ICANN Dakar Meeting

Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Update - TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 27 October 2011 at 10:00 local

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.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much.

Well good morning everyone, for those that in the room and those that are participating remotely. We actually have a really small group of people here. But...

Man: (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Yes. We probably have more people remote than we actually have in the room, but that shouldn't - that shouldn't make this meeting any less interesting and interactive, I hope.

So we're just going to run through a short update that we've prepared on the - on what's happening in relation to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. And then just basically open it up for discussion and questions.

And actually, you know, feel free during the presentation to jump in if you have any questions or comments.

So very briefly, we're just going to run through, you know, four different projects that are currently ongoing. The first one in relation to the IRTP Part B recommendations that were recently adopted by the ICANN board.

Then there are two IRTP Part B recommendations that are in the process of - well, they have received staff proposals, but these are currently on their discussion and then we hope to finalize those shortly. These would then go to the GNSO council for approval.

A quick update on the IRTP Part C. And then there's also the (unintelligible) who is a issue report.

So just a little bit of background -- and I think we have maybe a couple of new people on the - on the bridge, so we're just looking for motions here in the room and you know what the - what this is all about.

So the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 and its' objective is to provide a straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars.

Now, as part of the implementation of that policy, it was decided to run a review and make sure that it was, you know, working as intended and then determine whether there were any areas that required improvement or clarification.

And as a result of that review, a whole list of issues was identified, which were then chopped up in five different PDPs. And we're currently just started work on the IRTP Part C.

Might be of interest as well to mention that this is actually the number one area of complaint when it comes to complaints that are received by ICANN's compliance department. And I think they gave a presentation earlier this

week that confirmed that this is really the - by far the number one area of complaint.

So the IRTP Part B working group completed its' work by submitting it's final report to the GNSO council in May of the - this year. The GNSO council adopted those recommendations and a number of those were then forwarded to the board and adopted in August.

So very briefly on the recommendations that were adopted as part of that process. The first one is a requirement for registrars to provide a Transfer Emergency Action Contact -- a new acronym also known as a TEAC.

This is basically to address situations where an urgent response is needed and it would require registrars to provide a response in that four - in a four-hour timeframe.

Important to highlight that, you know, a response is just a response. It doesn't necessarily mean resolution there of the issue, but it's at least a way of bringing registrars into contact with each other in cases such as a hijacking, for example.

Another recommendation relates to the modification of section 3 of the IRTP to require that the registrar of record -- also known as the losing registrar -- will be required to notify the registered name holder or registrant of a transfer out.

Currently, I think it's - this is optional, but not a requirement. I think the working group felt that this might be another mechanism by which a registrant might be alerted if a - if a transfer is requested and then the person's actually not the one requesting it or there's an issue with it, so that potential conflicts might be identified ahead of time.

There is a specific language that suggests for modification of reason for denial number six. As in its' current state, it was felt that it was not really clear what was intended and open to interpretation.

And there's the deletion of denial reason seven. As in - as it is currently written, it actually cannot even be used.

So I'll just hand it over to Tim to talk about the implementation status of those recommendations.

Tim Cole: Thanks Marika. Tim Cole -- Chief registrar liaison.

The implementation status is, once the - once the board acts, it moves from the policy realm into the operations realm. And so our department is actively working on implementing the specific recommendations as they apply to registrars themselves.

So we have drafted the modifications to the existing policy language based on the various recommendations. And Brian Peck has worked extensively on that and he has - they are now at - under legal review so that we can make sure we've captured everything as required and done it in proper legal ease for the contract, et cetera.

And significantly - well, Marika pronounces it TEAC -- I tend to pronounce it TEAC. So I don't know - we already have differences here between our departments.
But anyway, there is a lot of discussion about how we functionally can implement that. And so based on some dialog we had with members of the working group, we determined that we would use the registrar data system called the RADAR to also support the functionality of the TEAC to the extent that registrars will be able to identify and list their Transfer Emergency Action Contact in RADAR.

And then that contact will be available to all other registrars when they log into RADAR so that they can directly identify the TEAC of another registrar if they need to communicate with them.

