EN

ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 18 April 2023 at 16:00 UTC

Note: 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/8YLKDQ

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group Call taking place on Tuesday, 18 April 2023.

For today's call, we have apologies from Raoul Plommer (NCSG), Crystal Ondo (RrSG), John Woodworth (ISPCP). They have formally assigned Juan Manuel Rojas (NCSG), Jothan Frakes (RrSG) as their alternates for this call and for the remaining days of absence.

As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite emails.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Alternates not replacing a member should not engage in the chat

or use any of the other Zoom room functionalities. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and back over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Devan. Well, welcome, everyone. Just a few updates before we jump into our work today. Just a reminder, I think most of the groups have already turned in their early comments, and we're getting quite a few of them, so it'll be nice to review those and get through those. But just a reminder that the early comment period does close today. And along with that, all those early comments are getting posted into our working documents, so make sure you take a look at those. Again, everybody should be reading up on all those early comments so that when we get to those, we can discuss them appropriately. And there's a few more groups that haven't provided comments, and if they want to do those as we go along, that's great as well. Obviously, we'll cover those points as we go through them.

Other than that, I think that the small team that we created last week to document or codify the current processes that registrars work through prior to getting into any dispute policy stuff, when there is a dispute, that informal process that we have today, that small team is going to meet later this afternoon or just in a few hours, I think, to start that work. And again, that'll be just focused on codifying those items that occur today in that registrar-registrar potential resolution paths for disputes. So, again, they're going to start working this afternoon or in a few hours, I should say, and focus on that.

Other than that, I don't know if we have anything. I'll ask any of the stakeholder groups, I guess, now if they have any comments they want to bring forward or any questions that they have for the group to respond to. So, any of the stakeholder groups have anything they would like to bring forward?

Okay. And I think lastly, we'll just go ahead and jump into our work plan again. And again, we'll try to do this every week just so everybody's on the same page of where we are and where we're heading. So, Emily, do you want to take us through this real quick?

EMILY BARABAS: Sure, Roger. Hi, everyone. Emily from staff. So, just one open action item, which is about kicking off that small group call that Roger was just talking about. So, we'll close that off today with the group meeting later this afternoon or evening, morning, depending on where you are.

We're focused on Fast Undo today and in the gap analysis working document. And then the goal, I think, is to transition next week into the Wave 1 REC 27 items in the charter that Caitlin is going to run everyone through and see if we can get some folks thinking about some of the solutions that are possible for those charter questions. And then we still need to chart out exactly if we go to TEAC, back to TEAC next, likely that, and then to TDRP. That will give the small group some time to – oh, I'm sorry, likely TDRP first and then to TEAC. And that will give the small group some time to think about how their work dovetails with the TEAC work while the rest of the group is focused on TDRP. But we'll keep folks updated once we have a little bit more of a sense of some of these pieces from today's discussion and also from the small group.

So, I think that's it for our work plan. Again our goal is to wrap up these topics by ICANN 77. There's a lot of work to do between now and then. So, I appreciate everyone staying focused and on point. And I think it'll be helpful for these discussions to have the written input from groups that sort of consolidates positions a little bit more. And hopefully that will be able to feed into our discussions about the charter questions. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Yeah, and I'll second that it's great that we've got the early input comments now. You know, we've had a lot of discussions in the past few weeks. And now we'll start to get those into stakeholder group stances. And we'll get to know where people are looking to go. So, I think it'll help out a lot when we get

to finalizing all of our charter questions. So, the timing works out very well. So, Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, hi. This is Steinar for The Record. I'm just curious because what I see from the project plan now is that we more or less are going to have a set of meetings discussing the TEAC and the TDRP without discussing and summarizing the input to the charter questions for Phase 2. Is that correct?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, thanks, Steinar. And actually, we're going to do those together. So, that's how we're going to go through all the public – or all the early input comments. We'll go through those charter questions and then look at – and again, everyone should be reading those comments to begin with. So, when we get to the discussions, everybody's prepared. But we're going to integrate those comments into our discussions on each of the charter questions. Hopefully, that makes sense.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, thank you. That makes more sense to me. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Steinar. Emily, please go ahead.

EN

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Thanks, Roger. I'll just add that it's also incredibly helpful where we're – for example, in the gap analysis, where we're coming into a topic, we've tried to already integrate some of the comments into the relevant areas of the working document. But if you see an issue coming up that your group has a stated position or written position on, and it's not naturally coming up in the conversation, please do act as an advocate for those positions and bring them into the conversation so we make sure that they are fully taken into account in the right places in the discussion. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Emily. Yeah, and that's a great reminder. And again, the public comment – or the early comments, I think, are going to really help. It's one of those where it's always nice to see on paper what people are thinking and be able to draw on that. So, I really appreciate all the groups that put in the time and effort for early comments. So, okay, I think that was all we needed to do before we jump into our work today. Let's go ahead. Yep, thank you.

Okay, so I think we're going to leave to the small team all those codifying questions and everything. Hopefully, within a couple weeks, they'll have something good for us to take a look at. But I think that we're going to move on and talk about the other pieces of this. You know, we talked over the last couple weeks about a couple options that have come up. And we've kind of skipped over this big section about fast undo. And purposely so, because it had a lot of information in it that we didn't have time on the previous calls to cover.

