

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
21 October, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 21 October 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/gnso-irtp-a-pdp-21oct08.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Adam Eisner - Tucows

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy development coordination Marika Konings - Policy Director Glen de Saint G ry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:

S bastien Bachollet - ALAC
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC

Coordinator: We are now recording.

(Paul Diaz): Thank you. And Glen, if you would, would you do the roll, please?

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly, (Paul). We have on the call (Paul Diaz), (Barbara Steel), (Mike Rodenbaugh), Kevin Erdman, James Bladel and (Mike O'Connor) and (Adam Eisner) and for staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings and myself, Glen.

(Paul Diaz): Fantastic. Thank you, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: And there are apologies from Sébastien Bachollet who can't be on the call today. Thank you. I don't know if anybody else has apologies.

(Paul Diaz): I've not received any. We'll see. Perhaps he'll join us later. All right. Welcome back, everyone. Hope you all enjoyed the extra week break that we had in between and things are progressing nicely as I hope you have all seen.

(Marika)'s already provided us the draft initial report. That will be the focus of our discussions today. An administrative issue as well and (Marika), rather than put words in your mouth, would you just explain to the group the timing you need in terms of printing of the reports and how we want to proceed on that?

Marika Konings: We would like to have copies of the report for the Cairo meeting to distribute to the counselors and any other people that are attending the meeting on Sunday and to that end, I need to provide the copier with a version of the report coming Monday morning.

So the question to the group would be whether I provide them with the current version of the report which of course misses some parts and hasn't been reviewed yet, or whether you would like me to update the report or redline or whatever is going to be decided by the group or as how we are going to proceed, so basically that will be the status on Monday morning.

That will be printed off so I don't know. Is there any particular views on that? And I guess the question is partly as well how would people like to proceed with reviewing the report as a whole because I guess it will

be in a state of development anyway even when it comes to the Cairo meeting.

(Paul Diaz): Yes, you've touched all the points and for everyone just to remember, the timetable that we'd set out on the initial report was ready before the 17th actually, we were slightly ahead of schedule.

Our goal was to have a final review of this initial report by the end of next week's call, but as (Marika) is explaining, timing is such we need to as a group make a decision do we want to put this draft report forward, have it printed up, ready for council, etc.?

Of course we will have caveats and notes in there that some of the issues are still being developed, etc., or would we like to try and take whatever discussions we have today and try and fit them in, again with a footnote that there may be additional thinking between now and the actual meeting in Cairo which for anybody who will be there, we're currently penciled-in to brief council on Sunday from 11:15 to 12:15. Pardon, 12:15 to 1:15.

Any working group members that are available, we'd love to have you there. Certainly not required. I understand that there will be a coordinated effort to go see some of the sights so if you want to do that, you can't make it, understood.

If you would like to be there, again, we'd love to have you. In any event, don't necessarily have to make a decision right at this very moment but if anybody has some thoughts, feelings, please let us know now.

Again, the idea is do we simply print up the draft report as (Marika) has originally put together for us last week with the caveats that additional work will be ongoing or do we want to try and capture any of the thinking that we have today on today's call, especially on issue number 3, try and work that into the draft.

Then we would have to quickly review it next couple of days and get that version out to the printer for the meeting in Cairo. What do folks think?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): It's (Mike Rodenbaugh). I guess initially what would be the purpose of circulating this report before Cairo broader than the group? Council's not really going (unintelligible) talking about it at this (unintelligible) doesn't seem to (unintelligible) that.

Marika Konings: This is (Marika). I guess it's more a question of the people have something in front of them that they can look at. I don't believe either that people will read it in detail but I guess it's nice that they see that work is in progress and ongoing and they can see what has been done to date.

I know Glen, you've been at more ICANN meetings so you might know better what do to with these reports.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. People normally like to have something to look at, even though they have been participating in the group and that or that they like to have something to look at and they will - that will also be put on either a stick or on a Zip file on the Web site, that we will have an e-copy as well as a hard copy but I know from past experience that people like to see paper, some of them.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Yeah, we'd prefer it on a drive. Yeah, I hear you Glen, but I guess what's the purpose of the meetings with the council? Is it really a working group meeting or a council meeting or what? I'm not really sure.

Glen DeSaintgery: That I think you should rather ask (Avery) about, (Mike).

