GNSO
Inter-registrar Transfer Working Group teleconference
27 February, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-registrar Working Group teleconference on 27 February 2008. 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/inter-registrar-transfer-wg-20080227.mp3

Notes from the meeting can be viewed at:

http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-trans-wg/msg00078.html

Participants on the call:

Chuck Gomes - gTLD Registry constituency

Mike O'Connor - CBUC

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

ICANN Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager Policy Development

Robert Hoggarth -

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Olof Nordling: That was the first contribution so – and they did indeed. And well, (Mike) did very well…

(Chuck):   Said.

Olof Nordling: …this time around.

(Chuck): Yeah.

Olof Nordling: So, basically what we haven't received anything from is the ISPs.

(Chuck): Okay.

Olof Nordling: And while the NCUC statement is still rather a response to web posting…

(Chuck): To what we're working about.

Olof Nordling: …way back.

(Chuck): Yeah, okay.

Man: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Thank you. Well the first thing I thought I'd ask here is did I – the little summary that I created, did accurately capture what we've done so far? I mean Olof, your notes were really helpful and doing that.

So I very much appreciate that but I thought I should at least ask people to take a, you know, to see whether I've grouped them accordingly that, you know, the way we have agreed.

Man: I'm sort of reading as we go. It looks pretty good to me as I skim it.

(Chuck): Well, obviously we can make corrections in it if I've done anything incorrectly so we don't spend a lot of time going over it again. We're

going have to when we get done with (all Mikee in) recommendations. And if I've figured it correctly, I think we've covered nine of the 19.

And we need to look at the total package when we get done and kind of revisit it to make sure that we're comfortable with what we're recommending as a total package. And so we can do that then. Certainly, if anybody finds anything there, communicate it because I quite likely could have made some errors there.

All right well, if – shall we start on recommendation, I think it's – let me get back up here and Group 2, recommendation 8, is that right?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, that's my (peg) on it.

(Chuck):   Yes. So – and that one is whether additional provision should be included in the DTRP on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred. I had raised some questions there that I'd like some responses on. (Tim), you're probably the best one to answer my question.

Now, the current policy allows dispute to be filed within 180 days. In fact, that particular issue I saw in the registrar public email list just in the past week or so. Is that much time really needed?

(Tim):   You know, I think you probably find some registrars. I think more time is needed but I wouldn't think less.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right, well that's good to know. And I kind of suspected that. So…

(Tim): Honestly, I mean that – when you get much past six months and you begin to get into (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay. This complicates it more.

(Tim): It's pretty difficult. Yeah, yeah.

(Chuck): Yeah, it really does. Is there another way to deal with this? Because it does get and of course, this whole – the thread on your left was having to do with this where there's multiple transfers. And I think Ross, was the one that said, "Well, this goes back to the first one. And if it was wrong, then go right back."

It's still kind of complicated. Is there any way to deal with this or just, you know, leave it alone?

(Tim): I think, you know, it gets much deeper than just what am I looked like on the surface because what are just really complicated are just trying to figure out, you know, who – like Ross is trying to make a distinction between a listed registrant and the legal registrant.

(Chuck): Right.

(Tim): You know, that concept, that – you know, we haven't really defined well and it's pretty much up to registrars to just come to agreement on it. You know, there's no definitive method to say. Here's how we show with you with the registrant list.

I mean a lot of those cases, you know, what happens is the registrars said, you know, "Look, I've got a good FOA because according to your

WHOIS at the time, you know, this was the contact, that's who I have the FOA from." And, you know, that's the end of the matter as far as they're concerned.

So, I think there's, you know, there's something that might need to be addressed when I think so. But I think it's a little bit different issue than just the multiple transfers that can you get more down to identifying, you know, the legal registrant, I guess, if you want to put it that way.

(Chuck): Mm hmm. So that might be a good point to capture Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yeah. And because when we talk about multiple transfers, that is multiple transfers from registrar to registrar. And we're not talking about transfers from registrant to registrant here.

(Chuck): That complicates of course, the niche kind of situations, that complications it even more. And I think that's covered in a little bit and another one of the recommendation, so…

(Tim): And I think that probably the most of the issue that arise around transfers – multiple transfers from registrar to registrar that when you get back to the basic problem, it stems from some type of hijacking or somebody opposite name that they didn't really have rights to. So you still get back to that ownership issue.

(Chuck): Mm hmm.

(Tim): We had rights to approve that transfer, who's the actual registrant.

(Mike):   Yeah, I think that's the reason that I lobby for. Certainly, putting this into a policy discussion somewhere is because, you know, that's clearly a hijacking tendency, what causes that. This is (Mike).

(Chuck):   Yeah, I think it makes sense to include this (unintelligible) site whether it's one of its own. Let me ask another question and (Tim) probably just stressed that with you, first of all. But is there any sense in combining this one with number nine that's in the next grouping? That's the one on whether special provisions are needed for change of registrant simultaneous to transfer within a period.

            Now, I'm not sure there's even a way of dealing with number nine but I bring it up now just because I want to – I guess, just looking for your opinion, as and expert.

(Tim):   Yeah, my opinion is that it certainly could help the situation. I think they could be related and in fact, you know, I mean as probably everybody knows GoDaddy's process or change or registrant requires the parties to agree that they don't transfer the names for 60 days just for that reason.

            Because the ones that ownership change has taken place, you know, we want to -- we have so many that happened and there's so many – (you're from the customers) with transactions, you can't, you know, go down and look at each one in a detailed form, Right.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Tim):   And so, we like that window for compliant to come in and for us to examine the situation a little bit closer. And in many cases with

registrant to call and talk just about it, we figure out what situations we let it go.

But it's all related because, what happens is when that registrant changes, its transfer takes place right away, you know, especially if multiple ones take place right away, then we may have a very difficult time trying to correct it.

(Mike):   Yeah. Right. One – sorry, (Tim). Are you done?

(Tim):   Yeah, yeah.

(Mike):   This is (Mike). One of the things you're going to see in our comments is something I'm not entirely in agreement with. But the DC is, you know, saying in their comments that they would like to reduce the number of 60-day holds in these processes as much as possible.

            The perception being the those 60-day holds are often used to keep legitimate transfers from happening between registrar. And the alternative that's proposed is that other mechanisms then long holds be used to the secure domains.

            And…

(Chuck):   If the hold -- the problem (Mike), if there's an easy way to get it off of hold, kind of (lock) situation.

