

**ICANN
Transcription
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting
Monday 28 July 2014 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 28 July 2014 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-d-20140728-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Barbara Knight – RySG
James Bladel - RrSG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Bob Mountain – RrSG
Arthur Zonnenberg – RrSG
Kristine Dorrian – National Arbitration Forum
Alan Greenberg-ALAC
Angie Graves-BC

Apologies:

Paul Diaz – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Your recordings have now begun.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the IRTP Part D Working Group call on the 28th of July, 2014.

On the call today we have Volker Greimann, Barbara Knight, Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg, James Bladel, Graeme Bunton and Kristine Dorrain. We have apologies from Paul Diaz and Avri Doria. From staff we have Lars Hoffman, Steve Chan, Ami Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to IRTP-D for July 28. Per our standard order of business does anyone have any updates to their Statements of Interest? Okay, seeing none just wanted to note that Arthur Zonnenberg has also joined.

I wanted to propose a change to the - skip around a little bit in the agenda today just to keep everyone on their toes - and would like to quickly touch on Item Number 4, review next steps and next meeting timetable.

Lars, I hate to put you on the spot unannounced but if possible do you have our work plan handy? Maybe if you could tee that up while I introduce? The issue is that next week which is, I believe, August 4, I will be unable to attend the call. So I wanted to position to the group that we have a couple of options.

Certainly would be interested or welcoming of any volunteers or staff if they would like to lead the call in my absence and continue to review the recommendations.

Alternatively I note that this is - we're starting to enter vacation season and we are slightly ahead of our projected schedule in that we have bookmarked almost all of August to review and finalize the report and we are down to our last couple of recommendations here. So I don't know - perhaps I'm being optimistic but I don't think we would need one, two, three, four, calls to finalize these recommendations.

So I'm also proposing the idea that we just give everyone a week off from IRTP-D on August 4 recognizing that that's also the beginning of vacation season in Europe as well. I see applause. I don't see anybody like putting up a red mark saying that they absolutely definitely want to have an IRTP call next week.

But okay so that seems like the - I'm going to make a rough consensus call here and say that generally people are in favor of taking next week off as opposed to finding a substitute facilitator for the meeting. Okay so next week we will be off and we will then reconvene on August 11 and hopefully everybody is okay with that. Seems to be a popular decision right now so.

Okay so with that, thank you very much and appreciate that indulgence. And then let's move on then to Item - Agenda Item Number 2 which is the discussion of our final recommendation, Number 17. And - let me see, I need to make this a little larger here so I can read it.

Good here. So let's see, what page is this on, Lars, the final recommendation is on which page?

Lars Hoffman: So, James, just scrolling down and then syncing so everybody will be on the page.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. So Lars is taking care of that. And this is the one that we are on - it's Charter Question F, Recommendation 17, is that correct?

Lars Hoffman: Yes, that's the observation and then if you go to the next page...

James Bladel: Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: So I'm going to scroll up to then and sync it so you can all scroll through and through and measure.

James Bladel: Perfect. Thank you Lars. Okay so we are then just for everyone playing along at home we are at the bottom of Page 14, roughly the bottom third of Page 14 where the text begins in red. And I will read our edited observation.

"The working group found the FOA as a rule in auditing transfers; a point also made by ICANN Compliance. In that respect the double authorization that comes with the use of FOAs for any domain name transfer is a useful step back can contribute to prevent fraudulent transfers or results transfer conflicts."

I'm not sure if "conflicts" is a word that we're looking for here. Perhaps "dispute" is something that we're looking for.

"Still the working group acknowledges that the use of FOAs can in some cases also be preventative of an efficient transfer of domain. This is especially true in cases such as those transfers, mergers and resellers and/or resellers and registrars.

Does the working group determined that for most transfers or most routine or..." we need to make some improvements there - "... most routine transfers," it probably the simplest way to say that, "...the FOA is an extraneous step. However in those situations where a transfer is considered to be or is challenged," I think we need some work here too, "... or the transfer is disputed," it's probably the simplest way to say that, "...the FOA is an essential element to establishing the validity of the transfer And authorization of the registrar."