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Well, I don't know if you had discussions with her about that or what the agenda is for that hour or not.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, I don't think she's come up with that yet, but if I would take it from past meetings, I would say that it's like an update.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I mean, generally, I don't have much problem with circulating this. It doesn't have any conclusions. I guess it would be nice if it has an executive summary before we did that, but obviously it's a work in progress. I just hesitate - I would hesitate if it had conclusions (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): Fair enough. Other thoughts? Other members on the call, what do you all think? How would you like to proceed?

Kevin Erdman: This is (Kevin). I guess maybe we can readjust at the end of this call if there are enough significant updates to put effort into trying to get a further revision.

(Paul Diaz): Okay.

Marika Konings: This is (Marika). I just wanted to make sure that if, of course, other revisions are made and other additions are made, we will need an opportunity throughout to make sure that everyone agrees with them or is fine with them, so we need to build in a little process then as well that everyone reviews it or at least indicates that they're happy with the updated version as it is.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I'd like to, you know, I'm just looking at this for the first time myself. I don't know about others (unintelligible) but you know if I have any (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): Yeah. If people don't have strong feelings one way or another, I'd like to just as chair pull it and wait and say why don't we plan to work off of or plan to submit the draft that (Marika) has already provided. To (Mike)'s point, we may not have always had enough opportunity to really go through it anyway.

That means between now and if (Marika) has to get it to the printer, it's really close of business this Friday, if there are any glaring deficiencies, misstatements, etc., we can get those, clean them up and then get the report in.

I think if we try and start capturing ideas and points that we're making on this call, there will be another call before the ICANN meeting. There will be a cutoff. We wouldn't be able to capture anything in say next Tuesday's teleconference.

It may be too much effort and again as (Mike) said, since the council is not going to be poring over this report. It is still understood, it's the

initial, etc. Maybe it doesn't make sense to try and kill ourselves to try and get up to the last moment whatever discussions we've had.

Let's put the initial draft forward, understand everybody, that means if there are things that we either don't get to today or you see during the course of the week, we do have a hard stop for comments, edits, etc., for the draft that will be printed-up and that hard stop will be close of business this Friday.

And (Marika), let's make it close of business your time because you'll be work on this, so that's what, Europe, so that's early afternoon. Is it about this time of day, the time of this call, a couple of hours extra?

Marika Konings: Around this time every day. No, it can be two hours and it's no problem because I'll be able to make any final edits on Monday morning, so close of business on Friday for anyone's time, that should be fine.

(Paul Diaz): Okay, then let's do that everybody. Let's make our lives a little easier. If you're preparing to provide this draft initial report, everybody will have opportunities if they see any errors, anything that needs to be changed between now and close of business this Friday.

As a working group, we will continue to move forward. Of course there is language already in the draft that says we are moving forward so there have been - and we can address those updates when we speak to council.

The agenda that I've seen doesn't say in detail what council, what (Avery) or (Chuck) are really expecting from us. I will assume that it's just an update. One hour is a lot of the council's time so maybe kind of

hard pressed to fill an hour at that but in any event, that's what they provided and I think it'll be useful and they can see the initial report. I'll just leave it at that.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I'm sure the council would appreciate any additional time, but one thing is maybe we should take a stab at an executive summary in the next day that the group can review and get that in here because that tends to be obviously what most people will read, you know, then we'll be slammed with hundreds of pages of documents for Cairo.

Right now, it's a little misleading because the first text here says that this report will be posted for public comment for 20 days.

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, we're anticipating the next step. All right. Then, to that end, great. Segue, why don't we get into our review of the report and hopefully it will be not much effort to cobble together an executive summary.

I think basically reusing a lot of the language that already exists where it will capture the key thoughts very nicely. Everybody has I hope access to the report, either printed it out or you can get it from the version that (Marika) sent us. Does anybody not have it and needs a copy sent to them right now?

Okay, very well. Then I guess the first two sections are just straightforward stuff, explaining where we stand, how the group was set-up, so I'll jump to page 5 or I guess line 55, it begins section 3, the background. I don't think we need to go through this line by line.

The read that I've done and (Marika) did a very diligent job it appeared capturing the history, how the group was set-up, what the purpose was. Please, if anybody sees anything, speak up or certainly to forward those notes on the list so that (Marika) can make this as accurate as possible.

Not hearing any prompts, then I'm jumping down to line 91, section 3.2, where we start presenting the three charter issues. Again, it appears that it's been well-captured. Obviously, the first one is just reiteration of the actual charter question and then there's some effort to capture where the group in general has been going with the issues.

