 Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Policy Development Process (PDP) WG Group meeting - TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 14th March 2012 at 08:30 local time
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

James: Okay, well, good morning, everyone. If we could, please, I don't think that we need to state that we need to start the recording and the transcription. I think that happens automatically since we're here in Costa Rica.

So if we could please, call the roll. Both what we'll do here is we'll start with the individuals in the room. We'll go around with the roll call and then we'll capture the folks on the phone. Okay? So let's start down at the end with Mr. Neylon and a mouth full of breakfast.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele Neylon, Blacknight.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, NCUC.

(Eddie Gelita):   (Eddie Gelita).

Simonetta Batteiger: Simonetta Batteiger.

Michael Collins: Michael Collins, ICANN staff.

James Bladel: James Bladel.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor.

Bob Mountain: Bob Mountain.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin.

(Hegu Lala):   (Hegu Lala).

James: Okay, and if we could also please go through the individuals who are on the phone?

(Angie Graves):   (Angie Graves).

Barbara Knight: Barbara Knight.

Roy Dykes: Roy Dykes.

Female: (Have you got the move)?

James: Rob Golding, you're also on the phone, correct?

Female: No, he's not on the line. He's on Adobe Connect.

James: I see, okay, so we will read in the name Rob Golding from Othello is also joining us. Okay. Thanks, everyone and welcome to the IRTPC session for ICANN 43 in San Jose, Costa Rica.

Our plan for today is that we will have our normal weekly PDP session for the first hour. And I say "normal" in that we will have an agenda very similar to those that we conduct every Tuesday. However, many of us will not be in our pajamas, so I think that's maybe a departure from our normal routine.

And then the remaining 30 minutes will be an open discussion with anyone who has attended the meeting that would like to weigh-in on any of the issues that are coming before, not just the group's agenda but any of the charter questions or deliberations of the sub-team.

So are there any questions, concerns or comments about that format or should we just continue to move on from there as Michele mutes his laptop. Thank you.

Yes, Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I have an SOI update. As of today I'm a member of the ISP constituency instead of the business constituency. Thank you.

James: Okay, congratulations on your rebirth. I don't know what the...

Woman: You left one and joined the other?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, we're talking seamless transition here.

Woman: Okay. Because they're very, very different you know?

Mikey O'Connor: I know and I'm really one of those other kind of guys than one of those first kind of guys.

James: Well, that does raise, I think, a very just a quick point, is there any sort of impact to this group of that change that anyone can foresee?

Woman: The good news is that we actually have a representative of the ISP in the group.

James: But do we have now zero representatives of business constituency?

Woman: No, we have Chris; I think is on there as well.

James: Okay.

Woman: We have I think a couple.

James: Kevin, I think as well.

Woman: No, he went to IPC.

James: He's IPC. Okay. Okay, thank you for that update, Mikey and congratulations.

                Okay, in the Adobe room, for those who are at the table and on the call, you'll see the agenda. So if you could, please take a moment. If anyone has any comments or additions to the agenda or if you spot any omissions please let us know. I don't see any hands going up, so I'm going to assume that we are okay with proceeding from this agenda.

                So Item 3 was a brief recap of our work plan and our approach and I think that if we could circle back just a little bit before we dive into the substance of our discussions our work plan is fairly aggressive, and as we reported to the council this weekend, but also I believe that we are tracking on target with that work plan.

                And if anyone feels otherwise, please hit your microphone or raise your hand, but I think that we are on target. We've identified initially that Charter Question A would probably consume the bulk of the deliberations of this working group, but I think the fact that we've kicked off the (big gathering) sub-team for the question of FOAs and some other efforts are happening in parallel to that Charter Question A. So we're not necessarily waiting for things to happen in a serial nature. We are parallelizing some of our work.

So anyone have any questions, updates or thoughts regarding the work plan or our progress thus far? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think - I agree 100% with James but I do think that we're going to have to start thinking about narrowing rather than broadening our view. One of the problems with these mind maps is that if we're not careful we'll broaden and add more and more leaves and branches and sticks and twigs to this and we'll not start converging.

And so I think that's the only observation I'd like to add is that we're going to have to sort of start consciously focusing in on stuff. And so I'm going to try and emulate good behavior on that when I do the mind mapping, but I think the rest of us also need to think about how if we're really going to land this thing by Prague we may have to be careful not to let it expand infinitely.

I see Michael (Brown), you want to...

James: And when you say Prague, you meant Toronto?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, we're not going for Prague?

James: Well, Prague is the initial report.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's what I was thinking.

James: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: The initial report by Prague is like -

James: It's still a challenge.

Mikey O'Connor: It's pretty special, yes.

James: Okay, but you said land this thing, I thought you meant...

Mikey O'Connor: Well, okay, your initial report is sort of landing it really because then it's just comments and diddling after.

James: Well, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, a couple of things, I'm glad I kept listening because I kept getting more things I could say. First, I guess on the first part I'd be curious to know if you think we've already broadened it, A) beyond scope, B) beyond what you should. So whether you were alerting us to something you already saw, and that's good.

                  B), I think in some sense you're right to raise an alarm about initial report because Prague is a lot sooner than we think. By the time we get home, unpack our suitcases, do our laundry, and everything else it's almost time to start planning to come back. I exaggerate a little.

James: Not much.

Avri Doria: But C) on issues report - initial issues report I think it's more the transitions from initial issues to final is more than just processing comment because sometimes an issues report actually will - of initial - will contain a few questions that we're looking for more feedback on where we've discussed something, we've opened it up, we've set a couple - you know?

                  And we need more you to get it to final report. It's, you know? So I think that - I'm agreeing and disagreeing simultaneously as I often try to do.

James: Okay, quick response, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know, as Avri was talking I was thinking, you know, maybe the form of the report for Prague is a little less final than we often do. Because, you

know, one way to do this would be to sketch out the big conclusions and the big ideas but not have the totally flawless graceful pros that a final report has and put it out as sort of a working, talking type document.

That would calm me down a bit because that transition from working, talking to paragraphs with sentences that have periods at the end takes a long time, and if we could kind of hit an intermediate level maybe we could take a little pressure off.

Avri Doria: I think there are many areas where we will be able to have sentences and periods and paragraphs. I don't see it as all a set of bullet points and questions. But I think it's really somewhere - I think it's close to a report and I think it is, you know? But I guess we also need to kind of talk to the person that will be writing the report to understand how gelled she thinks it is.

James: And she's been kind of jumping out of her chair wanting to get into this discussion. So go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, because - this is Marika, I really hate to disappoint people but if you look at the new PDP guidelines they're very specific as what needs to be in an initial report. I mean of course it's up to you to point out another form of report that's not called the initial report, but initial report needs a compilation of stakeholder group and constituency statements. I mean we already have that, a compilation of any statements received from any ICANN supporting organization or advisory committee. I don't think we got any, maybe from ALAC.