So I see Arthur, you have your hand up. You want to discuss these two paragraphs?

Arthur Zonnenberg: Hi, James. Yes, thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, go ahead.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Yeah, I'm not entirely in agreement with the wording that is currently in the report. And I need some more time to come up with an alternative wording that I would feel more confident in supporting. But since this draft was sent pretty recently I did not yet have time to come up with alternative formulations that would include the arguments made in the discussion so far.

Additionally I am aware that this discussion has been had previously and I need to read the previous arguments that have been made because I do not know if the current summary is partial or not whether it's been deliberated. I'm not sure at this point.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Arthur. Why don't you hold onto that thought because I have something I'd like to add after the end of this discussion that I think we'll go to some extent address some of the concerns that you've raised and I think some of the concerns that others have raised as well.

So hang on to that and certainly you have more time here, you're not being put on the spot now but I would ask that if anyone at this stage in the game - I would say that it's not enough to object to language as we have it. You know, you're also, I believe, responsible for submitting your preferred alternative language as well. So keep that in mind because I have some proposed alternative language that I will introduce when we get to the bottom of this.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: And I note that Bob Mountain has also joined the call as well so welcome, Bob.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: So I think we need some cleanup here and then we're waiting some alternative language from Arthur as well. So let's scroll down then to the next change which is the recommendation - Recommendation 17. The working group does not recommend the elimination of FOAs. I think that's really the short and sweet of it. Here's the addition.

"However, in the light of problems regarding FOAs, especially in cases of bulk transfers, the merger of resellers or resellers and registrars the group recommends that the operability of the FOAs be enhanced. Possibilities of such as FOA transmission could be done via SMS or through interactive websites. Any such innovation should however have auditing capabilities, this remains one of the key functions of the FOA."

There's nothing necessarily wrong with that statement in my opinion, it just needs a little bit of wordsmithing to say something like, the group recommends that the presentation of FOAs be enhanced. Possible improvements include transmission of FOAs via SMS or authorization through interactive Websites. Any innovation should, however, I would "must" instead of "should" have auditing capabilities as this remains the - not one of - but the key feature of the FOA.

Yeah, so something along those lines I think would probably maintain the material content of this recommendation and be a little bit cleaner. Bob, you're up.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks James. For the transcript this is Bob Mountain. The only thing I might want to suggest here is that the ability or a fully automated transfer be maintained if we're implementing, you know, changes to the FOA process and the FOA presentation, you know, the other adjustments we've made to FOA have all kept in, you know, kept the automated transfers in scope and made provisions for that. So I'd just like to make sure that we address that

and protect that, you know, that function which exists today and is growing so.

James Bladel: Thanks, Bob. Is there something in this recommendation that you're concerned that would preclude that practice or restrict that from happening - something that's happening now but would no longer be supported if this were adopted or - I want to be sure to make sure that we're not closing a door that we don't need.

Bob Mountain: You know, it looks like the possibility would be that the door - it could be something that would impact that process if, you know, like the currently the IRTP-C implementation is accommodating a fully automated transfer in the edits to the FOA.

Now in here if we have an FOA that is done via SMS if it's a preauthorized transfer, you know, the modified FOA or the modifications we're doing to FOA here should, again, sort of respect the work that's being done on the implementation team on IRTP-C around the concept of a preauthorized transfer.

So, you know, I like this stuff; I think it's great but it just needs to be, you know, that other use case needs to be (unintelligible) or I think referenced here just to be sure that it's not something that gets impacted, you know, when this thing goes to implementation.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Bob. So I don't think that we mean to imply any sort of timing changes with this sentence or this paragraph. So maybe what we should say is something like whether, you know, whether obtained in advance or, you know, somehow state whether or not this is - whether or not the authorization is obtained in advance or in real time, you know, neither use case should be precluded by this change.

