

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
IRTP D Workshop Meeting  
Wednesday 26 March 2014**

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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

James Bladel: Okay, welcome everyone, this is the IRTPD PDP workshop. So what you see, and I think everybody here around the table and even our folks in the audience, which includes a former Chair of an IRTP working group by the way, Paul.

But this is the final - do we need to take role? This is not a working group call. This is a workshop, so - but perhaps we could go around the table at least and introduce ourselves to the people that we've known when we're ready, and then we'll go into the phone and get Barbara and anyone else that's dialed into the bridge.

So if we could start with this gentlemen down here at the very end?

Steve Chan: Steve Chan, ICANN staff. I'm brand new to the Policy team.

(Barry Costa): (Barry Costa).

Lars Hoffman: Lars Hoffman, staff.

Markia Konings: Markia Konings. ICANN staff.

Graeme Melton: Graeme Melton from Tucows.

Mikey O'Connor: Gosh, the roll call moves fast. You got to be on your toes. This is Mikey O'Connor.

James Bladel: James Bladel from GoDaddy, and Mikey forgot to say he's Co-Chair of the working group and I'm the other one.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche. ALAC.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow, Andalucia.com, Business Constituency.

(Doug McClellan): (Doug McClellan), (unintelligible).

Kristine Dorrain: Kristine Dorrain, National Arbitration Forum.

Bob Mountain: Bob Mountain, (unintelligible).

James Bladel: And can we get to the folks on the call too?

Man: Turn it off.

Barbara Knight: Barbara Knight, VeriSign and also representing the Registry Stakeholder Group.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Barbara, and I'm glad you could join us.

Okay, so the purpose of this meeting, as we I believe indicated in the agenda, is that we wanted to present our initial report, including our preliminary recommendations, to the community for feedback. And, my concern is that everybody in the room already knows what those preliminary recommendations are, including the folks on the phone. So, this is really just for Paul's benefit.

Mikey O'Connor: And Paul is not really paying attention. He's just mooching our Wi-Fi, so maybe we could just end really early?

James Bladel: Well, I'm kind of looking to staff here for some guidance. We can go through these again, but I do want to emphasize the almost absurd level of redundancy that that would represent.

Maybe we could open up an open floor to the working group members if they have had a chance to review or participate in some of the IRTP discussions that we've had over the weekend and earlier this week, if they have had any discussions of this interim report and what their constituencies and stakeholder groups - and if they have any feedback from those discussions? Maybe that's one way we could intelligently use our time?

Holly?

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche, ALAC.

The feedback that I've had has been to really emphasize the fact that there has to be some comprehensible information on the ICANN site, and possibly on the registrar sites as well, or at least a link so that people who don't speak ICANN language can understand what their alternatives are if the name's been hijacked or however it's - they've lost it.

And, understand what ICANN Compliance can do or if there's some alternative they've got? Or if in fact there's something that we can't do and it's something that'll have to settle, say, whether in the business or between parties. You know, even that would be something.

That was the only feedback I had. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I had a conversation with Thomas Richter. Actually, Thomas was on the Counsel part of this, and he sent me a note that I will feed into - I fed it into the list that he said, in typical Thomas style, terse, I'd like 15 months better than 12 for the length of time that the - I forgot what the interval - we were - beyond the statute of limitations we're moving from 6 to 12. He's lobbying for 15.

And since you share a nationality and a personality with Thomas, Volker, you might want to talk to him about that.

Oh, (unintelligible) really cool. Echo from Graeme. (Unintelligible) nicely done.

Volker Greimann: Did he give any - Volker Greimann speaking. Did he give any reasons why these extra three months would make such a big difference that we should care?

Mikey O'Connor: I asked him to document that, and I believe that he's coming back with it. But I think the fast answer that he came back with was the renewal cycle, and his eyes kind of bulged out when I said, "Well yes. But what about people who renew in a two or five year cycle?"

So I think we'll have a - if you run into Thomas in the hallway, it would be good to visit with him a bit about this. You know, I think this is evidence of why working groups are so cool. I mean, we've dug into this pretty deep and I was pretty able to very quickly come back with a little list of reasons why we came at it. But, (unintelligible).

I'm not close enough to the microphone, but now I am.

Sorry about that.

James Bladel: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Thanks.

Yes, just from the business constituency perspective, Jeffrey Van Gelder is leaving the comment - for the public comment for the business constituency (unintelligible) - and the briefing meeting within. Unfortunately, he can't be here because of his Nom-Com commitment, so I can't give you any feedback on exactly - but it'll be likely supported. It's be in line with what the constituency comments were. And those were principles more than details and recommendations. We'll wait and see.

Okay, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Chris.

Barbara?

Barbara Knight: (Unintelligible) for the transcript.

So my concern would be with extending it even to the 12 months is - you know, we've had some conversations about the fact that, you know, the potential multiple hopping. And to the extent that we can go to 12 months as opposed to 3 hops or multiple transfers after an alleged transfer violation of the policy, you'd now be looking at 6.

