

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP  
Transcription  
Tuesday 13 October 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 13 October 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-20091013.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#oct>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon - RC  
Kevin Erdman - IPC  
Barbara Steele - RY  
James Bladel - RC  
Paul Diaz - RC  
Chris Chaplow - CBUC  
Eric Brown – gTLD Registries  
Tim Ruiz - RC

Staff:

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

Apologies:

Berry Cobb - CBUC  
Anil George – IPC

Michele Neylon: Could you carry out a roll call please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, I will do that. This is Gisella.

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings have started.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll do a quick roll call for you Michele. It's Gisella, good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, Barbara Steele, Paul Diaz, Tim Ruiz, James Bladel, Chris Chaplow, Eric Brown.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery, David Giza, Olof Nordling and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Berry Cobb and Anil George. If I could also just remind everyone please to state their names for transcript purposes. Thank you very much.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks everybody, good afternoon. It's Michele here. Just looking at the agenda we have for today, we've done the role call. Now the what - the next item of the agenda was the meeting in Seoul and what the agenda of that should be.

So does anybody have any thoughts on that? No?

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry, there's hands up. Yes go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: One suggestion I would have looking at the public comments received and some of the discussions we had on previous calls is that there seems to be a desire to possibly review the TDRP to see whether there could be any changes made to that to address charter question one on the urgent return of a hijacked domain name.

So an option would be to maybe have someone that is an expert in TDRP provide an update or overview of that process to the group.

Because at least I know myself I'm definitely not an expert in that area and there might be others that you know would benefit from a detailed overview of that. And it might help the group as well to help identify what if anything could

be changed or adopted to adjust for such a quicker process for resolving disputes.

Michele Neylon: So what's the TDRP, I'm getting confused with acronyms already.

Marika Konings: It stands for dispute resolution process.

Michele Neylon: Okay, can we just - okay so the dispute, the dispute resolution. Okay, thanks. James?

James Bladel: Sorry, a little slow on the mute button. To your question regarding any items to the agenda, I guess my question is have we decided on the format for this meeting? This is an open meeting with folks that are not necessarily participating on this group.

So you know what type of topics are on the table for that meeting and do we want to you know solicit topics kind of on the fly from the folks who show up there?

Michele Neylon: Good question. If we're looking at Marika's suggestion of some kind of overview of the existing policies, just kind of an explanation that might help.

But the one thing I would personally be afraid of is if we have far to open meeting that we end up with people raising issues that are way out of scope. Don't know what everybody else things of that. Marika? Your hand's up again?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika again, if I can maybe just you know raise as an example what some of the other working groups do, for example the registration abuse group how they run their open meeting is that they have a one hour meeting of the working group that is open for others to attend.

But it will only open for working group members to intervene and discuss so it's - like we have now, our regular call that's just you know progressing on the issues and the topics we're discussing.

And then the last half of the meeting is then open for others to ask questions or provide input on the discussions that we had in the first hour. So to have a bit that distinction and coordinate a bit of what issues are being raised and how the meeting is run.

So that might be something for the group to consider.

Michele Neylon: How well does that work in reality Marika? I mean do we - do you end up in the kind of situation where two or three people end up dominating the entire thing or is it something where you know you actually do get a reasonable amount of participation without there being fights?

Marika Konings: I think it works okay, the only thing of course is that it needs to be communicated well to those in the room. And the challenge a little bit if people are joining late they might not realize that they're not expected to speak or intervene in the meantime.

So that's something that you know needs to be managed or communicated well. You know of course in certain issues you'll still have you know some strong voices, but I guess that's as well for the chair at some point to say well you know we've really covered that issue and let's move on.

You know as this meeting is taking place very early and it's you know very specific, particular issue I'm not really sure how much - how many participants outside of those that are in the group will attend.

So you know I'm not sure how it will go, but I think it's manageable as long as we communicate well how the meeting is being run. And when people have an opportunity to intervene or make their questions, or as well be able to

direct them if the questions aren't related to what we're discussing to say well this is actually not for this group to discuss now but we're happy to take it back you know in some other form and you know discuss it there if appropriate.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well that's fair enough. I mean if it's going to be early in the morning which it is, then I mean - I presume I'm meant to be chairing that meeting, am I, or as the chair of the group?