EN

So, again, the fast undo is really nothing new. It was introduced many years ago in the IRTP days. And again, I think that there was some support out of this group to at least reevaluate that and see if it makes sense. So, that's where we are here. And I think we'll try to separate this from any of the other items and kind of focus on, does a fast undo make sense? Is it needed? Obviously, thinking about all those other parameters of what we put in place during Phase 1a. And everything we've talked about. So, I think put that in perspective. Is it really needed now? Has the landscape changed in the last 10 years that would make this more suitable than it was then? And think along those lines. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I have raised my hand to expose my ignorance. So, here we're talking about a reversal of the transfer due to non-response, which we already have in the TEAC process. Are we now considering moving that reversal to a non-TEAC situation? Such as, for example, in the transfer reversal process that we're discussing? Because I think in the last few weeks, the group did not like that idea. And, yeah, so that's my question. Sorry. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, thanks, Sarah. And I think, again, I think some of this is a little bit [inaudible] discussions and events that we've talked about. But I think that looking at a fast undo is, when I think about it, it's beyond a DNS reversal. I think it's really getting back to being able

to get a domain back into a different registrant's hand or the original registrant's hands from the new registrant.

And I think that that time period—and we've kind of been squishy on the time period, and as Sarah mentioned, the TEAC has a fast reversal built into it. And I think what we're talking about here is beyond just that. And even if it's time based, we haven't set those times. But it may be time based in that, okay no one's responded or it may not even be TEAC initiated but hasn't responded in two weeks or whatever. Whatever we come up with there. But to me, it's the bigger scope of it's not just talking about the TEAC reversal. And again, that's something we need to address. But this is talking about more of a functional, which may be used in both spots. But if that makes sense, Sarah.

Emily, do you want to walk us through this? I don't know whether we've reviewed this on a call yet. So do you want to walk us through this real quick. And maybe that'll kick off some good discussion.

EMILY BARABAS: Sure. And Sarah, I don't know if this helps anymore either. But what we attempted to do after talking about the full proposal at the top of this page, because I think the conversation kind of went into a bunch of different elements of I and for some people that might have been hard to follow some of the threads, we tried to break some of the things that are some of the sub elements of the proposal out into distinct conversations.

So this is the requirement for the gaining registrar to respond with a specific period of time. Yeah, so it's step four, essentially, of this proposal that is sort of similar to the TEAC for non-emergency situations. The domain would be transferred to the losing registrar if the gaining registrar does not respond within a given time period.

And as Sarah said, I think that that's the sort of what we want to confirm today. Sarah, you've advocated for it. We've heard a couple of people speak against it. But I think the goal for today is to sort of tie up that conversation and make sure that it's clear that everyone who has a perspective on this issue has an opportunity to speak to it.

So I don't know if it's helpful for me to talk through all the points, but I can touch on a few highlights of what's been discussed so far. So, again, here, this this sort of sub element is about a situation where a gaining registrar is unresponsive. And for a set period of time. So, again, with the TEAC, there's been discussion of it being 24 hours. It's currently four hours. It could be a longer period of time. It's not an emergency, but the transfer is still reversed if the gaining registrar is non-responsive.

And so the problem this might solve is if folks think it's a problem that the losing registrar commonly seeks informal resolution of a non-emergency issue related to a transfer and the gaining registrar is not responsive. So some thought that this could potentially be a way to resolve that non-responsiveness without having to resort to a TDRP. So from our understanding on the staff side, it's a pretty specific problem space.

There were quite a few concerns raised. I think Zak was one of one of the one of the ones who I think raised a number of these. A big concern was about the vulnerabilities for the gaining registrant and that that registrant is reliant on the gaining registrar to be responsive and to be an advocate on their behalf. They may not even be clear that this reversal is happening or that there's a need to respond and the consequences can be pretty significant.

I think the response to that was that this is already something that's happening under the TEAC and that the role of the registrar is to advocate for the registrant. There could be notification requirements and the counterpoint there was that this is potentially something that would happen more often than the TEAC if it's also for non-emergency situations.

There were concerns about gaming, like there are with the TEAC, but again, potentially more pronounced because it may be used more widely. And there were concerns about a seller sort of having an attempt to reverse a transfer that was completed legitimately, but then they decide that they want to roll it back. And that gives the buyer uncertainty regarding title for the whole period that it's possible to initiate a reversal.

Some folks floated the idea that this could maybe only be in play if there was no money changing hands. But I don't think that that was discussed all that extensively. And then it was sort of discussed that the current option is an emergency court order in a situation like this or working through the courts, more generally. And from one perspective there's different ways to think about burden of proof and that the courts are sort of designed to deal with these situations and that they're the best course of action. So

yeah, different perspectives were sort of expressed about this question of who should be in the right by default in a situation like this.

So what we've done in this part of the working document, we've added a couple of discussion questions that Roger, if you feel comfortable and interested in going through, they might be helpful. There are some similarities to this fast undo to the previously discussed ETRP proposal from IRTP part B. And so we've actually just summarized here some of the main concerns about the ETRP. And if the group would like to, you can if it seems like there's traction for this proposal, the group could think about what's different about this proposal, and how does it have the ability to be successful where the ETRP was ultimately discarded for a number of reasons, primarily around uncertainty for the acquiring party and disruptions to the secondary domain marketplace opportunities for gaming and so forth.

And then at the end of this document, the very bottom, we had a question for community input that was not in the charter that was about the ETRP, and whether there was value in revisiting this proposal or a variation on it, and whether there were new circumstances or facts that would make such a proposal possible to achieve consensus support on, and what specific needs the quick undo can meet that the TEAC or TDRP doesn't.

Roger, I don't know if it makes sense for me to summarize this or if maybe groups want to just sort of speak to the responses that they provided on that. But I'll pause for a moment.

EN

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks. I think this is a great time for any of the groups that want to talk to it, and bring up their comments on it. Again, this isn't a new thing, and I think several people have recognized that in their comments even. So, I think this is a great time for any of the stakeholder groups to come on and talk about their responses here and give any additional information they want to for the working group themselves. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Roger. This won't be anything new. I'll just sort of highlight what the registry stakeholder group put in there, and I'll take the blame for what is—I had the pen here from that standpoint.