If we extend it out even further to 15 months, then it just continues to compound. So I'm not certain even that you know moving it from six to 12 really gains us a whole lot is my thought.

Mikey O'Connor: And this is Mikey.

Goodbye Paul, you weenie.

You know, I am thinking about this again, too. I'd sort of like to - because you know when we were talking about this before, what we were really doing is

we were overloading the TDRP a little bit with you know registrant transfer issues. And so this extending of the -- God, I'm sleepy -- the statute of limitations, there we go - the extension from 6 to 12 months isn't - it was aimed at helping registrants gain access to the process, when in fact we've further refined our ideas, and this really isn't a process for registrants much at all.

So you know, when we get back on - into this after the break and we've got public comments back, I'd be open to discuss that more, Barbara. I think I may be agreeing with you.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks for that.

I can report - and I know Graeme and Volker are here as well, and were at the Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting yesterday. I don't recall that there was any feedback of any sort on this particular issue of the extension of the special limitations or really any of the preliminary recommendations associated with our work.

I think that that's in some respects a vote of confidence on just how well coverage and all representative registrars perhaps are in this group.

So, there was nothing - I don't think any action items or anything to be taken into account; however, we should probably just be open for public comment.

And I guess my question then to staff is have we received any submissions to the comment, recognizing that it's only been open for a couple of days before folks started getting on airplanes?

Man: Nothing.

James Bladel: Okay.

Okay, thanks.

So we've reached the end of the queue. Everyone has weighed in. Our attendants - our one attendee left. We did gain another attendee.

(Osvaldo): (Osvaldo).

James Bladel: (Osvaldo) has joined us.

And Chris, go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Just propose that we adjourn the meeting because I would like to go to the contractual compliance meeting (unintelligible).

James Bladel: That's an excellent point. There is a contractual compliance meeting conflicting with this, and I...

Mikey O'Connor: As co-Chair - co-second - I'm making this up as I go. Staff is raising their hands over there. They're going to ruin this again.

Man: They're going to roll right over it as well.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Here comes Marika.

Markia Konings: This is Marika.

Well, I actually just wanted to point out that ironically, although I think everyone preferred this meeting time, the attendance was much better when we had the meeting at 7:30 am.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, don't even go there. Don't go there.

James Bladel: I tell you what, this is an important point, and we should not discount the significance of that, and we will bear that in mind for the workshop for IRTPE.

Lars Hoffman: There were - there was food and drinks too.

James Bladel: That's true. There was coffee if I recall.

Lars Hoffman: Yes.

James Bladel: So, I think we attracted...

Woman: Yes.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, and the muffin things were good.

James Bladel: So with that, I think - you know, Chris makes an important point is that we don't want to sit here just because we had a meeting and we got the room. We want to make sure we doing some good.

If we feel like that we have exhausted the good that can be done, there are certainly other important sessions occurring in other parts of the convention center that are worthy of our time and attention as well.

And then, I know staff wants to go, you know, hang out in the staff room and drink Diet Cokes and gossip, so - all right, so with that we will adjourn this particular workshop. I thank everyone for coming. I thank everyone also - if we haven't had a chance to thank you for your diligence in coming to the weekly calls and putting together this report. I think that we are well on track for a final report.



You know, I think it's not unrealistic to think we might have something lined up by the London meeting, but we'll have to see what comes through.

So Lars?

Lars Hoffman: (Unintelligible) does it (unintelligible).

I presume we're resuming in - not next week, but the week after?

James Bladel: I believe we have scheduled to resume at the usual time of April 8th, which would not be the Tuesday...

Lars Hoffman: Monday.

James Bladel: It would be two weeks. Correct.

Thank you.

And I'm sorry, what the - the public comment period is currently open and is open until which date, if you can get that really quickly here so that we can read that into the record, that our interim report - our initial report -- I keep saying that -- is still open for comment.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

You know, we might want to think about talking about that cost structure stuff at the next meeting, because that's probably the most complicated thing we have yet to resolve.

Lars Hoffman: Agreed.

Mikey O'Connor: So...

Lars Hoffman: The public comment is open until the 3rd of April, and then the reply period, if applicable, would close on the 25th of April.

James Bladel: Fantastic. Thank you.

So we should have a good idea by our next call any initial public comments received. So thank you everyone. Hope you're enjoying Singapore.

And Marika, last word - last, last word.

Markia Konings: This is Marika.

Just conscious that the deadline for the first comment period is pretty soon after this meeting ends, so it may be worth as well on that call, then to - even if you haven't received any comments, to check if anyone is working on any so you can decide whether it makes sense to do the reply period. Or if nothing has been received, there's no requirement to run the reply period, because (unintelligible) there's nothing to reply to.

James Bladel: That's a good point.

Lars, can you take one action item, and that is on the Tuesday that we - or the Monday that we normally would have a meeting, so April - or March 31st, or whatever, send a note out to the list to ask individuals to let us know if there is a comment forthcoming from them or their constituency? That'd be great. Thank you.

Okay, good catch. Thanks everyone.

END