

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
10 March 2009 at 14:00 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 10 March 2009. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-irtp-20090310.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#march>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC
James Bladel - Godaddy
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC
Michael Collins - Individual

Absent Apologies:

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office
Marika Konings - Policy Director

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat absent apologies

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Okay, and I'll do the roll for us. Welcome everyone - another IRTP PDP A call on -- what is today -- the 10th of March.

In attendance we have Paul Diaz, myself, the chair; Michael Collins, serving in an individual capacity - excuse - yes; Michael O'Connor, from the business constituency; James Bladel, from registrar constituency; Barbara Steele, from registry constituency.

From staff we have Marika Konings and Olaf Nordling. And we've received an apology from Kevin Erdman from the IPC. And hopefully a few more will be able to join us as we progress.

Thank you all for being here today and for figuring out the crazy time schedule, the new phone number, et cetera. Quick update for you all - those who didn't have - who weren't in Mexico City, we updated the GNSO council on the status of this working group. Council was, you know, pleased to hear that we're kind of in the home stretch. We, you know, basically went over the draft text that we have, at least the conclusion, and made it clear that there were no new policy terms that we are going to be recommending.

However, there were some clarifications; for example, on our third issue. Also that we would be suggesting that additional research be done into potential use of the Iris protocol, (unintelligible) number 2, and to underscore the importance of looking into other mechanisms as they relate to registrant versus the admin contact authorization for transfer and the registrant's ability to overrule a transfer.

This issue in particular is envisioned as one of the key questions for what is currently slated as (PDPB). We made it clear to council that that was a very important issue for a number of the members and that we would be underscoring the importance of looking into that in future policy work.

If you can indulge me, we'll come back to the future policy work sort of the second half of this call today. Council has asked us, this working group, since we have the experience, we've worked well together, we all seem to really understand the big picture as well our particular

interests as they relate to policy transfer policy - council has asked us to start working on a - what would become the charter for the next working group.

And Marika's already put together a draft motion that could be introduced. And if we can, in the second half of today's call, why don't we take a look at that and make sure that we're kind of in general agreement.

So the priority - please let's try to get through what we have, what's left of our - the task before us, the PDP. There are really only a couple of things left. The draft that Marika's provided for us, I hope you all have available. We - this would be the 24th of February, the one at the top of the Wiki.

Okay, and basically I'll just jump to those places where we have had text changes. And if we can go through these, please let's make sure that we capture this correctly. I think the goal today is to -- for those of you on the call -- go through it, make sure we're comfortable. We will put this cleaned-up draft back out onto the list on the Wiki as well, for those members who couldn't attend today to, you know, kind of give their final sign-off.

And then, you know, the thinking this will wrap up next Tuesday. And we can decide at the end how we want to do that. Probably a quick call is going to be best - my preference would be. But if you know you can't make it and you're in agreement with the text, an email to the list just showing your support will count as well.

Okay. With that in mind, then, if we can jump out to Page 4, this is about line 90 in the report. You can see we have some reworked language here. And - I'm sorry, Marika, help remind me - this is based on what Michael Collins has provided us? Are this - Michael's changes were...

Marika Konings: No this is the - what is in the report currently is based on the discussions we initially had on our last conference call...

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...and Michael Collins provided a revised version of this paragraph in his email.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I can read this to folks. It's similar but there are a couple of important changes so please bear with me. What Michael is now suggesting - you know, it's probably easiest just to say what is different. It comes at the end, so please just bear with me.

It's - Michael's suggesting it now reads, "The working group, recognizing that it's not specifically in the remit of this working group to make any recommendations for Who Is modification, does support further assessment of whether Iris would be a viable option for the exchange of registrant email address data between registrars and recommends an analysis of Iris' cost, time implementation, and appropriateness for IRTP purposes."

Okay, so the emphasis here, the change will be, making explicit, "We recommend an analysis of Iris' costs, implementation, appropriateness," and again, emphasis, "for IRTP purposes."

Is everybody comfortable with that? Is that better capturing of the sense of the group anyway? The language we threw in here was sort of meant to spark discussion and, Michael, thank you for tweaking it. Is everybody in agreement with the focus that Michael's putting - trying to bring to this? We're recommending an analysis of Iris for IRTP purposes.

Michael O'Connor: Michael, this is Mikey. Could you elaborate a little bit on what your intent is here?