So a couple things. When I was working on this, I invested a fair number of hours going, digging through the archives. And one of the things that I found, because I wasn't part of the prior PDP effort, was that this had its origins back in the document now known as SAC 007, although it was not called SAC 007 at this time, it was published in July 2005. Let's just take a minute to think about how long ago that was, and what color, and what improved density my hair had at that point in my life.

So this thing came about as a result of an SSAC report about hijacking. And then this was brought up saying, well, you need some sort of a fast undo to take care of hijacking. And as we note here in our comments, the things related to hijacking issues are greatly different environment than it was 18 or so years ago.

In other words, this thing was brought up to solve a problem that has been largely handled in very different ways in today's environment. And so, for a number of the reasons that have been described when we were going over the different reasons, feedback about uncertainty of title, etc., this is why we're not generally in favor of this sort of thing. I mean, we certainly don't oppose the discussion of it. If there's somebody that has some brilliant idea that is able to solve some of these problems, very interested in hearing about it. So, we don't want to squelch productive discussion, but boy, awfully skeptical that we can come up with something that doesn't have the downsides of what is out there, of what has been previously considered. So, hope that helps. Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Yeah, that really does help. And I think that's the key. And you mentioned several times, something similar, I was trying to say, where's the landscape? And [inaudible] the BC response, kind of gets into it, but I'll let Zak talk to that. But what is the difference today that is different than then? And does it make sense to bring it in?

Again, I think reviewing it obviously makes sense. That's, it's a great idea to look at and see, but does it make sense to bring that concept in here? So, Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. I put in the chat and got some questions about my question about when the TEAC came out. So, Emily's now

advised the TEAC came out around in the final report of 2011. So, that would seem to me, and Emily and others correct me if I'm wrong, to be in the same final report that had rejected a parallel fast undo procedure. I'll give Emily a moment to either type or pipe in or anybody else.

Okay. So what we may be able to conclude from that is that at the time of the previous, we'll call it in short form PDP, in 2010, which came out with this report, final report in 2011, that group was considering a number of transfer dispute options and mechanisms. And one of them was the TEAC, which went ahead ostensibly and has been in place since then to address emergency transfer reversals.

The other one that was under consideration at the very same time and in the same reports, which did not go ahead, was a fast undo process. So, it might be that someone who was there would be able to speak to this far better than I, but it seems to be a reasonable conclusion that the TEAC was seen as the agreeable solution, whereas the fast undo wasn't for a number of the problems that are listed in the document or were listed in the document momentarily ago, and also in the wonderful slide presentation that staff shared with us back in February, which listed and summarized more of the objections to a fast and new process.

And to echo what Rick said, yeah, like if there was some brand new kind of solution that would root around these major objections that have been there since 2010, by all means, but it seems to me from the group discussion on the codification piece that the group didn't seem to be all that interested in creating a transfer policy

light and that it was a much heavier lift to create a process that was more robust than the existing transfer policy. And so for all the reasons that were raised in 2010, and we're reminded of today, the BC's early feedback, which is let's pause.

Mainly my early feedback, because for some reason, not a lot of people are truly interested in this, at least insofar as they're putting pen to paper. So I feel fairly strongly that an undo process isn't feasible absent some miraculous new solution. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks Zak. Yeah. And not getting into the intent of what the group was thinking 10, 12 years ago. You know, just like what we went through in phase 1A, we made progressively what we believe steps towards something better. And I don't know that this was a compromise there, the TEAC was a compromise, but maybe it was just one of those steps that made the whole process that much better that make a fast undo not as much of an urgency at the time. But I'll let Theo speak because I know he was part of those IRTP days as well. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, those were the days, but I sort of forgot more or less. Back in the day, we discussed this over and over came up with not a whole lot. But if you look at now, and back then, there have been some changes that could be beneficial to the discussion. I mean, about 18 months ago, two years ago, me and a couple of developers were actually sort of ping-ponging on the idea of a fast

EN

undo process. How would that look like? How could you assist that process?

And we didn't make a lot of traction there, except we came up with the idea, like, what if we put those registrant data in the blockchain and go down that rabbit hole. And basically, if you follow that rabbit hole, you basically come to a conclusion, like, okay, adding such technology can speed up the process. But the problem becomes that the implementation will be somewhat draconian, so to speak, because there's going to be very complex issues when you move down that rabbit hole.

And sort of combined with the fact that we didn't know, or sort of had the assumption, like, is there really a lot of domain theft going on? Is there really a need for this function? We sort of ceased that idea and didn't pursue it any further. But bottom line is there have been some changes when it comes into the field of technology. Technology, there's new technology that has emerged. But the question still remains, do we want to go down that rabbit hole? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks. Yeah. And again, you look at as the landscape changed, and maybe it hasn't, there's obviously some technology changes over that. But has anything changed in the ecosystem that points us to this? And as you bring up hijacking, and I think as we brought up over the past couple years, as we've talked about this, hijacking has not gone away for sure, but has been better controlled by new registrar systems, two-factor that they've put in place and things like that.

So yeah, when you look at it, it's like, obviously, hijacking is still important and still occurs. But it's one of those where it's probably not as prevalent, though, you base that against when it does happen, what's the impact as well.

And again, as Sarah brought up, I think earlier, we do have a fast undo and as part of the TEAC implementation, where it is possible, it's not required, but it is possible that if a gaining registrar does not respond, the losing registrar can request that that be transferred back.