So I'll ask if people have not had an opportunity to really digest this, then you've got the rest of the week. Not hearing any prompts, just jumping to line 117, issue number 2.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): One second, (Paul).

(Paul Diaz): Okay, (Mike).

(Mike Rodenbaugh): I'd like to (unintelligible) line 109 through 112. This is the stock inclusion that any proposed policy change would be outside the scope (unintelligible). I don't think that's (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Just a comment, this is (Marika), just a comment. This is basically copied from the initial issues report so this is not something that I thought of as a new thing or anything like that. This is a copy and paste of where it was in issues report as it outlines the issues quite well.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): This bullet came from the issues report?

Marika Konings: Yes.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Okay.

Marika Konings: This whole section comes from the issues report.

Man: Basically, (Mike), it's my fault. It's all of them.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): No problem. It's you for another day. Hopefully, we won't ever get there.

Marika Konings: But again, I mean, if anyone has an issue with that, I have no problem in taking it out. I mean, there's no requirement to literally copy things from the issues report, so if people feel that it might take the rest of the report out of context or anything like that, I don't think there is a problem either in taking it out.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Well, I'd prefer to cut it at line 109. Take out the next two sentences, personally.

(Paul Diaz): Yeah. Okay, this is (Paul) wearing my network solutions hat. We've been over this ground, (Mike). I would like to leave that in. Again, the discussions we've had on our calls and the communications we had with (Avery) and (Chuck) and e-mails as well.

I mean, I think those lines are important to note just because that's the guidance we were given. If we want to add language saying that some members of the working group had trouble with the guidance that we

were receiving, something to that effect, okay, but I'd prefer to see it left in. Thoughts from others on those lines, starting at 109?

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike O'Connor). I think that the tricks to "who is" is that it's such a gigantic thing. I mean, my observation over the course of this PDP is that "who is" is in a way an operational system that glues registries and registrars together and I think it's just such a huge change in scope if we open this up to that that I'd support your position, (Paul). I think we need to leave it the way it is.

(Paul Diaz): Okay. Other thoughts?

James Bladel: This is (James) and I also support the idea, (Paul). I think that if we want to add language, dissenting I guess from that particular point, then that's fine but I think we need to recognize that we put some boundaries out there on what we want to consider the reach of anything that comes out of this working group.

(Paul Diaz): Okay.

Marika Konings: And if I can maybe add, in the next section of the document, it does go into detail that the group did agree that it wasn't in scope but it wasn't completely off the table so it does talk about to who is questioned, so (Mike) that maybe alleviate your concern about this section. It is addressed in other parts of the document.

(Mike O'Connor): All right, thanks, (Marika), (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, well in section 5, going on, starting at line 345, (Mike). And again, certainly the group is open to if you want to insert some

language up front, please propose it. We can all take a look at it and that'd be good.

Also, just for everybody to note, a good chunk of the first Saturday in Cairo, the council will be dealing with "who is" issues, so it's never going away, that particular issue, right?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): No, not until it sticks.

(Paul Diaz): I guess that it's never going away. All right, then. Let's see. So we're back to the background stuff then, if we can - line 117, issue 2. Again, it's the same structure. There's a question. We've cut and pasted text from issue report. Again this is all part of background, seems to flow and flow nicely.

And there are no problems then issue 3, beginning at line 168. Same structure, just providing the background information and making the actual charter question part of this report.

I know I'm going quickly but again, you have the whole week if there are other things you want to raise, so I'm just going to jump to section 4, purely administrative, giving us some members of the working group, approaches taken, just basically for the record how we brought it all together and who was part of this effort.

Okay, and then we get to what's probably going to be the more interesting part. Section 5 beginning on line 217 on deliberations of the working group. Here, (Marika)'s tried to capture for us sort of the key takeaways that we've had either in our e-mail changes or on the various calls we've had all the great stuff about EPP and whatnot,

drawing heavily on our guest speaker if you will when (Scott) joined us from Verisign.

So, with that, does anybody - our discussion of EPP, all (unintelligible) message. Again, you'll probably need to have a quick - a more detailed reading, a quick scanning over it looks okay but we want to make sure and ask everybody to really digest it, make sure that it makes sense.