Michael Collins: My intent was primarily to try and distance us from the Who Is - the greater Who Is to date. While I realize that Iris might be something that could work for both Who Is and for replacing this current Who Is (unintelligible) there is no current method for registrars to get registrar contact information. So I'm saying that - I was just trying to avoid opening this up as a Who Is issue. I'd rather just - I was suggesting a study strictly for this purpose. I just felt like if we open this up to a potential replacement for Who Is - all of it may realistically be the way it goes after a study is done. The study may come back and say the only way it makes sense financially is if it's done as a part of the Who Is retooling. I'm afraid that if we put that - the whole Who Is issue into this, it becomes more likely that we'll get nothing done.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mikey again. You know, I sort of raised that in the Mexico session in my comments. And the sense that I get is that there may be more support for the broader conversation than you think. Paul, James, you guys, Marika - those of you who were in Mexico City, you could see the faces in the room and I couldn't. So there may have

been body language that contradicts it. But I'm not sure that we really want to narrow it that much.

I think we might want to just leave it the way it is, because the sense that we left the group with there was when you decided to take up the broader issue of improving the operational systems that bind registries and registrars together,. This would also be the time to take up the issue that we've uncovered with, or that we've been dealing with, in terms of exchange of email address. And I actually think that the language that we've got is a better reflection of that than the proposed revision.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can maybe just point out that on the Who Is issue, there - the council adopted a motion recommending I think a list - a long list of studies that are going to be done on Who Is dealing with other issues. So from that at this point in time I don't see that there is any request or demand yet to look at Iris from a Who Is perspective.

So in my view the difference between two versions is that as it currently is, the group would basically be saying we will indeed wait until Iris is going to be considered in the context of Who Is. While in Michael Collins' version, I would interpret it as the group wants to ask council and ICANN staff to look at that now and not wait for Iris in the context of Who is. Am I interpreting that right? Michael was that your intention between the two different versions?

Michael Collins: I think that summarizes part of it, yes. The timing is really a part of it, yes.

Paul Diaz: Yes. I would also add Mikey that, you know, being able to sit in the room and see - Avri, the chair of the council is - she made clear that her view is that the whole Who Is debate - basically she wishes that the two camps on this concern, you know, would try and find a solution - come together. However, she is also recognizing that, you know, both sides have dug in pretty well.

I think what gets lost - the concern that we've raised, trying to distinguish operational issues from broader uses and all the politics that surround Who Is - while it's recognized, I don't - I personally don't believe the council's there just yet. As Marika's just noted, they've passed a resolution to conduct some further studies. There was a lot of debate about those studies, what exactly they're going to look at, what's going to cost. I mean, they're starting to argue over doing further studies.

And, you know, when it's all said and done I think the timing concerns are a good one. And for the sake of this particular working group, keeping the more narrow focus - using Michael's suggested text, in my view but I'm open to what the group says, I just think it may be a little more appropriate for us as a working group focused on transfer issues to try to keep the discussion narrowly focused. The broader text or the broader treatment that we originally had, while we may think that, I'm not sure that it's really going to resonate just yet because the broader Who Is debate is really just so bogged down.

Michael O'Connor: Well I'm fine with that. I mean, that - I think anything that moves the ball forward is great. So I'll...

Paul Diaz: And not to be a wet blanket for everybody, but please understand that of the research studies that the council's currently thinking of - Marika correct me if I'm wrong, but Iris is not on the radar screen. Iris is not part of that. Correct?

Marika Konings: Correct. As far as I know.

Paul Diaz: So, you know, we're making this recommendation but it needs to be understood by the group that, you know, at this point it's there, it's on the record, and as IRTP PDPs continue, you know, and necessarily they will take time, future groups can refer back to this and hopefully it'll get worked in. But at least it's an immediate result. It's not like the council's going to take this recommendation and say, "Okay, let's do the study right now."

Marika Konings: Paul, just to add there - I mean, the council might take this and, especially if indeed the group frames it as different from Who Is, the council might take it up and ask staff to do a study specifically looking at that. And indeed, taking it apart - you know, apart from the Who Is study that will be ongoing that will be (costed) and the feasibility will be assessed. You know, this might be treated differently and - you know, I cannot of course speak for the council but if they would recommend that, it could happen as well that that would move forward apart from the Who Is studies and that discussion.

(Mark): Yes. This is (Mark). I think the further we can distance that from Who Is, the more likely it is to have some movement.

Michael O'Connor: I'm all for that. Okay. Never mind.

