. And I could use some filing in on which is which and which one we're working on, because I wrote a response from the (DC) for the 19 during the process that (Ross) led, and now bewildered by the (PDP) thing.

And so I'm wondering whether there are two email lists about this or two processes under way.

Olof: There are two processes. I mean a few - it's just - were singled out and was decided to launch (PDP) on those. And that's under way and we're still waiting for quite a few of (unintelligible) statements. But that's sort of narrow cost to only those four issues, which are described in the issue report.

For the remaining 19 issues, this is what we're doing today. I mean small group to consider, while a suitable order of launches of future (PDPs) for these issues, based on the prioritization that (Ross) - little prioritization group prepared and which is sort of essential background for this. So this - there - yes, there are two processes.

And what we're doing today on this call is actually to address the grouping together or proposing a running order of future potential (PDPs).

(Mike): Terrific. Thanks for clearing that up. At some point I'll go back through (Rodenbaugh) and figure out whether we're properly participating in the (PDP) process, but I'll leave that off for today and we can concentrate on the 19.

Chuck Gomes: (Mike), just to set you at ease in terms of your confusion on this, as far as I can tell, there's confusion across the council on this whole issue because of the common topic of both. And the constituencies - some of the constituency statements for the (PDP) that was initiated on the very limited four items with regard to transfer policy, appear to be more related to the 19 items we're talking about than the four items in the (PDP).

The four items in the (PDP) just are four reasons that are allowable reasons for denying a transfer by a registrar that needed - that have - that are - that have had some ambiguity. And the idea was to see if those could be clarified -- the ambiguity removed.

(Mike): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And so we did like Olof said -- we did initiate a (PDP) on that very limited set of transfer policy issues. And that's what constituency statements were asked to be submitted by each of the constituencies, including the (BC). And the (BC) statement really, as far as I can tell, related to these 19 items that we haven't started the (PDP) yet.

(Mike): Yes. Well and I wrote that, so I know that one real well. And, you know, the - just the confusion -- at least for me -- rose because I was participating in (Ross's) prioritization.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yes, and by the way, what you did is very useful. It's not directly related to the (PDP) that's underway, but it's certainly directly related to what we're doing. (And that's good).

(Mike): Yes, great. Thanks. I'm squared away.

Chuck Gomes: Now what other questions do you have?

(Mike): one of the things that we talked about in the prioritization process - we had a pretty substantial email exchange about the way that that process worked. I was quite enchanted with that. And one of the things that (Ross) and I sort of agreed at the end was that I might get a (mulligan) or a do-over on one issue. The issue that I was really interesting in was the number one issue, which was the possibility of a registrant initiating a review of a transfer or a challenge to a transfer.

And that one wound up sort of in the middle of the pack or towards the bottom of the pack because of the sort of mathematics that (Ross) used in arriving at his prioritization, in which he basically averaged the responses. But what was interesting about the ranking was that four people in the group ranked best -- very, very high -- and four people ranked at very, very low.

And - well my point to (Ross) was, you know, your - by averaging these, you're masking what is in fact quite a healthy disagreement. And it might be useful to explore that disagreement as a group and see if we can change each other's minds or somehow move the needle.

And I got quite carried away with sort of consensus style decision making because I spent a lot of time running companies actually using

consensus decision making processes. And I sort of lost that debate. Didn't push it real hard, but would like to lobby for the possibility of perhaps reordering some of the sequence that we'd take these up.

And I sort of view this call as a chance to do that, but I want to do it sort of out in the open and say, "Look," you know, "this - "the process that Ross ran I think was intended to come up with this order that we're talking about today on the call."

And while I'd love to reopen it, I wouldn't want to do that without acknowledging the work that the group did (for) - so my question is, are we essentially reopening the sequencing question that the priorities group did?