I don't know, if Lars, if there's something there that can be constructed into a meaningful and coherent sentence but I think that's what we're trying to get at with what Bob's contribution.

((Crosstalk))

Bob Mountain: Sorry. I'm happy to iterate offline and try and come up with something.

James Bladel: That would be great. Maybe, Lars, you could post a draft to the list and then, Bob, you could take a swing at it. No, oh there we go. I got a red mark from Lars.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: That's okay. Okay, Bob, does that address your concern here?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, that sounds like a good plan, James, thank you.

James Bladel: Okay. Next up is Alan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, probably irrelevant at this point since you resolved the issue. I was simply going to say that I can't believe an implementation review team for this recommendation would accept taking away functionality which is there at the time. So there's not really a lot of chance we're going to lose something by implementing this at some later date.

James Bladel: Thanks, Alan. I tend to agree. However, I think - and I don't mean to put words in Bob's mouth but I think the idea is that this recommendation could be approved before IRTP C implementation is complete. So it would be sort of in this granted but undeployed feature that could be the two implementation review teams could maybe collide with each other. At least, I don't know, Bob is that where you're going with this?

Alan Greenberg: Anyway, no I said I have no problem with what you're suggesting, I was...

James Bladel: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I came up with the comment before we came up with the first answer so.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay well this brings us to the end of our recommendations and the queue is clear. So I'd like to take this opportunity to make a proposal to the working group. And I think it's prompted by some of the conversations that were prompted by Arthur and by Rob Golding and others.

Specifically around FOAs but really it's a broader discussion than that. And so I'm proposing - and Lars, I sent that to you last night so maybe I'm going to ask Lars to dig that up - I'm proposing a new recommendation that we would add to the end of this report. And I'm just putting it on the table right now as a brainstorming exercise to see if this is something that is supported by the group.

But generally here's my thinking is that for each of these IRTP PDPs, from Working Group A which was led by Paul Diaz beginning back in 2009 I believe, or 2010, through IRTP-D we continue to uncover these - the elephant in the room which seems to be that this process is problematic. It is not as smooth, as streamlined, as secure or as easily audited and undone as it needs to be in order to fulfill its purpose and its purpose is to allow a registrant to vote with their feet if they're unhappy with the services of the registrar or to transact domain names between each other as we determined in IRTP-C.

And so what I put together was a topic that is not attached to any of our charter questions but is sort of a capstone recommendation for all of the

entire series of IRTP PDPs. And, Lars, I don't know if you have that - I saw a note come up and then disappear; I don't know if you have that handy or.

Okay so here's kind of what I just hashed out yesterday. And certainly I will send this to the list and I would ask that folks maybe take a swing at this. But essentially it says something like this.

"Finally the members of this working group, many of whom have worked together since IRTP-A launched several years ago, note that the inter registrar transfer policy, IRTP, is too complex to function efficiently as evidenced by the high number of - or the high volume of registrar issues and the volume of registrant complaints to ICANN. Fundamental problems are preventing this process from fully realizing its true purpose including," And then these were bullet points but we lost some of the formatting.

"Differing registrar practices, you know, parentheses, nonstandard implementation; domain name hijacking or lack of security." When we first started this process I think that there were some who were participating that thought that this was a myth but I think that hopefully that's - that issue has been put to bed and everyone is convinced that this is a rare but serious problem.

"Delays in processing communication; lack of urgency or portability." This goes to some of the comments that were made by Bob and by other folks in earlier PDPs regarding the delays and the slowness of the process that it's not possible to transfer a domain name sort of in real time.

Cumbersome dispute mechanisms, and that's been the focus of this PDP. The idea that if something goes wrong with a transfer that registrants and registrars have learned to work around the policy because it's the most effective way to get something actually resolved than working through the policy. And I think the registries would agree with this.