Paul Diaz: So people are comfortable then with Michael Collins' changes? That's what should go into the report right now?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I'm comfortable with it.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Great. Okay. So then Marika will make those changes. And I think this text appears - if we now scroll through out to line 149, right? It's the same text again. So that will get updated. Just quickly scrolling through the report. If somebody's quicker than me, what's the next line? (Unintelligible). Down in 440 it's the same thing, same language. Line 543, same thing.

Okay. Here's something new. Line 582, this would be Page 24. Here is - thank you James. I think you provided this - the examples of our market solutions.

James Bladel: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So...

James Bladel: This is the results of a conversation with - between myself and Mike Rodenbaugh both offline and on the previous call, where he had asked for some specific examples of (unintelligible) solutions. And he didn't want to leave it just at that. So I included a few examples here that I think are sufficiently generic to encompass the numerous products and services offered by a variety of registrars.

Paul Diaz: Okay. So we see the new text, lines 582 to 584. And then a reference to them in a clause that begins on the end of line 591-592. Everybody comfortable with that?

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Okay. Looks good then. Let's see. Little text fix on 642. No problem. (Unintelligible) statements. Should be no more changes, correct?

Okay. Now, of course, the conclusion section. Once again we had the same - starting on line 988, the same change will be made based on Michael Collins' recommendation.

And I think that carries us through. Yes. Okay. So the plan then - we will plug in - Marika will plug in for us these - the updated text that we just agreed to and push out a final, hopefully final, version of this report. We'll give everybody a week to look at it. Those who could not be on the call, in particular, you know, we'll encourage them to take a look. And I think we're hopefully at the very end of the - of this process.

With that said, a question for the group is how to confirm that this is in fact our final draft? I mean, I see one of two ways of doing this. We can either have a quick call next week at which time you can, you know, come on and basically say, "Yes, I support the text." We'll take the roll and that's good. We can then pass the final report on.

Simpler for folks, the other option is to, over the course of the next week, confirm to the list that you're in fact comfortable with the text as is. I already have Kevin Erdman's note to that effect. He said that as long as we took what Michael had offered, everything else was fine by

him. So just a thought - one way or another - whatever is easiest for folks. I mean, the list might be simpler rather than having another call. But if we see in the discussions that people do want to continue debating this, you know - I think what we'll probably do is schedule a call, have it there on reserve. If, however, it's clear everybody's responding on the list, then we can just note whether or not we actually need the call. Say, sometime next Monday, so there will be time for people to understand.

Does that seem reasonable? Fair? I think at this point we all pretty much know what the text is and if you have any problems you would have spoken up by now.

James Bladel: Paul this is James.

Paul Diaz: Yes, James.

James Bladel: Perfect segue, by the way, what you just said. It's not my intention to introduce something at the eleventh hour, but I did have a thought on my way back from Mexico City and I wanted to maybe put it out before the group and see if it warrants a mention in this report. And if it doesn't then I will hold my tongue for future working groups. Is it at all appropriate to introduce a new topic at this point?

Paul Diaz: Remember, karma will come back to bite you.

James Bladel: I know.

Paul Diaz: I guess the question is, what is it that you want to introduce? Is it within our mandate as we've so far narrowly defined it or is this something that might be better served in a different forum?

James Bladel: Well it's - I think it's very contextually appropriate for our material, but whether or not it's appropriate at this time is - I leave that really to the group. But the idea that through the course of our work we've identified a number of distinctions in the operational components between thick and thin registries. And I noticed that when we're talking about the new gTLD program, there's no mention of any guidance, requirements, recommendations, or policies relative to whether new gTLDs will be thick or thin.

And I think that we may be missing an opportunity to maybe make a recommendation. Either as part of our conclusion that, you know - identify that we've uncovered some operational differences and that we - if we have a preference for new gTLDs being thick as opposed to thin, then I thought maybe that was warranting a sentence or two in this report.

But if it's too late in the game, I certainly defer for a later group.

Paul Diaz: You know, I think that's a good point James and, you know, there's absolutely - Mike Rodenbaugh's not here, but he's our liaison with council. At any point we can use him as a channel to communicate things to the council and I think that might be - you know, we should avail ourselves with that. It's not necessarily a specific issue that was part of our mandate, but it's something that is clearly - fits within the context and there's no reason why we can't ask Mike Rodenbaugh to communicate that directly to the council.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead Mikey.

Michael O'Connor: I think that I could - may be a flimsy case but I think I can make a case that this does fit within our mandate in that if you took a premise that all of the registries were thick, we would have a lot more flexibility in terms of the recommendations we made. The reason that we can't make some of the recommendations that we want to is because of the thin registries not being able to support them.