So in addition to that, then we have an additional functionality that is a form that can be completed online. I don't know, is that available?

Woman: Yes.

Tim Cole: Next slide? Okay, because I don't think I control that, but I control this.

So this is the draft of what this - what the form would look like that a registrar would log in, complete some information. We are going to be sharing this with the working group to see if we get any feedback about possible changes to it.

This is a mock-up of what it would look like. But the idea is that the initial contact starting the TEAC process would be sent out from ICANN to the other registrar. And at that point, a date and timestamp would be captured.

And because the TEAC requirement has a very specific four-hour window for one registrar to respond to another registrar, this is the - this would be the sort of the standard way in which that clock timeframe will be documented, should there end up being subsequent compliance concerns about it.

But this form allows the registrar initiating the contact to designate their preferred means of contact. And the language of the message that will go to the other registrar will include the information supplied by the filing registrar, as well as information about how to respond.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Morning, Tim, and happy birthday, by the way. You're welcome.

The one question in relation to this -- because one of the concerns that several of the registrars raised during discussions of the IRTP Part B recommendations was that ensuring that the TE - the Transfer Emergency Action Contact would only be used for actual emergencies and not to replace, you know, their normal communications.

And in other words, just become somebody's a little bit lazy and couldn't be bothered doing their job, it shouldn't be used. So the one concern I would have with this -- and I'm sure we can continue discussing this further in the working group and with yourselves -- but just making sure that it is made very, very clear on this form, because - that it - this is only for emergencies.

And if they use it for other things, that that will have consequences. Thanks.

Tim Cole: Well, I'm not sure what consequences. There aren't any consequences written into the policy, but we certainly - if you want to draft some language for us to put on this form, we would gladly consider it.

It hasn't been finalized yet, and that's why we're showing you the draft. So if you have - if what it says here is not adequate, we'll welcome, you know, your contribution, because we simply want it to serve the purpose as intended.

Clearly, it will only be - it can only be accessed within the RADAR system, so it's not a public contact for the entire world to access. But there is also a transfer contact within the RADAR system that is available now, so this - it would be two separate contacts.

And certainly you can put - we can put language in here explaining the limitations for using this.

Michele Neylon: Yes, Tim.

I mean, I'm not trying to labor the point. It's just that in terms of the - this - of this contact thing, the main area pushback that we got from our stakeholder group was in the - kind of the feature (creep) -- a (creep) of the emergency contacts, so...

Tim Cole: Then tell us how you want us to do it.

Michele Neylon: Well, I mean - the main thing for me...

Tim Cole: I'm not - I mean...

Michele Neylon: I don't - I don't...

Tim Cole: I'm not objecting, just...

Michele Neylon: No, no.
Tim Cole: For this language and we'll…

Michele Neylon: No, no. I'm not saying that you are. I'm not saying that you are. It was just - it was just - the key thing is that I wouldn't want this thing to come back and bite us on the rear end. That's...

Tim Cole: Well Michele, you can continue to tell me that. I understand the concern...

Michele Neylon: No.

Tim Cole: ...but I don't know...

Michele Neylon: No, no. I'm...

Tim Cole: Other than giving you the opportunity to write the language that we use...

Michele Neylon: No, no. And I'm not...

Tim Cole: I can't - I can't go beyond that.

                   This is a policy that was adopted without any teeth to it, other than that you're
                   required to, you know, file - respond within four hours.

Michele Neylon: Well, it - the one suggestion I would make in that - in that sort - then in that
                   case is that the - this page in particular within the RADAR be available in
                   other languages other than English, because I don't - I think that some people
                   -- their first language is not English. They will miss the subtleties of a policy.
                   So if this could be - whatever language is decided on at the top of it
                   explaining what the purpose of the form -- would that be available in the UN
                   languages?

Tim Cole: We'll see how that can be accommodated. I'm not quite sure yet.

                   But - because RADAR doesn't - is not translated in other languages and
                   there is no immediate option - opportunity for doing that because of the way
                   it's structured.   But I will ask our technical folks if there is a possibility for
                   doing that.