(Mike O'Connor): I want to - this is (Mike O'Connor). I just wanted to chime in and commend (Marika) for a fabulous job pulling an awful lot of material together. I thought this was a pretty amazing document.

Marika Konings: Thanks, (Mike).

(Paul Diaz): And (Mike) any others that were in that subgroup as well, all this treatment of EPP, please, keep an extra share eye. Make sure that we haven't missed anything that we've captured, everything that the participants have come up with.

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike) again. Question for you. This is a good summary of the good conversation and my presumption is that we will at some point have a pretty lively discussion about the conclusions that we draw and that that's going to - you know, that's sometime in the future, correct?

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, that's what I was thinking, (Mike). If we look at the schedule, we have - our goal was to have the initial report ready, finalized if you will, by the 28th, by the end of next call. A new public comment period will start.

Concurrent with that of course the initial report goes out to the constituencies for their detailed comments. That whole interim period that runs from 29 October to 9th of December, you know, the expectation was yeah, that will be the lively debate where we're trying to come to conclusions.

And clearly we're going to want to have the input of both public and very importantly our constituencies as well, so I think that's why we're trying to get through some of these more administrative things as quickly as possible so that we will have as much time as we need to get to the lively stuff as you put it.

(Mike O'Connor): Well, great job. Thanks.

(Paul Diaz): (Barbara), I'm looking at the time. I know you have to sign off.

(Barbara Steel): Yeah, I do need to sign off. Before I go, I would like to give you an update because I have some homework from the last meeting and I apologize. I haven't had a chance to put together a note on it but I did talk to (Jeff Newman) over at New Star regarding their partial bulk transfer.

And specifically, I was to look into what the mechanisms they were using technically to affect the transfer and they are using in essence a modified version of the same tool that they used to affect the bulk transfer of an entire portfolio.

But what they've done is they've set it up so that it just accepts a list of names, as opposed to just taking all the names under one registrar and transferring them to another.

And then it does not push forward the expiration date nor does it charge the normal registration fee. However, they did outline in their offering what the charge is and I believe it's 20 cents a name or a thousand dollars, minimum. So I don't know if that information is helpful, but that's what I learned.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): This is (Mike). Did - a fire alarm went off in the middle of your speech. Did you say something about what happened in terms of (unintelligible) codes? Was there one for the whole batch or was it more like I think (Paul) was talking about where they did one authorization code per domain?

(Barbara Steel): When they're using the bulk transfer tool, it does not require an auth info code. Now if you're putting through a transfer just, you know, a regular transfer command via EPP, then an auth info code is required but in a bulk transfer process using the mechanism that I believe all registries are using, basically it does not require an auth info code in that particular circumstance.

Now what they've done is they asked that both the gaining and the losing registrar I believe confirm the list of domain names that are to be transferred, but I don't know what's the registrar who is bringing it forward actually coordinates with their registrants.

I believe in the New Star solution, it also requires them to provide I think two weeks' notice or 15 days' notice to each registrant that the domain name is going to be moved from one registrar to another.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): That's very interesting and helpful because one of the things that does trickle back to me from some of our constituents is just the sort of administrative hassle of having to come up with an auth info code per domain name.

If there's some way that we can weave that into our proposed solution, that would make an operational improvement if we could make that secure somehow, but I think people would release (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, I don't know where my network solution's at now. I don't want to prejudge whatever the group may want to come up in terms of sort of a super auth info code in these instances.

I was going to offer that in the past when we've assisted registrants, clients, you know, moving a portfolio of names, what have you, that because there tends to be so much more communication, this is a semi-unique process and getting it done is certainly not automated that all the level of communication occurs between us and the registrant, us and the other registrar.

There hasn't been the same level of concern about having auth info code for each and every single name, though given the process, we do have that if there was ever a dispute, we could go back to it for the partial bulk transfer idea that we're considering here as part of this working group.

It's just something to certainly to think through and discuss. Again, the age old, we want to, we're seeking to make things a little more convenient, are we potentially opening up security holes? Ideally, we'd

like to do both, you know, keep things secure but make things easier for the registrants.

And you know, I would strongly urge that we - if we decide to come up with a recommendation on something like a super auth info code that there is a security backstop there.

Exactly what that is I'm not sure yet because I haven't thought it through but I think that's going to be important that we don't want to have any of the output of this working group creating additional liabilities or security holes for a process that's not exactly the most secure to begin with.