And so I think that the fact that new registries are coming online without guidance as to being thick or thin, in a way, is in our mandate. Because if they put thin registries out, that's going to make it much more difficult to do the sorts of things they're recommending to do.

So I - you know, I love James' idea. I feel the same way he does, that if it's too late in the game to bolt this on, it certainly wouldn't be the end of the world. But I think it's a really good idea and does bear on the recommendations we're making.

Man: I'd be curious as to if Barbara has any thoughts on that from a registry perspective?

Barbara Steele: Well, I think that it makes sense to perhaps address it going forward. I don't know that it's really going to change a whole lot. I mean, we did talk a fair amount in this particular report regarding thick versus thin registries and the impact that it has on the solutions that are available.

Michael O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: But it's - I think it's implied certainly. But it's not really stated anywhere...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm totally comfortable withdrawing the suggestion. I just wanted to take the, what could be our last opportunity as a group to air it out and, you know, see what folks thought about that.

(Mark): This is (Mark). I think if...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Go ahead (Mark).

(Mark): I was going to say, I just think if it's suggested and implied, you know, in the rest of the report, which looking back now I think, you know, that it probably is, I think that makes more of a case for maybe actually adding it in then leaving it out. If we all feel this way and we think that the report implies that, you know, it may be better to just come out and say it.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Michael?

Michael Collins: I'm not sure that, just from a policy perspective, we're going to benefit too much from what - whether future registries are thick or thin, as long as we still have thin registries in existence. So if - while it may help to - it may help someday to make that transition (unintelligible). To require

all new registries to be thick, I don't think from the - an initial product policy perspective it's going to be as much benefit, especially when the largest registry is thin.

James Bladel: Paul this is James.

Paul Diaz: I think maybe the best path forward would to - when, you know, either the constituency or - within our own individual constituencies or as representatives, when we comment on the second gTLD draft applicant guidebook that point to the work of this group, or take our experience from this group, and maybe use that to form a basis of some comment to that effect in that effort, as opposed to bolting it on here.

And so then I would withdraw the suggestion that this be included in our report and instead maybe urge and encourage folks who intend on commenting or working on new gTLD initiatives to just take that lesson forward.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead Mikey.

Michael O'Connor: Could we comment as a group on this specific point to the guidebook?

Olaf Nordling: This is Olaf here and you can certainly make a joint submission to the public comment forum. And I would absolutely - regardless of whether you enter it into the report or not, please do provide it to the comment forum. I - that's really - well, all right, you may proceed to the council or

not. If the council would support it to some type of joint declaration, that - time is perhaps pressing for that. But at any rate, see to that it reaches the public comment forum. I think that's really the essential outcome where we need to have it. From seeing it only as historic perspective from those of us that are working within the gTLD process.

Man: Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Well let's see. Now I'm hearing different things from the group so let's just try to collect our thoughts here. I'm looking at the section where we - in the report, begins on line 480, discussion of thick versus thin registries. And I'm not sure - unless we - how we might bolt-on such a statement given what we have. It would be a very obvious bolt-on because it's not necessarily going to flow with the text we have. Not necessarily a problem, but it's just a perspective.

And - but I guess the more important question is, all right, where do we as a group stand? Is the suggestion that maybe we, you know, using our mailing list, cobble together some language and post it to the comment period under the umbrella of this working group? Is that the best way? Is that how folks would like to move forward with this? Do we want...

Olaf Nordling: This is Olaf again. I think that's a bit difficult perhaps. I mean, I think in that case it would be a joint submission by multiple individuals rather than a submission from a working group. Well, definitely easier to put up some kind of submission by people signing onto it than trying to get last-minute agreement within the working group for a working group submission. So - well, just some thought from my side.

Paul Diaz: Okay. How would you recommend - if we try and work together as a group, Olaf, what would be most effective way to do that?

Olaf Nordling: I guess if somebody comes up with some draft language and you use the mailing list and then people subscribe or not to that kind of statement and then it's a joint submission by multiple individuals.

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right. So that's certainly one of the options for the group. Our other option is regarding - to try to bolt-on some language. You know, we'll need to figure that out, put it in, and make sure that it is there. What is the group's preference? Which way do you think - is this something that folks really want to be on record, have it part of our final report?

Michael Collins: (Unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Michael?

Michael Collins: I apologize. I didn't mean to interrupt you. I just wanted to clarify that my earlier statement was not meant as an objection to including this. But rather just a statement that I think that it may work toward a beneficial change but I don't think in and of itself new TLDs being thick or thin is going to be very significant when the bulk of registrations and transfers occur with the gTLDs that already exist, in particular dot-com.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Okay Mikey.