(Mike):   Yeah, it could be that that's the solution. I think that (Tim's) objective is spot on which is we need some way to make sure that, you know,

hijacking isn't taking place. And the DC is saying that they'd like to see some other mechanism and it made to accomplish that.

And that may be that the way to do that is as you say to have an easy way to remove the hold. But on the other hand, that may just open up the security hold and…

(Tim): You know, it's funny, you know, we have to find the balance. Because if they want to secure transfers, then they're not going to be as easy as we could make them. If we want transfers as easy as we could make them, then they're not going to be secured.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim): (Unintelligible) and so I think that's the thing that everyone has to realize.

(Mike):: Yup.

(Tim): And I understand that the situation you're in is to what you want. You know, if you're just trying to transfer your name that you just want it to be easy. If your names have been taken or, you know, there's some issue, then, you know, you can wave that more secure. But, you know, it can't be both ways. There's got to be some kind of balance.

(Mike): Yeah. And I agree 100% with that. This is the classic information security dilemma.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   Is this one then one that is okay in the group that it's in or is that one of those that maybe should be a PDP on its own?

(Mike):   Which one are you talking about?

(Chuck):   Number eight.

(Tim):   (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: We're considering whether to group eight and nine as well.

(Chuck):   Yeah, I'm going to get to done. I just, first of all talking about – yeah.

(Mike):   Which group are we going to put it in?

(Chuck):   Well, it's in a group already by (Tom's). We're using (Tom's) grouping. It's in the group enhancement to the current transfer dispute policy. So it's in the second group.

              According to (Tim) thing, I haven't put it into my document yet, (Mike), okay because we haven't covered it yet.

(Mike):   Yeah, and I haven't got (Tom's) document in front of me. What's the name of (Tom's) document?

(Chuck):   That's the one we've been working off all along.

(Mike):   I know.

(Chuck):   You need me to send that now?

(Mike): No, no. I'm sure I've got it, I just need the name of it.

(Chuck): The transfer-grouping_draftversion – well, anyway…

(Mike): Oh, yeah. No, I've got that open. But I didn't see any groupings there.

Olof Nordling: Well, they're having seen bold actually.

(Chuck): Yeah, it's in bold.

(Mike): Handling, I got it now. I'm open.

(Chuck): Okay, good. Okay.

(Mike): I think that's fine in that group.

(Chuck): Okay. Now, is there any reason now, I think we've got nine in the third grouping. Is there any value in combining nine with eight or is nine not even achievable?

(Mike): I think it would be delightful to combine nine with eight and put it in that same grouping because it's just a different staff sort of the same problem in a way. I agree with you (Chuck) on that.

(Chuck): (Tim), what do you think?

(Tim): I think those few just given, you know, our experience that the to rule the problem of one is the other.

(Chuck): Mm-hmm.

(Tim): It would appear to make sense to me.

Olof Nordling: And now, nine is grouped on the new issues but that's perhaps not so material really.

(Mike): Yeah, I think if we pushed it back up into the clamp along with eight that that would make a lot of sense.

(Chuck): And we made aside the rename of the groupings too. That's kind of cosmetic thing that we can take care of later if they don't make sense when we get that. So that maybe okay.

Olof Nordling: So, we call it Group 2 combined (unintelligible)…

(Chuck): Yeah, yeah. We can just call it Group 2 for now. And I used (Tom's) categories for that document that I created. But we can change those of course. Oh, just trying to slide some continuity there so.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay. Now, since we're on nine for the moment, again, some questions I raised on that one were whether it's, you know…

Yeah, I know that this was a problem for verifying in our dispute resolution processes. This one has come off often. No surprise, I'm sure, to you, (Tim). But it's not clear that there's a work of a way to solve it.

Is it still worth spending some time on? It might be. I mean if we could solve it, it'd be great, from our point of view. I'm talking about from verifying's point of view.

(Mike): I think that we should set the goals out and let the implementations perhaps fall to another discussion.

(Chuck): Oh, I'm good with that. You know, I just wanted to – you know, I talked with (Barbara Steel) who manages the team that does the resolution for us. And, you know, we were trying to rack our brains how we would really do it and we kept running into walls. But I'm perfectly okay with, you know, having a PDP that includes this one. It takes a crack at it.

(Mike): Yeah, I think if nothing else is setting out the issue, having a conversation about it, exploring some alternatives, you know, the good conversation for the community. Because if we come to the point where we say, "Gee, this is really too hard to solve," then everybody knows that it's too hard to solve and perhaps they take a little bit more care with that kind of transfer.

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Tim): Yeah, I would agree just given that it's registrars that raised the issue. And, you know, I think they would like to see some dialog about it.

(Chuck): Good. No, I'm very supportive of that, yeah. So, okay. I think we could go then to 14 back in the Group 2, which is whether review of registry level dispute decisions is needed.

Apparently some complaints exist about inconsistency there. You know, nobody has ever, as far as I know, for us -- and we probably get more disputes in this than anybody else by far and we don't get very mini.

But, you know, it's like two or three a month as all – but has anybody used the appeal process? There's an appeal process if there's something that's inconsistent or think there's wrong. I'm not aware that they have.

(Tim):   And not that I know off. I mean we rarely use the DRP at all…

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Tim):   …simply because you'll find it much easier to deal with it directly.

(Chuck):   And which was the, you know, the intent of the policy anyway was to first of all encourage registrars to work it out so that's great.

(Tim):   And we're the subject of them once in a while, you know, some of your file one.

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Tim):   And we rarely dispute it. So, I mean we usually look at situation and, you know, the registrars convinced there was some issues and we…

(Chuck):   Yeah, right.

(Tim):   …you know, need to think.

(Chuck):   Well, (Tim), are you aware of any inconsistencies? The problem with this particular one is that without identifying what, you know, where the inconsistencies have been, it's really hard to evaluate it.

(Tim):   And I agree. I'm not aware of anything specific but I think before we could consider addressing that, we have to have more specific than what's there already.

(Chuck):   Yeah, in other words, we should identify what the inconsistencies are because those may be able to be dealt with directly.

(Tim):   Right, right.

(Chuck):   And we should encourage use of the appeal process.

(Mike):   I think that's really what this one is asking for isn't it?

(Chuck):   Well, there is an appeal process already.

(Mike):   But is it consistent across registries?