And recommendations for policies, guidelines, best practices, or other proposals to address the issue, a statement of the level of consensus for the recommendations presented in the initial report, information regarding the members of the PDP teams such as (exams), records, statements of interest, etcetera, and also a statement of the working group discussion concerning impact of the proposed recommendations which could consider areas such

as economic competition, operations, privacy and other rights, scalability and feasibility.

And so those are some of the minimum requirements for initial reports. So as I said, if the working group wants to put out, you know, specific questions it might always take another form, that's no problem at all. And just to note as well, I just quickly checked the publication deadline for Prague is the 1st of June.

James: Thanks, Marika. I think that is a nice splash of cold water on all of our faces that we will have that in June and then that there will be, I think even looking beyond Prague, once we get back from Prague and get unpacked and do our laundry then we're into August where very little progress moves in August in these circles. And then September and then it's time for Toronto.

So I think the warning is very well heeded that we really don't have a lot of time. And I think that every element - if I could just chime in here, I think every element that you just described is very much doable. It's ambitious but I think that we're starting to build out all of the components that you listed.

The one area that I would mention is that one possible approach for our initial report is instead of having policy recommendations with a final period at the end of them is that we could offer alternatives. So we could say, for example, the policy - possible policy recommendations are, nothing, light touch, and then heavy touch or something like that.

And then put those out for public comments and then specifically request that commenters address their preference of two or three choices. And I think that goes to Mikey's concern is too about narrowing everything that's been thrown open in this group.

So maybe that's how we should proceed with the target of our initial report being the required elements that Marika mentioned. But when we get to the

recommendations that we - if we can't get comfortable with a final recommendation in our initial report that we would just put out some alternatives or some options and then specifically direct commenters to those.

I see nods, I think, but I'm not really paying attention to the group here. Yes, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: The only thing might be the more specific or more defined you can be in an initial report the easier it will be to get to trade to a final report. Because, of course, I think we've seen it in some of the previous working groups where otherwise a big departure from what was in the initial report going to the final report which required putting out another version of the proposed final report to really make sure that the community had an opportunity to comment on it.

So I think the more specific the working group can be as we think this is going to be a recommendation, although we still haven't completely discarded this one and want your input, the more direction you really can give to the community as to why the thinking is going, I think the more likely you're going to be able to get from initial report to final report in one step.

James: Okay, excellent, thanks. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, so what this sort of seems to indicate to me is that perhaps after this meeting and we've gone back we need to go back through the schedule reviewing how we get to that June date, you know, where cutoffs on discussion are for various topics, etcetera.

Looking at your time and looking at how long it takes you to take what we do and get it into a report is probably a worthwhile exercise here, off in a corner, or shortly afterwards to get that, which is part of our whole thing is after each one of these milestone periods we go back to the schedule and say, "Okay, how do we make June?"

James: Agreed. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: And maybe also go back to that list of requirements or stuff that needs to
                  be in that initial report and check that against the mind map to see if we're
                  missing something that we still need to vote into our approach.

James: That's a good point and I was going to ask Mikey if there was any function in
                  the mind map to identify duplicates because it's possible that we may have
                  done that as well. So maybe we could take a look at that?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, yes, it's not automatic but there's certainly lots of things you
                  could do in the mind map to sort of say through observation, "Ah, this is a
                  green dot with a squiggle in it," and we can go find all those together.

James: Okay, well, we went over just a little bit on that session, but were there any
                  other thoughts then on our works plan, our approach, as Avri said, our drive
                  towards June 1 now is our new milestone. I think we kicked off this working
                  group with this session kind of as our next checkpoint. So now we have a
                  new one and we have quite a bit to do and I will - wanted to share with the
                  group for those who weren't here in the weekend that we had some questions
                  from Council about the number and lengths of IRTP sessions. So I think that
                  our commitment to an aggressive and ambitious work schedule is
                  appreciated, or at least was acknowledged. Yes?

Bob Golding: Yes, thanks, James, this is Bob. Are there elements in the project plan that
                  are beyond our control that we should take maybe an extra close look at to
                  be more aggressive on those items? Because I know we all know if we focus
                  on something we can get it done but there are maybe things we don't
                  necessarily completely have control over. So...

James: Yes, what would be an example of anything?

Bob Golding: Well, if we're requesting input and we want to get, you know, we need sufficient input to move on is that an area where we need to buckle down and maybe do a little bit of advanced preparation and promotion, that sort of thing.

James: Like, for example, the data gathering surveys?

Bob Golding: Yes, and other elements like that that are part of the project plan to get us into Prague that we should do a little bit of extra focus on.

James: Okay. Good point, thanks, Bob. Sorry, (unintelligible) my microphone. All right, so moving on to the agenda then, if we could - and that's a nice segue because then we could possibly get an update from the sub-team members.

                 And for those who are observing our group we have divided - divided is probably the wrong word, we have identified a smaller working group that are tasked with the specific objectives and these sub-teams are - there were two, other is a data gathering sub-team relative to Charter Question B which is the discussion about expiration about forms of authorization. That's led by Bob.

                 And we have another discussion sub-team that is discussing what an ideal change of control process might look like and that is being led by Simonetta. So if we could, and I don't know who wants to start here, Bob looks like he's willing to go first. If we could get a brief update of the status of the sub-teams and anything that you might want to present to the working group as a whole and anything that you might need from us. So go ahead, Bob.

Bob Golding: Great, yes, thanks, James, this is Bob. Just one correction, the data gathering subgroup is also working on the charter question with respect to (INID) as well. So...

James: Thanks, sorry about that.

Bob Golding: So I think as just a real quick update as we talked about the last meeting we have completed the draft of the survey that's been circulated to the entire working group. So I appreciate your feedback on that. I know obviously this week it's hard to get a look at anything like that, but when we come out of this conference it would be great if you could take a look and get us your input preferably next week.

Once we've got the input we'll then move on to finalizing the survey in a survey format, (fill it out), and test it and then in parallel to that we'll be building the list of survey recipients and we're going to be looking to I think take the two pronged approach. We'll be leveraging a personal contacts where I think we felt that in prior (instances) we've got a much better response rate when we reach out on a personal basis to contacts looking for all of the workgroup members to do that.

Also, leveraging the heads of the other stakeholder groups, the registry stakeholder group, you know, and head of the registrar stakeholder group to help us as well.

So at that point we'll then distribute the surveys, document the results, and then circulate internally for discussion, revise and then issue our final reports to the workgroup.