So I'll be expecting loads of coffee to be poured down my throat before I can manage sentient conversation. Any other thoughts on the meeting in Seoul?

Does anybody have any objections to what Marika was suggesting? No hands up, nothing.

Marika Konings: Well this is Marika and if there's no objection to that of course the next question will be who would be that person that will be able to provide such an overview.

And you know having quickly looked at the policy understand that it's often that the registry provider that's involved, so looking at Barbara, I don't know if she - or she would be able to identify someone that will be able to you know provide such an overview.

And maybe have as well some ideas of which areas might be suitable for you know reducing the overall timeline. And so...

Michele Neylon: Barbara, any thoughts?

Barbara Steele: I'm sorry, I missed part of that.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I can repeat, so the idea would be to maybe have a more detailed discussion on the TDRP in relation to charter question one. But as it's relatively new territory I guess for many the idea would be to have someone maybe provide an overview of how the TDRP works in practice as it might help the group to identify which parts might be suitable for modification or changes.

So as I noticed from the policy that the registry provider is one of the dispute resolution providers available to registrars, would you or would you be able to identify someone that might be able to give such an overview?

Barbara Steele: As far as availability is concerned I'm not sure that I would be available to do that. But - so are you looking to do this at the open meeting in Seoul or just in general?

Yeah, I'm not going to be able to do that. Eric, are you available in Seoul to do that? I mean I have a pretty good, like a timeline depiction of you know what happens when that I can provide.

But I'm not going to be available for that particular meeting.

Eric Brown: Yeah, I'll be Seoul, I can probably do that, if not myself, I can probably get Jeff or someone to step in if it's more legal oriented. But one of us will.

Barbara Steele: Okay, and in the interim I can go ahead and send out you know what I have as far as the timeline is you know from the submission through you know the entire process. Would that work or be helpful?

Eric Brown: Sure, I would think so.

Marika Konings: And what I will do then in the meantime I will try to see if I can update the schedule so those who are interested in meeting know as well you know that

one of the issues that will be discussed is the TDRP. So it might be an opportunity as well for all of us to learn more about that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other input on the meeting in Seoul? Okay moving on, the public comment period, Marika sent around a summary of the comments that have been received.

Did you all get a chance to look over those? Any input there?

Man: Everybody must be reading them right now.

Michele Neylon: Are we all running off to read them really, really quickly pretending that we had read them in advance?

Man: We are.

Michele Neylon: Thank you for your honesty whoever that was. It's okay.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul, I'm trying to get through them, Tim caught me. I was trying to read them now but in all fairness this was just sent out at least according to my clock at barely 7 am this morning my time.

So it's kind of difficult to get through this much in a few hours.

Michele Neylon: Excuses, excuses. I'm so disappointed.

Marika Konings: And that's my fault, I'm sorry for the late notice but I was hoping that people would have maybe reviewed the complete comments already so no need for the summary.

Michele Neylon: No, the summaries are needed, at least for me anyway. Thanks Marika. Okay, just looking at the text here that Marika sent around, I'll just go through just to save on those of you who are trying to speed read.

Summary analysis, three submissions were related to issues that were deemed not to be relevant to the chart requests, WHOIS accuracy, privacy and a complaint related to a specific registrar.

The other contributors provided input on the different charter questions or other related issues for consideration. So the - who would the people who submitted comments.

Okay, (Bob Ross), (Charles Christopher), (Patrick Medsik), (Peter Van) - I can't pronounce that properly so I'm not going to try. The registrar constituency of WYPO and I think Marika you said you'd received another comment from somebody else, was that correct?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika again, just a note I did receive an email as well that the IPC has submitted their constituency statement but I think they've submitted that directly to the secretariat.

And these comments, the registrar constituency did submit their comments as well as part of the public comment period. So something similar happened in another working group and there it was decided that they you know form each of those comments.

The decided to review the constituency statements all together and public comments together. I mean of course here we have less public comments to deal with so the group might decide to take everything together in one (reviewal).

Of course we haven't received all the others yet.

Michele Neylon: Right, well we do have - go ahead Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Well I was just wondering which constituencies do we have statements from or comments from?

Marika Konings: So far only the registrar constituency statements. I've seen that so far, I received a notice from Anil that IPC has submitted something as well and I presume that was sent to the GNSO secretariat. I'm going to check with Glen if she has received that.

