

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 25 August 2009 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 25 August 2009 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-b-20090825.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon - RC
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Miriam Trudell - IPC
Barbara Steele - RY
James Bladel - RC
Berry Cobb - CBUC
Anil George - IPC
Paul Diaz - RC
Tim Ruiz - RC
Eric Brown - RY
Michael Collins - Individual
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Mick O'Connor - CBUC
Graham Chynoweth - RC

Staff:

Olof Nordling
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, Miriam Trudell, Barbara Steele, James Bladel, Barry Cobb, Anil George, Paul Diaz, Tim Ruiz, Eric Brown, Michael Collins. And from staff we have (Olof Nordling), Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, thank you. Well, I hope everyone has...

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry.

Tim Ruiz: Oh, go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry to interrupt. If I may just remind everyone to please state their names when they speak, this is for transcription purposes. Thank you.

Tim Ruiz: Thank you for the reminder. This is Tim Ruiz. So hopefully everyone's had a chance to take a look at the agenda. The one thing I did want to mention or just to check on is the statement of interests.

I believe everyone that was mentioned on the call has submitted a statement of interest. But perhaps I don't know if Marika could verify that we've received all the statements of interest. Is there anyone that has joined the group, whether they're on the call or not, who still owes us a statement of interest?

Eric Brown: This is Eric Brown, I have not submitted yet. I'll submit it this morning.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. So please...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I know that there is one other person that hasn't submitted yet, but has already received a reminder. So we'll follow-up on that. But I think...

Tim Ruiz: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...we'll get -- as soon as we have all of these I think Glen will put them together on a site so everyone will have the link as well to that on the Wiki.

Michael Collins: This is Michael Collins, I'll update mine and resubmit it.

Tim Ruiz: Okay great. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks Tim. This is Glen. Yes, I will get them all up as soon as possible, probably during this week if everybody sends theirs in.

Tim Ruiz: All right. Thank you Glen.

Gisella Gruber-White: And (Chris Chucklow) has joined the call, thank you.

Chris Chaplow: Hello everybody.

Tim Ruiz: Let's see, who was that again?

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow: from the business constituency.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, thank you (Chris). The first item on the agenda is to review the charter and working group processes. So if you - I believe it's -- there we go. It should be on the Adobe Connect or on the Wiki. So if you scroll down into the (submit) IRTP Part B working group charter, the - this was the motion that was put before the GNSO Council to approve the charter.

And under the -- this passed the resolved the charter begins. And actually there's five questions or areas of interest that the group has been tasked with reviewing, looking at possible policy or perhaps best practice or whatever necessary in order to resolve. So we'll just look at those briefly.

The first one is in regards a process for urgent return or resolution of a domain name. And it refers to two reports; the SSAC Hijack Report which there's a link to that. And then also a statement from Tim Cole to (boost talk) in regards to a specific hijacking case and the circumstances surrounding that.

The second issue is whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed especially with regard to disputes between a registrant and an admin contact. I think part of the issue is that policy has cleared that a registrant can overrule the administrative contract, but how that's implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar.

So this is a little different from the first issue where a domain is actually hijacked. This is a case where for example was probably the admin contact was approved to transfer and the registrant disputes that it should have occurred. So dealing with situations like that.

The third issue is whether special provisions are needed for a change of registrant when it occurs near the time of registrar or the change of registrar because the policy doesn't currently with that particular situation. And it's been noted that that often figures in hijacking cases. So what can happen is the actual registrant of record changes and then directly after that a transfer request is received to move it to another registrar.

And because of the issue that this often occurs just before hijacking, various registrars have implemented their own policies in order to deal with that. And I think GoDaddy has been mentioned as a prominent example where once if a registrant - if a domain names changes registrant, there's usually a 60-day hold that prevents transfer until that time period has passed. So is that, you know, is that appropriate? If not, what other appropriate measures, you know, might be needed to try to solve that problem, if any?

The fourth issue, whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of a registrar lock status. And this has various elements to it, for example many of the lock provisions or the lock capabilities provided by our registry are visible within the WHOIS. That's not necessarily true perhaps with some of the lock mechanisms that registrars themselves might use.

And in either case, you know, give the registrants ability to unlock a name in either case, you know, sufficiently being dealt with. Do they have enough information in order to remove the lock? And what standards or best practices might need to be implemented to clarify that issue for registrants and make sure that they still have the portability of their domain names?

The last issue is whether and if so how best to clarify (nile reason) Number 7 which is that a domain name was already in-lock status provided that the registrar provides readily acceptable and reasonable means to the registered name holder to remove the lock status.

So this is related to the fourth issue, the one just before it. Again, since the registrar could deny a transfer if it was in lock status, you know, is there - are registrars providing accessible and reasonable means for registrants to unlock a name? And does further clarification about what accessible and reasonable is, does that need to be defined further within the policy?

So those are the issues. And then just finally in order to get to resolution, the part of the council's motion, their charter, is that further information from ICANN compliance staff should be gathered to understand the elements of the existing policy that are applicable to these five issues. And also the working group should work with compliance staff as it develops its policies or recommendations or best practices to be sure that they're clear and concise and can be enforced.

So those are the basic elements of the charter. And I'll just kind of stop there and just ask the group if there's any questions or discussion on any of those issues or any clarification needed.