So we've got quite a number of steps to go but I think we seem to be making good progress. The group's coming together well. I think we have a lot of support with the data gathering sub-team. So thanks to everybody for really quick responses in building this test survey. So I'd say things seem to be going well according to plan.

James: Thanks, Bob, appreciate the update. Is it helpful to put some hard deadlines either on this group or on the registrars when they get the survey? Would that help address your earlier concern about making sure that we control those timelines as much as possible?

Bob Golding: Yes, I think so. There's nothing like a hard date to get people to move more quickly. So yes.

James: And I think this is definitely a deadline driven culture. So okay. Any other thoughts or questions relative to Bob's update from the data gathering sub-team? Oh, I see Roy has his hand raised in the Adobe room. So go ahead, Roy.

Roy Dykes: Yes, thanks a lot, James. One of the things that's come to my attention, and I shared this with Barbara yesterday, is that relative to the registry stakeholder group and getting feedback on the survey from them I think it's going to be difficult to get good quality feedback on the survey if I just sort of dump it in the registry stakeholder group.

                 So what I had proposed to do, or the idea that I had, was to get feedback to see who's interested first and then just kind of individually share it with them. We had talked earlier in this forum about business partners or who to share it with and so that's sort of the approach that I was going to take with the registry stakeholder groups if there's no objections.

James: I think we're all nodding our heads here, Roy. So if that - if you feel that will increase the quantity and quality of the responses then definitely appreciate your advice on that.

Roy Dykes: Okay, thanks.

James: Rob, go ahead, please.

Rob Golding: Hi, it's possible that I've missed it in an earlier discussion but one of the questions that I write was have we had feedback yet from the registrars, sorry, registrees, as to their policy on locking domains after contact details

are out there? I know PIR locked the domain for transfer from 60 days if you change, I believe it's the email address associated with the .org domains.

James: Thanks, Rob; I'm not sure that we're following that. So can you explain? You're saying that PIR locks domain names...

Rob Golding: Yes, one of the things we've been doing as a relatively young accredited registrar is consolidating all the domains that we've got all over the shop as well as regularly you'll see having customers transfer in and transfer out. And one of the things we had come across was an inability to sort of bulk move domains from several registrars.

                And when we investigated that it turned out that PIR has applied a lock because the registrant contact had been changed at the registry level.

James: Okay. You know, I'm not sure that that's covered in the data gathering survey that we're preparing for - which really addresses Charter Questions B and C. So I think what I would recommend is that we reach out to Paul Diaz directly, who is on this working group but is not in attendance today, and see if we can get some clarification from him individually on that.

Rob Golding: Right, (unintelligible).

James: Okay, yes, I think that we should do that individually rather than alter the data gathering survey at this point.

Rob Golding: Okay.

James: Okay, Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering is this input or a question for Charter Question A, are you bringing this up because you're saying this is creating more work or is an issue for you or are you saying you would just like to understand this better?

I'm wondering maybe this is something that is interesting for our ideal process subgroup as information of some of those things that we should keep in mind?

Rob Golding: I'm concerned that we might be discussing something and the registrees may be going off with a slight tangent in implementing their own versions and controls relating to Charter Question A, the change of control.

Simonetta Batteiger: So you're saying we should keep in mind what existing practices are around transfers and make sure that registry processes are also taken into account?

Rob Golding: Either taken into account or perhaps they should be perhaps on the (unintelligible) they shouldn't be doing it, perhaps.

James: That's definitely a possibility, Rob. You know, I think certainly registries and registrars expect that one of the possible outcomes of PDPs is that they'll have to change some of their procedures and practices.

But in this particular case I think that we're probably stepping outside of what the data gathering survey is meant to capture. So we'll have to reach out to Paul Diaz directly and see if we can get some further background on this specific case.

Rob Golding: Okay.

James: Any other questions relative to the data gathering sub-team, the surveys, or the update from Bob? Okay, next? Turn to Simonetta for an update on the change of control, ideal process sub-team.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, there's not much of an update beyond what we already shared last week. We have a list of principles that we want to and need to discuss

probably with the larger group around what this process needs to address and keep in mind.

In listening to the comment that just came up and also listening to just some informal conversations I've had here at the meeting I'm wondering if we should also use the last 30 minutes of today's session to just ask also about some of the concerns and issues that in particular registrars are having with transfers these days?

Because I don't think we have actually asked them enough of about that. Because I heard some feedback on just by talking to people this week that I was completely unaware of and I'm wondering if we're missing a lot of that other information we need for that sub-team? So it's just an observation but beyond that I think we should take this list of principles that we started to discuss in our sub-team and bring it to the larger group so we can share this and get everyone's feedback.

James: Okay, agree. Can you think of any specifics that you were - feedback that you've received here? It's been in private sessions or...

Simonetta Batteiger: No, this is not secret at all, so I can share. So I spoke to one registrar who was sharing a lot of frustration with moving a larger portfolio to them, for example, and then just being unable to complete the task because the way you do transfers today just operationally you need to do a lot of WHOIS lookups and then you max out your allowed amount of WHOIS lookups in the process and things like that I think we haven't even thought of or discussed in this group.

But if we come up with a process for this transfer function these are the type things that registrars are really concerned about and that really create a hassle for them. So I'm just hoping that we can find a way to get more of this type feedback and make sure that whatever we walk away with is also

perceived by the registrars as something that's actually addressing one of their main concerns.

James: Okay, thank you. Yes, Matt, go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Not to go too deep into that but I think James or Michele or Bob, correct me if I'm wrong but I think right now registrars have an obligation to white list IP addresses for the purposes of doing transfers and a registrar can't actually block for an operational reason to do WHOIS lookups. In radar there's a white list IP and I believe that's the purpose of that. But anyway, we might want to take that offline.

James: Yes, and that's something that I think is very important but it's not universally used is that folks are not always maintaining their white list IP addresses in radar. But if we have encountered even situations where those are regulated or have quotas associated with them. So yes, it's probably something that we could talk about.

                 I think it's on that boundary where it definitely affects things like change of control, especially in large batches or in volume. So it definitely addresses the scalability of whatever procedure we propose or whatever ideals process we - but it also starts to get into some other questions about registrars playing nicely together with their WHOIS systems and thin registries in particular.

                 Thick registries, not an issue. You know, we know exactly who - where to deliver the FOAs because we can get that information from the registry operator. But it's mainly we're talking about thin registries where registrars are being a little tightfisted about the information that they're sharing with one another.

                 Okay, thanks for your update, Simonetta and were there any other questions or comments relative to the ideal process? Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, maybe just a note that Rob Golding has further explained his point that he was making on the call. So for those of you who can read it in Adobe Connect.

James: Okay, I'm sorry; I have not been paying attention to the chat room, Rob. So maybe if we can capture that and we'll take that to Paul.