Others have not submitted yet but the deadline...

Glen DeSaintgery: I think that I've seen the IPC comments Marika.

Marika Konings: If you can post that then to the mailing list Glen that would be helpful.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, I don't think I have.

Marika Konings: Oh you haven't. Let me then go back to them and see...

Glen DeSaintgery: Did you get them...

Marika Konings: It might have been submitted to the public comment forum but I think that has been closed or you know it's - I'm not sure whether we are still accepting comments there because the forum has been - you know the deadline has passed.

So I will go back to them to see where they've submitted it.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Okay, with the public comments that we do have, can we - and we realize that people haven't had a chance to read over them all. So there weren't that many comments. Do people want to go over them now or do you

want to have time to read them and then come back to them again in the future?

What way do you want to deal with them?

Marika Konings: Michele this is Marika again because another question for the group would be how they would like to review the comments or how they would - I mean some of the other groups we've developed the grid in trying to address each of the comments or each of the element of the comments separately.

And - because as well as part of the effort of you know being more thorough and about comments being received and how they are being considered by working groups and how they are being taken into consideration.

And why or why they haven't been taken into account, I think it's you know going to be more important going forward as well I think in the light of the new affirmation document which talks as well about the importance of you know respecting public comments.

So something for the group as well to consider how they would like to go about that and reviewing and addressing those.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Does anybody have any thoughts or input on this? You're all very, very quiet today which is kind of worrying. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Well I think - I mean just a suggestion, but you know kind of shooting from the hip a little bit I guess would be just - you know in some of the summaries I've seen that I've liked are the ones that well whether they identify who the comments are coming from or not, but look at the substance of the comments and group them where they're similar.

So that we just have basically a list of these are the comments, a summary of the comments that were made on various issues without repeating you know combining them so that we just have an issue list.

So that we can look at one and be able to compile a response to the issues and we are not being responsible to respond to individual commenters because that can sometimes be a pain but it would be a comment to each of the issues that were raised.

And you know maybe in some cases it might be that it's not within this group's charter to deal with whoever, but that kind of issues list that I've seen before, that I kind of like that.

Michele Neylon: That would be like the way it's been done in the post disparity group, Tim is that what you mean?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: That kind of grid type thing. Does anybody else have any comments or thoughts?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here.

Michele Neylon: James has a hand up.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele this is James and I just wanted to agree with what Tim was saying there at the end. I like the - I prefer the method where comments are mapped to charter questions even if a single comment touches on say multiple areas of the charter that they're mapped to that.

And we use that to kind of inform the discussions of those various charter questions and if they don't map to the charter question then we know that as well.

Michele Neylon: And for those of you who are not logged in to the Adobe Connect, Paul Diaz agreed with that comment from Tim and James. Barbara do you have any thoughts? David, Eric, anybody?

David Giza: This is David, I'm good with the approach.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So the - then the grid type thing we agree would be a good approach to take?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here, yes. To do it when we discuss the different issues, one of which we've sort of discussed now haven't we, and four we've still got to do.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other thoughts? Okay, so Marika, that grid type thing you were doing with that other working group seemed to be a popular option if we could use that that would probably help.

Marika Konings: Okay, I will develop a similar one for these comments received here.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. And okay so maybe we might come back to that at the next meeting?

Tim Ruiz: Is that something - and this again is just a question based on you know being reasonable about - just Seoul is coming up and I mean is that something Marika can get done before?

Michele Neylon: I'm sorry by the next - okay that's a good question as well, sorry Tim, you're perfectly right. Marika, I mean is that - are you under pressure at the moment time wise?

Marika Konings: Always under pressure but as this is a relatively low number of public comments I think it will be feasible to get that ready by the Seoul meeting.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Right, okay, just move on - yes, sorry Tim?

Tim Ruiz: No, wasn't me.

Michele Neylon: Didn't quite catch that.

Tim Ruiz: That wasn't me Michele.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry, thought it was, beg your pardon. Does anybody else want to jump in here? No, okay. So we'll move - so Marika's going to do some work on that just to make the review of the comments that little bit saner.

The next item we had on the agenda was to wrap up our initial discussion on Issue A which is whether a process for urgent return/resolution of a domain name should be developed as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report.

So does anybody have anything further to say on that at this time? Marika and then Paul.