Okay, so the working group, just moving on to working group processes, we're not go into those details, they're linked to on the Wiki. So I would just encourage to, you know, take some time and look at how the working group will function. Just briefly we'll be working on a consensus basis and the chair

will actually be responsible for determining consensus in each position. And it mentions four different consensus quantifiers I guess.

(One of) the unanimous consensus position, which would be just everyone is in agreement. A (rough) consensus, which means that there may be a small minority that agrees but most - or disagrees, but most agree. Strong support but significant opposition. And then the fourth would be minority viewpoints. And I think in every situation the processes call for the opportunity for anyone with a minority viewpoint to be able to express that and have it part of the -- in the report that the group produces.

So look at those a little bit further and I guess if there's any questions right now about the processes, we could take those and try to resolve those.

Okay, so moving on then to the Issues Report. Again, I would prefer that we not go deeply into the Issues Report. Again, it's linked to on the Wiki. And if you haven't already -- I would hope that everyone here has taken a look at the Issues Report and if you haven't already, I would encourage that before the next call so that you're familiar with the background and how we got to where we are today.

And also the other thing I would encourage you to review if you were -- even if you were involved in the brainstorming session in Sydney, the transcript and a recording of that session is both available and they're linked to on the Wiki as well. So those are two - that's another thing I would strongly encourage everyone in the group to review if you haven't before the next call.

How many - any questions or comments right now in regards to the Issues Report? All right. Well we'll go on to the election of the working group chair then.

Beyond the registrar and liaison assigned by the GNSO Council to the group and serving as the interim chair until we select a chair. So this - so the next

discussion is basically, you know, how are we going to elect that working group chair.

And so I'll open that up to the group, and would -- I guess at this point if there's any interest from anyone on the group in serving as chair, I would like to know that as well and perhaps we could put that out there. So any takers on that?

Paul Diaz: Tim.

Marika Konings: Tim there's some hands up in Adobe Connect, (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Did I miss any hands on previous issues?

Marika Konings: No, I don't think so.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. So Paul go ahead and then James.

Paul Diaz: Hey, Tim, it's Paul Diaz. I just wanted to step up here. I was the chair of the IRTF Part A working group and unfortunately I won't be in a position to chair this time although I intend to actively be involved. In the interim however I have spoken with some colleagues and one has graciously offered to put his hat in the ring. So I would like to nominate (Mikaylee) as chair for this working group, the Part B working group and am seeking a second.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. Did we have a second for (Mikaylee) or any other nominations?

James Bladel: This is James and I would like to second (Mikaylee).

Tim Ruiz: All right, any other nominations at this point or discussions or discussion of (Mikaylee)? Well, I do want to put out there that if, you know, please speak up

if you feel that there's a, you know, that there may be interest, but, you know, you're not able to respond particularly on this call, we could leave that out there yet for another -- for one more call before resolving the issue. But if not, we could resolve that today. Any other -- Marika you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes, no, I just wanted to -- this is Marika -- point out to the group something that has been discussed and considered in other working groups is the appointment of a vice chair or a co-chair to share workload or in those cases where the chair is not available, he or she might delegate the job to someone who wants to volunteer.

I mean, that's something for the group to consider, this can be done as well at an at-home basis if the group - if the chair is not available for some reason, just something for the group to consider. And again, they don't necessarily need to take a decision on that now, that might be as well done in the next meeting or so.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. I think that's a good idea. Anyone else?

Michele Neylon: Do I need to say anything Tim?

Tim Ruiz: That was next Michele, is just your response if this is - if you accept the nomination...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I have no problem with that and in some respects it probably might work out better that it was us as we -- while we are in accredited registrar, we're very small in the grand scheme of things, so if anybody has any contentious issues regarding transfers, we're less likely to have a vested interest.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. Thanks Michele. We just wanted to mention too that a, you know, the - at least, as I see it, the chair of a working group like this, you know, is a

neutral facilitator. However, that doesn't mean to say that, you know, in situations where, you know, they have a particular viewpoint that that can't be shared, you know, as long as that's - it's made clear that that's being shared as more as participant and not as chair. That sometimes can be a fine line, but I think other chairs have dealt with it rather well. It hasn't been a problem.

So serving as chair does not necessarily mean that your viewpoints or opinions can't be expressed and, you know, take part in the group work that way.

Michele Neylon: Michele here again Tim, just so -- well, I think you know this anyway, the problem with me and my opinion is trying to stop me sharing it.

Man: There's no real risk there.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon:): I'm just being reasonable because I think as most people probably know, some of the larger registrars are more likely to be targeted or possibly attacked by various third parties with relation to internal policies, whereas a smaller registrar such as ourselves, we haven't had a chance to upset too many people just yet.

Tim Ruiz: All right so Marika maybe I'll just ask, you know, if (process issue here), can we just, you know, call for any objections and if none, determine that Michele has been selected as the chair of the working group, does that sound reasonable?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think there's an official procedure and I think indeed that's how it's been done in the past in most working groups, so I don't see a problem with that approach.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, thank you. So then any -- are there any objections to Michele serving as chair of the group? All right. Hearing none, then congratulations Michele-- I think congratulations we'll see -- but as being selected as the chair of the group.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: Go ahead Michele

Michele Neylon: Okay, so as I'm now the chair of the group until such time as you all decide that you hate me and choose somebody else to replace me, I'll just take over from Tim. Thank you Tim for your help with this so far. And just so you're aware, I -- this is the first time I've chaired an ICANN working group, so hopefully I won't make a total (hane) of this and if I do, I'm sure you'll all be wonderfully understanding and all that -- says he with crossed fingers.