Chuck Gomes: I think the answer - and (Tom) and Olof, you were involved in the group as well and I wasn't, so please correct me. But I think the answer is yes and no on that. I don't think our task is to redo the prioritization exercise. We're really tasked with trying to come up with a proposed plan for tackling either some subset or all of the 19 items in terms of continued policy development.

And so whereas we might not just redo the prioritization exercises in the very act of making some suggestions like grouping the different recommendations for possible (PDPs), does in fact provide an opportunity to revisit the one you're talking about.

(Mike): Well yes, especially since the prioritization groups I think - Olof, chime in here because you were on that (unintelligible) as well - but I think that when we were doing the prioritization we were operating under the assumption that really all we were doing was establishing the ordering

which we would tackle things -- that we weren't actually commenting on the substance of the points -- simply the sequence in which we were going to...

Chuck Gomes: Right. And at least from my point of view as being a councilmember, whereas the prioritization exercise provides some good - a good starting point, it doesn't seem very feasible to open up 19 different (PDPs) and run them serially...

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...or even in parallel.

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And so we're trying to come up with a more feasible means of tackling some or all of the 19.

(Mike): Well I'm enchanted with this approach and I mostly am doing this to sort of give due acknowledgement to the process that happened before, but I think it's...

Olof: Yes, (unintelligible).

(Mike): ...right approach.

Olof: Recalling then that this is of course a priority list and then it was put forward like that, if I recall, it derived from the working group, then for (unintelligible) proposal for the (rounding) order. Then I mean leaving

the decision on exactly which bunch should we start (PDP) on, (bring it to the council).

And as Chuck mentioned, 19 (PDPs) - well then we're starting to plan for almost our grandchildren.

(Mike): Yes, I agree.

Olof: Chuck and my case, huh? So it's rather (natural). Well one approach could for example (unintelligible) selection of approach to start with. I mean one could say that, "All right, well here we've got (the running) order in. Let's (unintelligible) the proposal and let's say that, 'Okay, we take the first three and nothing more,'" for example.

The first three issues, and that's what we concentrate on. Or we say, "Let's start with the first five," or we say, "Let's start with number one and see if there is anything really ancillary for which we could launch at the same time which could easily be combined with number one among those who are further down on the list. And maybe there are not even one but two more and so on, which can be grouped together.

So actually we're at liberty to proposed ,and of course basing it on the prioritization and the work that already has been done in that respect.

(Mike): One of the threads on our - on our email list that I'm subscribed to -- and I have a feeling I need to get subscribed to the other one -- was this notion of clumping or grouping. And I think that that's a good idea because a lot of the 19 are groupable.

(Tom): (Unintelligible).

(Mike): Yes.

(Tom): (Unintelligible) that first chart added.

(Mike): Yes.

(Tom): So we - if we carry on with (the part you had) we should determine whether some of these issues in these groups should be maybe grouped in a fourth group, which is not (described), but adds issues that should be evaluated whether they're feasible or not.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And (Tom), you're getting at what I obviously - I took - (Tom) obviously provided one possible grouping of these, which...

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...I think was a good start. And Olof has mentioned that there was not totally dissimilar grouping by (Ross) in a previous document.

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But what I did is I looked at each one individually in terms of, "Okay, is this really feasible?" Because in my opinion, unless there's some indication that something is really achievable, we don't have resources to just do (PDPs) for (PDP) sake if there's not reasonable chances that some good progress could be made.

And that's kind of the gist of a lot of the questions I ask, even going a little bit further and thinking about ideas that could be done, because

that relates to feasibility. So took kind of a different tactic there going down the feasibility route.

(Tom): So the big question is now what are we actually going to do? I mean we have to stick with something. I guess the list we have from Olof, that stems from a time before the prioritization group has worked it out. I think that's one way of grouping it. But since we already gone through that effort, having that prioritization, I would rather use that one and try to some way keep the (unintelligible) prioritization group (kind of) show that it's really hard to come to common conclusions.