(Barbara Steel): Very good point, and I apologize. I do have to run at this point. Is there anything else that you'll need my input on before I do that?

(Paul Diaz): No, (Barbara). Thank you and please just, if you would, everybody, we've asked everybody, you know, look at the report carefully, especially the sections thick and thin registries, things that are specific to your constituency, just to make sure that we've captured it accurately, we don't have any omissions or misstatements.

(Barbara Steel): Okay. I definitely will do and I will send back just a positive confirmation one way or the other with all my thoughts before the end of the week.

(Paul Diaz): Fantastic. Thank you (Barbara).

(Barbara Steel): Thank you, everyone.

(Mike O'Connor): Thanks, (Barbara).

(Paul Diaz): Okay. So back to our report then. I guess we're up to about line 274. We're talking about Iris. Okay, it's what it is and we'll want to make sure (Barbara) and her colleagues in the registry constituency in particular are comfortable with the language.

I think it's accurate but we'll want their expert input. Beginning on line 288 then, registrant versus admin contact approval. Describing the process. Means accurate based on all of our discussions.

Jumping to line 314 then, thin versus thick registries. Okay. Here's one that I need to put to the group and make sure we have this finally straight, (Marika). Beginning on line 337, the report currently reads, "It should be noted that thick registries are not obliged to include registrant e-mail addresses 'who is' data."

I still - I don't believe that's an accurate statement. I think the thick registries are in fact per their registry agreements with ICANN and there's a list in all of those agreements for the data points that will be collected and not being an attorney but that list, it's a contractual obligation.

I'm under the impression that those thick registries must publish that information that is collected which would include the registrants' e-mails. So, this is sort of an issue for us and we'll need to just be 100% sure on that one.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): This is (Mike). Is (Olaf) on the call? (Olaf), is this one that you can give us a quick ruling on?

Olof Nordling: Rather to be really on the safe side, I'd like to consult with (Dan) first when it comes to the contract invitations, so let's leave it for (Marika) and I to check with (Dan) and our legal services to really be sure that we were expressing it in the correct way. Is that okay?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Yeah, absolutely, and we'd prefer an attorney, you know, legal's guidance because we don't want to be judging contracts if we don't have that expertise.

(Mike O'Connor): I think it would be helpful to add one more bullet here about - to the effect that Verisign.com and .net are thin registries and all other GTLVs are thick registries. That's (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, I know I've seen that.

Olof Nordling: I am not 100% because we have GTLVs which are pretty odd features like (Dart Arpa). I don't think that (Dart Arpa) is considered a thick one so we'll have to choose our words there.

Marika Konings: And then the second bullet point under the heading thin or thick registries mentioned there, examples of thin registries are .com, .net and .jobs is mentioned.

(Paul Diaz): And there's one, okay. You know, an example of thin - .jobs is something that individual users are going to come up against. (Dart Arpa) is such a unique creature. That would be tough one to change the language but if jobs is there, okay, there's something that's if you will a little more mainstream.

(Mike O'Connor): It seems like the thing to do is just make the list of all the thin registries, you know, include (Arpa) and jobs. Is there a way to figure that out?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, let's (unintelligible) nice little homework for us.

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah, just what you need.

Olof Nordling: That's what we needed. That's what the doctor ordered.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Maybe this homework could be deferred until after the meetings in Cairo as not the highest of possible priorities but it would be useful in the final report to sort of know which ones are the thin registries, I think.

Marika Konings: We can check because something like that might already be available and if so, we can already include it and if not, if it takes some more time, we can maybe do it after Cairo.

Man: And (Mike), you mean GTLBs, correct, because for a basis of comparison, there are dozens of TCTLBs as well.

((crosstalk))

(Paul Diaz): You guys definitely don't have to go there. What I would ask, (Mike) makes a good point. Some of the list may not need to get into this initial report but I really do want to get a definitive answer for line beginning 337 down about the obligation of thick registries to publish or not, because those two bullet points I think are very, very important in the report and I would hate to have a factual misstatement in the report

that gets both printed up and then importantly is pushed out for community comments.

No point in not doing that homework up front and then having a whole bunch of people calling us out on it, either in the constituency statements or in the public comments. Let's at least try and get (Dan) or whomever to give us an answer on that. It should be I would think a pretty easy thing for them to do quickly.

All right, then. Line 345. Talking about our favorite "who is."

(Mike O'Connor): This is (Mike). I have an important correction on 346. There's a typo of "tough."