Reliance on outdated communications for authorization such as facts and email. So this goes to Arthur and Rob's point is that these things fail; they fail and then they hold up the whole process and they terminate the transfer and they can discourage registrants from pursuing the transfer.

And then generally consumer confusion, and here I tell the story that if there's anybody who should be an expert in this it is the members of this working group that worked on these transfers. And myself I have chaired two of the four.

So certainly we should have some expertise on this. And I have struggled myself in transferring my own personal domain names. So, you know, if it's a challenge for someone like me who's been working on this for a number of years then what hope do casual registrants or consumers have in understanding this process particularly if something goes wrong?

So there that I ended this. Therefore, the working group recommends that following the implementation of all IRTP recommendations, including IRTP-D and remaining elements from IRTP-C that the GNSO consider convening a panel to discuss these topics and make recommendations for data collection and analysis that will determine whether enhancements have truly improved the process.

If after a period of - some period of time - the GNSO, along with ICANN staff, determines that the situation with transfers has not improved then this working group recommends that a top to bottom reevaluation of the transfer process be undertaken with the goal of creating a simpler, faster and more secure policy that is readily understood by registrants.

And the thinking here is that there will be no IRTP-E. I don't think anyone has the stomach for another band-aid or another polish or another tweak. That if this is not - if this does not work and if the issues that were uncovered as part of these working groups do not improve then I think that what we need is we

need to take a fresh look at this very similar to - and I hate to draw comparisons but similar to the way that the EWG took a fresh look at the Whois issue. I think that we need to take a fresh look at transfers.

So that is something that I am putting on the table as a, you know, as a talking point at this point, as a brainstorming exercise. I think that we need to capture something like this in our report if not in a recommendation and at least in a - in an observation and as part of our working group discussions on improving the end to end accessibility, integrity, security and effectiveness of this process.

So with that I'll take a queue and it looks like Arthur is up first. Go ahead, Arthur.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Hi, James. Thanks for your brainstorm suggestion. I think that would be a welcome addition and recommendation from this working group. I would like to shortly add there points, no less. One is that we make observations on the security even though none of us are technically security experts. Maybe some of us are but we have not been identified as such.

Secondly and thirdly I think that the - in addition to the FOA we should measure the use of client transfer prohibitives and the 60-day lock. In particular because the IRTP-C group is already changing the way client transfer prohibitive works where you have to have it in your registration agreement before you can implement it.

I would even go so far as to say that you may need an active opt-in but that may be delayed until a full fresh look, as you say, at this whole IRTP. There are too many arguments starting way back in IRTP-A that have to be considered. It may just be that the facts prove that this is still a complex and cumbersome process and that end users are not experiencing this as a very friendly policy. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Arthur. And you're correct, what we are referencing is the changes to the policy that will go into effect on, I believe, January 31 of next year, 2015 which will specifically tie the registrar lock to the client transfer prohibited status in, you know, at the registry.

So I think that - I would look forward to any edits or modifications to this that if you feel that point is not covered. Alan, you're up next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I certainly support what you're saying. One small change in the first sentence, I would replace GNSO with ICANN through the GNSO since this recommendation will ultimately be accepted by the Board by wording it like that they're effectively committing funding.

This kind of review process is not cheap and putting it in their - as their responsibility via the GNSO which obviously has the policy responsibility they're essentially committing to funding whereas otherwise it's going to be a separate process.

James Bladel: Okay so I understand what you were driving at, Alan, but I'm not quite sure how to capture that in the language. You're saying instead of GNSO - if after a period of X then we just say just ICANN staff?

Alan Greenberg: No, no where it says that the GNSO consider that ICANN...

James Bladel: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...through the GNSO...

James Bladel: That ICANN...

Alan Greenberg: ...commits to.

James Bladel: Commit to - okay so commit in advance to - so take away their discretion, take away consider and...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: And replace GNSO with ICANN through the GNSO.

James Bladel: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Which says the GNSO is the executing body but it's ICANN doing it and therefore accepting the recommendation by the Board essentially is committing funding.