Okay, so the next item on our agenda is really to discuss the substance of Charter Question A and I think this strikes directly at the suggested by Simonetta that we start to present this list of concepts or principles or requirements capture, whatever we wanted to call that list coming out of the change of control ideal process sub-team.

So the question I would have for that sub-team and for Simonetta is do you feel like that list is in a state recognizing it's very rough draft, but do you feel like it's in a position where it can be shared with the larger group now?

Simonetta Batteiger: I think it can be shared, it's not final, and it would benefit of feedback and input from anyone who can take a look at this and tell us their thoughts. And I know that I have myself not given all my feedback yet. So I don't view this to be like the final, final version. But I think it would be a great idea to share it and just get some thoughts and some feedback. There's a lot more people in this room and on the phone today than we often have on the workgroups. So that it's a good opportunity to tap people's brains.

James: So as long as we qualify it with - that this list is written in pencil and it's certainly just an early attempt at trying to capture all of these elements, that nothing is set in stone. So I'll read through some here and we'll see if we can get - provoke a response either here in the room or maybe someone behind me will throw some heavy objects at my head to get our attention.

But here are some of the concepts that we laid out and this is - when I say "we laid out" I don't know, a few weeks ago I just threw some things onto a

list and I know they've been modified and added to and edited by some of the other folks.

So this is I think what I understand to be kind of the current state of these items, but we can certainly build on them from here. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. First of all I want to check with the folks on Adobe Chat Room. I haven't shared this with you and so you'll see it in a second in the room, but then for people here in the room make sure this is big enough that you can read. I'm sort of juggling a bunch of stuff. And then the final point is what you're looking at on the screen here is in fact the original, not the edited version, because I haven't pulled that up yet.

So when people - this is the list from James' original email. I've picked off a few but this is by no meals the composite of all the chat that's been going on on the list.

James: Okay, thanks, Mikey. That's an important point. So if you remember a spot and edit that you've made that's missing from this list please point that out as well. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: And maybe another thing to add to this is that by no means this is ordered in priority. This is just whatever came to James' mind first, second and so this is not to say the most important thing we came up with right now is this naming piece. So keep that in mind when you look at this list.

James: No, and I don't know how we can beat up this list any more than we already have except to say it's a brainstorming, it's a conversation starter, it's written in pencil and it's not carved in any kind of a irrevocable stone tablet. Okay, so that said, let's kind of get the conversation rolling here by looking at some of these principles.

The first one is that just the terminology or discussion that sometimes we have used the term "buyer and seller" because recognizing that the aftermarket is the most common example of a change of control, but as we've discussed in the working group, there are a number of other examples that don't happen, necessarily, in a commercial transaction.

So we wanted to neutralize the language by going something like assigner or assignee or I'm certainly open to other types of things. I think what wasn't necessarily important to get to an answer, but just to say that buyer and seller were probably too limiting based on a number of the scenarios that we talked about.

So does anyone have any thoughts here, does anyone feel that we really need to solve this right now, or this is a good principle, or - I can't believe Michele Neylon has not hit his microphone light yet today, so but we'll just press forward, then.

The second concept was, as we discussed and I think as Bob and Simonetta and, oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Avri Doria: No, not sorry, I'm slow reacting. I totally agree with principle of the change. Assignor and assignee, way a lot of people get confused about the or and the ee and not knowing which applies to me.

And, I mean, I - so that would be my only concern. I agree with the principle that it is not, you know, buyer, seller. But assignor, assignee is just, especially given that not everybody is an advanced English speaker, even among those of us that speak it natively and so that differentiation is sometimes tough. So I would just bring that caution up.

James: That's a fair point and I think the transfer says something like, losing and gaining, or something, so maybe that's a little bit something easier to translate.

Avri Doria: Yes, but you don't want to say, well, you don't want to say the loser and the gainer.

James: Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I would be really curious, especially on this one because I think it's very important that as small as this may seem, to make it clear because otherwise people will get really confused and I have the same reaction, but at the same time, I don't have a better idea.

So if someone in this room can come up with a better term, or maybe we need to do something like find a term, but then put in brackets what that means so that it's really clear, you can get confused with it, right, in the final wording.

And I know that the gaining and losing language is also confusing a lot of people just as much as the current registrant and I don't even know what the other one is and that couple of terminology. I haven't found a good one yet, but we should strive to find one.

James: Yes, I agree and, you know, I think my only request is that while we can maybe stay in the abstract, we think we're on the right track here and not necessarily whip out our thesaurus or thesauri, or whatever and tackle this today. Yes, Bob?

Bob: Was there a problem with gaining registrar and losing registrar and gaining registrant and losing registrant? Because it seems like those are words, we all know what they mean and everybody in this...

James: Except the policy actually never says losing registrar. It says registrar of record and gaining registrar. So my only request would be that we just don't create new acronyms.

Bob: Yes.

James: Okay, so I've got, wow, this one is surprisingly spirited. So I've got Michele first and then Mikey. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'd be very, very against this idea of gaining, losing registrar, registrant because a change of control may not actually be a change of registrant in the sense that the entity, person or persons who is making use of the domain name could simply have changed name. So for example, if I have a corporate entity, let's call it Widgets Limited, and I renamed that corporate entity to Coffee Limited, none of the partners have changed. The domain's not moving from anywhere to anywhere else. We're just updating the WHOIS details. We're changing the holder but it's not actually changing who's actually using it.

                So, you know, a change of control concept for me cannot - can apply where you have a change of corporate details or something like that or maybe, you know, a single white female becomes a married white female, or whatever way you want to put it.

                So, you know, a surname changes going from their maiden name to their married name or they get divorced, you know? There's a lot of permutations that I really don't like commingling this with transfers between registrars because that's what got us into this into the first place.

James: Fair point. Okay, so I have quite a queue here going. I'll take this order, Mikey, Bob and then Rob in the chat room. So Mikey, you're first.

Mikey O'Connor: I just want to back up Michele's point. I was going to make almost the same one. We're not talking about change of registrar, we're talking change of registrant and then I put in the notes there's - we probably want to take note

of the difference between really a change of control versus a change of info about controlling person or entity or whatever.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, just coming back on that, Mikey. I mean I agree but the problem is with some of the ccTLDs if you change the organization that triggers a change of control which that would happen, for example, in .eu, if I was to change my company name or tweak it in the slightest as far as registry would be concerned that's a transfer, sorry, that's a trade in their terminology.

James: Okay, thanks. Bob, go ahead.

Bob: Yes, thanks, this is Bob. I guess not necessarily in love with gaining and losing registrant. It just seems to one is the most obvious for everyone, but nonetheless the - could that not be a use case where the gaining registrant and the losing registrant happen to be the same? And for that use case where there's only a change of information?

