

## **Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting**

### **Locking of a Domain Name Meeting**

**Sunday 14 October 2012 at 15:30 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.

Coordinator: At this time I'd like to remind all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. Thank you sir. You can begin.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. So welcome back everyone. We will now have a session on locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings, PDP working group. This group is chaired by Michele Neylon who's in the room and ready to give us an update on the groups. So Michele, let me hand it over to you.

Michele Neylon: Thank you (Stephen). (Alan) is my co-chair on this working group but I think he has a conflicting meeting at the moment. I'll go through a set of slides with just a brief overview of where we've come from and where we hope to be going and if anybody who's here has any questions, save them until the end. I don't actually have that many slides anyway.

Okay, so the GNSO council initiated a PDP which is limited to the subject of locking of domain names subject to UDRP proceedings. If you recall, there had been a lot of discussion about possible UDRP reform which has since

both decided to be postponed until after the delegation of the first new TLD round but we - this particular aspect of the UDRP is currently being reviewed.

So currently there're no requirements to lock names in the period between filing complaint and commencements of proceedings. And there is no definition of status quo which has resulted in different interpretations and confusion.

So the charter questions that we're trying to deal with are as below - whether the creation of an outline of a (prompted) procedure which complainant must follow in order for a registrar to place a domain name on a registrar lock would be desirable, whether the creation of an (unintelligible) and of the process that a registrar can reasonably expect to take place during a UDRP dispute would be desirable, whether the timeframe by which a registrar must lock the domain after a UDRP has been filed should be standardized, whether what constitutes a locked domain name should be defined, whether once a domain name is locked subject to a UDRP proceeding, the registrant information for that domain name may be changed or modified, in other words, the Whois data.

Whether additional safeguards should be created for the protection of registrants in cases where the domain name is locked subject to UDRP proceedings.

So far, we've conducted a survey amongst registrars and the UDRP providers to get a better idea of what's actually going on, what current practices and what the current issues are. Public comment forum opened to obtain more community input.

And we also did some outreach to the GNSO stakeholder groups on BSOs and ACs to see if we could get some input from them as well. We've been working on our charter questions and we hope to publish our initial report by December.

At this meeting in Toronto we have a meet - we have a hopefully interactive session on Thursday morning which starts at 9:00 a.m. and we'll have several of the working group members will be taking particular viewpoints on certain of the - some parts of the charter questions and hopefully we'll get a bit of input from the community.

We had a quite interactive meeting in Prague so hopefully this time in Toronto we'll have a similar experience. The - several of the working group members here in the room and others I know are (going to be) in Toronto as well. So if (anyone has) any questions, feel free. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Michele. Does anyone have any questions for Michele? I hear (crickets). No questions? In that case, let me thank you for the work and the presentation, a rather short presentation and just to explain that there are two conflicting meetings with this one so unfortunately we have had some conflicts on the agenda. It's been difficult to resolve them as currently - as an NCPH house meeting which has just been called which is taking away some of the counselors.

So apologies to you and to the group for the low turnout but it's, I'm sure, not a reflection of the lack of interest. It's just the scheduling conflicts. Thank you for being here and giving us this update. Please thank the group on my behalf and the GNSO council's behalf for their work.

Michele Neylon: Thanks (Stephen) and it's all been a pleasure to have your docile tones introducing us for these and it will be missed.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much Michele. Operator, this session is now over.  
Thank you.

Coordinator: At this time all parties can go ahead and disconnect from today's conference - disconnect at this time. Thank you. One moment sir.

END