(Paul Diaz): Evens out because we forgot the (unintelligible) given the nature of the "who is" problem it's probably a Freudian slip that's probably best corrected, excellent point.

Yeah and the rest looks okay but if we're quoting the registry constituencies so we'll want to make sure that (Barbara) is good with the characterization and as always, if folks want to see text changes and whatnot, post it to the list, get it to (Marika), and we can make any of those changes if it's appropriate. And then 361, the auth info code.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): (Paul), if I could drag us back to the "who is" for a second. One of the things that I'm sort of on the fence about is how hard to push my notion that "who is" is really in addition to an information system that's also an operational system and that operational nature of "who is" really is intertwined with the historical rumpus about the information that's contained in it.

And I don't know whether I feel strongly enough about it to lobby to put a bullet in that section along those lines or not. Do you have a sense, a feeling as to whether that would just be a huge distraction or would it be a useful addition to the conversation about "who is?" because I could sort of go either way on this?

(Paul Diaz): Before I say anything, what do others on the call think?

(Mike O'Connor): What is it that you want to add, (Mike)?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Well, I'd have to sit down and draft something but the observation that I've been making is that "who is" is the system that binds registries and registrars together right now.

Leaving aside EPP and (Ira), there's really only one system that's used as the glue between registries and registrars and the sort of stalemate on "who is" over the information disclosure requirement has brought operational development to a standstill.

And so the thought would be that I'd sit and sort of try and draft something to sort of tease those two aspects of "who is" apart and do it in such a way that maybe progress could be made on the operational side while the stalemate is wrestled with on the information disclosure side. I'm sort of making this up as I go.

(Mike O'Connor): So (Mike), you're thinking that if we could somehow separate the operational dependencies of "who is" from the other legal and privacy controversies associated with that system that we could continue to improve, enhance and innovate the operational systems without kind of

having to have this other controversy chained around its neck. In fact, I probably will listen to the MP3 and steal your paragraph.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Okay. I agree with you and I think that - I hate to - (Paul), I hate to go back to the first part where we were talking about EPP and the poll message idea, but that sort of idea would - is similar to what (Mikey)'s proposing, is it's taking something that is right now - "who is" is the only game in town but it's taking something and building something into a secure EPP environment as an alternative to this other system that is fraught with problems and controversies so that operationally we can all continue to innovate, so maybe (Mikey), maybe you and I can work to draft something somewhere and then we can put it out to the list for comment?

(Mike O'Connor): That'd be great. I'd love to do that. (Paul), are you okay with that?

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, I'm all for it. That's why I wanted to hold my tongue and let others - by all means, that's the plan of the working group. You know, we're trying to have a good debate here and if you guys can, please don't send it out at 5:30 on Friday afternoon and expect us to get (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Paul Diaz): By all means, let us take a shot and then post it to the list so that everybody can see and maybe you guys will be capture in a good way. Maybe we'll come back to it and say oh god, it's still just "who is" and (unintelligible).

Well, I mean, does that - I'm curious. I know that we have folks that have different thoughts about "who is" and its relevance on this particular topic but I think that - is that somewhat non-controversial, the idea of some of the operational aspects of "who is" could be separated from the controversial aspects and then that would free-up things like transfers and inter-registrar transfers especially, but are dependent upon each other for this data to continue?

Kevin Erdman: This is (Kevin). I think that's possible but I think you also have to consider policy impacts because if you open up protocols for transfer of information and yet there's different types of information available, you have to look at that in the whole context, so I think it's a wise idea to say that we want to focus on the operational aspects but we also have to do that in conjunction with what data's in there and how that might impact some of these other concerns.

(Paul Diaz): Good point, thank you. I agree with (Kevin). Let's see what you guys can come up with. I think it's very, very hard to really separate things that can't be looked at independently.

Operations can't be looked at independently of the policy, but maybe it can be captured in such a way that it at least gets - you know, we can arrive at consensus on it and it will get some more thinking going in other (fora), as well.

(Mike O'Connor): I think one of the - this is (Mikey) again. I think one of the things that I'm thinking about is using this as a chance to start a conversation rather than perhaps get us all the way to the end of it, but if we could come up with some way to divide that issue, and this, you know, this will be the hard part of drafting.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): (Mike), why don't we make plans to just chat briefly tomorrow and maybe we can put something - draft something up and post it to the list?