Michael O'Connor: Maybe we could add that to our statement - what you just said
Michael.

(Mark): Well I guess - this is (Mark). I guess that begs the question of do we
think that all registries should be thick registries?

Michael O'Connor: I certainly do. This is Mikey.

((Crosstalk))

Man: A corollary thought to that, Michael, would be do we - are we okay with
the idea that the new gTLD program could yield dozens or hundreds of
new thin registries? And how would that impact some of the working
recommendations we've done?

Michael O'Connor: I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Collins: ...repeat that I don't object to including it. I just didn't - I don't object to
including it.

Paul Diaz: Okay Michael.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Paul Diaz: Sure Mikey.

Michael O'Connor: I kind of like both. Each serves an important purpose - both having
it in the report and having a statement from us as individuals. The

individuals help with the immediate task of drafting the new gTLD stuff that Olaf needs. But I think that it's also pretty useful to have this embedded in a report that persists beyond the moment. So if I had my druthers I'd take both.

James Bladel: Paul this is James.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead James.

James Bladel: Rather than - you know, this is kind of my interruption, so why don't I take the action item to put together some candidate language for editing in the group. And then if we decide to include it either as a separate group statement or a part of this report or maybe as part of the motion when we submit this report to council or if it goes away entirely, you know, that - I really don't have strong feelings in any direction on that. But I think maybe the onus is on me to make a recommendation for where it would go before just kind of throwing this on the table. So I can (unintelligible) today.

Paul Diaz: Okay. What I'd ask of the group, however, is I think there's certainly enough of us on the call - I think we should make a decision whether we anticipate including this in the report or working on just a group recommendation that goes to the public comment on the new applicant guidebook. Only because it, you know - you need time to craft the language and then we're putting it out to the list. You know, I see the report - the final version of our report is going to take longer because people now have to wait to see what's there, comment -- you know, the back and forth.

Again, can I, you know, poll those who are on the call - do you prefer to do - include this in the report or in a separate submission as part of the comment process but not add new text to our draft?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Sure. I don't know who got in there first. Barbara, please.

Barbara Steele: Okay, thank you. I would probably prefer that we address it as part of the new gTLD comments for the application guidebook. Just because I'm of the mindset that this particular report we're very close to finalizing it and I just am concerned that if we try to add on something additional to it now, you know, we're looking at probably at least a two to three week delay by the time we get everybody on board. I think we can be just as effective by addressing it through the other venue of a comment to the guidebook.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Mikey?

Michael O'Connor: Well, I'll hang out on the other end of this argument for just a minute. I think one of the advantages of having it in the report is that then we get two-for-one. We get something that persists but then we could also simply refer the public comments process to the report, or at least to that section. And, at least from my perspective, that's worth a couple - three weeks to get that in. Because I think this is a wonderful point that James has raised and I'd really like to have it in both places.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel: I'm going to split the difference here. I think that it might be a good idea to have some reference to it in the report but I think Barbara is correct. We'd get more traction if it were included in the draft applicant guidebook and if the statement were made there it might be more contextually appropriate. So I think - this is what I come back to. I really don't have strong feelings on where it goes. I just wanted to kind of raise the point.

But I think commenting as a group and referring to our report and then maybe, so we don't lose folks in the other three issues - or the other two issues contained within this report, we could just maybe highlight those areas where thick versus thin is discussed. Draw a recommendation or an advisory from that and then go forward from there in the draft applicant guidebook comments.

Michael O'Connor: Splitting the difference as well - what if we added that comment as an appendix for this report? So that it's not part of the body of the report but we reference it.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Let's hold that thought for a second Mikey. (Mark) or Michael what are your thoughts?

(Mark): I'm kind of split because I think it definitely does push the report back. But at the same time I kind of wish that we had recognized this earlier because it does seem to me to be important and it does seem to be a critical lynchpin that - for a lot of things that we discussed it's really hard to implement them with the thin registry model. And so while I don't want to set the report back, I don't want to give short thrift to something that potentially is important.

And I don't know that I agree that it might be better handled in a gTLD applicant guidebook because I think this issue does relate pretty directly to a lot of what we discussed and it's just unfortunate that we didn't kind of hit on this earlier.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Michael?