Michele Neylon: I mean, the thing is - I mean, one of the common complaints that ICANN staff
                   and compliance have is that there have - they have issues with registrars who
                   are not in the English-speaking part of the world.

                   And if RADAR is one - is a tool that is accessible to all registrars, then -- in
                   my humble opinion -- then that would be an obvious place to look at
                   implementing something in terms of making it slightly multilingual.

                   I mean, if it's an in-house built set of scripts and things that like that, then
                   surely it is customizable. I mean, that - that's - just to me, would just appear
                   to be logical and surely would help to remove some of the pain and - that you

and your staff might be suffering due to a lack or - of communication or a misunderstanding.

Thanks.

Tim Cole: Definitely understood.

So that is - that is the way we are technically going to support the implementation of the TEAC so that it is not outside of - it doesn't just require that one - it - a he said/she said kind of tracking for the four hours.

There is at least a way to identify the initiation of that so that if it comes back later we can - we can identify that. As far as - as far as the language and wording, I - you know we're definitely open to suggestions.

And I will, you know, look into whether or not there are ways to put in different translations at this point. I'll have to talk with our technical folks about that. I'm - just - I don't have an answer for you right now.

Marika Konings: So there's a question from James Bladel.

It says, "Many transfer issues involve registrars who do not participate in working groups or attend ICANN. Is there an outreach communication plan to ensure that these folks are aware of changes to the IRTP?"

Tim Cole: Well, you know, once we are - once we have the technical ability for the TEAC set up and the language for adoption in the - in the policy itself, then we have a requirement under the RAA to provide a reasonable notice for implementation.

And we have a requirement to notify all registrars at that point in time, so there will be clearly a notification to all registrars at the point in time that it is in place and a, you know, a deadline for complying with the implementation.

So we have a - one-communication mechanism for those under the 2009 RAA and a different communication mechanism for those under the 2001 RAA. So we'll have to follow both, which is one of the reasons that we want to do it all at once rather than trickle it out and say, "The policy language is changed here, but TEAC isn't ready for implementation."

We want to implement all at once and have one announcement to clearly explain what all the changes are about. So I hope that answers your question, James.

So do we have IRTP Part B recommendations requiring staff proposals? That's next, back to Marika.

Marika Konings: So thanks Tim for that update. Let me just scroll further here.

So I'll briefly talk about the - where our - oh, have a little bit of echo here. Yes, we're good? Okay.

So just briefly talking about some of those recommendations that came out of the IRTP Part B working group that actually requested staff proposals before a council consideration.

So those deal specifically with the first one -- a clarification of Whois status messages relating to registrar lock status was the recommendation number eight.

And the second one related to a new provision to lock and unlock domain names in relation to the removal of one of the denial reasons for those that need to actually provide clarifications as to how domain names can be locked and unlocked.

So basically I've had already prepared a second - what are we doing about the echo?

Man: Would you like to (go in) Adobe?

Marika Konings: Yes. I don't have.

Man: Oh, wait. Can you turn it down?

Marika Konings: Yes. I have no mic on. It's my own - it's not on Adobe.

Man: Is this - right up here, this little - or - excuse me, I'm sorry. The mic here?

Marika Konings: No.

Man: Okay. All right, just - yes.

Marika Konings: But my speakers - my speakers are all clear, so okay.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: So staff actually - Sorry.

Man: It's okay.

Marika Konings: Trying to fix some audio issues.

Does anyone on the phone bridge have their speakers on their - on their computer open and the phone line at the same time? If so, please mute one of the two.

I think we're already better.

Man: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

So there's already a second draft of proposals that we've been - that staff has prepared for feedback from the IRTP Part B working group. And then you'd find the link here, so basically it looked at the working group's deliberations on these issues and come up with two proposals.

And following some additional discussions with the working group, we've tried to address some of the questions and issues that were raised. Now in the second draft, there's still a number of issues that people have concerns about, so we're trying to work through those.