Okay. Where's the actual. I'm looking for the agenda. We have that in this group. And Marika what -- you put up a vote on the Adobe Connect in there with regard to meeting frequency.

Marika Konings: Yes, correct. It's a question for this group whether you would like to meet every week or once every two weeks. The previous IRTP working group met on a weekly basis, but as there are currently a lot of other working groups on as well, there has been some -- some groups have decided to -- or opted for meetings every two weeks.

I see so far nine people have expressed their opinion. I don't see anyone yet opting for the every week option. I don't know if there's anyone on the call that's not in Adobe Connect that would like to express their opinion on this question.

Chris Chaplow: Chris speaking, I can't get into Adobe Connect so I'll just say, I'm not usually opinionated either way. I know in the communications team we started off every week for a few weeks and then dropped down to every two weeks and it was quite good to get us going. Thanks.

Tim Ruiz: James has his hand up Michele

Michele Neylon: Oh, sorry. Yes, James go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi this is James. Just wanted to point out that there is another working group that also meets on Tuesdays in the afternoon for my time but several hours after this one UTC. So if that one is meeting currently weekly I believe but we're having this week off, is that correct?

Michele Neylon: James this would be the working group I'm involved with as well I presume.

James Bladel: Yes it is. And so I wanted to point out that there are some other working groups that we probably want to steer around if it's a weekly or biweekly event.

And then a second question or item up for discussion would be the duration of the call. I've seen that some working groups for example if they have a weekly call they drop down to an hour duration and then some biweekly calls are a little bit longer. So I just wanted to point out that there's options there as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody -- who else -- anybody else got their hand up?

Marika Konings: Yes, Marika here. If I can just add to that, I think the group should know as well that of course at any point in time they can come back to the decision and indeed decide -- if they decide now to meet on a biweekly basis and at some point see that not enough progress is being made, you know, there's no problem switching back to weekly schedule or the other way around.

So the group could decide to try out a certain approach going forward but at a certain point in time revisit that decision if they feel that's required to make

Michele Neylon: Okay. So far we've got four people with no preference and seven saying every two weeks. So I suppose we could work (perceive) on the basis that we're looking at every two weeks initially and bearing in mind as James mentioned that there are other working groups. So maybe we might just be able to set up a Doodle or one of those things so we can just see which times and days work best for everybody.

Marika Konings: If I can just add something to that because I think in the current state that ICANN is in we have working groups and meetings basically every day of the week. So as a team just at least the time of the day and the day that works for most now just want to ask do most people that this is a really bad time and bad day? Because going into the Doodle process doesn't necessarily make things easier to find a better time or day.

Michele Neylon: Good point. I mean for me it works fine. I don't know about anybody else. Anybody else have any comments on the time of the day or the day of the week?

James Bladel: This is James.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim, yes.

James Bladel: I just wanted to point out that this was the incumbent time slot for those that were on the previous IRTP group, IRTP A, and I see that most of those folks are also on this group although we've picked up quite a few others as well. So I think that, you know, whether that's just a question of inertia or old habits or whether it makes sense to keep all of the IRTP groups in some sort of a uniform time slot, that's something for the group to decide.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Tim Ruiz.

Tim Ruiz: I'm lowering my hand now.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Fair enough.

Marika Konings: And again just to add there, you know, if any point in time the group feels they need to revisit the time and the day of the meeting, that's no problem. I just want to caution because we have currently so many groups going on and it's a real challenge to every time -- especially if a group doesn't settle on a set time and day, it's really complicated to find a time and day that works for most.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so can we proceed on the basis unless we get objections that we'll continue using this time slot then? Has anybody got any strong objections to this time slot? Okay, I'll take that deathly silence to mean no. Either that or else nobody can -- everybody's afraid of me or nobody's phones are working.

Just as a word of warning my network people are telling me that there's some weird issue with our network in our office. So if I vanish off the call it's not because I hate you all, it's because technology has worked against me.

Okay, moving on. Okay, so the questions that we've been asked to look at. Does anybody have any issues with any of those questions or anything that people don't understand? Do people need any clarification of the issues at this juncture?

Chris speaking. Yes, I have to hold my hand up to needing sort of a good bit of clarification. I don't think there's one, you know, specific issue that we can just focus on right now. It might be -- if there's somebody that can mentor me a little bit that might help so that I can have either a call or emails on some issues later during the week before the next call.

Michele Neylon: Which time zone are -- by the sound of your accent you sound like you're across the water from me but you could be on the other side of the globe for all I know. (Chris) which time zone are you in?

I'm in European time.

Michele Neylon: Right.

I don't know which water you are talking about.

Michele Neylon: Fair enough. I'm in Ireland. Marika has her hand -- wishes to say something.

Marika Konings: Yes, no I just wanted to point out and especially for those who are new to these issues and you know, some of these issues might require some technical expertise or more explanation.

What we've done in the previous IRTP working group is for each of the issues identify whether there were any experts, you know, within the different companies or groups that are participating on this call that might be of assistance in briefing the group on, you know, particularities around a certain issue or the technical ways and things work.