James Bladel: So we would be tying their hands...

Alan Greenberg: That - exactly.

James Bladel: Thank you. Okay, Lars, did you catch that?

Lars Hoffman: Yes I did, James.

James Bladel: Perfect, thank you. Thank you, Alan, good catch. Good improvement there. Arthur, is that an old hand or...

Arthur Zonnenberg: Oh, I have one more correction although I'm not sure is in the observations of the FOA, it says the losing registrar must send a copy of this FOA to the registered name holder. However, in the process the losing registrar may send a confirmation of registrar transfer so it's a different template. But it refers to the same FOA but it's called the registrar of record, not the losing registrar.

And the naming is different. So that's the second paragraph, maybe we can have a look at that if it is worded correctly, just a minor point.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think that that may also be one of the things that's changing - but let's capture that because I think that's also in a bit of a state of flux right now with the new policy that takes effect early next year. Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, James. Graeme Bunton for the transcript. Just want to voice my general support for this. You know, it's clear there are some, you know, legacy quirks in all of the transfer issues. And taking that fresh look I think is really warranted. You know, Arthur's unhappiness with the FOA I think is reasonable in a lot of circumstances. So, yeah, let's put this in there and let's take a look at it in the future, it's worth doing. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Graeme. I agree. You know, part of what got me thinking about this was that, what Arthur was saying as well as Rob Golding, it was also what Berry was saying about just the lack of data and the lack of, you know, statistics on these types of things. And maybe part of this review, you know, here is make recommendation for data collection and, you know, data analysis. And I think that's a nod to what Berry was adding last week or maybe it was two weeks ago, that we just don't have sufficient data.

But I also think that this is us recognizing that our scope was very limited in these working groups. We could improve or enhance the existing policy but we kept running into these existential issues, you know, in every single working group we would run into a problem that was sort of overarching with the policy.

I mean, here we, you know, the issue here, although we spent a lot of time talking about FOAs, but the real issue here was the fact that transfer disputes were the number one complaint - registrant complaint to ICANN and yet the TDRP has been used, you know, 20 times.

That just does not compute. Why is there this, you know, every quarter or every year this angry mob of registrants that want to challenge transfers and then there's this process specifically for disputing transfers that's never used. And so I think it's that disconnect that this working group has observed in IRTP-D.

In the previous working group we observed the disconnect where change of registrant was being affected by a policy that was designed for change of registrar. In the previous working group we looked at security and locking practices and how confusing those were.

So I think that all of these just kind of roll up into this idea that - and I'm doing a little selling here so I apologize if folks feel I'm being non-neutral - but I am just observing that through this history of PDPs that we keep bumping up against the policy as it stands versus how it needs to be or how it ought to be.

And I think that, you know, it - we're giving it one last chance here with these improvements before we look at a wholesale replacement that fits the modern industry. So sorry to go up on a little soapbox there. Holly, you're up - or Graeme, did you have something to add?

Graeme Bunton: No, sorry old hand.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Graeme, thanks for that contribution. Holly, you're up next.

Holly Raiche: Yeah, just a slight change of wording to the final sentence in what you propose. It's not only a policy for readily understood by registrants but given to the concept that actually a process that is usable by registrants as well is that I think you're aiming at.

James Bladel: Absolutely correct, Holly. And if we can capture that in here a little bit better I put in customer confusion but we can certainly say consumer confusion and accessibility or, you know, utility of the - of this process in helping consumers,

you know, do what they're seeking to do. I would welcome any changes in that regard.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

James Bladel: Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, James, than you. I think you're on the right track here. And I think there's a certain amount of issues that still need to be discussed and because of our scope we hadn't had the opportunity to do so. However, I would just - one little tweak of the wording here as well, we are saying following the implementation of all IRTP recommendations while that may take a while, we now how the implementation schedules look like most of the time.