Michele Neylon: I still have an issue with gaining and losing because that suggest - I know it might be kind of getting into semantics of it but ultimately I've just actually gone back to Avri's point. My God, I'm supporting Avri, what next? The - we have to be careful about the language that we use because ultimately what comes out of it is this goes through various stages of reports, comments, feedback and everything else, then it goes to motions and what have you and then it goes to implementation.

And I've already seen with IRTPB where the choice of language that at some various points along the way has caused people who had actually followed the entire process to be coming to us and going, "Oh, my God, what the hell have you done? Where did this come from?" And then we have to calm them down and say, "No, actually this is what we were talking about, the language has changed a bit."

And don't forget, those of us who actually have to implement this more often than not we're not lawyers. You have to explain to the lawyer what exactly it is that we're trying to do and get this to do this and (then battle) and somebody in Operations has to go tweaking EPP interfaces and everything else.

I mean the simpler, the clearer the language then the easier it will be. And don't forget this is supposedly a multicultural, you know, international multi-stakeholder bottom-up, yada, yada, yada, oh, (ratty, calm down) organization. So how do you transpose that into multiple languages where the differences between those terms are relatively clear in English for those of us at a certain level aren't going to be clear, they don't translate.

James: Okay, thanks, Michele. I have Rob Golding in the chat and then Simonetta next. Rob?

Rob Golding: I'm basically agreeing with Michele. We have possibly a slightly different view only because of the kind of people we deal with but we allow (unintelligible) of details which would allow Mrs. Smith to become Mrs. Jones because she gets married. But that doesn't change anything other than what we sent to the registrees.

We have (unintelligible) of trade where it's moved in terms of control from one of their customers to another one of their customers, but it particularly takes the case when we (move) from one of our resellers to another one of our resellers but we are still their registrar of record.

And we have this concept of transfer when it moves between one registrar and another. Gaining and losing are definitely not the right terms of update and probably not even trade. And current and new would probably be about the only words that would fit or existing and updated or something like that. And none of our customers are going to understand what assignee and assignor is.

James: Okay, thanks, Rob. And Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh, I had the exact same thought. I thought about - I mean really there's old and new. Old sounds bad but current and updated, current and new. I mean that is a lot more clear. It may not sound that fancy but that were some thoughts that I had when I - and it's the same thing that Rob said.

James: Yes, and I put myself in the queue with almost the exactly that same thought is that's something that maybe isn't the flowery language that we like to use in ICANN circles but it translates well, it's understood and remember this process is targeted at people who don't come to these meetings and read these kinds of policy documents. So I think that's also a thing.

                So what I'd like to do is say thank you for the thoughts on this and move on and see if we can cover one more of these. We have eight minutes before our open Q&A session. So if we could move on to the second one, I think there's 12 or 13 of these. So we should probably, you know, keep charging forward here.

                So the second one was that if the assignor and assignee, which we've already decided we hate those terms, but if these two parties are both customers of the same registrar then they should make use of that registrar's internal change of control process first.

                And I think that what I was trying to convey here by putting this out is that this policy is really for those situations where either the registrar does not offer an internal change of control process, which they're not required to offer, I think that through the PowerPoints we saw that many do, but it's certainly not an obligation. And then the second thing was that - second scenario was that there is a change on control in conjunction with a change of registrar.

So this is essentially saying in that case where there is no change of registrar, it's just a change of registrant, that the registrars policy or process should be used first.

Any thoughts on this? I'm sure there's a number, so okay, Michele?

Michele Neylon: I like it.

James: You like it, okay, I love it. Great, very short and succinct.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think there's nothing - I have no objection to this at all but I'm just wondering one thing that we may want to capture in conjunction with this one is to say that at least recommend that whatever internal process the registrar is using I don't want to proscribe anything but it shouldn't materially conflict with what you can expect if you were to move your name from A to B.

So I don't think it should be complicated, for example, to do this within one registrar than it should be if you move from A to B. And if a registrar, and I don't have an example in mind, had something that would make it super complicated to do this, versus it's so much easier to transfer from A to B. I don't know if we would want something like that as an outcome.

This was just some thoughts. And then also I was unaware of this, too, that there's no need for a registrar to offer an opportunity within their system to update owners. I don't know, maybe one of the recommendations should be that each registrar does offer this because what other opportunity, what registrant that that registrar have to either move their name away or update owners or maybe even struggle with, "Okay, my company name is XYZ, I was purchased, it should now be something else and that registrar doesn't allow a process for that." I think that should be rectified.

James: Okay, so that's an interesting point is we should maybe not just necessarily take it as a given that registrars don't need to offer this and say that you

should offer this. I mean we are discussing this change of control and they could go a long way towards simplifying the ICANN area of that if they had an internal process that wasn't too burdensome.

I think I've got Matt and was there - oh, okay, just Matt then. Thanks, Matt.

Matt Serlin: Yes, thanks, James. It's the first time that I've heard that and maybe my brain is a little mush as a result of this week but I'm just thinking out loud. If we create a process that is only applicable to a certain amount of cases and it's optional for registrars, what have we really accomplished?

James: Oh, I should clarify, this is - I only have one example, which is the change of account function at GoDaddy which I think was presented in one of the slides which is if you and I were transacting a domain name and we were both customers of GoDaddy and we didn't really feel the need to transfer somewhere else we could use that process as opposed to an ICANN process.

And I think the gist behind this recommendation was - or this thought was this is to - this ICANN process is to step in where registrars doesn't have a process.

Matt Serlin: Right, but then doesn't that then create challenges for example for ICANN compliance? Like how do you enforce something that isn't necessarily applicable in all cases to all registrars?

James: Yes, but now we're starting to get into this area of a customer service, you know? Some registrars are going to be better at serving their customers than others.

Matt Serlin: Right, but we have that today and we have the Uniform Transfer. You know what I mean? I don't know, it just worries me that this is going to create unforeseen consequences. And I know we're just kind of talking through it.

James: Well, and maybe that's where Simonetta's point about one of the recommendations is you should have a process, you know, and you should use that first.

Matt Serlin: Right.

James: Which means that this whole change of control that we're talking about is only in that case where the registrant and the registrar change, but I'm building up quite a queue here. I saw Marika first, then Michele. Okay, so Marika, go ahead.

Marika: This is Marika, isn't there a way to address that possibility? We used to have a kind of, you know, "These are the minimum requirements of a change of control process." And, you know, whatever process the registrars have should at least have that and they can do whatever else on top of that but then you avoid having A and B saying, "Well, there's this ICANN process, but registrar's might have their own process as well," and trying to match that.