So maybe that's something as well for the group to consider for each of these issues whether they're specific experts or people they would like to tap on to provide a little briefing or explanation of the specific issue and why it is an issue or what the problems are.

And that might help as well if the group starts getting into discussions of potential solutions to have some feedback on whether certain things are feasible or actually can be implemented down the road. So that's something to consider going forward.

Michele Neylon: Mikey you have your hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I just wanted to say that I've been I think on just about all of these along with Tim and I'd be happy to mentor anybody, including you. So if you want that as a resource, I have lots of spare time. Happy to help wherever I can.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. Anybody else have any other comments?

Anil George: Hi. This is Anil George. I'm not on Adobe I just wanted to -- I know that there are two Mike's. I was just wondering which I Mike just offered mentoring.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. That's why I call myself that at ICANN because we seem to have an overpopulation of Mikes. So it's Mikey O'Connor that's offering.

Anil George: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: So you've got a Mikey, a (Mikaylee) and (Michael) in the same group so that's going to be great.

Anil George: Yes, we really need a Mike. We usually have at least two or three Mikes.

Michele Neylon: There is a Mike but he's not on the call as far as I -- he hasn't made it onto the call from what I can see.

Anil George: Okay. So we do have a full complement.

Michele Neylon: We do. We do. We have the full complement. We have a Mike Rodenbaugh who hasn't appeared on the call. He's on the list though.

Anil George: Perfect.

Michele Neylon: Marika what is the exact timeline on this?

Marika Konings: For -- you mean to get to the end result?

Michele Neylon: Well no, I mean this is ICANN we're talking about here. I mean to get -- what's the next -- to probably say for example looking for feedback from other constituencies and possibly public comment. Is there a timeline on those?

Marika Konings: Well the milestones that have been put in the charter, you can see (so up there) are basically just the initial report, first common period and the preliminary final report. There are some specific deadlines that are in the ICANN bylaws but, you know, to be honest they've been proving very difficult to adhere to because most of them are just too short.

So, you know, what I could recommend to this group looking at the timeline that's there, that's basically based on experience with previous working groups. It's look at a timeline and probably divide that up and seeing where -- at which stages they would like to receive for example the constituency statements in order to incorporate that into the report and reflect on those.

So in one of the other working groups we spoke to several of the constituency reps and they indicated that a 30-day timeframe should be sufficient for them to provide input but that's something to take into account looking at that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Right. Okay, so let's -- has anybody on the call read the SSAC report yet? Or can I presume that everybody has read it?

Tim Ruiz: Yes this is Tim, (Mikaylee). Yes, I have read the one that is linked to on the page. I want to mention though that -- and I don't believe it's been posted yet, but that the SSAC has completed another study that -- it's more related to this in the sense that it's about securing domain names and authenticating, you know, the actual registrants, that type of thing. That I haven't read completely yet but I know that's going to be due out from the SSAC if not already, very soon.

Michele Neylon: It's already...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: And I think there'll be -- it already is, okay. And I think there's some information there that may be applicable as well to this group and would encourage that you read perhaps even link to on the Wiki.

Michele Neylon: Yes, that would be a good idea. I think that was published quietly by the SSAC about a week ago. If for those of you who haven't looked at it, it goes into a variety of different things including the attacks on the ICANN domains and a few other ones, quite a few high profile things that they talk about.

So what is the next thing for us to do here? I suppose it's to look at -- can we identify...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry.

Marika Konings: There might be an idea or two inside (unintelligible) from the SSAC and ICANN staff to give an update to the group on those issues and allow us to offer some questions. Maybe that's something for the next call if the group feels that might be helpful.

Michele Neylon: Okay, very good. Has anybody got any other input?

Paul Diaz: (Mikaylee) it's Paul.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Hi Paul.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul Diaz and Marika if you would please that new SSAC report that both Tim and (Mikaylee) were referencing, SSAC 040, we should add that to the Wiki so that's centralized for everybody and I do recommend that

everybody skim over that. It will provide useful background for a number of the discussions we'll have as part of this working group.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll get that posted and I'll send as well a note to the (unintelligible) and I'll also add that (unintelligible) or the other report too.

Paul Diaz: Yes, and along those lines definitely concur that we should invite (Dave Pasotell) because he was the lead author on at least two of the three reports we're talking about from SSAC.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So if we -- so Marika could you see when would he be available to take those questions and give us an update?

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll see if he's available for the next call then in two weeks.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. Right. The other thing I suppose is just in terms -- as a lot of this stuff has to do with the ICANN policies and I'm not -- I'm personally not familiar with everybody who's in this group. I know there are several people from the registrar constituency who would be familiar with things and I know that some of the others would be.

Has everybody on this call read the current policies on transfers and the -- what's it described as Marika? The Consensus Policies of Inter-Registrar Transfers?

Marika Konings: Yes I think. I think it has a longer title even than that but I think you're correct.

Tim Ruiz: (Mikaylee) this is Tim.

Michele Neylon: Hi Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I think that's -- that's probably not -- I'm not sure if that's linked to on the Wiki or not. That might be good as well as I believe there was at least one

advisor, there might two, in regards to the policy that would be good for everyone to review as well because the advisory actually at least the one I'm thinking of has direct application to at least one of the points that we'll talking about in regards to, you know, changes to WHOIS data not preventing the transfer and the conditions surrounding that.