Marika Konings: Just to mention that you know if we are having the discussion on a TDRP in Seoul we'll have a chance to discuss that in further detail as well at that point.

Michele Neylon: True. Paul?

Paul Diaz: She beat me to it.

Michele Neylon: Okay, fair enough. James?

James Bladel: Yeah Michele, perhaps if you could - if you or Marika could give us a one sentence summary of where we left that discussion I think - I'm jumping into this cold and just came off of another call, so I'm not sure I really want to say that I'm fine with where we left it when I can't really recall how we ended our previous conversation on Issue A.

Michele Neylon: From what I recall and I'm sure Marika will correct me, we - I think from what I can recall we decided that we - a lot of this stuff was - a lot of the issues were sorted out between the registrars before going to the registries.

And from what I recall I think Barbara may have said something about - gone through with the number of times that complaints actually made land on her desk and the number was very, very low.

That's just my own personal memory.

Barbara Steele: That's correct.

James Bladel: Yes, and so we were looking at something for example in the - as a mechanism for an urgent return we were looking at something that would be an escalation if that inter registrar cooperation were to fail. So this would be a means to escalate to the registry.

Am I remembering that correctly, or?

Michele Neylon: That sounds right to me, I don't know if anybody else has any input. Marika, you've got a very good memory.

Marika Konings: Maybe not a good memory, but I'm just looking at my notes from that call because some of the other things we discussed were that it should be as well you know we should have criteria that are objectively determinable.

And I think that's where we spent some time discussing in these cases can you have any criteria that would really be objective and allow for a quick return or you know what is the burden of proof? How much time will you need to spend to actually prove that there was a hijacking and should be returned?

Then there were questions as well like in case if you go indeed looking at a separate procedure, what will be the default status? Would you return to the original status or would you freeze the status that it's in until you've resolved there was dispute?

As we've already discussed as well some elements and as well the question arose there as well like how does the TDRP fit in there? And you know should the group review whether there's a way to actually speed up the TDRP or see whether a separate process could be developed within the TDRP that would address this specific issue?

James Bladel: Okay, and then there was - I'm sorry, this is James speaking again, and then there was another question if I recall and perhaps this is more of a question that was maybe meant to bring up and didn't get a chance to address it.

But the question of whether this process or whether this process would be an optional mechanism for registrars or it would be required or mandated process that they would have to provide at the registrant's request.

Meaning that the registrant would say you know I agree with you that you and Paul Diaz can work this out or I don't trust that you guys are going to work this out and my advantage I'm going to compel you to use this particular process as opposed to allowing you to use your existing communication channels.

And I think that we touched on that a little bit or if we didn't we should have.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika, I guess we'll go back at some point as well if we'll be looking at the TDRP on whether registrars should be able to initiative or not. I guess that's closely linked as well to that question.

Michele Neylon: And I think some - from what I recall now James, this reminds me, so I think some of the problems we were looking at was if we put too much in there that it would actually break things badly.

That we'd end up with - it would be overly (policied) as it were, might be too much policy. That's my recollection, Paul has his hand up.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele, I just wanted to make sure for the record we're all in agreement even though we're saying we're moving on, these are just our initial discussions, right?

I mean it's clearly understood to everybody we'll have opportunity to talk about this in Seoul. There will be opportunity to come back and flesh out what we're talking about here in terms of perhaps changes to the TDRP or something new, whatever the case may be.

It just keeps striking me, we keep seeing this moving on to the next stage and all the working groups, it's usually when the group has reached some form of consensus that we use that expression moving on to the next issue.

This is just a first round of discussions, correct?

Michele Neylon: I'm personally just moving on because I'm trying to keep an agenda as opposed to letting us go off into crazy tangents. So as far as I'm concerned, everything is - personally as far as I'm concerned everything is - nothing has been decided, everything is still being discussed.

Paul Diaz: Excellent, perfect. Just wanted that for the record, thanks Michele.

Michele Neylon: I mean just from my perspective I'm involved with a couple other working groups where the calls are excruciatingly painful because people go off on tangents for hours and nothing moves forward.

And I think people die a little on the calls, so I prefer if we just - at least make some effort to keep to whatever agenda we have. But I'm not saying that we shouldn't be discussing things again if needed.

But I feel that we should be making some kind of tangible progress as opposed to just talking each other to death. Has anybody any other input on that at this time? Nope? Olof, hi Olof.