And - but at the end of the day, I think at some point we need to decide whether, you know, there is working group support for this or whether, you know, there's just some disagreement and that's something that I'm - can maybe - would be raised in the public comment period.

Because the ideas following getting to a state where we feel that the majority of people is comfortable with the proposals as they are, the idea would be to put those out for public comment and get community feedback on those proposals.

And once that process is finalized and, you know, potentially any changes are further made to those proposals -- these would then be considered kind of adopted by the GNSO council before they can go to the ICANN board for their consideration.

And, you know, if there's any interest to go into more detail into those specific proposals, you know, we can maybe do that at the end of - end of the meeting.

So now I'm just talking about the IRTP Part C PDP. This working group had kicked off not too long ago, then the council initiated a PDP at its' meeting in September.

And there's currently a call for volunteers open, you'll find the link here. The first meeting of this working group is scheduled for the 8th of November at 15:00 UTC.

So anyone interested in this topic, please share your details with Glen via the GNSO secretariat and then she'll add you to the mailing list.

The issues that this working group will be looking at is - it's first of all a change of control function. But this is actually one of the issues that came out of the previous IRTP working group had quite extensive discussions in relation to this issue.

It's - currently, there is no (permission) of, but a change of control (leads) in the context of IRTP.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I can just - because I head a couple of people talking about this in the hallways and they're a bit confused by what we mean by change of control, because those of us who've lived the IRTP for the last two years know exactly what it is.

But for those outside it - so I mean, just in really, really, really simple terms, what do we mean by change of the control, Marika?

Marika Konings: I believe we mean change of registrant.

So this is something that, for example, is defined in certain ccTLDs where it's specifically described how you can change registrants. But it doesn't exist in ours or any other policy.

And as a result -- as I understand -- a lot of people actually use the transfer functions to prove ownership and transfer ownership. And that causes certain issues that the previous working group felt needed to be explored and an examination should be undertaken to see whether it would be appropriate or helpful to try to define this change of control or change of registrant function in the context of the IRTP.

This is also linked to other reasons of denial. I think just in the 60-day lock following change of -- what does it say again in the IRTP? It's the change of registrant details, right?

Michele Neylon: No, the - there's no - there's nothing within the policy to cover a change of registrant details.

There is in the policy to cover a change of registrar inter-registrar transfer. The problem we had in IRTP B was we were asked to possibly examine the change of registrar for transfer.

But then when we looked deeper, we discovered that there was no policy in that area at all, so that's how we ended up with it - an IRTP C, in part.

Marika Konings: Right.

But it specifies as well in the report that, you know, this consideration should be considered together with two of the reasons for denial and I think later to - relates to the creation of a domain name and being able to deny and if there - in the first 60 days of creation and as well this other denial reason, which -- I don't remember the exact wording -- but it's also that 60 days -- I think -- after a transfer, you cannot immediately transfer it out again.

I think that's it. So once it has been transferred, a registrar can deny a transfer that - if that takes place in the first - in the 60 days after initial transfer. James is saying correct -- first 60 days and 60 days from previous transfer.

So (unintelligible) consider this (unintelligible) with the, you know, change of (personal) function.

Second issue that's going to be considered in this working group is whether there should be provisions on time limiting as Form of Authorization -- or FOAs -- whether that should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out.

And if I understand this issue correctly, it reads true that a form of authorization can be submitted. A registrar potentially couldn't do anything with that and three years later to suddenly submit that request and a, you know, a transfer out could happen (unintelligible) intention it happens so long after they (unintelligible).

Tim Cole: They're trying to enhance domain name portability while maintaining domain name security.

                 So it's trying to find a good blend for both.

Marika Konings: Right.

                 Everything specifically (unintelligible) that first comment. And the IRTP working group discussed this quite extensively, but felt that we needed more time - needed to be given to this issue and exploration, as well, of maybe models that are being used in other - especially country code TLDs on, you know, whether that would be something that would be applicable as well to the gTLD context.

And a third issue relates to the question of whether there should be a process - or whether the process could be streamlined by the requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars whether than proprietary IDs.