Michael Collins: I think that the - I think it would be fine to (unintelligible) said and include this if everyone else does.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Then let's do that. I guess the question becomes, you now - we've never - there's never been an arbitrary deadline. There's no line in the sand that they're expecting. You know, this group has moved along at a good pace and, you know, if we've identified something that the group feels is important, let's take the time, do it right. I guess the question for us now is do we - you know, do we feel that expressing these thoughts in the body of the text or in appendix - which would make more sense? Perhaps that will be easier to judge when we have some text available.

But I guess for all of us as we're waiting for that, think about where this will have - where it will be most appropriate or make the most impact. It might require some tweaking of the language if it appears in the body of the text, you know, and we'll make those changes as necessary. Or, you know, it can be a standalone that appears in a new appendix that we'll attach at the end.

So this will come back to you then, James. If you can work on - get your thoughts on some initial text to get a discussion going, post it up

to the list, and then we can - then we'll make this our first order of business on next Tuesday's call. And at this point, obviously, we will need a call next Tuesday.

James Bladel: Yes, and in the interest of keeping this moving I'll commit to having that done by this time tomorrow morning.

Paul Diaz: Sure. In the next day or two, will be great. That should be enough time.

All right then. So, you know, everybody will be looking for that and please mark your calendars and we'll do this again next week. And what I'll do is - Marika if we can impose on you guys again. The rest of the world, I should say, but since the states has jumped ahead, I guess it's easiest for all of the US-based people to do it at the time you used to, correct?

In which case, you know, Marika if you can arrange to have the facility available and if you all can do this at 1400 UTC so that hopefully it's straight-forward. We'll reach out to Mike Rodenbaugh as well, being on the West Coast. I think if we - actually he may be happier with the 1500 UTC because it gains him an extra hour. But just for consistency sake, why don't we try to do it at the same time like we did today.

One last thing before we go - and we can address this in more detail later since we're not ready to recommend the final report. But Marika also developed for us a draft motion. I know at the start of the call in Mexico City council has asked this group to take a first whack at a motion for - okay, wait a minute, I'm getting ahead of myself. There are two parts here.

Marika's drafted a motion that the council will use to take the report and, depending on the terms - the recommendations or the advisories that we're including - although we're not looking for or recommending any wholesale changes to the existing policy, we do have some things - this whole Iris issue needs to be a part of that. You know, the clarification that bulk transfer can apply to a particular TLD - all the names in a particular TLD, not necessarily the entire base under management.

So these things - that draft, you know, Marika posted out on the list and it's on the Wiki as well. At this point Marika do you feel it might be better to wait before we even take this up, plug in the new language that we had agreed to about Iris, and then we can perhaps hit this as well next Tuesday?

Marika Konings: Yes, I think that's fine. Especially as we are discussing the other issue on the thick versus thin (unintelligible) that need to be incorporated here and then in the end, depending on the agreement we can reach on the list.

Paul Diaz: Okay, yes. As soon as I started talking, I was like - it probably makes more sense to - let's update this. So also look for that everyone - this motion. And we'll pick that up on Tuesday.

Also in the back of your mind, if you please start thinking about or take a look at - council also asked us to start thinking about the (PDPB) (unintelligible) Number 2 - what have you. We have on the Wiki the original drafting team that clumped the issues together. And if folks would take a look at what was proposed as (PDPB) undoing by our (TP) transfers, one of the issues that we are highlighting in our report

about looking at additional provisions, these are the registrar overruling admin contacts and transfers. That's included. That was Issue Number 7. Council made it clear, though, that they are open and amendable and, in fact, were kind of encouraging. Take a look at all the remaining PDP issues and if we feel as a group that some of them could be incorporated into the second effort, that we can make those recommendations.

While this group has moved a long at a good pace, just looking at the number of issues that are out there, this overall process could take another 18 months or perhaps more. So council asked us to start thinking about it and, you know, would like to discuss it on the call. And then if there is some general agreement we might even take a stab at beginning to flesh out what the next working group's charter might look like.

But again, don't want to get ahead of ourselves. That's sort of the little bit further out task. For next Tuesday, though -- and we will send out a reminder of course with the call-in number and all the rest -- we will address the text that James is going to come up with, figure out where to put it into our report. We'll also take a look at the draft motion that Marika's provided - preparing for council. And if time permits then we can start talking about the future issues.

Anything else for folks while we're still on the call? Questions or concerns? Okay, with that, I thank you all very much for your time. Good discussion. And please look for these - this text will be coming out on the list and we will hit it again next Tuesday.

Michael O'Connor: Thanks Paul. Great call.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Have a good week. We'll talk to you soon.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Bye-bye now.

END