(Mike O'Connor): That would be fantastic. Listen to my fire alarm. That's why I've been going on mute all the time, but yeah,...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Maybe you need a new battery.

(Mike O'Connor): No, it's the stupid building. Yeah, let's - I'm free all day tomorrow so let's just, you know, either late on this call or by e-mail, let's just pick a time and we'll...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Okay.

(Paul Diaz): Very good. Okay, we'll look forward to it then. All right. We've got about 15 minutes. I'd really like to get through this section. I think we can so if we can, let's press on. We're back at line 371 beginning on issue 2.

And again, we had the background. (Marika)'s tried to capture the key points. As always, have until the end of the week to make any substantive comments, changes, etc., but it seemed pretty consistent with what I've heard on the call, just read on the list.

Then jumping to line 397, our issue 3. (In kind of things), some background, some explanation of the existing bulk transfer process works, and the only thought here is the possibility that probably not today but perhaps on the next call we might have some additional thoughts or discussion.

We didn't really wrap-up our discussions on partial bulk transfer in our previous calls. Do we want to afford ourselves sort of an extra bullet point saying this particular issue is still under active negotiation by the group, you know, and it's findings will be reported in the - in a later version or more likely in the final report? Is that implied or do you think we need to make something like that explicit?

(Mike O'Connor): (Paul), this is (Mikey). In a way, I would sort of view the whole report that way, and so if we were to say that, I think we might want to say it everywhere, yeah.

(Paul Diaz): And I believe (Marika) you did have some language like that somewhere noting that the working group's efforts are ongoing? I'd find it now but I think it's there so I guess we don't need to add something at line 440 or beyond.

Marika Konings: I'm not sure whether that is somewhere in the document or I mention in the e-mail, but I'm happy to add something on the cover page to it and to clear, you know, to print up copies and distribute them, let people know that this is a work in progress.

(Paul Diaz): Honestly, if we're going to take a crack at an executive summary, to (Mike Rodenbaugh)'s point, the overly stressed council, that's all they're going to have time really to get to. That to me would be the best place to put it, the end of the executive summary.

That's just up front, very clear to people that hey, here's our understanding to this point in time. Please be aware the working group

continues its efforts and we can work it in them if we cobble together an executive summary.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Paul Diaz): All right then. Line 441 begins our section 6.

(Mike O'Connor): (Paul), hang on a minute, this is (Mikey) again. Oh dang, that stupid fire alarm! On 421, line 421, what I heard from (Barbara) earlier today is that that may not be the case, that there may be a small registration fee assessed like a dime a name and a thousand bucks minimum.

(Paul Diaz): In fact it's - yeah, that - very good catch. It's not a registration fee. They call it something else and we'll need clarification as to the processing fee or administrative fee, but they're careful not to call it registration because the date is not changed.

(Mike O'Connor): Got it, okay, so 421 is indeed accurate, still?

(Paul Diaz): It's accurate except for the use of the word "registration."

(Mike O'Connor): Well, no, I mean, if they're not calling a registration fee and they're calling it something else, then that would leave 421 still accurate.

Olof Nordling: It is accurate but perhaps not complete then, if there is a processing fee or something of the sort.

(Paul Diaz): Right, yeah, exactly. It needs the additional clause. However, a small processing fee, whatever they're calling it, is assessed. We'll get that

to (Barbara) just to have her tighten the language or add a clarification for us. Good catch.

All right, then. The section 6, our constituency comments. In each of these, I would really just ask that the representatives of the various constituencies to please look at it carefully, make sure that the characterization of your constituencies' positions and comments have been accurately reflected.

My quick read was that it really was accurately captured, but let's be sure and again, try to get that much - try to get that section addressed by Friday because again, since the constituency statements are a matter of - going to be a matter of public record, if there's any inconsistency, we'd be silly to have it in our report when people can refer to the actual statements.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): These were like preliminary constituency statements, right? Technical constituency statements come next.

(Paul Diaz): That's correct.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): (Unintelligible). Make it clear where we're at in the process.

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, and (Marika), can we do that? I forget from our timeline we called them...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): It was the input or something like that?

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, instead of...

Marika Konings: Well, we just called them constituency statements. We just indicated that there was a chance to provide further update. That's how we put it in the timetable.

(Paul Diaz): What if we just add the word "initial?" Would that cover it for everyone? Our initial constituency statement's public comment period? That's really what it is. The second one will be coming up beginning at the end of this month.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): That works for me.