I mean there are just really opposing views on that. And - but we came up with something. We might not be happy with it. I'm not happy with it personally, but I would think that we should stick to it and work some official exercise. And we got them resolved and now kind of making everything (unintelligible) doesn't really sound right to me.

So the process of just taking the first ones (unintelligible) the first one and seeing what could be included with that one is the (path) followed. And what I would think we should use - maybe have look at that kind of grouping and see whether we can already apply certain feasibility problems to certain subjects or not.

Chuck Gomes: I'm comfortable with starting out that way.

(Mike): So am I.

(Tom): All right. Well that would be - so you all have the documents? So we probably could start on going through the points -- just customer feasibility. And what I would suggest is that we - from our viewpoint as

a group just supply the council with that further information and (unintelligible) to make a final decision whether they want to have the topic in this (PDP) or if they already have enough knowledge to see that it's not feasible.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and one idea that I threw out on the list -- and by the way there is really only one list, (Mike). The (PDP) hasn't actually started actual work on those yet. And so I don't think a list has been created has it, Glen? Are you still on?

Glen de Saint Gery: I'm still on Chuck, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Is there a separate list for the...

Glen de Saint Gery: There is a separate list, yes.

(Mike): Oh okay. There is. That's right. I guess I have seen it. But...

Glen de Saint Gery: And that is to - the statement went to that list.

Chuck Gomes: Because we haven't even decided yet whether to do a working group on that, right?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. Well there's a - council as a whole is working on it.

Chuck Gomes: I understand that. We're kind of doing that on almost everything now, but...

Glen de Saint Gery: That's right, yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...the (unintelligible)...

Glen de Saint Gery: That's - for the list (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...to decide whether to do a working group. The idea isn't to have the council do all the work, so...

Glen de Saint Gery: Quite right, Chuck. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Mike): Yes. I think the one that I'm on is the (GNSO trans) - (WG) or working group list. And I think the other one is (GNSO trans) (PDP).

Glen de Saint Gery: That's right.

(Mike): And I have a feeling that some of the conversation has taken place on (PDP) and has - (Rodenbaugh) forwarded a note or two to me that sort of led to my bewilderedness. But anyway, I think that this approach that we're evolving towards is fine. And at some point, you know, I'd love to chime in and lobby a bit on some of the, you know, I noted Chuck that the - my pet one -- the one that I was so favorite of, you viewed as quite infeasible. And I...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And we can - let's talk - when we get to that, let's talk about it.

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Because...

(Mike): That's what I'd love to do.

Chuck Gomes: ...maybe I'm wrong. I'm trying to raise questions. Because if - I - myself, I have very difficult time envisioning how that could ever be implemented in any sort of effective way. But we can talk about that when we get there.

(Mike): Yes.

Olof: A little suggestion from my side -- Olof here -- that, all right, we've got - well the document to follow, I think it's - well (Tom)'s document with the - with Chuck's comments in red. And perhaps the right approach is now we have three groups and that - or three potential (PDPs). And maybe the way to go ahead is to say that, "Okay, well this does it. The following issue does it. the following four reasons of unachievability should be just deleted and rather pruned from the grouping that (Tom) has provided." Is that a way forward?

Chuck Gomes: Works for me.

Man: I would...

(Tom): That would be my idea.

(Mike): My edginess is that before we go the pruning and I'd like to debate the unfeasibility part. So...

Chuck Gomes: That's how we would do the pruning, isn't it?

(Mike): Yes. I mean I just - I - what I heard Olof say is that we were going to go ahead and prune those now.

Olof: Well the purpose would be that. I mean rather - because I believe they've become pretty bulky as (PDPs) with all these issues included.

(Mike): Right. And so before we - if we're pruning now, I'd (unintelligible) before a little debate on the infeasibility before we do the pruning.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I was...

(Tom): That is what we plan to do, yes.

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds like a plan.

Olof: Yes, that's absolutely it.