Olof Nordling: I just managed to raise my hand. Well we did also just to rehash what was discussed to some extent was that whether it would be a one step process or two step process if we had some of that kind of return.

And whether - if it was a two step process whether we kept it in its current state or returned it pending the final decision.

So there were a few options we discussed which end up as some kind of matrix if you like. Just to rehash or refresh our memories about it.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Right, we'll have to come back to all this again anyway. Now the other - another item that was on the agenda for us to have a look at was to start having a look at issue B, issue B being whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a registrant and admin contact.

The policy is clear that the registrant can overrule the admin contact, but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar. Now has anybody got any thoughts on that topic? Olof I presume your hand is up from previously?

Okay, wow, hands going up left right and center. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Michele, this is James speaking and I guess I would like to get a better understanding of what you know not going through all the different

potential variations on how this is implemented. But when the concern is - and I think this is if memory serves this question was raised from IRTP A, does that sound familiar Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yeah, that's right.

James Bladel: Okay, so I'm trying to remember the context of the differences of implementation and how that can harm the transfer process. And trying to think about what the potential outcome or how to clear that up would be.

Because it says right there in your charter that the policy already establishes the - you know the hierarchy between admin and the admin contact and the registrants.

So I just want to be sure I'm understanding exactly what it is we're setting out to solve by including this on our charter?

Michele Neylon: You know it is Paul's turn but I suspect that Marika might be able to give us a little bit more insight into this so I'm going to let her go first if you don't mind.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: I just wanted to point out that this is not an only issue that was raised by the IRTP part A working group, they made a comment as well to - in the same direction.

But there was already in the previous IRTP working groups that this was already identified as an issue. And actually just - I'm going to pull up the relevant sections from the issues report in a second so people can have a quick look at some of the comments that were made in that respect.

Actually I think it was an issue that was raised as well by GoDaddy like a couple of years ago in relation to this issue. So if you give a few seconds I can pull it up so people can refresh their memories.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Right, I guess thank you Michele, two things. From IRTP A as I recall this question was focused on the design, and I'm hope I'm not putting words in Michael Collins mouth.

But his concern was really to focus on the precedence given to registrant over admin contact, less on the specifics of or the mechanisms that registrars are using.

And he used an example for (domainers) who are you know in some sort of business transaction with the domain, often the admin contact is involved and a registrant can come back after a transaction has been completed, claim that it wasn't done.

In some cases there's fraud associated with that or confusion and he was pushing the A group and that's where we are today too. To make the recommendation that we look at whether the admin contact can have equal rights in authorized end transfer, that was my recollection of A.

It was not focused as much on the mechanics of when things are locked and who can remove a lock, etcetera. My other point that just to - for the record is I wanted to as we start this discussion underscore the point that the registrar constituency made.

And that I feel very strongly about that the policy that's in place now is there for security reasons. Everybody remember the registrant contact information is not required information published in WHOIS, therefore it's usually out of the public domain.

And not susceptible to some form of social engineering or other fraud to initiate discussions or recommendations to allow the admin contact to have equal status and what not, will introduce security concerns, something that this group needs to be ever vigilant about.

If we agree to make any changes that we always have to remember it's sort of the classic trade off between convenience and security. And any changes in the rules as they relate to registrant and admin contact will definitely have that sort of implication.

Just really want to underscore at the beginning of the discussion that that's something we should not take lightly and in all of our discussions always have that in the back of our mind.

Michele Neylon: So just one thing Paul, so just to clarify something, you were saying that the registrant, the admin, there's a difference in which is publicly available? What did you mean exactly?

Paul Diaz: Although they often may be the same, the registrant contact information is not required to be published in the WHOIS, the admin contact is.

Michele Neylon: But it's going to be published in the WHOIS on the thick registry?

Paul Diaz: Okay, I'm showing a bias because such an overwhelming majority of cases in dispute occur in common net.

Michele Neylon: Right.

Paul Diaz: So they are not in the thin registry models. But of course we all recognize that the registrant is the ultimate authority here and at least in the thin registry models if you were to change the rules, make admin equal status or require

publication registrant contact, that will introduce security concerns that I was alluding to.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim Michele, I can't put my hand up, but personally I - oh, I was just going to question Paul in regards to the - you said the registrant contact data isn't required to be published. Is that - I thought that it was, it's just that the email address is the part that's not published?