                A way of doing it might be setting up basic criteria saying registrars should have a change of control process, at a minimum it should meet these criteria and for anything else what you want to offer is up to you.

James: I think that's also a good - and that kind of substantiates a little bit more of Simonetta's recommendation. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Echoing what Matt is saying, you know, the last thing I would want to see is a situation where you have one set of registrars complying with one policy, another set of registrars complying with another policy because that doesn't help anybody, and it doesn't help registrars, doesn't help registrants, doesn't help ICANN, doesn't help anybody, it's totally pointless.

I like Marika's idea of - maybe that's somewhere along the lines we need to look at, but the other thing I was just kind of thinking was maybe it's the kind of thing where we go and we ask for (unintelligible) supposedly security experts, you know, "Is this the kind of thing that you think would be suitable for this? Is this an issue?" I don't know, but ultimately if it's not a binding policy, even if it ends up being shoved into some kind of SSAC advisory specifically then maybe that's where it ends up.

But I just don't like the idea of a policy that has two tiers because, you know, we're debating about the RAA at present, and we're seeing going, "Why can't ICANN do this? Why can't ICANN do that?" You know, splitting policies, that just causes more confusion.

James: Okay, thanks, Michele. It looks like we've got Mikey and then Matt. Okay, so Mikey, go ahead. And, I'm sorry, I just want to point out after that we're probably going to have to start wrapping this up because now we're running into our public part. Go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know, this has been a really good discussion for me because when I first read that I sort of went, "Huh, yes, that kind of makes sense. It's kind of logical." But this discussion has convinced me, no, not so much. I think we don't want to have this little branch.

So I'm tending to sort of say back away from this particular idea all together, let's do a change of control function with Marika's caveat that we specify the high points that it has to hit but it's the same whether it's inside or between two and leave it at that.

James: That promotes a really interesting question, but I want to yield to the queue. Go ahead, Matt.

Matt Serlin: Yes, thanks, James, good point, Mikey. The only thing that I was going to say was that we're talking about the registrar function and the registrar piece of it

but there is also some discussion about this happening at the registree level. And so it would - James, to your point if you're updating information at the registree level regardless of what internal controls and processes the registrar has in place then whatever policy we come up with that dictates what happens at the registree I would think still needs to be adhered to and followed. So...

James: Okay. So we'll probably close off the discussion on that one. I think that one still needs a lot to - a lot more effort. It's - Mikey, your hand is still - okay, I'm just going to disregard that hand then. And again, these are talking points, these are conversation starters, these are not designed to - not the beginnings of language or findings or recommendations or anything even close to that.

                So - go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Just a quick comment, as talking points they really do work quite well.

James: Yes, I think they certainly served their purpose, at least the first two. Okay, well let's put a marker here and say that during our next meeting we will resume our spirited discussion about these two and then we'll hopefully move on to cover some of the others.

                And if you have some time on the plane and you - or playing Words With Friends or something like that and somebody has a good idea for synonyms for old and new or losing and gaining then please feel free to share those with the list. Michele, yes?

Michele Neylon: It was actually Rob Golding brought a couple of possible terms into the chat...

James: Okay, and again...

Michele Neylon: ...which weren't apparent.

James: Okay, thanks. I haven't been watching the chat very well because it's just a chewing bubble gum and playing drums at the same time, or whatever. So if we could make sure we capture those, Marika, and we'll send those to the list.

                So now we're three minutes into - I see we have a few attendees and I'm hoping that this has prompted a similar level of excitement and interest in the observers that it has in us. So I would like to then - I can't turn around so I'm just going to be rude and kind of speak to the microphone and not the folks behind me. But I would really love to speak to the team there.

                And that is that we have now allocated the next 30 minutes of this session for open Q&A. If there's anything that someone would like to add to our discussions, any questions they have for this working group or anything like that now is the time to raise your hand, come on up to the microphone, have a seat at the table. There's plenty of chairs at the table with microphones if anyone would like to come and join us.

                Otherwise we're going to start to suspect that you're here for the coffee and the WiFi. But please join us at the table and no one, not even looking up.

Michele Neylon: You can pick on Rafik because I know he's got an opinion on this. He's here.

James: Oh, hi, Rafik, welcome to the...

Michele Neylon: (Eric)'s there as well.

James: (Eric) is a member of the working group.

Michele Neylon: Oh, he's a working member? Wow.

James: Absolutely.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, (Eric).

James: So Rafik, what are your thoughts? Just give us three, four minutes of your take on this session and any questions you might have. Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so it's Rafik, for the transcript. I am here just observer. I think that working group is doing good job and I see that there is consensus among the members. And I like that discussion about assignor and assignee, but I understand to make it really easy as policy to be understood by people outside ICANN community and to make standard policy to make this transfer between these smooth. Anyway, that's all.

James: Thanks, Rafik. Any other thoughts or anyone would like to come to the table, please, otherwise our next move is we're going to have Mikey fire up his mind map here and just kind of give a presentation to the audience about what we're talking about here, this change of control which I think to - I try to think in generic terms as much as possible but I do believe that this affects just about every possible registrant at some point or another in a domain name lifecycle.

                   It doesn't have to be domain investors or companies that are transacting names. It happens - it can happen to anyone. So if there's no other thoughts here we'll have Mikey maybe give us a run through and if you could make it just long enough for me to go get a cup of coffee, Mikey, I'd appreciate it.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm your man. So once upon a time in a time long, long ago the focus of attention about all this stuff was transferring domains between registrars and that's what this policy, the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy is all about.

                   What we discovered in the 82 preceding working groups on this topic is that there's a difference between transferring domains between registrars and transferring the control of domains between registrants and a lot of times the

registrar transfer policy is used to accomplish the change of control at the same time which is a sort of good news, bad news story because most of the time it works fairly well, and in fact there's a pretty extensive industry that's sort of grown up around this idea, the domain name aftermarket, that has combined these two concepts, but they don't combine gracefully.

And so in an earlier working group we decided to pull those ideas apart and establish or at least have a conversation about a policy definition of the change of control as opposed to the change of registrar.

And so we went off looking for ideas about how this could be done, and one of the conversations we had is we went to look for sort of good examples of a very sparse, very high level definition of what this could be all about.

And in one of our sub-group calls we stole the Nominet process as sort of a starting point for the conversation. So again, this is all written in pencil, this is all subject to extensive review and may change a lot. But the - what's up on the screen, or at least is going to show up on the screen, is this summary of the Nominet process. Nominet is the registry for the .uk ccTLD.

And what Nominet lays out on their Website is sort of two chunks to the process. The first chunk is the chunk that relates to if you're the current registrant here's some things that you need to do. You need to tell the - in this case, and this is another one of the distinctions, this is a registry driven process as opposed to a registrar driven process because in the .uk TLD the registry does this.