(Tom): Yes, that's what we should do for next half an hour.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Well then why don't we go through them just following (Tom)'s order and my notes and anybody else wants to jump in. And that takes us to number one -- 1J. I'm not sure what the J means, because I wasn't involved in the previous thing. But anyway...

Olof: That's a previous sort of - some kind of automatic order form the original document.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

Olof: So...

Chuck Gomes: In the original document...

Olof: (Unintelligible)

Chuck Gomes: ...it was J and it's priority number one now. okay.

Olof: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That makes sense (now). So now that one to me certainly would be helpful from a - and I'm going to be often speaking from a registry point of view where we - we're the dispute resolution provider. But that certainly would be helpful.

The big question for me - or I ask, you know, there's a question and a sub question. do all registrars have email addresses for registrants? Are there still some legacy ones -- forget about proxy services right now -- that don't have email addresses, or are we pretty much past that, (Tom)?

(Tom): Well I can only speak for my company. we do have it, but I know from a lot of other registrars that they don't, especially the one with reseller connections. You know, they only get the data they really need, especially in dot com issue case.

With the other (TTLBs), it wouldn't be a problem for most of them. But it's very hard. And that one I would actually think that we should have an own (PDPs) and we really we should kind of work out what benefits really are or not...

Chuck Gomes: So you think that...

(Tom): really.

Chuck Gomes: ...this particular one may warrant a (PDP) of its own.

(Tom): Oh yes. That's very controversial. I mean I just have to think of some (unintelligible) I would be totally opposed to such a thing. And it's hard to prove to them that they do have the registrant email addresses. So in terms of enforcing it, we will have a hard time. We could say every domain name, which is registered after a certain date has to have that, but there's only two ways how we can achieve this.

First thing would be we could change the (RAA). The second thing, which I don't think is very likely to happen actually, to change the (unintelligible) requirement in there. (The other thing) would be to change it in the who is policy, which would be not in the interest of a lot of the privacy applicants I guess. So I think that's a very hard and very contentious issue.

Chuck Gomes: And how do we - how do you deal with the privacy services -- the proxy providers and so forth? Sometimes the proxy provider's actually the registrant...

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and maybe not the underlying user. So how do you actually implement this particular thing in those cases?

(Tom): Well for proxy registrations, as far as I understand the policy, said I can set this up - who's there at the registrant is actually the owner. You know, the underlying contact data is the subcontract between the registrar or the proxy service and the underlying data holder.

So that would be a way to actually implement that they have an email address there. There just wouldn't be of any use since most of the proxy providers are operating on a lock system. As long as the domain name is in this proxy status, they're not acknowledging any kind of transfers anyway.

So if you want to transfer out of most of them, you have to put in your real data and unlog your domain name and then we don't have that problem anymore.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Tom): So it's - the proxy registration is not a (really a) problem. It's more the privacy discussion we had around who is over the last three or four years that hasn't been resolved. because what we want to do now is put even more unguarded information into the who is...

Chuck Gomes: Well...

(Tom): ...which I'm very sure some people won't be too pleased about.

Chuck Gomes: is that what this recommendation is saying? because I didn't necessarily read that into it. I know that - I thought this was just saying - providing some way for us registrars to get the email address of the registrant, not necessarily publish it in who is. obviously if you publish it in who is, it makes a - I can see the advantages of that from a transfer point of view. but it's not - but then you get into all the privacy issues.

(Tom): Yes. well the problem is that if we would not do it in a who is, we would need a totally different system away from it, which would - might be a good idea anyway for a technical point of view. but that is another contentious issue. that really - it really (unintelligible). And the benefit of it is kind of unclear.

So I think in terms of feasibility number one, it's very hard and it should be tackled (unintelligible) tackled as an old (PDP). it has too many relations to different subjects. so it's not something that will make the transfer process itself better or worse in a short period of time.

Chuck Gomes: So help me understand how this got to be priority number one.