And again, Zak raised a few questions, a few comments and questions on that when it happened, and not necessarily specifically toward the TEAC, but just as the fast undo discussion where is the registrant input there, just because the gaining registrar doesn't respond quick enough, does that mean that a new registrant should lose that domain? So

But before we jump back and talk about some of the questions, I wanted to see if any of the other stakeholder groups that commented want to mention anything. And again, as you look at these, yes, it just seems like the stakeholder groups agree that it's always good to look at this process. It was brought up a dozen years ago, and now it's being brought up again, and it's great to review it. I don't know that we're seeing a strong push. Honestly, I'm not seeing a push for it at all. Sarah mentioned it in her number four up above. We've had discussions on it, and it has gained a lot of traction.

And I guess a few of the options that came out of that was not the complete fast undo anymore, but possibly a DNS reversal or a

locking of the domain for additional times, and a few of those items. And again, maybe those stepwise possible improvements eliminate the need for the complete fast undo. Jody, please go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Roger. So, I was a proponent of having this, and the reason that we wanted it was when there is a hijacked domain name, and it is an obvious hijack, and this would be hard to prove—well, it is easy to prove if it is an obvious hijacking, actually. But the main point of this was to get the DNS reversed to protect the registrant's customers. I've been involved in one of these, and it was an awful experience for 72 hours or however long it took before we could finally get the domain name back to the DNS that it was supposed to have. The domain name was never transfer reversed. I am not sure how the registrant was able to get the domain name back. I don't know if it was held hostage and they paid the money to have it back. But this was the one attempt that I can recall vividly where basically it was for an airline, and registrant's customers were kind of SOL basically on trying to get home because the website was down and all operations were ceased.

Now, that's the kind of thing that I was trying to protect against. But I think that what I'm hearing is that there's just way too much pushback on this to protect against this one situation because there are way too many other situations that this can be gamed by people that hijacked the domain name in the first place. So, if there was some way that we could somehow get the DNS reversed while we try to sort it out, but I'm not sure that there's

enough support to do that. So, I'm just throwing out my opinion and I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Jody. Yeah, and I know that you had mentioned that you were interested in a fast undo. And again, I think that that idea was associated to obviously the fast undo of, okay, the registrant gets their domain name back. And I think that, as you just clarified, that wasn't really your intention. And great if that does happen, like in the TEAC instance, but the intention is let's try to resolve the disruptors. If something's brought down, it's fairly simple. And I'll put that in air quotes because generally that's never true. But it is much easier to just go back to where the DNS was and make that functional for a while while a dispute's occurring.

So, I think that as it was discussed 10, 12 years ago, a fast undo sounds right. But I think there's bigger issues around it. So, it's not one of those that's easily solvable. And maybe I'll have Sarah jump on here after Zak as well. But the idea of protect what was occurring through, as I said, DNS reversal process, not a transfer reversal process. Based on all those headaches, while a dispute is ongoing. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. So just in response to Jody's concerns, of course, I'm sympathetic to those and I imagine others would be as well. I think that the way I would suggest looking at it is that when Jody—not you personally, someone in your position—is met with

a situation where it's, as you put it, an obvious, clear case of hijacking, that means that someone has made an assessment of the facts and looked at the log records, looked at the ownership records, etc.

Whenever evidence was available, they were able to easily come to the conclusion that this is an obvious case of hijacking, unauthorized transfer. And so rather than go through the TDRP, and in the absence of a fast undo, what do you do? Well, you have the solution of contacting the other registrar and working it out. If it's very obvious, you'd hopefully have the cooperation of the other registrar, and that's the solution that works most often.

And then there's also the TEAC is in place to address that situation. So you're not without remedy entirely. But I think that the difficulty comes when we say, well, this is a clear cut case, the DNS should be reversed, or the transfer should be reversed. But there is that crucial step of that assessment of it being a clear cut case.

And so any procedure that doesn't involve that initial assessment and relies on an automatic reversal, that's where we start getting into the problems. But I think with the other two solutions, there should be a high degree of comfort in fixing those kinds of situations. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. And maybe I'll call on Sarah here just to clarify her on a reversal process is needed, but not necessarily fast. But, and again, a reversal process, obviously TDRP is technically a

reversal process. But we were talking this fast undo or anything else we've been talking about is maybe something in between, where people completely agree, yes, and actually make something happen. And again, we've been squishy on timelines on that. And maybe that falls into this gap of everybody agrees, yes, we're going to do it, we're going to get things corrected. Or we're going to leave it as it is, because that's obviously an option.

And then the TDRP, but there's this gap in between possibly that can be filled somehow. And I think that's where this discussion is. And to your point, Zak, on automatic, that does—especially when it's affecting customers and their customers' customers, it becomes a concern. And as you said, if there's a check, it makes it a little easier to take that next step. But obviously, that has to exist. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. I think I'm not sure what you wanted me to comment on. So we've agreed as a group to work out a transfer reversal process, and we have a small team that's going to address that. I made a proposal for what that reversal process could look like, which was the multi-step thing we saw on screen. Step four was reversing the transfer if the register did not respond. But not everybody liked that, which is fine. We don't all have to like everything together. I won't take up our time reiterating why I think it's a good idea. You all know why I think so. I don't really want to put time into going through that chart of problems with the ETRP and suggesting resolutions to those problems if it's not going to be useful.

So if the group is interested in considering this transfer undo thing, then I can do that. But I feel like we've already decided that we don't want to do this. So what do you want me to do now? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. Just to be clear, the small team is going to work on codifying the friendly path kind of idea. We're all talking about if there's a dispute here, some type of reversal. And again, it doesn't have to end in a reversal. The dispute may come to resolution and say, oh, okay, it actually was an okay transfer and the dispute is no longer open. But the small team is going to focus on that friendly path of both sides agreeing that it needs to be worked and should be worked. And I think that then there's this, what you pointed to, Sarah, with that number four in the list is either they come to an agreement that they're not going to agree or they're not responding. And then is there something that happens between that happy path where everybody was getting along and a TDRP or a court case? Is there something that can occur in between? And that's what this discussion really is. So, Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you for clarifying that, Roger. So, I would suggest what happens if the gaining registrar does not respond in the friendly path undo process, what would happen is that the complaining registrar reports them to compliance. Because even if there's maybe no requirement for—we should probably have a timeframe in which they should respond. And then, like, the domain reversal

doesn't happen, but you can go to compliance and say they didn't do their obligation of responding in this circumstance. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, and I think that that's the issue. And again, I think the small team is going to focus on documenting that happy path and then exits out of it when it's not as happy. But they don't need to do anything besides that. If they don't agree or they're not responding, that goes to something else and the small team doesn't need to solve those issues. This working group needs to solve those issues.