I would recommend at least seeing them - analyzing how they work otherwise the way it's worded right now one might consider directly following the implementation of the last one so the last recommendation is implemented, for example, January 1, 2016; January 2 we would start the discussion panel.

I think we - some of those may need some more time to be analyzed properly and to see how they play out. So I'm not sure if we could change that language just to ensure that there's a certain review.

James Bladel: Thanks, Volker. And I was trying to say that but I agree with you that I probably failed in that regard. But what I was thinking was that when this was all implemented and, you know, in production that there would be a - that would initiate a period of observation and data collection so that the registrars but also ICANN Compliance would, you know, would now be tracking the performance of the IRTP as a policy.

And that after a period of whatever we, you know, whether that's 12 months or six months or, you know, a year and a half or whatever, that they would then review that data and say, look, you know, transfer disputes are down

30% or transfer disputes are unchanged or whatever the metric is that we want to use we can certainly identify some measurement of whether this has improved or had no impact on the situation.

So I think that that's that I was trying to say here and maybe, Lars, if we can work on the wording here so that it addresses that more clearly - okay thank you - that maybe we put the time period up closer to the beginning of this recommendation process. Green checkmark. Okay thank you. Arthur.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Hi, James. Thanks. I would like to add to those metrics at least some sense of failed or addended transfers by registrants as I think that will be an interesting metric. And just to - just to understand what you said, are you saying the 60-day limitation or the 60-day prevention on transfers is, by the IRTP-C, now tied to the client transfer prohibited status? So that means if you remove the transfer prohibited status do you also remove the 60-day prevention?

James Bladel: Boy, now I'm going to have to go look that up. I know that the - so let me answer your question backwards. I know that the new policy talks a little bit more about the client transfer prohibited status and saying essentially that the - that must be removed if the registered name holder requests that.

And it says it must be removed within 5 days. So I think that that - it's speaking somewhat to the 60-day locking practice. However, there are some unimplemented changes in IRTP-C that discuss the 60-day lock practice and the 60-day lock ability to reject a transfer because the domain name has been transferred less than 60 days ago or the domain name was created less than 60 days ago is - that has not changed.

So I would recommend let's take this offline because I think that that is something I would have to look up and I think that depends on the specific nature of the question. But as far as your previous statement, your other point

about tracking the number of transfers that are abandoned or that are started but are never completed, I think that that is an important metric.

I think that another important metric would be if a registrar is to track the number of - the number of times that they are contacted by support, the number of transfer related support issues for one; the number of times that they worked informally with other registrars to request or to effect a transfer reversal; and the number of times that they experience a registrant who's claiming that their domain name has been hijacked that is not related to an account compromise, you know, it's related to something else like email.

So I think all of those certainly probably not going to be able to capture all of those on this call but I think those should be part of that discussion of what sort of data points would need to be collected in order to make an intelligent decision whether or not this process needs to be revamped.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes, Arthur.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Just a quick note on the 60-day lock, I do remember in London hearing the IRTP-C group talking about an opt-out out of the 60 days in certain circumstances. Now from user experience I can tell you that it's pretty difficult to explain to your customer that they can opt out of the 60-days if they trade the name so if they change the owner then they can opt out of the 60 days but they cannot opt out of the 60 days if they just change the registrar. That will be impossible to explain to end users and they will, you know, try alternatives and think of ways to get out of the 60-day limitation. Just so you know and the group knows.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Arthur. I think that's something that would definitely be a point of discussion for the IRTP-C implementation if it's in conflict with other policies.

Okay so here's a thought. I see the queue is now clear and I thank you for everyone for indulging or even, you know, supporting the idea that we need a - this has been a long train of work going back, you know, as we mentioned almost four years.

You know, our children have grown and our trees and everything have changed since we started this process and it's been a long train and we have now this caboose that we could put at the end of the train and say, you know, the goal was to improve this process and bring it more closely aligned to its intended use.

And if it's not serving that purpose then it needs to be thrown out and it needs to be, you know, reengineered, re-envisioned, rebooted, whatever the term that's, you know, used more commonly today.