(Mike): well the process of setting the priority was that the people in the working group each assigns their own ranking. And in almost all cases, there were the average masks a lot of disagreement. there were a lot of folks like me who put this fairly low and there were a lot of other folks who put it pretty high. And my underlying assessment is that there were - I'll do another three clumps view.

There were sort of registrar accountability kinds of things there were quality improvement kinds of things, and there were technical kinds of

things. And a lot of technical issues tended to hold the day in the ranking process just because of the way the votes worked out.

And so one approach to this one might be sort of piggybacking on ((Tom)'s) comment that a lot of the recommendations sort of imply changes to the back office processes in the registrars and the registries, and that that might be a clumping, because this is not the only one in this list that implied that people have to hold on to either new data or process data in a different way.

But if we went back to the voting, I'm sure that what we would see on this and any of these is there was a lot of dispersion in that group and we never really had a conversation to try and reduce that dispersion. Basically (Ross) just added the numbers up and this happened to be the one with the highest score.

Chuck Gomes: Well it sounds to me like for - at least for now, we can finalize all of our decisions once we see the total picture, but that it might make sense to put this one in a category by itself for now because of its complexity...

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and possible feasibility, okay...

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and not leave it in a group where it would - because like (Tom) said, if anything is ultimately done on this, it might have to be (PDP) by itself. Now we could change that view later on when we go through all of

them, but is that a good step right now -- just put this in a category by itself?

(Mike): That works fine for me.

Chuck Gomes: And Olof, are you kind of keeping track of what we come up with on these?

Olof: Kind of.

Chuck Gomes: Good, thanks.

(Tom): and I agree as well, so...

Chuck Gomes: All right, well should we go to five then?

(Mike): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now I thought five and six have some similarities there. And is it true that the real big issue here is whether or not names are unlocked in a timely manner?

(Tom): No. It's - in the first part there is no really - a description about at what point of time a domain name can be unlocked and what the exact requirements are how that looks - how that lock looks like.

So for extraordinary, everybody could claim, "Well it's on some kind of a (transfer) lock." That doesn't use the official registry lock (there), and there's a lack of definition. that's just defining. Number six would be the time (unintelligible) of the (FOAs) is that if you - once you got an (FOA)

signed by a person, registrars tend to hold this forever. so once you run against lock, they never check the who is data again. so at the end, (unintelligible) trying to transfer domain names away, which already changed the owner.

And for that, the transfer (is not valid). the (FOAs) they have is not valid anymore.

Chuck Gomes: Right. no, that part I understand.

(Tom): So they're independent from each other.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Mike): But do they belong in a clump together along with, you know, there are some other ones -- like we skip down to number 15 or number 1.

(Tom): Well they're both very technical and related to pretty much the same process.

(Mike): Yes.

(Tom): I would think they are.

(Mike): Yes. And maybe we could make a clump out of that and some of these other ones.

Chuck Gomes: Well tell me (Tom) how time limiting (FOAs) would solve number six.

(Tom): Well you would have - if you would say (FOA) is only valid for 15 days, you would have to automatically check at 15 days whether you have to have a new one or not, right? so right now nobody is making any checks. once you got the (FOA), it's the understanding of (unintelligible) the registrars that - okay they got the allowance of the owner or the administrator (unintelligible) to transfer the domain name. And that is not rechecked at any time, and that policy would actually force registrars to recheck.

Chuck Gomes: would it be unrealistic, assuming that the time limit was brief enough, to now allow other changes once a transfer is initiated (unintelligible) initiated?

(Tom): there are a lot of - number six is more or less belaboring the problem. whether time limiting itself is a solution to it or not, it's a different matter. I would even pose it totally different. I would rather say as long as the contact (unintelligible) is still a contact. you might be - and it's not older than two months or something, you should be allowed to use it.

Chuck Gomes: But do you see five and six as achievable?

(Tom): Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Those aren't too hard. So those might be good to - I mean and...