Which is what most registrars rely on in getting confirmation of a transfer. So the reason the issue with the admin contact came up is because even if you should decide want to go to the ultimate authority, the registrant, it's difficult to do.

Because there's no way to get the information necessary to contact. So the registrants published and along with address and I think a few other elements that are required. But the ones that registrars typically contact then aren't available. IS that accurate?

Paul Diaz: Yes, that's accurate Tim, I'm sorry I'm simplifying things too much. Right, it's the email and therefore the automated systems that registrants have to process transfer requests based upon the email.

Tim Ruiz: Okay, thanks.

Michele Neylon: And I'm looking just for - since GoDaddy's on the call and it's a perfectly good example, just to confirm looking at the WHOIS I was on godaddy.com, there's no email address visible in WHOIS on Part 43 for the registrant for the (unintelligible) for both the admin and the taxee.

Paul Diaz: Yeah I know - Michele just to follow up on that, I know one of the issues, because when this has come up, I mean this has been discussed for two years now. But one of the issues that came up was you know there was

some suggestion about why don't we just require the publication of the email address?

Well the problem is that we're not even required to collect it, so registrars in some cases might but in other cases they may not even have been collecting a registrant email address.

And so the result is that you know we put a - I think a pretty difficult burden. We didn't know how to deal with that issue, you know the retroactively trying to get email addresses for all registrants.

Again primarily with the com net or the thin registries that are the issue. So I don't know if that's reason enough not to visit that possibility but I just wanted to throw that out that that was one of the things that had been talked about.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. James, you have your hand up?

James Bladel: Thanks Michele, this is James and I just - I think that Paul and Tim through that exchange and with yourself covered some of the things I wanted to raise. But I did want to point out that I think we're very careful in - or whether it was either TPA or council.

But I wanted to say that the language of the charter is very careful in that it's discussing the implementation of how registrars dispositions differences or the approval between registrant and administrative contact with regard to transfers.

As opposed to changing that dynamic and I agree with Paul completely that we should reinforce or preserve the idea that the registrant can overrule the admin contact for all of the security concerns that he raised earlier.

And I think that this could perhaps be a flavor or a component of the previous topic which his the urgent return because I think very simply if a registrant

comes back later then we would obviously need the urgent return mechanism to reflect that they overruled the transfer.

But other than that I think most of the topics have been covered but I just wanted to echo some of Paul's statements relative to the security and the way our charter reads is that we're talking mainly about implementation as opposed to changing that pecking order.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Anybody else got anything else to say on this? No? Okay. We're doing pretty well time wise. So anybody have anything they wish to raise at this time? Am I going to make ICANN history and have a conference call that actually finishes early?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, we could also move on to issue three.

Man: Ah geez, Marika, don't do that to us.

Marika Konings: Unless people want to finish early, that's fine.

Michele Neylon: No, I'm only winding you up. Issue three which was what exactly?

Marika Konings: It was whether special provisions are needed for change of registrant when it occurs near the time of change of registrar policy does not currently deal with a change of registrant which often figures in hijacking cases.

I'll post it as well in the agenda.

Michele Neylon: Well if you just post it somewhere we can view it. Okay, does anybody have any thoughts on that?

Chris Chaplow: Is this the - Chris speaking, is this the one that GoDaddy has implemented anyway themselves?

Michele Neylon: James or Tim would one of you like to respond to that?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim, I can comment on that. Yeah, we have implemented something like this. And it's evolved over time as we've tried to address concerns that were raised with it. I think you know initially we were trying to be as broad as we could with it perhaps.

Was even concerned over the fact that you know the admin contact has transfer authority so we had concerns there when that changes under certain circumstances.

But at this point basically what we've done is if a domain name completely changes hands between registrants, in other words you know perhaps for example the domain name is sold in the after market and so it's completely being transferred to another registrant or owner if you will.

We will facilitate that change, we don't feel that it is something we're required to do. But we'll facilitate that change for free, we just notify the participants that if they proceed before the treatment - if they need to do a transfer if they proceed before transfer then they agree to not transfer for 60 days for security reasons.

If they need to transfer then they should do the transfer first and then make the change at the new registrar. So that's basically the way we've kind of implemented it at this point.

But the reason being that in our experience, domain names have ended up hijacked quite often start with some change in the registrant and also in the admin contact.