(Chuck):   Well, it's in the policy so it's supposed to be. And that's what I'm trying to identify. If it's not, then it's a compliance issue, not a policy issue.

(Mike):   Well, and I think, you know, when I read this and it says, "A Review of Dispute Decisions " I agree that this really reads more like a compliance thing but perhaps the policy question is whether or not to launch such a review.

(Chuck): Yeah. But even that's not a – I mean like I said, the review could be the first step in the policy.

(Mike): Yeah, but I mean I don't think there is policy in this one. I think this is really inappropriately placed in a list of policy decision.

(Chuck): So does it make sense on this one to move it to the "Delete from policy recommendations" but recommend that a review maybe by the ICANN compliance team to see whether there are indeed some inconsistencies.

(Mike): Yeah. I mean I think we could move it to the "Delete" and then say that we support showing ahead with such a review but we didn't give it as a policy.

(Chuck): Yeah, that's what I was saying. Yeah, that – others, what do you think? Is that a…

(Tim): Yeah.

(Chuck): …a good way to handle this one?

(Tim): Yeah. (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay.

Olof Nordling: I say, we're making a good headways.

(Chuck): Yeah, wow! And so, I'm going to wrap myself out here.

(Tim):   (Unintelligible) with everybody else.

(Chuck):   All right. Good. Well, that's great. All right. So now, where we're at then that brings us to 16 huh? We're on a roll. Whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as part of the policy, you know, I've heard this one a lot but how on earth do you do it?

Now, I actually came up with – I don't see how registries could do it because we can authenticate the registrant so anybody could give us – you know, file a complaint and, you know, we have to go back to the registrar.

The only idea that I came up with this morning when I was reviewing this one was maybe again that some process could be put in place through the ICANN compliance team. But even then, they're going to have to – you know, they don't have the means of authenticating. They're going to have to go back to the registrars and authenticate whether the person filing the complaint is really a legitimate complainer or not.

(Mike):   Yeah, this is one that I'm really keen on. And let me speak to it, I think that the goal at least from my perspective is some way for a registrant to launch a process and not having to depend, you know, in the terms of the mechanics of validating the legitimacy of that, I would tend to leave that to an implementation team.

But the thing that's coming through to me in all of the constituents that I've talked to is that they're frustrated because they sometimes can't get the attention of their registrar and thus can't get a process initiated. And so, what they're looking for is just the way that kick a process up.

And if it turns out that authentication is hard, then we have to identify that as something to be figured out but still leaves the goals in place to give the registrant a way to kick off the process.

(Chuck):   Yeah, so at least kick off some investigation or something.

(Mike):   Yeah. Yeah.

(Tim):   It has to be transfer-specific, I mean, you know, for example there's the IBM, you know, registrar complaint process but it's not, you know, it's not well-read, well-known.

(Mike):   Yeah, and that's kind of a big hammer to drop on something as focused as this.

(Chuck):   Why – what do you mean by big hammer?

(Mike):   Well, isn't that one more broadly aimed at dissatisfaction with registrar performance and a whole bunch of other things?

(Chuck):   I don't think it has to be.

(Mike):   Well, and perhaps that's the thing to do say, take a look at the existing. I always thought of that as, you know, more of a customer service complaint kind of cycle.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, you mean you're partly right…

(Tim):   That was…

Olof Nordling: …because it's sort of they accumulated the complaints and that would then kick off the ultimate weapon sort of…

(Mike): Right.

Olof Nordling: …from ICANN's side.

(Tim): I think that's really what it is. I think it is a customer service issue. The registrant is – I'm trying to contact this registrar and can't get a response or they won't cooperate if their, you know, challenging transfer then that's a customer service issue.

And it seems like it should go through, you know, if we were going to have a process – there should be a single process for those kinds of issues, the registrants to raise and – so that there's a single kind of, you know, collection of this stuff so that we can track what's happening in various registrars.

Because if something like that exist – I just think, you know, that does need to refined but it shouldn't focus just on transfers…

(Mike): Right.

(Chuck): I don't know. Maybe it is good to focus – to include in any revision to the transfer policy, communication if nothing else within the transfer policy that communicates what registrars – what process they should use if they encounter that situation.

That wouldn't be very hard to do but it might be very valuable to have that in the transfer policy.

(Mike): Well, and another approach would be – I think the problem that a registrant might have – let's say that I lose my domain in January and I submit to the complaint process and it takes until July for enough of those to accumulate.

Maybe the thing to do is to tweak that process say, well, issues where a registrant is trying to recapture a domain from hijacking. It don't have to be accumulated. They can be processed immediately so that you don't lose all that time of building up to critical mass.

(Tim): My question is whether they should be accumulated at all?

(Chuck): Yeah, me too. That's what I was thinking.

(Tim): Well, yeah. (Mike), I think it's by a complaint and, you know, they're – some of them are like a month old, I mean that, you know, it's…

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim): …late, I mean, you know, the…

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim): …(they're) cutting glass or we resulted otherwise, you know, it's just like…

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim):   …why do they use – why don't we get them as they happen so we can respond to them in a timely way?

(Mike):   Well, see then. What that says is that we leave this in the PDP process and perhaps what we started to do is describe a bit of the way that we solve it. But I think that question of whether or not to include this in the PDP as a topic is the one that I'd to zero us in right now and I would lobby that we do include it and that, you know, what we've started to describe as perhaps a way to accomplish it, which is the first question you had (Chuck) which is...

(Chuck):   Yeah, right.

(Mike):   …can we do this at all and I think – I don't know if that's the right one but it sounds pretty good to me and...

(Chuck):   And Olof, you might even – of course you're -- I know you're capturing some of these stuff we're having but does it make sense to just touch base with (Stacey) on this with regard to whether something like this would be best just for information that we would fit into if PDP was initiated, we fit into that to see whether it would make sense to just use the existing customer service process or some other process specifically for transfers.

(Tim):   And I think if we could…

Olof Nordling: Right. I think I know half of the answer.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Olof Nordling: And half the answer is, I think well, then we can complaint forward and we'd be innovated.

(Chuck):   Yeah, that's probably true, yeah.

Olof Nordling: So, whether it's really practical to open or why not.

(Chuck):   Yeah, you're right. Yeah, I understand.

(Tim):   This is (Tim). (Unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Yeah, please.

(Tim):   Yeah, what I think we should make it clear is that only I don't buy that (unintelligible), I mean if there's – if the registrant has a customer service issue, it should be able to do with the IT and complaints with period, whatever that complaint is about.