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...it doesn't hurt to lump them together. they seem to - even though, like you pointed out, they have - they are distinctly different. those are not - those certainly would be good to leave in the group, right?

(Tom): Yes. they're core parts of the transfer policy.

Chuck Gomes: Any (unintelligible)...

(Tom): (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...disagree with that?

(Mike): I'm fine with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And then seven...

Olof: So five and six is little mini-group so to start with.

Chuck Gomes: Well I mean if we just assume for right now (Tom)'s group's in place...

Olof: Okay, okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...we would (unintelligible) them as part of them Group 1. we can always come back and revisit that I think, but we'll for right now just leave them in (Tom)'s first group, right?

Olof: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then seven, this one's related I think to Item 2 where it's a little bit different but they're both needing something too. I think has to do with

the emergency, you know, if there's a high profile name that needs to be put back really fast or something like that, but both of it, you know, a transfer has to be undone.

Is there a reason why two and seven wouldn't be put in the same place since they're both kind of dealing with undoing?

(Tom): No, I agree. I think it would rather technical enhancement or policy enhancement. It's not really anything to do with the (unintelligible) process or something.

Chuck Gomes: So two and seven could go in the same group as - and do we care which group it's in for right now? We can refine it later, but...

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe add - put two and seven both in this group for now?

Olof: (Unintelligible).

(Tom): Yes, we could - actually we could just strike number seven. that would be my suggestion.

(Mike): So two is the one that's further down your list, right?

(Tom): Yes, though I would strike that, actually. No, two. Not seven.

Chuck Gomes: You'd strike two?

(Tom): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Wasn't...

Olof: yes. Well done it's a bit conflictual because then we start striking out what was highly prioritized. And then we should probably say that, well this is not feasible or if it's redundant in comparison to seven or something like that.

(Tom): I - well I think it is. two is redundant to seven in the meaning -- in the essential meaning. so we can combine them or we can mark it as redundant. however, you know, but...

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we combine two and...

Olof: (Combine) them.

(Tom): Okay.

(Mike): Yes. I...

(Tom): Okay. Combine them.

(Mike): ...think that's right.

Olof: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: That way nobody will criticize the priority of number two in that sense. but - and for right now leave it in this group? is that okay?

(Tom): Yes. For me I think it's technical and it refers to the 60 - the A lock you have.

(Mike): I think - I'd like to push back a little bit on that one if I might (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

(Mike): I think that there's sort of a broad (theme) of non - of unwinding a transfer that's not technical but rather is sort of driven by a dispute. And it seems to me that two especially, but also seven, I don't believe those to be so technical as (Tom) you're thinking of them. I'm thinking of them more as - again, as a domain registrant and saying, "Yikes, the domain got transferred. Help! what do I do?"

And not so much the technical side of it, but just the intervention of unwinding the transfer or at least somehow flagging it that there is an issue that's got to be resolved.

Chuck: I don't think I'm following your point, (Mike). what's your concern about the technical issue?

(Mike): Well what I heard (Tom) saying was that this was pretty much a technical discussion. So (Tom), am I misunderstanding?

(Tom): well it's both. I totally agree with you, but if we want to have the discussion you're pointing out actually, you know, we really have to tackle it somewhere else. it would be rather how the dispute process is working.

(Mike): Yes.

(Tom): right? So we could maybe group it to two things, right? but there are two issues. one is a 60-day hold period some registrars implement...

Man: Yes.

(Tom): ...(where they just say), "Well that's in the contract. we have to keep the domain name for 60 days. we're not transferring it back because who knows whether that might be (fragile)." and there's the problem that if you find out that your domain has been hijacked, you know, what to do then.

Man: Right, right.

(Tom): Right? So in the wording how to is kind of framed. It's shard to tell which of the two is actually mean.