So that may be good for everyone to review and perhaps any questions about the policy or any questions to registrars about how they might view it or interpret parts of it, you know, might be a good topic for discussion as well.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Michele Neylon: Hi Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I think maybe if (Olof)'s on the call there are also some quite a bit older documents that we might want to post out to the Wiki., some of the very initial Issues Reports and so on. I'm not sure whether the one that's up is a summary of those or whether we should get some of the original documents up there too. It would be useful just to have those historical pieces up.

Michele Neylon: I mean you can also post them to the main list as well rather than waiting for staff to post them to Wikis and things. It might help if you know the document specifically yourself to sort of just move this forward a little bit. Do you have any documents in mind Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Part of the reason that I'm pointing at (Olof) is because there are a boatload of them and...

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...it gets a little bit confusing as to which one to post.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I'm just going to comment on a specific point. You know, in drafting the Issuers Report I try to go back through all those documents but it is quite a challenge and quite confusing because there has been some overlap and there's also some delay in certain documents. So I would caution a bit going back too far because you really need the context into which group developed which document and for what purpose it was developed.

And I try to group all the relevant information related to those previous documents in the Issues Report. And, you know, Mikey if you find any part that you think are relevant for this discussion and should be included here, I would rather recommend to take them out and provide a link because I think some of these documents it might not be clear to some what the purpose was or what the, you know, the discussions around the document were.

Mikey O'Connor: That works fine for me as long as you've gone (unintelligible) Marika I haven't read your latest one. So I'll bow to that because it is really confusing. Some of those documents go way back.

Tim Ruiz: Yes so this is Tim. I'll just echo that. I think that if you review the Issues Report and look at the reference documents there I think it's going to cover most of what's probably relevant to this group in my opinion.

Michele Neylon: The other thing as well guys is I mean we don't want to be trying to look at too many documents going back too far (unintelligible), otherwise we're never going to finish. We'll never get anywhere.

The most current SSAC advisory, the one that myself and Tim have mentioned a couple of times, I think it also includes references to a lot of the older documents that other people have mentioned. There's no point in looking at something that happened ten years ago because we'd hope that everything has moved on a little bit since then. So just try to keep it a little bit more -- keep it kind of focused.

((Crosstalk))

Anil George: This is Anil George. I just had a question. I was wondering since I'm new to the group and I'm getting to know you guys, is there a place on the Wiki where we have access to information or the statement of interest about all of the members of the working group to (unintelligible), you know, your -- everyone's background?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Those will be posted shortly as soon as we receive most of the statements of interest.

Anil George: Okay, thank you.

Michele Neylon: Just answering that for me. If you Google me, you'll find most things about me anyway. So I don't have anything to hide. But I see a couple of people with their hands up. James.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks (Mikaylee) and I would echo that you have nothing to hide as a follower of you on various social networking sites. But getting back to the collection of different sources of information and not trying to overload that process but as a component of the existing IRTP policy, there is a separate document that describes the transfer dispute resolution policy as it exists currently and (since then) I think it's very germane to the first and second questions that are outlined in our charter.

So I'd like to point that out as possibly a recommended reading and as well as if we can get any usage statistics on that from staff or from the registry reps that are on the call, I just wanted to point out that that was also a good resource.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Just one thing as I'm looking at the Wiki at the moment, Marika is that the full most current list of the members of the working group at present?

Marika Konings: Yes, it should be.

Michele Neylon: It seems to be -- I don't see Michael Collins on there. Oh, he is there. Sorry Michael you are there. What's RYC?

Marika Konings: Registry constituency.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Sorry because all the acronyms at ICANN would drive most people to drink.

Marika Konings: I'll put a footnote there explaining all of these.

(Michele Neylon: Yes, I think for a couple of you newer to the process it's confusing. For those of us who are in the process all the time, it can get confusing and it's hard to translate. CBUC is commercial, isn't it?

(Marika Konings): Yes.

Michele Neylon:): And NCUC is non-commercial. It's like my head is hurting. What is -- IPC is intellectual property.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Right. Any other comments at this time? Anybody? No? Quiet. Okay. Right. Since we're (unintelligible). Okay, moving forward with the chart of questions then. What would -- Marika what would you suggest is our next course of action?

Marika Konings: In the previous group I think they just decided to go from, you know, they had these well three issues just start at the top and move through each of these and try to address them one by one. I mean the group here might consider as the last two are very closely related to take those two together.

But I guess again that is for the group to decide if they feel there should be one issue that requires more time or there's more time to do it now because there's some other initiatives going on that, you know, are reviewing similar questions or -- but again otherwise just starting at A might be a proposed approach.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody have any problems with us moving from A to B -- I'm sorry A to E rather than trying to nit-pick about which one we start looking at first? Tim has his hand up again. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I think that's a reasonable approach just looking at the issues and how information from one might flow or effect another. So I think that's actually laid out there pretty well that way. And possibly when we get to D and E I think the information -- what's being asked there in D, you know, would actually effect E but I think together those are probably, you know, overall a single issue and I think that would work well.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I am sort of dialing back in to this one after kind of a long hiatus and realized that there's a fair amount of overlap between this and the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery working group. Have others thought about this and have an idea of whether we should coordinate?

Michele Neylon: I think several of us are on both groups. I know I'm on the post expiry and I know that both Tim and James are.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I am too.

Michele Neylon: I'm not too sure if anybody else is who's on this call. Paul are you on the post expiry as well?