    What I don't think we want to do is say that a registrant can initiate a dispute resolution process for a transfer to ICANN. That, I think would open up…

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Tim):   …nightmare for ICANN. But I think we should make it clear. I don't think we need policies for it to interject the note into the either policy statement transfer that has – if you have a problem with the registrar over transfers, here is the mechanism that you're not getting response and it could mean the IT just like anything else.

But I don't have a problem if you want to put this into PDP type of thing but I think the resolution of the policy related.

(Chuck): Yeah. Other than maybe – I think later on we'll get to one where it talks about making certain things – making sure that all registrars will make the transfer conditions and support, you know, openly available to all their registrants and something like this could be part of that.

(Mike) Yeah. And that one thing I'd like to add, you know, I don't want to lose sight of registrant who's lost their name. The clock is ticking. Days are slipping by. There is this urgency notion that says, "(Bang), I don't want to just file a complaint, I want to chase after that runaway domain."

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Mike): And it may be that filing the actual dispute resolution process by a registrant is too big a leap and I can understand that. But I don't want it to just go into a black hole either and then…

(Chuck): Well, that goes back to (Tim's) comment that, you know, there probably shouldn't be that queuing up but rather hopefully, you know, transfer issues would be considered urgent enough that they would get processed quickly.

(Mike): Yeah. And I think that if we could make that clear that would address the concern that's coming from the constituents that I talked to, which is – I won't repeat. But at the same time, I certainly understand the issue of validating the legitimacy of these things and having end users actually able to trigger a complex process.

(Tim): Right and they might do it to their detriment because if, you know…

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Tim): …some -- you know, if they're trying to contact a registrar and I'll response so that's one thing but you'll have – if we allow that you'll have cases where, you know, first step they'll take is to initiate this ERP when in reality they might be able to resolve it quicker, you know, through the registrar, you know...

(Mike): Right.

(Tim): …if that registrar is unresponsive so…

(Mike): Yeah. So, you know, I think the topic is worthy of a good substance in policy discussion that results in a process that works both for registrants but also for registry and registrar.

(Chuck): So, it makes sense to leave 16 in the group that has been right now, is that correct for now?

(Mike): Yeah, I think so.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Tim): Yeah. Sounds good.

(Chuck): All right, good. Nineteen then is whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer

dispute resolution options available to registrants. That's one I was just talking about.

To me this seems like a no-brainer but it certainly could be left – I'm not saying drop it, I'm just saying it's probably an easy one. Am I wrong on that?

(Mike): I think that's right.

(Chuck): (Tim)?

(Tim): Yeah, I don't, you know, I wouldn't be I mean it's, know, it's publicly available on ICANN's website and, you know, to make that information available to registrar.

(Chuck): And well – of course, it's not for us to decide but obviously it says requirements or best practices. This almost seems to me and it is not my time to even be deciding that but it seems like it should be a requirement that this kind of information be made available to registrants. So, it could be just on the website. I'm not saying, you know, a big expensive effort but making sure it's readily available.

(Mike): Yeah. I think you're right. I think this is a…

(Chuck): And that's okay in this grouping, I think, isn't it?

(Mike): Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay.

Olof Nordling: And then if it's a requirement, then it becomes (unintelligible) question now.

(Chuck):   Well, that will be the policy. That I think…

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

(Chuck):   …what the PDP has to cite, should it be a requirement or a best practice we're working on.

(Tim):   Yeah.

(Chuck):   One of the things (Tim) is I'm thinking ahead on this and we've got, you know, we're going to come up with several different PDPs. And one of the critical things in my opinion is going to have good representation from the registrar community on each of these because it's so critical. Even on this path we're doing peers in (Tom's) participation is so essential to make that we don't overlook things.

(Tim):   Right.

(Chuck):   And to a (laddering extent) registry because of the dispute process but most importantly registrars.

(Tim):   Yup, (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: Just thinking the priority value that the priority group put on into was pretty low 16 so I guess this is sort of a trade off between low priority in that respect and each of implementation.

(Chuck): Yeah, which I think is okay.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, quick check-out counter, so to speak.

(Chuck): Okay, all right. Well, then that takes us then to (Tom's) third grouping that he titled "New Issues Related to the Current Transfer Policy" and the number three is whether there is a need for other options for electronic authentication like a security token in the FOA because of the security problems with email.

Now, this clearly becomes a cost item for registrars and probably could be registrants to depending on how registrars handle it. And so, it might only work for those who elect to do it but that doesn't mean it still wouldn't be something worth pursuing. What are the thoughts on that?

(Mike): Well, from the registrants' perspective, you know, I sort of put this one in the category of anything that makes the process better, faster and more secure, et cetera, et cetera, is a good thing.

(Chuck): And would you be willing to pay for getting a token – a certificate with no ID?

(Mike): I would but I have unbelievably valuable domain names…

(Chuck): Mm hmm.

(Mike): …so I'm an unusual person. And so I think that it might be that your notion of making it an opt in affair for the registrant would be an option. I guess, you know, I'll sort of fall back to the original site, which is anything that makes it work better sounds good to me.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Mike):   You know, I hearken back to the really early days when the internet
                 was sort of the way and, you know, email was pretty goofy. You know,
                 we had a pretty tough time and I sort of see this is just another
                 incremental step in sort of…

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Mike):   …15 years of technical development around this.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Mike):   And if there is a good, secure token way to do this then that's a good
                 thing. And one of the nice things about this is that there are now a
                 whole lot of relatively cheap, relatively easy to implement token
                 technology…

(Chuck):   Right.

(Mike):   …that weren't there 15 years ago.

(Chuck):   (Tim), what are your thoughts on this one?

(Tim):   Well, you know, I agree I just don't – I'm not sure that the – but my
                 whole belief is that losing registrar initiative process is the wrong way
                 to look at this thing to begin with. And that if we flipped it around
                 contrary to everybody's belief, I don't think it's being more difficult to

enforce than what we currently have and that, you know, a transfer should start with the gaining registrar.

We can actually authenticate the individual making a request better than losing registrar ever will by just using something like the WHOIS database which is, you know, is problematic.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim): And a lot of …

(Mike): Yeah.