(Mike): I think one of the troubles with this newly reordered list - I was just back at the document that Olof sent this morning. And unfortunately I'm going to have to translate really fast, but one of the things about that sort of framing document is that there were three clumps. there was a dispute resolution clump, there was a form of authorization clump that had a couple, there were who is issues, and then a (daggle of other).

And I think that the substantial bullets become clear when they're reinserted into that context, because there was a little paragraph for each of the clumps in the original document that sort of framed what we were talking about. And by - it got very confusing in the working

group because we broke them apart by that, and I think we're running into the same confusion here.

unfortunately I don't have a map to take...

Chuck: Well whether it's technical or process or both, are we in agreement that these two - that seven and two should be pursued further?

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I mean we can - in terms of the technical details, the process deals and stuff, that's going to be part of a (PDP) if we - if a (PDP) is approved.

(Mike): Right. And that...

Chuck Gomes: And they seem - I'm hearing, at least from (Tom), who is going to know more about than I am because he's a registrar, these are feasible things to work.

(Tom): Yes. Well the 60 days is feasible. this undoing a transfer and kind of defining whether it's fragile or it's not fragile, this all hijacking stuff, you know. Actually I'm not sure about the feasibility of any kind of (determined) that. I don't even know the registries will ever be able to make any determination on that.

Chuck Gomes: Well they won't without registrar involvement, because...

(Tom): Yes, but even that, you know, a lot of the cases where you really have fragile transfer of a high valued name, the registrars both have the

documents you need, right, because one of them is fake. but it's always hard to tell, you know?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Tom): And should the domain name be transferred back or not, you know, it might be the case that the correct owner has it and they are dispute from someone who's just claiming that he had the name, whatever, you know. There are clearly cases for the regular (courts) in some way, you know? so - and it's up to the registrar actually to hold himself harmless and stuff like that. So (he should)...

Chuck Gomes: That was...

(Tom): ...have processes in place.

Chuck Gomes: That was like the sex.com case.

(Tom): Yes, it is. Right. it's free. if it comes down to that, you know, it's very, very complicated, you know, because documentation and the whole process itself has so many loopholes.

Chuck Gomes: But it probably should - the time probably should be spent on that. they may find it different, but it - the time probably should be spent on that, huh?

(Mike): I see your point.

(Tom): Oh yes. but that's (one of those) things - this hijack report, you know, and all the (variables) and how it, you know, how it happens (and go

on), you know, you really need some kind of analysis for it. you have to dive deep into it. And I would rather see that as a separate subject, which is hard to achieve. we should talk about it, but not keep it in that general (PDP) because it will just (overboard) it.

Chuck Gomes: So you think this ought to be restricted in some way -- the...

(Tom): Yes. I would just restrict in the place where we have seven right now, I would just leave it to the technical things, period -- to the 60 days. The thing about the hijacking report I would put into a separate (PDP). And we can suggest that we need to have this separate (PDP) about that issue, no doubt. but for that, we really need the separate issue report. we need to have some statistics, we need to have some experts telling us about how that happens, whatever. that's a very long process.

Chuck Gomes: So this is another one that we might isolate like we did number one? or that part of it would be isolated?

(Tom): That would be what - my thinking, yes. we should clarify what we mean by both of them and it should be isolated. And we should see whether we should make an (own) (PDP) out of it or not. I - it's a very important issue. I absolutely agree. And we have no way of dealing with it right now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Mike): I'd be fine with that. I think that, you know, to the extent that we can deal with technical issues wit great dispatch, that's a good thing. to the extent that we can hold on to these broader, much harder issues and

make a commitment to work on them and figure them out, that's also a good thing.

So one way would be to essentially acknowledge that there are two clumps that these belong to, one being a technical one and refine issues in there, and one being a broader sort of dispute resolution unwinding one...

(Tom): Yes.

(Mike): ...that's going to be much harder and refine the issues for that and launch two different (PDPs) to address them.