And again, we conflate kind of saying a TEAC and this, but the result is probably the same result. If after two weeks someone hasn't responded, even if they started and responded initially, and then haven't done anything for two weeks, is there a time period that makes sense that says, okay, if that's true, then this occurs, and maybe the "this" is a DNS reversal.

And I think what we're trying to get to is a fast undo as defined prior to now, and what we're trying to define is undoing the transfer. And it's a solution. It's resolving the issue.

Now, a DNS reversal does not resolve the issue. It just affords the losing registrant accommodations while the dispute is being resolved. And that dispute may be resolved between two of the registrars or maybe has to go to court or has to go to a TDRP.

I think that a fast undo is undoing the whole thing, where a DNS reversal is not, and it's not trying to solve, not trying to say

anything is right or wrong. It's just trying to lessen the impact while a dispute is ongoing. So, Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. So, as I said in the chat, so I'm just going to verbalize that, I think what we ended up with here is sort of three levels of thing. We've got the TEAC point of contact. We've got the reversal process, which is probably not fast, just reversal, and then TDRP. I would request that the small team working on that reversal process should please consider a timeframe for the response requirement. I like a week. I feel like a week is pretty good. But my understanding was that we are creating policy for this small reversal process, [the calm] reversal. So, I see Zak in chat saying that it would be a codification of informal procedures. I might be misunderstanding the group's intent here. I thought that we are codifying it into policy. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Sarah. And I think that your timeline suggestion there is well within reach of that small group of saying, okay, the happy path is—and the timeline might be multifactored. It's like, even if—and again, to me, we're talking, the TEAC is just an entry point, and then we talk about times after that.

So, to me, it's use TEAC or not use TEAC. Okay, now, both sides are aware there's an issue, a potential issue that is seen. And now some solution has to happen.

And maybe the happy path is, well, it's going to take us more than—and Sarah, you suggested a week. Maybe it takes eight

days or ten days just to get the evidence back and forth so everyone agrees and everybody is satisfied that it can reverse. So it's one of those. I'm happy if the small team suggests, after a week, then this goes to someone else, or they can request an additional time, if needed, things like that. But I don't want them to solve what that next step is, I don't want them to solve that—Zak doesn't like there's an automatic reversal. I don't think that that's what the small team needs to do. It's just, okay, the happy path is no longer happy. So we move on to something else.

And again, it's not just codifying this, as Sarah said. I think adding timeline to that makes sense for that small group to suggest. So, Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. In regards to Sarah's comments and your remarks, I would point out that the, strictly speaking, a codification of the informal process would not contain any trigger to compliance or otherwise, because the informal process itself doesn't. If one registrar contacts another and says, hey, can we talk about this, and the other registrar doesn't respond at all, nothing happens in terms of compliance.

So a strict codification of that would result in any compliance action or other step. But in terms of the timeline that you mentioned, Roger, in terms of a possible trigger to compliance, that's something that perhaps a small group can discuss. It would be a variance of the informal process. And it could, for example, be that a registrar has the obligation to at least respond, even if

they don't have the obligation to roll anything back. You know, that's something that we can consider, perhaps.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Zak. Yeah, and I think that makes sense. And again, I think that that's what the small team is going to do. So that's good for that. But what I think we need to focus on is—and maybe to Sarah's point here, we can make this fairly quick and simple, is I don't hear an appetite for an undo, as in an automatic undo. We've got other ideas out there, but that's not an automatic undo of a transfer.

And again, a TDRP does do an undo. So let's get the terminology in here right. Or it could lead to an undo. You know, a court case could lead to an undo. But what we're talking about here is a process, a policy process, that does an undo prior to those things. And I think what I've heard, and I'm going to ask, by the way, what I've heard, I think, is that there's not an appetite for that at this time.

And again, in reviewing [inaudible] whatever it was, and the recent discussions, there just hasn't been a big appetite for that transfer undo functionality outside of, yeah, and it's something we need to talk about, because it is part of TEAC path. And does it stay there or not, will be another question. But right now, I don't think we've seen an undo process in between the happy path and TDRP or court order. So that's what I'm hearing.

But I'm going to sort of leave it right there. And I'm going to have everybody think for a few seconds. And I'm going to ask to maybe

clarify what I may have just stated. So, for those that agree with what I stated, which is, I don't think we have support for an undo in between the codification, the informal process that the small team's going to work on, and between a TDRP or court case— again, throwing those together, even though I know they're separate. I don't think we're looking for a transfer undo in between those, or we don't have support for that.

So, if people agree with that, that we don't have support, please raise your hands. Okay, Sarah, I don't have a problem with that either. So, I'll ask the no then first, Sarah. So, drop your hands. And so, I'll ask the no, because that fits the way I stated it. Okay, maybe I can't ask it that way. So, I will ask it Sarah's way.

If you support an undo process between what the small team's working on, the informal process, and a TDRP or court order, if you support having an undo process, an undo transfer process, somewhere in between there, please raise your hands.

So, we have a lot of support that has not been mentioned on a call so far. A lot of people have raised their hands that say they support an undo function between the informal process and a TDRP. So, we've got a lot of people that say they support that idea, but most people haven't talked about it. So, okay, please lower your hands.