(Tim): And so, you know, it's just really, to really file that issue, just thought, you have to kind of turn it around and say, "Now, this true token might help, but it doest really solve the real problems that I see with transfers and that is trying to authenticate who's…

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Tim): So it's only the gaining registrar can do it but they're not allowed to get into the picture. So, just trust the losing registrar got what you needed, you know

(Mike): Yeah. Now, do we address that question and one of these other ones because I tend to agree with (Tim) that – and I would put that in a, you know, much different category than this sort of technical issue. Like, you know, I feel that this is something that the geeks care about, whereas the issue that (Tim) is raising, I think everybody cares a lot about.

(Chuck):   Maybe – I don't think it is addressed elsewhere but we could – wherever we put this one, we can, you know, certainly add that comment that that consideration might be useful to consider in policy development. That makes sense?

(Mike):   Yeah. I just worry that, you know, if we hand this one to geeks, you know, security geeks, they're going to go in a different direction than if we hand this to a group of people with the question that (Tim) is raising.

(Chuck):   Well, that's probably in our control. When I say "our" in the GNSO's control because if PDPs are formed, we're going to be looking for volunteers to be part of those PDPs and so it'll depend a lot on who volunteers.

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Chuck):   At the same time, we need to try to get that diverse mix of viewpoints in each PDP.

(Mike):   I guess what I'm talking myself into is the notion that we might want to keep this one pretty narrow and pretty technical and then formulate another one to address the issue that (Tim) is raising, which really goes to the whole core of the process itself. I mean what (Tim) is working on something that would be quite for a substance of change to the way things go.

(Chuck):   That make sense to me but I'm not sure it's our role to add to the recommendation that a review group have made and spent a lot of time on.

You know, that's why I was trying to lump it in with this one as kind of a way of sneaking it in there so that at least if that's considered, it may be there's an alternative way of doing something different as better than doing a security token.

(Mike):   No, I agree to that.

(Tim):   (Unintelligible) included that it anyway was because it was -- it's basically that the whole different concept for transfers it's not like a minor or not even just a considerable change to the existing transfer policies. It's like a – you're like a whole new transfer policy.

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Tim):   So, I think this is where it kind of gets.

(Mike):   On the other hand, I think it's a worthy conversation. And if there is a way to either start it or perhaps even have it and use this as the nose of the camel into the tent, I'm okay with that.

(Chuck):   That's just what I was trying to do since it wasn't specifically fall down.

(Mike):   Yeah, that's nice.

(Chuck):   So, is this okay in the third group, just leave as part of a third PDP group for now?

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Tim):   Yeah, I think so.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. That brings us then to – we already covered nine.

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Chuck):   So, we're – now, we're down to ten on whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provision is going to lead for specific violation should be added into the policy?

                It seems to me that this is an issue that comes up all the time with regard to compliance and everything else. We've been talking about it for years. And correct me if I'm wrong (Tim) but it doesn't seem like it'd be too hard to develop some progressive steps and – for repeated violations.

                Do you think this is something that registrars would support?

(Tim):   Well, registrar has actually raised the issue, I believe.

(Chuck):   Yeah, which surprised me because it kind of pissed them too.

(Tim):   Right, right. So, yeah, I don't see why it wouldn't be supported.

(Chuck):   So, this is a good one to leave in that group, right?

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Chuck): And probably not a real tough one but we don't need to worry about that right now. It certainly doesn't need to be isolated, I don't think.

(Mike): Now, I agree. And let me start with that, but then, who are these penalties aimed at? Are they penalties aimed at registrars or at registrants?

(Chuck): Well, I don't know if there's any penalties you could impose on registrants unless you took their domain name away.

(Mike): Well, that's what I was wondering.

(Chuck): Because there's no contractual relationship. I think basically it means registrars were not following the policy, it's a compliance issue.

(Mike): Okay, all right.

(Chuck): But anybody disagree with that?

Olof Nordling: No.

(Tim): No.

(Mike): No, I'm fine with it.

(Chuck): Okay, all right. Then eleven, well we're really moving guys. We'll have to tell (Tim) that he was slowing us down huh? Just kidding. Whether registrants should be able to retrieve off info codes from third parties other than the registrar. And my question is like whom? I mean...

(Tim):   That means there's only one other place.

(Mike):   What is it?

(Tim):   Well currently, it had to be the registry itself.

(Chuck):   But the registries aren't the -- I mean...

(Tim):   How do you authenticate who's asking?

(Chuck):   Exactly. And even in cases it's easy, you know, it's a little bit easier in
                the case of a thick registry. But even then if the data isn't kept up to
                date, maybe it's just a few days behind or something, you have a lag,
                the registry is really not the authority, the registrar is.

(Tim):   Right, right. Yeah, so I never -- I didn't understand this one before, I
                don't understand it now. I mean I understand the concern but I don't
                know how we would solve it.

(Chuck):   Yes. Is there any real way to do it without creating a terribly unsecured
                process?

(Tim):   Yeah, I don't think so.

(Chuck):   Doesn't seem like it to me.

(Tim):   I've got major -- I have major changes in a lot of other policies about
                the way registries and the registrars operate.

(Chuck):   (Mike), as a business person, what's your thinking on this one?

(Mike):   This one falls pretty low in my interest level. You know, I read it and
                  start to scratch my head and ask the same questions that you guys just
                  did which is I don't where they'd come from? And I also share the
                  concern that if we're not particularly careful, we could make the
                  process all lot secure rather than more secure.

(Chuck):   Yes, oh yes.

(Tim):   I think it's, the way I look at it is it's -- somebody's frustrated with the
                  lack of compliance and so this was their answer. I don't think this is the
                  way to go at it.

(Mike):   Oh, I agree with that.

(Tim):   With the better enforcement that registrars are supposed to make this
                  up into codes available. And if it's not happening, that means the
                  enforcement issue not a...

(Mike):   Well what baffles me with this thing is that here I have a recalcitrant
                  registrar that's not giving me my (unintelligible) and so I can get it from
                  somebody else?

(Tim):   Yeah. Yeah, I think that's pretty much it. Yeah.

(Mike):   No, I think that's a bad plan. I think it's sort of…

(Chuck):   My inclination would be to put this in the recommendation for delete
                  area, keeping in mind that when we put this back to the council and

they take it their constituencies, if people want to challenge any of our thinking, it's not as if we're making final decisions but I would lean towards putting this on the delete group.

(Mike): I'm fine with that.

(Chuck): (Tim) and (Olof)?

(Tim) Yup. (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling (Unintelligible).