(Paul Diaz): A simple fix. We'll just add the word "initial" then.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): (Unintelligible) 6.3.

Marika Konings: Just a question, this is (Marika). And Glen or anyone else, did you receive any other indications that we'll be receiving any other constituency statements from those that haven't submitted anything yet?

Glen DeSaintgery: No, I haven't. I've pinged the ISPs. I think they're still outstanding, aren't they?

Marika Konings: Under NCUC and...

Glen DeSaintgery: NCUC has not given me anything in the (A-lac nan) or the other.

(Paul Diaz): Yeah. I believe (Sebastian) made a comment for us on the list to the effect that (A-lac) didn't have a position at this time. They were just participating and will form their views (unintelligible) forward.

And some correct - I don't believe NCUC or ISPs have any members on the working group so I wouldn't necessarily expect anything from them. Of course, in the second round when this report's out there, they're welcome and we'll be encouraging them to provide comments in the next round.

Marika Konings: Then I'll take out then the reference to these, otherwise it might raise the expectation that something more will be added from other groups while it might not be forthcoming..

(Paul Diaz): How does everybody feel about that? Does it make sense to drop their names since they haven't, so we don't create unrealistic expectations? I thought if we drop them, do we need to just say something at the beginning that I'm pretty sure we do already where we say that it was put out to the community, that it's understood that we didn't deliberately exclude them, they sort of self-selected out of this particular round?

Marika Konings: I can add something to that - to the structure.

(Paul Diaz): Yeah, and then if nobody has a problem, sure, why don't we drop them, add just an extra sentence explaining that and certainly we'll talk to them in Cairo and beyond, trying to get their official input in the next round.

All right, well we've done fantastic work today, folks, because obviously our section 7 conclusion next step, that's all the work that's still in front of us. The various (anacies) are just verbatim reproductions of

whatever was submitted when it was originally put out, so fantastic. We might even finish a few minutes early.

Okay, then. You know, as we said - I'm sorry. Does anybody have any other issues, questions they want to raise before we wrap-up?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Paul), sorry, it's Glen. (A net) came through from (Avery) I think which will simplify your lives quite a lot. I sent it through to (Marika) that she doesn't in fact expect a whole report.

(Paul Diaz): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: I just think that words again...

Marika Konings: I think you mentioned that she's fine as well with PDP statement of work, that was actually just basing it with (Olaf) as quite on track with this report, why that wouldn't make sense to share it, especially if we have a good executive summary or statement of work might just be the executive summary.

(Paul Diaz): Does that make sense, (Mike Rodenbaugh), consistent with your experiences on council? At this stage, that would be the appropriate thing, what the council would be looking for?

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Yes, basically they just want to know exactly where we're at and don't misrepresent that this is agreed by the group because it's not quite yet.

(Paul Diaz): Right, and the good news for all of us, I mean, we should take heart that we're on schedule. That's an achievement in PDP working groups in and of itself, so we have some good news for council for a change.

Marika Konings: I can put such a statement together which provides a bit of an overview of indeed where we are, I guess, including the timetable and then maybe a short summary of what is in the report already and saying that this is still a work in progress and I can share that with the group for feedback later this week.

(Paul Diaz): That'd be excellent. Okay, (Marika). All right, everyone, well short of any other questions, then we'll be looking forward to what (Marika) is putting together. Also looking forward to inputs from folks, clarifications or additional text for our draft.

On next week's call, of course, it'll be the last call before the break for Cairo. Just looking at the calendar, remember all we decided that we were going to skip the week we're in Cairo. We're not going to do a formal meeting.

So again, we will meet on the 28th but we will skip the 4th and next week's call then, I would ask if we could return to issue 3 about partial bulk transfer. We were having discussion/debate about some of the details, what it would entail, what it might not entail, etc.

Or there was a suggestion maybe this is not where we want to go, whatever. Let's get back to that debate so that we can go into the Cairo meeting with a pretty good understanding of where we all are before the next round of comment period starts, which will be the day after our call.

That's what we've currently scheduled the 29th, it's supposed to be the opening of the next public comment and constituency statement round. So with that, I thank everybody for their time. We'll look forward to continue discussion in e-mails and certainly talking to you all again next Tuesday.

(Mike O'Connor): Thanks, (Paul).

(Paul Diaz): Very good. Thank you, guys.

END