As I understand it, the currently registries assign proprietary IDs to registrars (addition) to IANA for registrars and that can cause confusion.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes, just to put this in context.

As a losing registrar of a domain, you will receive - might receive an email notification from the registry to say that a domain - a transfer request has been received from another registrar.

But a lot of registries don't refer to the registrar either by their actual name or by their IANA ID. They'll refer to it by some randomly assigned proprietary ID that the registry has assigned, because it would be following some kind of logic.

But I see reference to (unintelligible) themselves and one - I have absolutely no idea what that is - well actually, that could be ours. I'm not too sure.

But anyway, the point being that it's - it would just be a little bit helpful, because if you were to see, you know, strange activity going on, you'd - it'd be a lot faster to identify things.

But then at the same time, I don't think it's such a huge, huge, huge issue, but it's more a case of applying some kind of understandable standard of naming our assignment of these IDs in communications would be helpful just to - for the - for the rest of us who don't have staff of thousands.

I think now Adam might actually want to make a point on this.

Adam?

Adam Eisner: I was just going to say it's just a - it's an issue of standardization.

And when you have proprietary IDs, you know, everything from communicating the registrants or trying to report on things internally is difficult. And it seems to be a weird spot to have something entirely non-standard.

Marika Konings: Right.

This is - this is Marika. And I think James Bladel is asking the same question -- is this issue controversial at all? Presumably, it's a - mainly a question for registries, because I think they are the ones that are assigned.

And currently they're proprietary, so I don't know if that's for a specific reason. I do know that they - but I don't recall by heart what they actually said, because they did submit some comments as part of the comment period on the preliminary issue report, where I think they went into some detail on their views on these different issues.

So that's probably something the working group should, you know, take back and look at and, you know, we do have registry reps on that group. So maybe indeed it's a very easy issue to fix, or, you know, maybe there are some concerns or some reasons why the system is as it currently is.

Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: When - as far as I'm aware, I don't think it is controversial to me.

I mean, it's one of the - the ones that, you know, we discussed as an - in the IRTP B, mainly for the kind of reasons that Adam would mention. It's not - it's not one of those kind of, "Oh, my - oh, the world is going to end if this isn't changed," type issue.

But that being said, if it's an easy thing to change, then why not change it? I suppose the other side to it as well is that as you enter into a world of new TLDs where there are potentially hundreds -- if not thousands -- of registries having some level of standardization at this - at - in these areas, would probably help to clean up issues further down the line.

Marika Konings: Well, it would actually be really nice if we have a non-controversial issue for a change. I mean...

Tim Cole: It doesn't mean we talk any less, though, about it.

Michele Neylon: Well, Tim - I mean, if we don't spend three quarters of an hour arguing over the positioning of a comma, it wouldn't be ICANN.

Marika Konings: And I'm just quickly looking, because I actually pulled up the registry's comment on this.

So, you know, just for the discussion -- as we have plenty of time -- it actually is stated that it's a - it is generally agreed that the registrar name changes often do make it difficult to ensure that the correct registrar is identified and use of the IANA ID may be helpful in confirming registrar identification.

At this point in time, all registries that provide monthly registry operator reports to ICANN are required to provide both the registrar name and the IANA ID to identify (unintelligible) information in the core registrar activity report file.

So it's reasonable to think that all registries do maintain this information in the registration systems. The (unintelligible) the registry stakeholder group reserves further comment until more information is available and specifically what aspect of the process could be streamlined by the requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs.

Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I mean - and - I mean, the thing there is that, you know, if they're reporting it back to ICANN, ICANN sees it, but we -- the other registrars -- don't.

So that's - I think that's part of the reason why we - it would be a small issue for us -- but not controversial.

Tim Cole: I think all they're saying is that because they already use it in another - in their - (unintelligible) on a different report, that it shouldn't be difficult to do here.

I - that's the only thing I think they're mentioning.

Marika Konings: What (unintelligible).

Okay. So, you know, that working group still has tons of issues to discuss, so I'm sure we'll be coming at - coming back to that - back to that.