But we don't apply that to this situation any more. So I don't know if that helps clarify that or not. So I guess we have raised this issue just simply because of our experience and what we've seen in the past.

And that you know I mean we've even seen that it was deemed reasonable under the previous discussions and under the current policy to the registrar may deny a transfer for 60 days after an inter registrar transfer.

So we're just proposing that would be reasonable that such a denial of transfer for some period of time after a registrant transfer be considered as well.

Michele Neylon: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Chris again, can I ask, do you get many complaints or what sort of percent, you know doesn't have to be off the top of your head obviously, but a percentage of problems in inverted commerce that are caused in genuine cases by that policy? Thanks.

Tim Ruiz: We don't get - I don't know what it is. I know it isn't - it's by far not the majority of situations. We do get complaints, I can see if we can find out what percentage it is.

But what normally happens is if someone does complain and we're able to do some separate confirmation or whatever their situation were where we'll let the domain name go.

Other situations where it isn't real clear we can't get confirmation from both ends of the transfer then we'll you know even though we may have a complaint we'll leave it in place.

And you know we try to take that - those complaints even more seriously and do what we can to try to resolve them in situations where a pending renewal is coming up.

Because we know that that concerns the new owner, that you know they're going to have renew it with GoDaddy before they can transfer whatever, so we have that situation.

So we do - we tend to work if anyone who complains, but on the other hand security is the main concern so if we can't you know make some sort of determination or confirmation on both ends, both the old and new registrants, then we'll leave that 60 day lock in place.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Marika and then James.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, because I have a question because in researching this issue, you know I came across as well as several registrants complaining about it and they thought it was unnecessarily restrictive.

But I thought at some point that I had read that GoDaddy had changed the policy that instead of making that 60 day lock mandatory it was like optional. So someone changing the WHOIS details could actually uncheck the box that would put on that lock.

Is - I'm answering correctly that's not how it works any more or that it used to work like that for a while and it does no longer, or?

Tim Ruiz: No, it never worked that way. What we would try to do is when someone wants to do a - you know that registrant type transfer, is to make sure they know up front, you know here's the - you know here's this optional service that you can use to do this.

But part of the - what you have to agree to or part of the - of our policy in regards to facilitating that change of registrant is this 60 day lock.

So the optional part is that they don't have to deal with us. They can transfer the name before they do it and change the registration if it's a different registrar.

But if they choose to use the service, change the registrant with GoDaddy then they have to agree to that 60 day lock. So we tried to make that painfully clear up front so that no one is surprised later.

That doesn't mean that even though they see it that they don't later complain about it. But it's not - it's never been optional, the 60 day lock is not an optional thing, no.

Marika Konings: Okay, thanks.

Michele Neylon: James and then Eric.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele, this is James and I wanted to go back just one previous topic to I believe it was Chris's question about the complaint and what other types of alternatives can be used to get that.

There's another side to that coin Chris which is how frequently this has saved a potential hijacking. And I can tell you that that is probably much more common than the types of issues that you were describing.

So the scenario where - while it's in this GoDaddy had a 60 day lock, the original registrant comes up and says hey I think someone has compromised my account and I think that they're trying to move my domain somewhere else.

And we're able to help them resolve that issue because of this, so I think that that's a much more common outcome of this policy than the other side of that coin.

Michele Neylon: Eric?

Eric Brown: Thanks. This is two quick questions for Tim, that maybe you can just help clarify for my own knowledge. At what point do you reject the transfer if there's been a registrant change or registrant transfer?

Is it before the transfer request is sent to the registry or is you know during the act and act period and you do some kind of check there and reject the transfer?

And then the second question is - and maybe you said this but I might have missed it, what constitutes a registrant transfer? Is it any update to the record or just certain fields like the name field or you know if I change my telephone number does that constitute a registrant transfer?

Tim Ruiz: Right, the - we can't deny a transfer before the request because the request starts at the gaining registrar, so we're not even aware that it's occurring until we get the notice from the registry that a transfer has been requested.

So we would deny it at that point. When we receive the request, the - that domain name is flagged in our system, and so then that transfer request is rejected.

You know we've had it various ways over the past and we've tried to tighten it up to be more compliant with you know the current advisory and with concerns that have been raised by various parties and some of the complaints that we've received.