So you tell the registry which domains you want to transfer to another person or entity then you - this is a little more detailed than we're planning to get in our final recommends, but in the Nominet world you identify the new registrant and indicate who's paying the transfer fee then you agree to contractual language that binds this on the losing/old/assignor side of the transaction and launch the transaction.

Then it gets shifted to the gaining or new or - oops, juggling a new multi-screen deal here, I goofed up a little bit. There we go. If you're the new - I like new, new is good, I'm sticking with new, it's easy to say, the new registrant then you start out by being notified that the old registrant has relinquished it or wants to relinquish it. You accept that this is indeed a transfer that you're a party to and that you want to accept.

We had an interesting conversation about unwanted inbound transfers which is pretty cool idea, I never thought of before, you pay, you presumably would also enter into an agreement and then at the end of that process both parties would be notified that this has been accomplished.

That's sort of a very sketchy, high level view of what we're talking about here. It doesn't sound that complicated when you describe it, but as you can see from earlier discussion there are some very subtle nuances that we, as the working group, want to make sure we get right. We also want to make sure that this is as sparse and light as we could make it to allow as much flexibility in the implementation as we can.

And that's just sort of a high level view and I've accomplished my mission as providing James the amount of time he needed to go get some coffee.

James: Thanks, Mikey. We had one other thought from Rafik here that I think he wanted to introduce to the group, and then if we really can't prompt any more questions from the room then we do have some housekeeping announcements that we should probably go over before our next session.

So Rafik, if you would please, repeat to me what you - repeat to the group what we just discussed a moment ago.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, James. I was just asking if the working group members consider it how long it is transfer on the change should take. So, I mean if it takes long time it

becomes maybe irrelevant. So how to make it a limited time and to - I don't want to take, as example, (ARDP) but did you start brainstorming about these?

James: I think we may have actually missed it. We did? Okay, Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: You know an old brain gets foggy as to where conversations took place, but I know that Mountain and I have had conversations about this. There's one of the key words that you can kind of look for in the vast notes whenever they fall out of this thing is the length of time that the form of authorization is kept open for.

Because, for example, in the aftermarket sometimes what they do is they leave the - when the seller wants to transfer a name they'll transfer it to a registrar and then they'll indicate to the registrar, "Yes, I want you to sell this name and so I'll grant my form of authorization in perpetuity." Because unlike the mythology when you transfer a name to a registrar that's selling it to you - for you - sometimes that takes a year or two for the actual sale to take place.

And sometimes if your name is really crummy it never sells, and at the same time the market place doesn't want to have to interrupt a sale to come back to the seller and get the form of authorization because that takes quite a long time. So then the buyer has to wait a really long time. So we're going to dive into that a bit and talk about exactly that question that you've raised in the context of the authorization of the seller to allow the transfer away and how that can be handled.

On the one hand you don't want these to linger, on the other hand there is a business reason why sometimes sellers actually want it to be essentially up on the want ads wall for quite a long time and we have to figure out a way to balance those. That ought to get a rise out of Mountain.

James: Actually, I think that we may have - at least I had a different take on Rafik's question, or Rafik's comment, which is not necessarily the lifespan of a FOA or whether it aligned with any kind of listing practices or expirations but more along the lines of if a registrar, or if we determine a registry, may have roles in this have received the FOA from both parties, how long - what's the time limit for them to actually execute this change?

                You know, with current inter-registrar transfers they have - they can if they're concerned about things; they can actually draw it out five days. But that's the most - the longest time that the losing registrar can elongate this process.

                So I think - and maybe you can give us some hints here, but I hadn't considered the idea that there would be this shop clock on this transaction that once both parties have acknowledged that it's time, you know, that the registrar must be compelled to act in a certain timeframe. That was my take on Rafik's - and I think that we haven't really discussed that aspect of it.

                Yes, Simonetta and how about local (unintelligible) if you could please...

Simonetta Batteiger: Let her speak first and then I have a reaction.

James: Okay, and if you could please introduce yourself and state your name and affiliation and then your question, please.

Mikey O'Connor: Turn on your microphone.

(Ukar Takeama): My name is (Ukar Takeama) from (JPNA) IP Registry of Japan. So maybe my question is very primitive. I may be naïve at this discussion but I think this issue is really related to the every day business of registrars that I think less registrar people attend this meeting later than I had expected.

So what do you think the reason of that because I thought many registry people are watching - have to be watching this issue. So - but I don't know why less registry people are here. So...

James: And I think if registrars we also...

(Ukar Takeama): Sorry, registrar.

James: Registrar or registry?

(Ukar Takeama): Registrar.

James: Registrars?

(Ukar Takeama): Yes.

James: Well, I'll touch on all of them. Registrars, I mean we also scratch our heads sometimes when more registrars don't participate in ICANN and show up to the meetings and especially in working groups, it has a direct impact on their businesses.

Registrees tend to have usually one or two representatives representing the entire stakeholder group. They do things a little differently and we do have one, I believe, on the call and one or two on the call.

And then as far as the ccTLD registries, this is a very - I thank you very much for introducing this topic because we are, as a reminder, at 10:15, meeting with the ccTLD - I'm sorry, CCNSO, which is the group that manages all the ccTLD registries, many of whom, as Michele and others have pointed out, have a functioning change of control process.

And we would definitely like to, you know, be the beneficiaries of their experience with those processes and so I would encourage everyone at the

table to - I can't promise that they have coffee, but they do have a meeting room that we can go and join that discussion and from what I'm hearing from Marika this is the first time ever that a GNSO working group has asked the CCNSO for input. So we have to be on our best behavior or they won't let us come back again. I don't know if that addresses some of your questions, but...

(Ukar Takeama):   Yes, okay, and do you have any other channel other than public comment, public comment please, to conduct (unintelligible) gTLD registrants?

James: I mean, to participate in this? Go ahead.

Woman: Or, usually, as we discussed before, I think that this working group will present its recommendations in different ways, so there will first be an initial report that will hopefully be published in time for Prague and then the idea would be as well, in addition to a public comment forum, to also organize a workshop in the same kind of format to present those recommendations and try to get - encourage discussion.

And possibly the idea might be as well to reach out to some of the groups like the registrar stakeholder group at that stage to really directly say, "Well, this is what we're thinking of proposing. Do you think, you know, this is something you can work with and will improve things?" So I think that in addition to public comment, hopefully we'll have that opportunity to get input from different communities and groups.

James: So thank you. I have a short queue here of now Simonetta and Bob and Michele and we're running out of time, so what I would like to - I would ask kindly, because we do have a few announcements, if we can keep it to about 45 seconds to a minute. If that's at all possible. So go ahead, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: All right, this is going back to the previous topic that Rafik was bringing up and that you also responded to, to me there is maybe a difference between

the transfer itself when both parties kind of initiated this actual, now we want to change control piece and when the length and duration of an FOA.