Okay, so then the second question is, those that do not support having an undo function in between the informal process and a TDRP or court order. Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, we were counting.

So, we've got more than two to one that think an undo process is necessary between the informal process and the TDRP.

RICK WILHELM: So, Roger, can I make an observation?

ROGER CARNEY: Yep. Thanks, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. So, I made a comment in the chat that said, I think, to read, y'all been pretty quiet. And sort of reiterating the registry position, we don't see a way around this that gets around the issues related to title. And while I'm sympathetic and empathetic to the point that Jody brought up about the hijacking, because I've been involved in those things before too, I've also been in situations where people have claimed their name was hijacked when really they sold it. And unless you're a skilled doctor, it can be difficult to correctly diagnose between hijacking and buyer's remorse. I say that with a grin on my face.

And I also don't quite understand the statements where we're talking about this. And we don't have people suggesting alternatives as to how we're going to split this thing. I mean, if the small team is going to work on this, as we'd stated previously, registries stated previously in the comment, happy to hear it and entertain it. But the issues that have been previously raised 10 years ago or more around title, we've not heard anyone even run

something up the proverbial flagpole about how this sort of thing is going to be avoided.

So, happy to hear people invest the time and see what they come up with, but would really like to hear a few ideas as to why this isn't going to be just a thinly veiled, a poor remake of a movie that the prior group saw before. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Rick. Yeah. And maybe the add-on question to this is, to Sarah's point, which went by much long ago, that she would be interested in digging into this if people saw that it was viable. And I think she may not have used viable, but if there was interest in it.

And that's the key, is for those that said, yes, they think an undo process here could be useful, do you see it as being able to come up with a viable solution that resolves the issues raised? And also all of the reasons why it didn't come out 10 years ago. And again, as Rick mentioned, if there is a group of people that think that they can create this that solves those questions, it'd be interesting to hear. Because as Rick mentioned, I haven't heard that. And that's what I'm kind of looking for. So, Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, not on the spot. I don't have a perfect solution here. I raised my hand because I feel that at this stage, it's still a situation where a registrant, a losing registrant may end up facing or holding the short end of the stick because his options are zero. He might not have a registrar willing to go to bat for him under the TDRP who

says you're on your own. I'm not going to invoke this procedure because it has risks to myself. And he might be faced with a registrant that has hijacked his domain that might be somewhere in Timbuktu or China or some other jurisdiction where it's very hard to get an emergency court order against that party.

It might be a solution that if we looked at the UDRP where the registrant agrees to bind himself to a common jurisdiction that is not his own jurisdiction, if we had something in the transfer process which would have probably to be incorporated into all registration agreements, that such a common jurisdiction could be established, then that might be a different solution.

But at this point, without having that, without having a solution for the registrant to be able to enforce his rights, I think we need to have some form of undo. And if we have some form of undo, there also should be certain ways to ensure the transfer is legitimate by, for example, if you buy a domain through escrow and the escrow service provides for ID verification way beyond what registrars currently require for that. So if, for example, passports are shown and all that kind of good stuff, and then only then is the domain released by the escrow service might be a business case for the providers of those services, but it might be increasing on the cost of acquiring a domain name.

But ultimately, the buyer has to protect himself from a clawback, and it's in the best interest of the buyer to ensure that the seller cannot claim that the domain was hijacked after the fact. So, yes, there should be a process, there should be something built around that. And the reason I say that is because otherwise the registrar

may be faced with a situation where he will never get his domain name back.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Volker. Yeah, and that's one of the reasons there was a question here in the discussions of if there's money exchange does that change, does that set boundaries on any of this? And I don't think it's just on an undo or anything, but any of the disputes or anything.

But to your point of the registrant, I think that we've got pretty good agreement. I think Zak has carried the flag here pretty good on at least providing the recommendation that the council should look at a registrant focused way of disputing—and I don't know if we say ownership or not, but disputing a change like that. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I think that what we're hearing when we do hear some kind of need for rollback is like a break glass situation where you've got a really problematic situation and you may not have response from either the gaining registrar, or perhaps you've got an obstinate gaining registrar who's not willing to participate in some sort of a solution.

And so I don't know the magic wording for this, but whatever we do, it seems like we do need some sort of an emergency solution for these things to help mitigate it. Whether we'd use it or not, we just need it, I think I'm hearing. Now, what that looks like, we'll have to define it. And that may prove to be entirely impossible. But

I think we can make a dent in this, at least in some forms, to set the bar pretty high on what circumstances this would work and make sure that it's resilient to abuse. That's very vague in general, but I think when we discuss this later, we'll flush this out a bit. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Jothan. Yeah. And I think you're describing that point of where everybody's kind of getting to, but again, I just want to back up and mention what I thought I had heard, and maybe I'm wrong, is that the undo is, I guess, the hammer instead of using a screwdriver or whatever it is. And the reason that the DNS reversal concept came up was that more screwdriver approach and that fit it better.

But again, maybe I'm just hearing that wrong and that people really do want to undo a transfer, but they're not interested in the reversal or maybe they're interested in both, but I don't know. It just seemed like those emergency things need time to be worked out. And an undo doesn't give you that time because it's done at that point, where the reversal provided extra time.

So, again, that's just what I thought I heard. And maybe that's all wrong. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger. To me, what I hear when I hear a fast undo in between the informal process and the TDRP, when I hear that, what that means to me is that the losing registrar wants to get the

domain name back. And the gaining registrar either disagrees or hasn't responded at all.

Because if the gaining registrar agreed to transfer it back, it would be solved informally. So what that means is that there's either a case of disagreement or a case of non-response. And if it's a case of disagreement, you can't have a fast undo period because there's a dispute. And if there's a dispute, it has to go to court or TDRP or some other measure.