Chuck Gomes: Now I need to warn you guys that I've got another meeting that I've got to be ready to - ready for in five minutes. So...

Olof: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: That doesn't mean you guys can't continue.

(Tom): (Unintelligible).

Olof: That's the same with me.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay. so then let's look at - can we at least look at 15 and 18? now 15 to me -- correct me if I'm wrong, (Tom) -- but this seems to go totally against what was - what we tried to do in the original transfer policy.

(Tom): it is. it is just a remake of all the discussions we had before, whether it's (auto acknowledge) or (auto neck).

Chuck Gomes: And...

(Tom): And that is trying to turn it into the (Auto neck) discussion again. So we...

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) turn into a gaming situation again.

(Tom): Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I would say we eliminate 15.

(Tom): I would...

Chuck Gomes: ...for that reason.

(Tom): ...(unintelligible) and eliminate it, yes?

Chuck Gomes: Because that's not an enhancement to the policy. that's a total reversal.

(Tom): We already discussed that and the group that came up with the original transfer process agreed not to use it. so we should stick with that and not have the discussion again.

(Mike): Yes.

Olof: (Unintelligible) have a very low priority.

(Mike): And again, I have to chime in for the deficiencies and the priorities (setting) process. certainly a lot of us rank this question for exactly the same reason.

Chuck Gomes: So is anybody opposed to dropping this one?

(Tom): No, not me.

(Mike): Me neither.

Olof: Sold the lowest bidder.

(Mike): Sold to the lowest bidder. Right on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And then very quickly, on 18, I checked and we're already doing that. are there registries, (Tom), who are not doing this?

(Tom): Yes, I guess all except you. It's...

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) well I'm saying we're doing it. when we switched to (EPP) my...

(Tom): No, no, no. No, no. There are certain things called (riots), and some registries are using them and some are not.

Chuck Gomes: So - but this isn't - okay so this probably is relatively low hanging fruit that just needs to - some consistency.

(Tom): Yes. everybody already agreed on that. it's just that it never happened in execution as far as I know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Tom): So that should be real low hanging fruit and not very controversial.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So we've got at least - and we can decide later whether we want to call the titles of these groups differently but we've kind of narrowed down group one at least for now. it seems to me we're going to need another call or maybe more than one.

(Tom): Oh yes.

(Mike): Yes. And Olof, I hold great hope for your summary of the conversation, because I haven't been taking notes, but I think that summary would be really useful before...

Chuck Gomes: Olof is very good at that. let me...

(Mike): Oh, wonderful.

Chuck Gomes: ...assure you.

Olof: Very concise, I promise you.

Chuck Gomes: And so, Olof, if you can distribute the information from today's call, that'll help (Tim) and anybody else who wants to - is supposed to be participating in this. And then...

Olof: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...what's timing for another call? some of us are starting to travel next week to India. are we going to be able to make a little more progress on this before India?

(Tom): Well why don't we - because I have to drop off now, why don't we debate that on the list? I'm available this week and next week, so...

Chuck Gomes: I'm available limited next week. I'm probably available this - on Wednesday of next week. I'm traveling to India on Thursday and then from then on it's - and then Monday - I'm probably available Monday and Wednesday, just to let you know.

Man: Okay.

Olof: What about Wednesday next week, same time as...

(Tom): Sounds good for me.

Olof: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Think that works. why don't you put that on the list and then we'll == we can all confirm.

(Mike): Yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay.

(Mike): Sounds great.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, everybody.

Glen de Saint Gery: (Unintelligible).

Olof: Okay.

(Tom): Thank you. Bye.

Olof: I guess (unintelligible)...

Man: Bye.

Olof: ...(works out by Friday). I don't think I can make it today and I won't be available tomorrow for doing it. But by Friday early my time.

(Mike): Terrific.

Olof: Okay.

(Mike): Thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olof: I suppose.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks. (Unintelligible) the (next call)...

Olof: (Unintelligible) everybody.

END