And so next I just briefly wanted to mentioned the thick Whois issue report. And this actually follows on from a recommendation from the IRTP Part B working group to request an issue report on the requirement of thick Whois for all incumbent gTLDs.

I think in the context of the discussions of the IRTP A as well as the IRTP B working group - I think there have been several notions of the fact that it

would be really helpful in the context of IRTP to have thick Whois for all gTLDs.

But at the same time, I think the working group realized that there might be other considerations that need to be taken into account before a recommendation is made that there should be such a requirement.

So as a first step in that process, they recommended that an issue report will be requested to really scope the issue and, you know, identify other aspects that might need to be considered, you know, before a recommendation would be made to actually, you know, require this of all gTLDs.

So we're actually in the - in the process of preparing the issue report. The idea is to, you know, follow the new GNSO PDP that was adopted yesterday and actually prepare first a preliminary issue report that lets them put out for public comment to, you know, ensure that we have provided all the information that is needed for the GNSO council to take an informed decision and for our community members also to express their views on whether a PDP should be initiated on that.

So after that, we'll, you know, we'll look at the comments received and update the report if deemed appropriate. And then the final issue report will be submitted to the GNSO council. And then they'll need to take a decision on whether or not to go ahead and start a PDP.

So I guess for those interested, you know, how do you get involved? As said, the IRTP Part C working group is looking for volunteers, so, you know, please sign up if you haven't done so yet.

I think it's likely that this working group will, you know, follow a previous practice and meet on a weekly basis for 60 minutes and, you know, work their way through the issues. So feel welcome to join.

And here are links to some of the recent reports, as well as the transfer policy.

And that's it. Adam?

Adam Eisner: I had a couple questions, Tim, about what you were talking about, but we scooted to the next topic before I thought of them.

Oh, sorry. Adam Eisner at Tucows. Okay. Nevermind.

Man: (unintelligible).

Adam Eisner: Number one -- and this was - probably been discussed, so I apologize.

What is - how do you define response for the TEAC, in terms of four hours? So a human versus an auto-responder, or does it matter? And B...

Man: A human.

Adam Eisner: Any idea of what the email that will go out kind of looks like? Because when I think about who's going to end up reading that email at two in the morning -- it'll be someone, but it might not be someone as well versed in the world of policy as, say, I don't know, me?

Tim Cole: You know, we haven't drafted the actual language of the email yet, but we certainly will ask this working group for their input.

Marika Konings: I think there is some language in the IRTP working group on what a response means.

So I don't know if - probably should look there at, you know, what is said there, because I think they wanted to avoid indeed that it would be an

automatic email response saying, "Yes, we received your email. Please don't reply," and, you know, that kind of response.

Adam Eisner: I can write pretty good auto-responders, so I don't know.

Tim Cole: Well, you know, I think that's a very legitimate question.

The thing - at one point we were talking about this being a full loop system where the - they would have to go - you would have to go online to file your TEAC request, it would go out and then they - the responding registrar would have to come back through RADAR to answer.

And that would have been a way to, you know, completely prove it, but it's also a way to add significant - potential significant hurdles to responding. And so, you know, after some discussion, we determined that, you know, we'll be the outbound, but the response would have to go directly to the registrar and that's most - presumably the most efficient way for work on a solution to be initiated as quickly as possible.

Having said that, you know, it's going to still be to some extent whether the initiating registrar - we probably have to come up with terms for which TEAC is which at any given point, but the initiating registrar, you know, as you say, you know, an auto-responder is not satisfying the same thing as some other, more personal response.

So, you know, to the extent that we can approve - include language in the email about that, you know, we will. And we'll -- again as I said, we'll seek feedback, but I don't think we want the email to be very long. We want it to get right to the point and, you know, and give people the information quickly so that they know that they're expected to respond.

Michele Neylon: So it - just to explain - I'm sorry, Michele Neylon. Blacknight -- dirty, filthy registrar from Ireland.

Just to explain to Adam and (Rob) -- who's also sitting at the table -- just a bit of a background of where this came from. From the discussions within the working group, one of the areas of concern and an area where there were issues when it came to transfers between registrars was that certain registrars were very -- how's the best way to put this?