And if there's no cooperation, which was B, the other contingency, that sounds a lot like a TEAC situation. Because TEAC, I believe, is more than just an emergency contact requirement. It also includes a provision, as far as I understand it, that if there isn't a response within the specified period of time, that can be sent to the registry to effect the requested transfer.

And so that, to me, is a very dangerous kind of procedure for a lot of the reasons we've discussed several times. But it does exist. It has been abused somewhat. We're looking at adjusting it. But that is your fast undo process for the situation where there's no response. And there isn't a fast undo process where there's a disagreement between registrars, period. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Zak. Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, in response to that, I think Zak fundamentally misunderstands where many of us are coming from. This is not a

EN

dispute between registrars. This is a dispute between registrants. The registrar might be the one to trigger this, but ultimately, this is not a dispute between registrars. This is the registrant who claims that he had his domain stolen. And maybe that transfer process then allows for a certain time period where the gaining registrant can provide evidence that he has obtained the permission from the losing registrant and is absolutely certain that this has to be a legitimate transfer. And then this can be entered into a dispute process.

But I feel the registrant doesn't have a venue now and the fast undo is that process. Ultimately, we have to make a decision. Who is more worthy of protection here? Is it the old registrant or is it the new registrant? Is it the party that has owned the domain for a significant time and maybe operated the business under it? Or is it someone who acquired that business?

And ultimately, if you acquire a domain name, you also have the option to take the matter to court and enforce the contract that you have. The clawback doesn't change that you have a contract with the losing registrant. And I think the more protection-worthy party is always the losing registrant because he has no protections currently. Not directly, at least. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Volker. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. So Volker, you'll never hear from me that I don't think there should be a procedure available for registrants. In

fact, I've been saying the opposite. So I agree with you completely that fundamentally, this is a registrant-to-registrant dispute. And that's why we've talked about and I've previously proposed a registrant-initiable dispute.

That being said, that's not what is before us right now. The most we'll be able to do is a recommendation in that regard. What's before us now is when a registrant has complained to the registrar and the registrar has decided in its discretion or in its goodwill to advance the case of the registrant and trying to roll back a transfer.

And now, Volker, you have valid arguments that we should err on the side of the losing registrant. But we've gone over this before. There's arguments where we should err on the side of the gaining registrant. But in either case, if there's a valid dispute, that's something that can't be resolved right away. And we don't know that restoring the status quo to the one that existed before the transfer is any more fair than the recent one, any more fair than with the new registrant.

So I don't think we should wade into this. I think we've got a TDRP. We've got the codification of the informal. We've got the TEAC. And for all the reasons from 2010 to now, there's not going to be consensus on a fast undo because there's just too many overt problems.

Unless we say that despite all these overt problems that have been expressed, we still want to just make a policy judgment call, we're going to side with the losing registrant instead of the gaining registrant and we know that there's going to be problems with title,

we know that there's going to be people who've lost millions of dollars who bought a domain name. We know that the new business may already be running with 100,000 registered users, but we're still going to reverse it. And we're not going to worry about if someone's trying to game the system by being a party that sold it and has seller's remorse. We're just going to make a policy judgment call because we have to decide somewhere. To me, that's not a great solution, although I see the merits in it. Ultimately, I don't agree with it. I think we leave it alone and we move on. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Zak. And again, I think it gets down to, and maybe Zak mentioned something and Sarah responded on the non-emergency side. The TEAC, as it says today, and even the suggestions that we made so far, maybe extending that timeline a bit, still has that TEAC action of the possible action of an undo. And again, I think that that exists today.

But Zak suggested, and I don't know if it was actually how he suggested it or not, but it led me to think, okay, if we get into a scenario where we're coming out of the friendly path because there's a disagreement, and this wasn't started via TEAC, but there's a disagreement or no response, then, is that exit, I guess, the entrance of that exit a TEAC? Is that the next possible step?

Not that it has to occur, but if you're not getting a response in your normal, informal, codified ways of doing things, then do you just contact the TEAC and see if you can get a response? And again, obviously an option, it doesn't have to happen. And then, if you

don't get the response again, then that leads you to a solution or an option of doing the undo, as it is today in the TEAC, or continuing on another path.

So, again, I think that Sarah mentioned that we were talking about non-emergency, yes, but is the TEAC just an escalation point, then, that even if it's a non-emergency, we want to look for resolution to roll it back, so you contact the TEAC? I don't know, and I don't know that Zak was suggesting that or not. He just mentioned that there's an undo in the TEAC.

And again, my question was, is the TEAC action still valid? And to me, I don't know, and I don't know if we've answered that question. And in today's world, four hours, and we've talked 24 hours, is a non-response, is the action, I guess the optional action of an undo still valid? Or is there something else that can be done at that time? Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, I mean, maybe we're just too hung up on the idea of the fast undo. Maybe a fast lockdown rollback would be the better choice here. The domain would stay in the account of the acquirer, but it would be rolled back to the DNS settings that it had prior to the transfer. It cannot be updated. It is locked in place until the matter is resolved by both parties in whatever means or method of resolution we agree upon. I still think there should be a court of common jurisdiction somewhere. And as long as the domain name cannot be moved, cannot be updated to affect the previous business, then the interests of the losing registrant might also be

protected. And he does not face this situation that he will never get his domain name back.

I mean, ultimately, we want to protect both sides here. And the dispute that we see is you cannot make one side happy without making the other side unhappy when you have a transfer undo. And I guess the lockdown with the rollback might be the better choice here, then, because it's a less invasive procedure and it protects the rights of both sides.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Volker. Yeah. And I think to Sarah's comment in chat, I think DNS rollback is part of the small team that's meeting later in the sense of when they agree. But what we've focused on is not that, because the small team is going to handle that. What we've been focusing on is when there's not agreement or there's no response. And again, the TEAC kind of handles that as an option.