Those, to me, aren't the same thing, so just because someone tells their registrar, "I am okay with you allowing to let the name go out whenever the request comes in."

And the second piece coming together where you actually get the request, I think if that second piece is there, that's when this time clock starts of this is now the transfer period and how long it takes to complete the transfer versus the first one, to me, is almost the only thing that (unintelligible) an indication, "Hey, I'm interested, to sell this name," which doesn't mean that it transfers immediately at all, it could be sitting there for years or never transfer.

James: I agree. They're slightly different time periods, but they could overlap. Okay, Bob?

Bob: I was just going to address - the question is, first point, I think rather than, you know, if the other registrars aren't here, I think it's actually a good thing, I think this work group is very well represented, it's balanced, we've got people from various other groups.

And I think there's probably a bit of trust that we're going to come up with rational recommendations and that we give people lots of opportunities to weigh in. We're not going to pull the rug out from underneath their feet, so I think that's probably why more people aren't here is because they're really not worried that they're going to get surprised by anything.

James: I tend to agree, but on the other hand, we had a couple of folks raising their hands with the IRTPB recommendations were presented yesterday saying, "What? I've never seen these. Where are these coming from?" So, you know, I think it's a little bit of both. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I just want to say, well, first of all, it's good to have somebody from the audience actually asking questions and giving us input.

James: Yes, thank you.

Michele Neylon: And we really need more of those. And to what James was just saying, yes, I was sitting in the registrar stakeholder group meeting yesterday and when somebody came up and start asking questions about IRTPB's recommendations and implementation, I just go - I was lost for words because it wasn't as if we hadn't tried to get input.

It wasn't as if we hadn't had multiple comment periods. It wasn't as if we hadn't had multiple updates, stakeholder group meetings, multiple email discussions on the registrar stakeholder group mailing list.

And yet at the, I'd say the 25th hour or something like that, you still have people going, "Oh, I didn't know anything about this." Christ's sake, I mean, it ends up in this ridiculous situation, yes, sure, maybe they trust us to make good policy, but time and time again, it's the same people.

The same people from the registrar, the same people from the registrees, it's the same people, well, I think Mikey has a category unto himself, since he's, you know, he is Mikey, but it's always the same people. That's not good.

James: Yes, no, but to Bob's point, I think that the other folks, the vast majority of registrars have confidence that their delegation to this working group has these issues in hand, but yes, it is always surprising when something is two years old and, you know, when you talk about a dead horse, you know, the horse is dead and we've had a funeral and we've moved it to the state and somebody wants to dig it up and check for a pulse, you know?

And it's like, no, no, no, no, no. So we have one more guest at the table, I would like to take his question or comment. And we do have a few quick announcements, so if you would, please, state your name and your affiliation.

(Shawn Willkie):   (Shawn Willkie) from (Lattice) Domain. I feel like I'm the digger that you just mentioned, I'm a little late to the party. I am just wondering why we are discussing the Nominet model. Are we considering...

James: Go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: One of the problems with diving into a working document like that is that, you know, we were sitting there looking for just something to hang an outline on, so we grabbed one that was easy to scrape off the Web and that's why I sort of went through that disclaimer about, it's all in pencil, blah, blah, blah.

Because for one thing, the Nominet model is a registry-based model. And so please don't take that to mean that we're in any way endorsing or planning to follow that. We just needed something to grab some words off of.

(Shawn Willkie):   Okay.

James: And we had, in the working group, grabbed a few country code examples, Nominet, EU, IE. I guess what we're saying is, if you have any suggestions, change of controls that you're familiar with and that you like and that you think work well, you know, send them our way because we're looking at everything right now.

(Shawn Willkie):   Yes, I do have a positive opinion of the Nominet model, however, it's not as linear as it seems, because I'm working on a case right now where now they're requiring one of my clients to execute a letter headed document stating that they want to change the registrant just because an email address belongs to an old employee that no longer works there.

James: Okay. But that's, yes, okay, thanks. But no, I don't think that we're using that as a model. Just something to hold up on the screen and poke sticks at it and see what we like and what we don't like.

                And in fact, we're going to discuss with the CCNSO - I see your hand up, Michele, but I'm sorry, we've got to cut this off. It's been a very, I think a good working session and if I could say, they've all been good working sessions.

Michele Neylon: The only thing I'd say is, you know, if this gentleman wants, (Shawn) wants to give input, you know, either you can join the working group - it's still open, isn't it?

James: Yes, we're always open for new members.

Michele Neylon: You know, or just ping one of us if you've got particular input and make a comment or something.

James: Yes.

Woman: And the mailing list is archived, so you can go back and look at any of the discussions. The calls have all been recorded so they can be listened to, so please.

James: Yes, no secrets here. So yes, so we wanted to very quickly just have a few housekeeping announcements so please, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So for the meeting with the CCNSO, it's (filing) at a quarter past 10:00 to quarter to 11:00, it's in (Bougainvillea), that's in the main hotel building on the - I think you need to go in direction of the Tropicana, then up the stairs to the 5th floor or elevator.

                So we're expected there shortly and I hope many of you will be able to join. I understand that they will be in a room with, I don't know, 100 people,

because it's really that they - all the ccTLD operators are there, so it will really be good to have many of you there as well and be able to have a lively discussion.

James: Thank you. And just wanted to put out one more announcement which is, there will not be a teleconference on Tuesday. This following one, I think we may have blocked that as a free Tuesday on our work plan. If not, well, we'll just have to suffer the consequences because most people are still, you know, hanging out in Costa Rica or on their way home or digging through their inbox, which is probably getting its revenge on them by that time.

Mikey O'Connor: Or digging up horses.

James: Or digging up horses with IRTPB and seeing if you can just, you know, shock the paddles to the horse one more time and talk about (TIAC).

But anyway, so that is our session. We certainly appreciate everyone's input, not only the working group, but also the folks that gave us their thoughts and comments, that's exactly why we wanted to have this extra 30 minute session.

And, you know, the working group is still open if you want to join and we would appreciate - always appreciate (unintelligible) on that and hope to see at least a few of you at the CCNSO meeting, you know, guys, don't make me go into that lion's den solo.

So come on, you know, and they won't have us back - you'll be, okay, (Eric)'s got my back so, you know, I know that at least the (LAC) TLD folks will go kindly on me, the rest of them, if Michele goes, maybe the center folks will be nice as well, but I'm probably on my own with (Erin) and - but thank you, everyone.

And we'll conclude this meeting now and I really appreciate your morning. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: So, oh, yes. So just...

END