They weren't exactly the most responsive. So what would - what could happen is that they - that a transfer -- and a - an illegitimate transfer, basically -- somebody who - hijacking domains, whatever -- they would transfer to a very small registrar or a registrar who haven't exactly a good track record, in terms of being responsive.

It would then take days to get some kind of reply from them in order to be able to undo the transfer or basically sort the thing out, during which time main servers would have been changed, Web sites, email -- all sorts of other things would have ceased to function.

The underlying concept with the - with this transfer emergency contact is to make it an obligation in those instances to - for somebody to respond. Now, that doesn't mean that -- for example, if Tucows has an issue with Momentus -- that you guys just can't pick up the bloody phone and sort it out between you.

The key thing is, if you can't pick up the phone -- or in your case, you know, jumping in the car, drive over and beat Adam over the head with something large -- that you will - that there is an obligation.

Adam Eisner: Ottawa and Toronto are very far away from each other.

Man: (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Well, but - well, looking at the way Adam kind of does things with skateboards, I'd hate to see what he does with a car.

Woman: (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Whatever it was. He keeps damaging his self.

                  But the point being that, you know, this - if you still - if you have good communication channels with the gaining and losing registrars and you want - and all that, because there's no - there's no issue. You don't need to resort to this.
                  But it's the case of where you do need to resort to us because you can't get an answer -- you don't know who the hell to talk to, you - it counts for a contact that you're finding in RADAR or whatever isn't of any use to you.

                  And you can do - go down this route, which then means that if this keeps on happening, then -- Maguy Serad -- we're lucky to have in the room. Good morning, Maguy.

                  Her team are then in the position to do something, because there is actually a policy that is being breached. But again, the thing - key thing is this is not to replace anything else. And of course there are still other policies with respect to the dispute of transfers -- it's the emergency when you can't get in contact.

                  Thanks.

Marika Konings: Adam, do you have any other questions?

Michele Neylon: And just by way of kind of comment, both Adam and (Rob) have volunteered for IRTP C.

                  (Rob) should introduce himself since we'll have to deal with him over the phone moving forward.

(Rob Vilma): Hi. I'm (Rob Vilma) from Momentus and I run the group of registrars for Momentus.

I think I just sent my volunteer email, so there you go. Look forward to working with everybody.

Michele Neylon: And Adam, who may not be known to others in the group.

Adam Eisner: I'm Adam Eisner from Tucows. I run the domain name registrar business over at Tucows.

Marika Konings: Well, welcome on board. And we'll be talking a lot to each other, I'm sure.

Looking around the room -- any other issues people want to discuss? Or...

Man: (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I suppose the other thing would be that it would be -- just following up on what I said during the meeting between compliance and the registrar stakeholder group the other day -- that if Maguy and her team can share detailed information with respect to complaints around transfers, this would help.

And also as well, if we can work with Maguy and her team so that they are - because - we're sure that they are collecting the right information, because one of the things -- it came up in a couple of sessions over the last two days -- you know, part of the, "Lets beat up on registrars," kind of love fest between GAC and various other bodies.

Just because there was a large volume of complaints in relation to transfers does not necessarily mean that there is something either wrong with the

policy or with the registrars affected, because people can lodge a complaint, it - that does not necessarily mean that the complaint is valid.

For example, a Whois complaint that we received about twelve months ago -- as per ICANN policy, the Whois was perfectly valid. The fact that the contact details in the Whois were not the contact details that the person submitting the complaint would have liked to see is irrelevant, because that was a dispute between two third parties.

But this - and it's the same kind of thing that - with transfers -- that there are going to be people complaining because they don't know how transfers work. They assume certain - they make certain assumptions. They assume that registrars can magically move domains into accounts with other registrars.

I'm sure Adam and (Rob) and other people who are on the - who are dialed in have had this kind of experience where somebody has kind of said, you know, "Why can't you move this domain to my account with GoDaddy," and see if I can kind of wave a magic want and just make it happen.