Paul Diaz: Yes I am (Mikaylee).

Michele Neylon: Anybody else? Michael you on this?

Michael Collins: No, no I'm not. This is Michael.

Tim Ruiz: I think Mike Rodenbaugh may -- I'm sorry this is Tim. I think Mike Rodenbaugh may also be participating in both. And I think -- I guess I'm not convinced there's as much overlap as it might appear but I've been given all the number of cross members if that should occur I think we're going to be able to identify it pretty quickly and be able to deal with it.

Michele Neylon: I would tend to agree with Tim. I think there is definitely -- I'm not too sure whether the overlap is huge or not, but they definitely effect -- impact each other. James you had your hand up there for a second.

James Bladel: Yes, just to echo what Tim was saying, I think that there may not be as much overlap as would initially appear. But since we have a good cross- (pollenization) of both groups, you know, we should just be mindful of it and address it when it's -- if and when it arises.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to add to that I'm as well the staff person on the other group so hopefully I'll be able as well to identify if there are any issues that this group should have a look at that the other group is discussing. So we'll hopefully have plenty of eyes and ears to cover that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Are there any problems with any of the -- I mean one of the problems with the other working group that we ran into was actually just dealing with basic terminology.

And has anybody -- is there any part of the terminology that we're using in the documents that we've been presented with so far, are any of those terms confusing for anybody at present? Are there any terms that people are not comfortable with or any terms that people are unclear about? Or can we just work away with the terminology we have? James has his hand up again.

James Bladel: This is James.

Michele Neylon: Yes, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, I just wanted to point out, it's not something I'm personally unclear about but I just wanted to highlight an area where perhaps a clarification of terminology could be used and that's in Charter Question C when it discusses change of registrant.

And I wanted to point out that in my dealings with various country codes this is often called a trade where a registration changes registrants but does not cross a registrar boundary. So I just wanted to maybe point out that that might be one concept that could use some definitional work to distinguish it from other types of inter-registrar transfers.

And I'd be willing to put some thoughts on the mailing list for folks to (unintelligible) and we can maybe flesh out a better definition.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So you think -- if we were to replace the phrase "change of registrant" then maybe like a "trade" would be a term that you might be more comfortable with?

James Bladel: Well I'm not advocating that we replace it I just want to make sure that we are highlighting the difference between that and a transfer across registrars and that we put a little bit of a spotlight on that. Whether we have multiple definitions to it, that's fine but I want to make sure for the purposes of that

question and going forward through all five questions, I want to make sure that there's no confusion over that concept.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have anything to add about the terminology? (Unintelligible) Adobe Connect. Nobody's got their hands up.

So, okay, James if you could when you have a moment post some thoughts on that to the list it would be helpful. So if we were to work then on the basis that we will look first of all at A and then when we've had a look at A we will move to B then to C, D and E and possibly realizing that there might be some overlap between some of them.

Anybody have any problems with that? I take that silence as a resound (unintelligible). Okay. Marika you okay with us?

Marika Konings: Yes, yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Right. Now what else is on this agenda? Looking at this agenda you've given back to us. Okay, so the Seoul meeting schedule...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Can we just go one back (Mikaylee) first?

Michele Neylon: Oh, yes, sorry. Yes, I was looking at that big chunk of text in the middle. What exactly is that?

Marika Konings: This is basically, there's a requirement in the ICANN bylaws that there should be a public notification of the initiation of a policy development process, so a public comment period.

So this is an opportunity for the group apart from just telling the world that this policy development process has started to ask some specific questions if they

would like the public at large to respond to and could just be posting the five charter questions or the group could consider as well adding some further details if they feel there are certain issues they would like public input on.

So I'm happy to put a first draft of such a notification together and put it on the mailing list and maybe the group can then review and discuss that on the next call. That would be a suggestion.

Michele Neylon: I -- just before you do this I would humbly suggest that you do as similar to my previous request with regard to the other working group that, you know, we include clear links to definitions of the terminology that people can agree on because the other problem I personally see is a lot of these requests for comments use language that normal people can't really understand. Tim has his hand up again.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, sorry (Mikaylee), actually I had a comment in regards to the previous point so I don't want to confuse things here so I can wait if...

Michele Neylon: No, no go ahead because I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...talking about as well so go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. Yes, just, you know, as I was looking at A and B in the charter it occurs to me that there could be some potential need to discuss not so much a definition for those two situations but more, you know, what types of situation falls into which area and it may be to some extent they'll overlap a little bit.

But, you know, the difference between urgent and return resolution of the domain name for some reason perhaps hijacking versus undoing of inappropriate transfer. You know, so what would we consider an inappropriate transfer? Would we want to restrict that just to when the

registrant disputes the approval of the admin contact? Were there other situations? And you know, how might the urgent return resolution affect that or come into play there?

So I think there's some overlap there. I just wanted to point that out that dealing with those completely separately will either require some discussion about where we draw the line there between those two situations or perhaps looking at them maybe a little bit in tandem.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else got their hand up? Okay, I presume that you just have to take yours down yet Tim. Okay, so...

Marika Konings: (Mikaylee) can I add something to Point 6?

Michele Neylon: Sure. Please. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's something I should have added there and something as well that we've done in the other group is the development of a template for constituencies. And there again, you know, constituencies (unintelligible) principle, you know, submit the information as they'd like but other groups have opted to provide them with a template of questions. Sometimes just using the charter questions or sometimes breaking those down and adding more specific questions.