So let's put some of this onto the list and let's take a swing at that. And maybe we can refine this for our next call which as we already determined is going to be August 11. Okay so thank you for that exercise. I hope that was worthwhile.

So let's move on to Item Number 3 and I think that when we look at the recommendations we need to consider the expected impact. And this is part of, I believe, part of the new policy development process where we try our best not to make recommendations either that, you know, unnecessarily create more harm than good. You know, we certainly don't want cures to be worse than the disease.

So one thing that I would ask everyone to do since we have a week off is to schedule some time to go through each of the recommendations and try to play devil's advocate a little bit and think about what a negative consequence of each of those changes could be.

For example, and I think we've already touched on one, is that removing the registry layer from the dispute process could make that process more expensive and therefore less attractive as an option for registrants.

And we discussed that, you know, we want to make this change but we don't want it to have the side effect of becoming a barrier to that process so that registrants are discouraged from disputing a domain name unless it's an extremely valuable domain name or, you know, they built a business around it or something of those - something like that. So I think let's take a critical eye towards the recommendations. And I would ask that we take that to the list.

The next step as well in considering - after we consider the impact and once we finalize our wording, is that we'll need to test the level of consensus for each of these recommendations. And the process that we've used in the past, and I'm open to suggestions if folks would like to try something different or see this change, but the process that we've used in the past is to put out a Survey Monkey, and it's kind of a survey or a poll to determine the level of support for each recommendation.

Now I want to be clear, this is not about voting, it's about determining whether or not something - unanimous support or whether something has divergent views and therefore needs to be fleshed out a little bit better.

You know, it's more of a tool and a way of measuring consensus as opposed to making a determination. So I'm interested in getting the group's thoughts on whether or not they have strong support or strongly object to using a survey for this purpose? I believe it is something that we had used for IRTP-B and IRTP-C and I think it worked fairly well even for some of the controversial recommendations that were coming out of those groups.

So does anyone have any strong feelings about using a survey or a poll to test the level of consensus? Okay no one has any strong feelings one way or the other. Arthur.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Hi, James. Yes, A Survey Monkey could be a quick way to gauge consensus. I would like, however, that to wait sending the Survey Monkey until after the two weeks to collect our thoughts and to summarize and finalize the recommendations that we're making to see if we can agree with the recommendations so far or that we disagree and with the Survey Monkey include more options than just agree or disagree.

James Bladel: Thank you, Arthur. Typically the Survey Monkey - I'll answer your questions backwards. Typically the Survey Monkey includes agree or disagree along with a text box explaining the reasoning for support or lack of support. And it was my understanding that we would not undertake any sort of consensus test until these recommendations were completely finalized and I don't expect that will happen before the last week of August - so the week of August 25 is probably when it would start sending out invitations to participate in that survey.

At this stage of the game just wanted to judge whether or not the group had any objections to proceeding down that approach.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Okay, no problem.

James Bladel: Okay so with that said that brings us then to the end of our agenda for this particular meeting. I see lots of green checkmarks so I think everybody's pretty much on board with that way of proceeding. I will go ahead and give everyone 11 minutes back to their day so don't say I, you know, never gave you a present.

So just to confirm that we will be sending around some updated language here to finalize. I realize it's fairly rough and it's more of a brainstorming

exercise, I would say strawman but that has some negative connotations in ICANN these days so I'll say more of a piñata that we could put out there and everybody can take a whack at it.

And we'll also make some of the changes to the report. We'll look for some updated language from Arthur and of course anyone else who wants to offer suggested alternatives for any of the recommendations that we've covered so far. And our next meeting will be on August 11. So enjoy your Monday away from talking about transfers.

So if there are no other items of business we'll just close for today and thanks, everyone, and see you on August 11.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Lars Hoffman: Okay thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Terri Agnew: Once again, that does conclude today's conference. (Aisha), if you can please stop the recordings.

END