Marika Konings: Right.

Michele Neylon: So I think it's important that we, you know, get more information on some of these things, especially when it comes to the change of control.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Very good point.

But, you know, I just want to point out as well, because - and I think it's part of a broader discussion that presumably the GNSO will have as well, because there's also an issue that was raised in the context of registration abuse policies working group too to have better data.

But same time, I think we need to point out that of course, it's, you know, it's not really a compliance job to, you know, go through those lists and check. They did that once and it took a lot of time for them to find that.

You know, their job is to find out which are valid complaints and address those and solve them. So I think we need to find there's another better system to indeed - to, you know, use the data that they get.

But also - look, I'm sure registrars get a lot of complaints or have data on them. You know, how can we make better use of that as well and put the whole picture together? Because presumably, what we receive at ICANN is just, you know, a drop in the ocean or at least just a part of actual issues that arise.

Maybe we should start thinking as well of how we can work better with, you know, other data points and try to, you know, put that picture together. And hopefully as well, you know, get, of course, the input from compliance.

Or maybe, you know, I know there have been discussions previously on how that system can be improved so more valid data can be obtained to inform policy development.

But, you know, at the same time, of course it's not, you know, their core function to look at that. And there are a whole lot of other big issues that they're dealing with, so we need to make sure that we, you know, balance that.

Michele Neylon: I mean - Marika, I don't disagree.

I just - it's just they've - when you talk about a volume of complaints out of context without putting it in the context -- for example, the size of the registrar.

I mean, I remember when the data was shared with us by David Giza a couple of years ago -- it was very, very clear that a couple of the registrars whose - who's names kept on cropping up - that they had a very small number of names on their accreditation, yet they had a disproportionately high number of complaints, whereas, you know, Tucows, Enom, GoDaddy, Momentus -- are going to generate a certain number of complaints, simply because of the sheer volume.

It's the same with us in, you know, we - our volumes would be in relation to .ie, for example. I mean, we run into issues all the time involving the (unintelligible) ccTLD, because we're the largest registrar.

And that's - it's something that needs to be taken into account when compliance say -- or anybody else for that matter -- sorry Maguy, not just picking on you. But just in general, if somebody just grabs a figure and just says, you know, "There were 500 complaints against GoDaddy."

Maybe there were. I'm sorry, James. Because (unintelligible) there. But it's just - if they've got what is it - whatever it is number of names and that's a tiny, tiny, tiny, tiny percentage of names with which there is a purported problem and which may not actually be a problem.

Marika Konings: You know, as I've said I think it -- this is Marika -- I think a very valid point.

And I think - I don't know if we did it for the IRTP or for a - for a post-expiration, but at one point we did, you know, really scrub the data and really looked at indeed - at the issues, but that really took a lot of hours, you know, from the compliance staff to, you know, to put it together.

I mean, I think it was valid -- the information we got -- and really helpful to really identify, like, is this really an issue or not? And I think we found yes, it is an issue. Even after scrubbing data, we do see that there is a real valid issue. But the - but yes.

Michele Neylon: The thing - the thing is this. I mean, if the - if, you know, there are a lot of tools available to collect information and to analyze information. And ultimately, if you're - if things like transfers are constantly being identified as being a hot issue, then -- while I don't obviously enjoy kind of increasing workloads for people -- I would say that, "Look. In this instance - if you're going to beat us over the head about something, then, you know, please give us quality information that we can work on - work with."

And, you know, the more that's given, the easier it is for us to identify which parts of the policy may need - may need to be adjusted -- which parts may need to be tweaked.

Or maybe it's a case simply of both registrars/registries/ICANN/ALAC and whoever else -- just educating end users more.

Marika Konings: Okay. Any other points? And, you know, just before we close of, I'd - I just would really like to thank those volunteers that have stuck with us through IRTP A, IRTP B -- now we're on to C.

You know, to Michele -- I see that James - James on the call. So, you know, thank you very much for doing that. And now three more to go, so hang in there.

Thank you all very much for coming. And this meeting is now closed.

                          END