So again I would like to propose that I prepare a first draft just based on the charter questions so that people can then think about if there are any other questions they would like to add and we can hopefully review and discuss that on the next call if you all agree.

Michele Neylon: Okay. We've covered pretty much everything. The last item seems to be with relation to Seoul.

Marika Konings: (Mikaylee) if I can add something to that.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Marika Konings: I've just put up a little poll in the Adobe Connect. It's related to we're already in the process of scheduling for the Seoul meeting and as most of you know there's a lot of stuff going on and the schedule fills up very quickly, so this is just to get an idea of whether this group would like to have a public meeting there.

And I put up a little poll to see whether people are attending and whether they would like to participate or if they're not attending whether they would like to participate remotely if the time of course allows or if they feel we shouldn't have a meeting there.

It would be an opportunity of course to interact with the broader ICANN community and have discussions there. We do it with some of the other working groups as well but it's not a requirement. It's an option for the group to discuss.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Okay. James you're first. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, I just wanted to put on the table for consideration one approach that was used by a previous working group during the face to face where a portion of the meeting, at least the first half hour, was the regularly scheduled working group meeting during the Seoul event. And then the last half hour was somewhat of a workshop where anyone in the community that was not part of the working group was welcome to join and participate.

And I thought in addition to getting some good ideas it was also an excellent recruiting tool for the additional participation on the working groups. So I'd just like to put that out for consideration.

Michele Neylon: Nice idea. Paul you had something to add.

Paul Diaz: Yes, just a question for you (Mikaylee) and Marika Konings, a logistics question. Seoul is I'm assuming similar to the Australia time zone for those of us on the East Coast and in Western Europe, a meeting during the workday there would probably be some crazy (unintelligible) hour back here.

I'm just wondering, you know, with the participants -- again, recognize a number of us on the list -- if we're not physically in Seoul I think participating remotely could be very difficult if the time is similar to Sydney.

Marika Konings: I can have a look and see what's still available in the schedule and see what that works out in the different time zones and maybe take that back to all of you at the next meeting to see what whether or not we would have (critical mass) in Seoul and remotely to have such a meeting. Would that be...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: I think that would help Marika just because again like when you did your workshop you did it early and that was helpful. But if it's scheduled more during the daytime hours there in Seoul it just becomes really, really difficult to dial in remotely.

Marika Konings: I'll have a look and, yes, I'll see if we can have a breakfast meeting which I guess will be the best moment of the day to have -- I guess that will be evening time in the U.S.?

Paul Diaz: Yes, it's like a day later and stuff. Certainly make the effort and if you could just confirm and then we'll take it up next week.

Marika Konings: I'll do so.

Michele Neylon: The time difference for those of you who are interested is UTC plus 9. So is that the same time zone as Sydney? It's practically the same, only a couple of hours out maybe or something. I don't know.

Marika Konings: I think Sydney was a bit more...

Michele Neylon: Possible.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I think it might be an hour difference or an hour less perhaps, something like that.

Michele Neylon: Not a huge difference then. On the plus side those who are going there won't be bothered by our staff unless they're really feeling like living dangerously. Okay, so we'll come back to this thing about the meeting depending on slots are available. So Marika should update us on that we hope.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Is there any other business we need to attend to? No? Okay then. So can we wrap this up then and pick up again in two weeks and follow up on the main list in the interim?

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry (Mikaylee) can I ask one more question?

Michele Neylon: Sure.

Paul Diaz: It's Paul Diaz again. Just for the scheduling then, if we go to a biweekly will it be a standard one-hour meeting? Are we going to try and do perhaps 90 minutes? It just seems if we're only meeting every other week, I'm just comparing it to the first go around on this, over time that's a lot less time that we're putting into the working group if we leave it at one hour per session.

Michele Neylon: Well one thing I would add to that is that there's also -- we should also be communicating via the mailing list and the interim period as well. So...

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: I would just like to mention that, you know, some may have difficulty with doing more than an hour. But, you know, I certainly think it might be helpful to try to schedule these for 90 minutes or allow 90 minutes keeping in mind that, you know, if we can wrap it up in an hour, great, but if it has to run over a little bit, having that extra time might be helpful.

But we have to remember some may have to drop off the call so we're going to lose some participation after that first 60 minutes. At least that's my experience. But having it scheduled for 90 might be helpful just to be able to wrap up some things and not have to drop off the call if we're in the middle of something.

Michele Neylon: That seems reasonable. Anybody else have any thoughts or -- James you've got your hand up.

James Bladel: Sorry mute button issues. This is on a separate subject so I'll wait until everyone's had a chance to discuss Tim's point.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I think everybody who's voted has voted in favor of 90 minutes on the little poll thing that Marika put up.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I just voted for 60. At least a try. I think again I think it's just a matter of logistics for most people on the call. And we have to keep in mind too the staff is, you know, they have -- this isn't the only thing they do. They have a number of different calls throughout that day or throughout every day

probably. So, you know, to the extent possible when we can keep it to 60 minutes I think that's practical at least my opinion.

Michele Neylon: Okay. How about we meet at a happy middle ground where we shoot for 60 but if we can have -- allow for 90 where possible but we'll try to keep it as close to 60 as possible.