(Chuck) Okay.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

(Chuck) All right. I'm keeping a few notes myself and then I'll check Olof's notes to make sure I got it right.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) the other way around.

(Chuck): So okay. Make sure I put that in the right place. Yes I did, okay. All right, that brings us to 12. Whether the policies should incorporate provisions for handling partial bulk transfers between registrars. That is transfers involving a number of names but not the entire group of names so by losing registrar.

Now this is something, (Tim) correct me if I'm wrong on this. I had several questions on this, but I -- New Star actually introduced a new

registry service to accommodate this need. Did any other registries do it? I know we didn't.

(Tim):   Not that I'm aware of. No.

(Chuck):   Yes, I'm not aware of it either. I just though I'd check to see if you were… Now certainly this puts a burden on the registry, anytime you do this to validate lists of names with both involved registrars. I don't know if that's terribly big burden but there's a law that registry's would probably…

Now, in doing this, this probably wouldn't be hard to solve either, registries would probably need indemnification you know, between the registrars involved so that -- because they're just following the instructions of the registrars.

And my next question is, is there enough demand for this to go to the trouble of a PDP?

(Chuck):   Was it – with CFC I think was the company that was involved in wanting this. Was it from Register.com or something? I don't know its number.

(Tim):   Yeah because it was part of the partial list of the portfolio of names from Register.com that went with that piece of their business. That business unit wanted to get those names over.

(Mike):   Well you know, I am not one of the (unintelligible) -- go ahead then.

(Tim):   I'll just say we had a few instances like that. But we usually work it out somehow with the party. Now we've got one with quarter right now. An ISP who's moving and their sellers so they want to get their names moved over (unintelligible)

(Chuck):   This really relate to the fee, if there's more than 50,000?

(Tim):   You know, I think that's probably really what it's getting to is how can we circumvent either associate it perhaps. But, you know, that's...

(Chuck):   So, is that something that should be looked here? Is that really the (crop) to the problem?

(Tim):   My question is, you know, isn't this, you know just some way for the registries to offer services or differentiate themselves or whatever. You know if they see a value and they're getting requests from the customers to revoke process or some kind of rate on a bulk process or whatever. And there's something that the registries can look at individual just like New Star did.

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Tim):   You know it is, you know, we hear a lot about one size doesn't fit all with the registry. This could be another one of those kind of...

(Chuck):   Where did you hear that? You're here. Yeah you know, it is and by the way, I can tell you that I know that they approached our business team on this and for some reason they decided not to do anything about. So I think it's probably a matter of just other priorities.

(Mike): You know, I think that another scenario is just that you know, there are those folks who have big domain portfolios now and they sometimes sell chunks of their portfolio. And it can often be a lot of names, 5,000; 10,000; 15,000 names at a time. Is there a mechanism for a bulk transfer in that circumstance today?

(Chuck): Well I think the only, and I haven't looked at it recently but somebody else can jump in if I get it wrong but I think there's a mechanism that ICANN can authorize a bulk transfer.

And if it's under 50,000 names and ICANN authorized, but ICANN only does it on certain circumstances. And unlike the CSC example, the reasons didn't apply. So it couldn't be done that way. So it didn't come under those conditions so...

It may be that this should be -- it doesn't hurt to look at this issue. What do you guys think?

(Mike): I think it's worthy of taking a look at. I'm not that kind of domain owner so it doesn't matter to me but you know, there are folks that do have, well some of them even would have more than 50,000 I suppose and it's just a transaction. It's not a big thing that they've sold a piece of their portfolio to somebody else and they want to move all of the domains at once.

(Chuck): Mm hmm.

(Tim): You know I don't have a problem with them wanting to do that. That there's a process in place to do it but I, you know I would have a problem if they're going to say "Well there's going to be some minimum

-- you know, some cap on the fee imposed or that kind of thing because I don't think that's appropriate.

Now in bulk transfer, that ICANN's policy allows us where it's a case where you know the, basically, you know one registrar for example of going under and it's the bulk transfer of all their names from one place to another.

So it's not, it's very specific about what it applies to. And I get (unintelligible) we've got a domain in which the 20,000 names, they want to change registrars. So, we're going to make it easy and give them (an expedient).

Well, why would we do that? I mean we worked closely with domainers in that regard and that if there's huge number of names, well we try to make it as easy as we can from -- to transfer out and we work with the other registrars transferring in and we get some pretty good (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Tim):   I don't -- we'd be as cooperative if we had to do it for, you know…

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Mike):   Well I think that (Tim), you've just raised a point that I don't think there's a huge amount of disagreement on. I don't think that this should happen for free or without sort of normal fee structure. I think there's a difference between that, you know, trying to evade a fee, I'm not keen on that at all.

And this notion that as this domain portfolio hold their concept continues to evolve that people aren't going to be moving, chance of names around between each other. They used to sell them one at a time to each other, now they sell them in clamps.

And facilitating that, I think, would be a good thing for that that facet of the industry.

(Tim): Now, you know, I think the one thing that couldn't be done and it is probably the current problem in reality is that is if there's a -- if a single entity is the actual registrant of a large group of names, you know, do you need – and the they want to move 10,000 names, do you need 10,000 FOAs or it's a single FOA where you can demonstrate as an registrant every case sufficient to move those names.

(Chuck): I thought that -- it's been a long time but I thought that the transfer policy allow that so you don't have to have separate FOAs but it's been so long since I looked at the details that I could be memory deficient there.

(Tim): Yeah, and if it does then I'm not sure where the issue is at. Now, you know, one we're dealing with right now and it's – and I don't think it really should fall under this, and so, then that this is why this comes up.

And I think it's inappropriate. And that is that we've got it like if we have an ISP who where the (unintelligible) reseller who wants to move and they want to move their portfolio of names.

Well, you know, they're not an accredited registrars. So, as much as we like to help them, you know, if they don't get the individual FOAs from their registrants, you know, how can we just add that part of the process and say, "Yeah, we'll okay the transfers" without the registrants having any knowledge.

(Chuck): And that's not an uncommon situation, is it?

(Tim): No, it's not. But it's a different situation and I don't know that this is going to, you know, this kind of – the transfer policy can really deal with that.

(Mike): Yeah, I wouldn't be terribly keen on that one because it seems like that would also be a gigantic garage door to massive hijacking,

(Chuck): Yeah.

(Tim): Right.