So at this point it's only if the actual registrant changes. So you know if a registrant moves and changes their address that's a different thing.

But if the - for example if you know the actual name of the registrant completely changes or the - or changes hands from registrant to a company,

you know that situation would trigger the lock or a need to comply or agree to that lock in order to complete that particular change.

And you know you kind of - it's related to the fact that you know there's nothing in our agreement that really provides for an assignment of a registration agreement.

So we also have to go through the process of making sure that we have the registration agreement in place with the new registrant. And you know really none of that is covered in the RAA with registrars.

So this - it's a part of our actual process to make sure we have a registration agreement in place with that new registrant.

So essentially just - it's actually a new registrant.

Eric Brown: Okay thanks, just one follow up and you clarified it very well there, I should have been more clear. I was curious if you put like an EPP status on when the registrant changes and therefore block the transfer as opposed to actually (nacking) the transfer.

But I think you did clarify it there. And your other points were very valid.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else have anything else to say on this? No? Okay. This call finishes up at 4, is that correct Marika? I'm sorry, well 3, or sorry I'm confused by time zones at this stage.

Marika Konings: We don't have an official end time, I think we've said in the past that we would see where we will be at after an hour and see whether the group needed to go on for another 30 minutes.

Michele Neylon: Okay, no problem. Do we want to continue this on or do we want to call this a day?

Marika Konings: Another item we would need to discuss is the next meeting after Seoul.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so we should probably look at wrapping this up then. Okay then so the next meeting is when? Let's see, where's my calendar gone to.

Marika Konings: If we would follow the normal schedule of bi-weekly meetings the next meeting would be on the 10th of November.

Michele Neylon: Right, but we're having a meeting - we're having one meeting in Seoul on the 26th of October.

Marika Konings: Yes, correct.

Michele Neylon: Fine, perfect. And then after that we were - I think Marika and myself were thrashing out possibilities for meetings after that, weren't we?

Marika Konings: Yes, because one issue is that the ALAC has its monthly meeting on the 24th and I think that is a conflict for some of the members of the working group.

I don't think anyone on the call today, so one option would be to have a meeting on the 10th and the 17th, to avoid the 24th.

Or another option would be to start on the 17th so we avoid the conflict. But it would mean that there will be three weeks of no activity.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika maybe the best thing to do would be to post that - those options on the list. I mean I've already given you my view on those, so if you want to post that out to the list so anybody else who has any particular preferences can give input.

And if there's no input from anybody we'll remove democracy from the equation and just make a decision.

Marika Konings: Well maybe the question for those on the call as you already said your preference would be would there be any objections to having the meetings on the 10th and 17th and then return to the bi-weekly schedule.

Michele Neylon: Preferences folks?

Man: Can we take it up on the 10th?

Michele Neylon: Barbara agrees I think.

Barbara Steele: Yes, that's correct.

Michele Neylon: So does Tim, and I think that was an agreement, was that James? Kevin? Okay, I don't see anybody disagreeing. Oh there's more people agreeing.

Everybody seems to agree. Okay, so that's - so for once we've agreed on something, oh my God. Wow. Right. Okay, we've reached consensus and so that will move with that.

Everybody's happy? So the next time we talk will be at some ungodly hour in the morning in Seoul, is that correct Marika?

Marika Konings: That's correct. Seven o'clock in the morning.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'll have to talk to you between now and then Marika to make sure that I actually make it there at 7 o'clock in the morning. How many of you will be there in person who are on this call?

Barbara won't, Paul won't, Tim Ruiz will be, James Bladel will be, Eric Brown will be, I will be, Kevin Erdman won't be.

Chris Chaplow: Chris won't be.

Michele Neylon: Chris are you all going to be trying to get involved remotely on this - in the meeting?

Chris Chaplow: Chris yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Not sure Michele, I will try.

Michele Neylon: That's okay. Kevin and Barbara, are you going to be able to participate remotely do you think?

Barbara Steele: I - it's not optimistic for me.

Michele Neylon: That's okay, just checking. Okay then so can we just call this a day and I'll see you all in Seoul at some ungodly hour in the morning?

Man: Sounds good.

Man: Thanks Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay, right, for some of you I'll speak to you later, for the rest of you see you in Seoul or somewhere, thanks a lot. Thank you Marika.

Man: Thanks Michele.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Bye bye.

END