Man: (Mikaylee) I'm sorry just to follow up and (unintelligible) question from (Paul). Did we agree at the beginning that there would be a Doodle because I understand ALAC members have difficulty? There's always something -- their monthly meetings at this particular time slot. So if we're talking about a 90-minute schedule with a goal of doing in 60 but is it at this time or are we going to try and sort that out through a Doodle survey?

Marika Konings: Maybe we could time it in such a way that it doesn't fall on their -- I mean if we do it biweekly we should be able to time it in such a way that...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: That's what I was looking for, yes.

Marika Konings: I can check with ALAC staff how -- if it's really in a month's time the next one so whenever...

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, sorry, it's Gisella. The ALAC call is on the last Tuesday of every month at 1400 UTC scheduled for 1 hour 30.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So if we just aim to have the call the week before or the week after each one of those then, then that shouldn't cause a conflict.

Gisella Gruber-White: Correct.

Marika Konings: So I'll have to look at the calendar to see if we then need to have one call following one week, you know, to get out of the rhythm that we conflict with their calls I guess.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Would it make -- okay, guys how about this as a suggestion. Because -- just to get things moving if we were to have another call next week and then have it every two weeks then that way hopefully we wouldn't clash with the ALAC call.

Marika Konings: I think that makes sense.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I would agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: But for a selfish reason because a week after that I'll be on vacation again.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well we're going to work on the -- okay, sorry Marika. Go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Sorry to interrupt Gisella. The next ALAC call is on the 22nd of September (unintelligible) but if we do just get it next week and then every other week it shouldn't conflict with ALAC.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Chris you don't like that idea?

No simply because (unintelligible) I'm actually traveling to Marina Del Rey this time next week so I won't be able to take part in that but...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: But that's just for next week. We're just trying to get the schedule kind of somewhere close to sanity so that we're getting most people most of the time.

That's right. And I'm also learning the Adobe Connect and playing with it a little. It seems (unintelligible). Thanks.

Marika Konings: Just to point out to those that are new to Adobe Connect, I did put up a link as well into Wiki that gives you like an introduction to some of the basic functionality of Adobe Connect. So that might help in getting familiar with the options and tools you have at hand there.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. Just a question for Chris and perhaps the other CBUC participants. Is that everyone with the CBUC that will be going to Marina Del Rey or will others be able to participate in the call?

No I think it's just me as part of the communications sub-team working on the Web site.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, okay. Yes, I was just concerned. We try to be as flexible as possible but if an entire constituency or entire interest group or whatever is not going to be able to participate then, you know, we might want to consider that.

Michele Neylon: Okay, James you had question on something completely unrelated.

James Bladel: Yes, something completely different. Just to point out just because we have a lot of new folks on this group as the name implies IRTP B is the second in a series.

So while we're talking about different reading or review materials that might be helpful or relevant to our discussions, I would encourage everyone to take

a look the issues that were covered in IRTP A that wrapped up earlier this year and possibly even peek ahead at IRTP C through I don't know how far they go, just in case we start to find ourselves going down one of those paths we should just bear in mind that this is a part of a sequence as opposed to just an isolated (TBT) working group. And that's all I wanted to add on that.

Marika Konings: Again if I can just add something to that.

Michele Neylon: Yes, real quick.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Yes, just to echo basically what James and there's also some of you that ask like some more information or introduction on the issues her. I think the IRTP Part A Issues Report and the final report gave us also further details as to how the process works and the different functionalities of the different steps in the procedure. So it might be as well helpful introduction to some of the concepts that will come up throughout the discussion here.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika do you still have your hand up or is that from before?

Marika Konings: No, no, sorry, I have to lower it.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. That's okay.

Marika Konings: There you go.

Michele Neylon: I'm getting used to this kind of thing having to check. I do apologize in advance. And has anybody got any other issues to raise at this time or can we wrap this up? Okay, can we wrap this up then? Anybody have anything else to say?

Okay, then so Marika we're scheduling this call for next week at the same time. Is that okay?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Michele Neylon: And then we'll do it every two weeks from then on bearing in mind that some people may not be able to make all calls but unfortunately while we can try to accommodate people we can't accommodate everybody all the time.

Okay then, so if anybody wants to follow up, anybody has any queries or anything, I think you all have my contact details and Marika's details and most of you have posted to the list. Okay. Thank you.

Tim Ruiz: Thank you (Mikaylee). I appreciate you stepping up as chair too. It's great to have a new face or a new voice in that seat. So appreciate that.

Man: Thank you (Mikaylee).

Michele Neylon: You mean fresh meat, a new victim.

Tim Ruiz: Fresh meat, there you go.

Man: Fresh meat works.

Michele Neylon: Yes, yes. Oh, I think -- who was it that was looking for help? Chris (unintelligible) was looking for -- if you want to ping any of us off list with any queries you have please feel free to do so.

Great. Thanks very much for that, yes.

Michele Neylon: You'll find I'm really not hard to find. I mean I'll be honest with you, if you can't find my contact details within about five minutes, you're looking in the completely wrong place.

Great, okay, yes.

Michele Neylon: And if anybody else has any issues with any of that kind of stuff I mean I think several people have been through a lot of the stuff before who probably can help out with clarifying things. So I'll leave you all to it. Okay, thanks. Talk to you next week.

Sure, bye now.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Man: Thanks (Mikaylee).

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks guys.

END