(Chuck): And then it can put the registry in a vulnerable situation there too.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Chuck): So -- and that's what I was getting earlier. Well, is this one is okay leaving in group three?

(Mike): Okay with me.

(Tim): Sure.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right, that brings us then the number 13 which is whether additional provisions relating to transfer of registrations involving various types of WHOIS privacy services should be developed as part of a policy.

(Mike):   This one, looked like the nose of another camel coming into the tent.

(Chuck):   Well, you know, it's a real issue I think in a sense that registrars I think and correct me if I'm wrong on this, (Tim), but are terribly dependent on WHOIS to be able to execute. And the registrar really has to use WHOIS to be able to execute the transfer.

                And now, on the case where the privacy service is the registrant, I suppose the process could still work. Are there cases with privacy services where it would be difficult (Tim), if you're the new registrar, the receiving registrar to get the WHOIS information you need to or does that work out okay with privacy services?

(Tim):   Well, I think so. I mean instead of an issue, sure, it raises an issue. But, you know, it's what the registrant up into and it's usually conditions around on how to make a transfer happen.

                So, you know, and the whole point of – for example if domain is by proxy that we used, you know, that they actually become the registrant of record and it separate agreement between them and the registrant, they make it clear, you know, that none of these -- these certain things are aren't going to happen.

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Tim):   Plus you want to take over to the name and we'll allow you to do that, but you cancel the privacy services and transfer is one of them. So, if they actually want to transfer the name, then they have to cancel that service.

                And so part of the private – the added value to privacy is security.

(Chuck):   Mm hmm.

(Tim):   And, you know what, usually made clear by most registrars I think that offer it may not be (unintelligible) case.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Tim):   So, I don't think --- and you know, obviously, sometimes registrants don't understand it, they didn't read the agreements or whatever.

(Chuck):   How common is it for registrars themselves to offer the privacy service…

(Tim):   How common?

(Chuck):   …rather than through a third party?

(Tim):   Yeah, I'd say it's more common.

(Chuck):   It's more common, okay. Oh, yeah I didn't really know, that's all.

(Tim):   Yeah.

(Chuck): So, is this one okay to leave in Group 3 for a little more investigation at work?

(Tim): Sure. Yeah of course, as far as I'm concerned…

(Chuck): Okay.

(Tim): ...it is.

((Crosstalk))

(Mike): The (unintelligible) group that I was a part of, did see this as the nose of the camel coming into the tent and was pretty cautious about it. Because it's sort of -- in that discussion it was perceived it's sort of re-opening the WHOIS issue and nobody really wanted to touch that especially (Ross) at that point.

(Tim): I mean, if I'm (unintelligible) I'd rather see it just deleted but, you know, that's just my personal.

(Mike): Yeah, and I would support deleting it as well.

(Chuck): Well, what do we think guys? What's our rationale for deleting it?

(Mike): Partly, the rationale that came out at the review group was that we couldn't find an edge between this particular policy discussion and the larger WHOIS policy discussion.

And since it raised so many of the same issues and we felt that it was likely to become very long, very divisive and unlikely to yield much of in

a way of an outcome. I thought we could use that as sort of a rationale. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Just as to look from my side, is this something which could be a subject for while the WHOIS established?

(Tim): No, it's this simple. If the registrant absent o privacy, and they have – and they can opt out, then, you know, all of this is just, you know, registrars, even registrars who don't understand or don't want to deal with the situation. I mean the registrants opted in. They've made a choice. They can undo that choice. But, you know, I just don't know where this can ultimately go and I...

(Chuck): So, this is really a non-issue.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, well it's – perhaps it should be but perhaps it is an issue. But my question was rather that perhaps this is something to be considered in (Liz's) camp where she's reviewing all kinds of WHOIS studies.

(Chuck): Well, some of the studies that we recommended and obviously no action has been taken on them yet. But certainly deal with privacy services and so forth.

I don't recall whether any of them actually examine privacy services related to the transfer policy. They may have but I just reviewed it very quickly yesterday, that little summary document that you sent out.

So, what's the – I don't have strong feelings on this. So, if the group thinks we ought to put this in the delete – the recommended delete category, I'm okay with that. Is that still leaning?

(Mike):   Yeah. And maybe what we do is rather than use the divisive rationale that I just rattled off, maybe we use the non-issue rationale that (Tim) is describing but you…

(Chuck):   Yeah, and that's what I was getting at because if in fact that whether it's a privacy issue or not, you still have an official registrant.

(Mike):   Yeah.

(Chuck):   It is the authority over the domain name.

(Mike):   Yeah. And so, if people have an issue with that, they need to take that up with their privacy provider.

(Chuck):   Yeah.

(Tim):   Right, right.

(Chuck):   That make sense?

(Tim):   Yeah, I think so.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right, well I – okay, that's fine. I'm okay with that.

                Again, all this is going to be reviewed by the council and through council members to their constituencies. So there will be people, there will be opportunity to discuss these further in a broader group.

(Tim): Well, and Olof, to your point, at that point, it could get sort of reframed and tacked on to the broader WHOIS discussion. Because at that point then it would be sort of the rules of the road of how privacy providers behave.

(Chuck): Although it doesn't seem to me that this needs to get into the WHOIS discussion. I may be over simplifying but, you know, the transfer policy, you know, the authority for authorizing transfers is the registrants. And whether it's a privacy service provider or a registrar that's a registrant or whoever the intended registrant is, the policy still should work.

(Mike): Yeah, that's true. I agree.

(Tim): Yup.

(Mike): I'm okay with that.

(Chuck): Okay. Well, I think we only have one more, guys.

(Mike): Yeah.

(Chuck): Number 17. Whether additional requirements regarding WHOIS history should be developed for change tracking of WHOIS data and nuisance resolving disputes.

Now, being a dispute resolution provider as a registry, this would be really helpful, okay. But it's also probably has quite a lot of impact if we were to do something here.

How do you think we should handle this? The WHOIS data isn't Escrow, is it (Tim)?

(Tim):   It is now. It's starting to be.

(Tim):   So, you guys are the first one. So, that does includes WHOIS data? Is there any way to use the WHOIS data for this that registries could use it? It's probably kind of hard huh?

(Tim):   Yeah, I suggested it come up and, you know, I think it's probably doable but it would be – but there's a lot of issues around how we work that out, how we give access, how we...

(Chuck):   Yeah, yeah. We're pretty confident.

(Tim):   And the results involves the Escrow provider because, you know, they're guaranteeing a certain amount of indemnification period with that too so they're going to have input into how that all happens.

(Chuck):   Is this one of those that should be isolated as its own PDP?

(Mike):   You know, the other problem with this one is...

(Tim):   And really – well, go ahead (Mike) I'm sorry.

(Mike):   Okay. It is -- you could imagine a fair amount of abuse of this information if it's not really well protected. I think, I'm sort of adding on to your comment (Tim) that the process for which people get access to this information would have to be pretty carefully thought out. Because

otherwise, I could see an IP lawyer, you know, going to town, trying to reverse domain hijacking name and getting hold of this data.

(Chuck): This is the kind of thing that could be facilitated by a centralized WHOIS, I'm not necessarily advocating for that but...

(Mike): Yeah.

(Chuck): So that – because it really is a problem for registries that are dealing with disputes. And going back in time, to find out what the WHOIS record was at a given date. It's very hard.

(Mike): Maybe the analogy is to the real estate records that are on file at county court houses in a way. Maybe that's the rationale behind this.

(Chuck): Well, the rationale on this makes perfect sense to me. I don't have any trouble understanding the rationale. It's probably pretty complicated to do.

(Mike): Well, it's another one like the earlier one that sort of changes the transfer process a good deal. Maybe this is...

(Chuck): No, I think it has more to do with the dispute process than it does the transfer process itself.

(Mike): I'm sorry but the -- yeah.

(Tim): It does relate back go to, you know, those multiple transfers.

(Chuck): Yeah, yeah.

(Mike): Yeah. I'm liking this one. And it could be a pretty tasty…

(Chuck): Oh, it could be. I think there's huge potential here. There's huge challenges too. Is it appropriate to group it with the other things we have in the last group or should it be isolated? Or should it moved up with the one on the multiple transfers and things like that?

(Tim): I'm going to...

(Mike): I (unintelligible) that last option actually.

(Tim): Yes, and so am I.

(Chuck): What was that group two?

(Mike): Yeah, enhancements to the current transfer dispute policy.

(Chuck): Okay, the pretty heavy duty one. But I'm okay with that.

(Mike): That's been a deal…

(Tim): I think it's kind of (crooks) of the (unintelligible) there, so.

(Chuck): Yeah. Yeah. So, we would put that back in Group 2. Let me find Group 2. There we go.

Olof Nordling: Combined with anything or...

(Mike): Perhaps clustered with...

(Chuck): You want it clustered with nine and eight?

(Mike): Yeah.

Olof Nordling: Oh, this is a sizable thing.

(Mike): Yeah, this Group2 has turned in to pretty big PDP.

(Chuck): Well...

(Mike): We might want to think about...

(Chuck): Rather than try and solve that right here, what I was going to suggest we all do between now and our call next week is everybody take a look. And as soon as Olof gets his notes out, I'll revise my little summary because I've been kind of doing that as I'm going right here and make sure I have it right. And I'll get that out as soon as possible.

And if before our meeting next week, if we can – each of us kind of take a look at this with the idea that – hey, we're going close to coming up with the recommendation of several PDPs and here's the groupings of them. So, that our call next week would be primarily devoted to discussing whether we're comfortable with putting forth the groupings that we have and whether we want to make any changes to that.

(Mike): Yeah, and maybe the goal at the end of the call is to have those groups done.

(Chuck): Yeah. And then it's just a matter of, you know, writing up our recommendations to the council. And of course then another question we're going to have is probably helpful for us if we have an opinion that we agree on in suggesting whether some of these could be done simultaneously or whether they should be done serially.

And even, you know, some recommendations like, I was suggesting like it's going to be really critical on the all the PDPs to have good registrar involvement. It's probably the most critical factor but you also want, you know, people with diverse points of views so that you don't get some work done. And then you come back and you get opposition late in the game.

Does that make sense? I just, you know - to shoot for that in our next meeting with – Olof, if you can get me the notes early tomorrow then I will try and turn around tomorrow the revised grouping document that I started and then ask everybody on the group. And it'll be nice having (Tom) take a look at what we did with fresh eyes.

Olof Nordling: I'll get it to you very early your tomorrow.

(Chuck): Okay, good.

Olof Nordling: Fairly early my tomorrow.

(Chuck): Okay, that works for me. That nine hour difference works pretty well, doesn't it?

Olof Nordling: And it's well, the nights more than that. I'm 1:00 am now. Oh, talking about it today...

(Chuck): Oh, you're talking about today.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, yeah. I've shifted, I'm into Friday.

(Chuck): Yeah, yeah. You're into Friday?

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

(Chuck): Where are you at?

Olof Nordling: No. Sorry, Thursday.

(Chuck): There we go in that, okay.

Olof Nordling: Not leaping two days ahead. That's not a…

(Mike): (Unintelligible) two day internationally (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling …we're getting late, I can hear that.

(Chuck): Where is Olof?

Olof Nordling: I'm in Taipei, all places.

(Mike): But he flew twice around the world I'm guessing.

(Chuck): Well, is there anything else we need to talk about today, guys?

Olof Nordling: Just to confirm dates for next call.

(Chuck): That's right, yeah. Is the time next week, okay? I guess I should look at my calendar too. I don't know if I put something in there. I might have put a place holder, that would be on the 5th. No, I didn't. So, it looks like it's okay for me on Wednesday, March 5th, same time.

(Mike): It works for me.

(Chuck): No…

(Tim): Let me check in here real quick.

(Chuck): Yeah, go ahead.

(Tim): Well, my computer will let me here.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Mike): I'm wide open all day so...

(Chuck): Mine looks pretty good right now. I'm sure it'll change. But as long as I get something locked in, I'll get that taken care of.

(Tim): It looks good for me too.

(Chuck): Okay, good. And so, Olof, I'll send an email off to Glen and let her know that we're going to do same time. And we may be, you know, that will be not have to be a real long meeting.

But we may be really close than other than finalizing it and everybody getting a chance to look at our final document that we presented the council. So, at most, two more meetings and we actually may be able to do via email, the finalization of the document.

(Mike): Yeah, I think that's right.

(Tim): Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay. Well, thanks guys. This was a very productive session.

(Mike): Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Chuck): Have a good day.

(Tim): Bye-bye.

Olof Nordling: Thanks.

(Mike): Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Bye-bye.

(Chuck): Bye.

END