But to what Volker was just saying is, if they're not agreeing, that falls out of what the small team is working on, so DNS rollback has nothing to do with it. If they both agree that DNS rollback works, then OK. But if they're not in agreement, then is one of the entry points out of that a DNS rollback?

And again, if there's no response, and again, my question is for a TEAC, if there's no response, is the more appropriate thing to do a DNS rollback or do a full transfer undo? And I think those are the questions that I keep going back to. And I'm not sure that we're getting answers to those things. So, Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: I would offer just generally that the consequences of a DNS rollback are very poorly understood by everybody within earshot, because that would mean splitting the DNS of record, the control of the DNS from the sponsoring registrar. And that kind of puts us into very uncharted territory.

I think if the group decides to do something like this, it would be better just to tell the registry to undo the whole transfer and give it back to the previously sponsored, the so-called losing registrar. And then if a court or somebody else comes in and says, or whoever has decided that the name needs to get re-transferred to the new registrar, then go ahead and do that.

But if we sit here and say that, well, we're going to split the DNS from the sponsoring registrar, what happens to the situation if the registrant wants to make a change? The systems involved in all parties are not really set up to handle this situation where the DNS control is split from the registration data control—I'm sorry, from sponsorship.

So if the group decides to do something like that, I would really strongly encourage us not to introduce a new set of failure modes into the equation. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: And you're bringing up great points of a new topic, not a new topic, of an option that was raised. And obviously it has the pros and cons to it as well. So I think that's valid, Rick. Sarah, I'm not sure the small team really has scope on this. Again, they're just

EN

going to do the happy path. And what we're talking about is a non-happy path. What can happen? So I don't think the small team is going to touch on this.

So I think we get down to the point here, and we've got 10 minutes left. According to our voting that we just did, there's support for continuing with an undo, the idea of an undo, between the happy path and a TDRP or court case. So I think that what we'd like to see maybe is concepts around that. What does that look like? And again, I think to Sarah's point where she brings it back to the small team. But I think this is a different process outside the small team.

Now, the small team may exit to these processes, but I don't want the small team focused on those things. I want them to get their work done and codify what occurs today in that happy path. But we had 10 people raise their hand saying that an undo was something that they favored in this scenario of disagreement or no response.

So I think that we need to look for the ideas from that group of individuals that want to, or stakeholder groups that want this idea to put something on paper so that it can describe, okay, so if the two parties don't agree, this is the few steps. And I think Steinar kind of mentioned it in chat as well, maybe a flow chart of something. You know, okay, this is what occurs and this is the outcome of those steps. And then if there's no response, okay, these are the steps and this is the outcome of that response or that path. Emily, please go ahead.

EN

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I think in addition, Roger, I think it's a great idea to ask folks who feel like there's a viable path here for a fast undo proposal to put pen to paper and bring that to the group so that folks can respond to it. I think it's also really useful for any proposal that comes forward to specifically address how it will manage some of these pain points that have been raised in previous discussions, because I think the question is not only who's in favor of fast undo, but who thinks there's a viable path for such a proposal in this working group and in the context of the broader community when this goes out to public comment and so forth. Noting the opposition and the concerns that we've seen before.

So just a slightly different question to think about if you are seeing a viable path here for a proposal like this, please do take charge and put it on paper, bring it to the group, ideally by next week. I'm not in a position to put deadlines around this, but we are really running out of time to kind of extend these conversations and really put some thought around some of these issue areas that have previously been identified that have been surfaced in public comment and think about how your proposal would address those to see if there is that viable path for the rest of the group. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Emily. Yeah, that's great to add that in as well. So, yeah, and Emily mentioned fast undo and—again, I think the fast undo is in this gap spot. The TDRP, the court case, all those things are undo mechanisms. It may not resolve in an undo, but it's the path of an undo. The informal process is an undo process. And we're talking about this. And again, maybe it's not fast, but it's

this gap undo that we're talking about between happy path and something more extreme. So, I think that anyone that wants to do that, as Emily mentioned, and Steinar, and I'll let him speak next, but Steinar suggested coming up with a flow diagram of those different paths that we've identified, again, disagreement and no response, and how those processes and how the results may not answer the questions that came up, but we have to be able to say it did answer these or didn't answer these. So, I think that that's what my ask is for that group of people that are looking for this gap undo. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Actually, I want to thank Rick for an excellent explanation about how tricky these things can be, and set by separating the sponsorship or domain name and the DNS record, so to speak. So, even though they are technically feasible and workable for the registry, if they want to take action to change the DNS server for a domain name in this kind of limbo process, it actually breaks some sort of a relationship between the sponsoring registrar and the DNS resolving connected to the data that the sponsoring registrar has at the time.

So, what I think is that when the small team comes back, they actually have to look into the different dependencies in the different scenarios. And one of the key questions is, at least the way I understand it, in what scenarios do the registry have to be involved in the process? My understanding so far is that the registry want to be some sort of a silent part of it and not interfering at all, because it is a matter of the clients to the registrar and not to the registry. So, I'm definitely looking forward

to the outcome of that small group discussions, and looking forward to further discussion. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Steinar. Yeah, and again, so everybody in the small team as well is clear, the small team is going to focus on that friendly path that yes, the two registrars agree that this needs to be looked at and resolved. Now, if that's an undo or not, that may not be true, but they're only going to be codifying what occurs today naturally, what happens informally today. It's not going to get into, okay , both sides disagree, or one side's not even responding. The small team's not getting into that area. They're just going to codify the informal process today.

We have just a couple minutes left. Emily, if you have your hand up, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: I hope we're not overstepping here, but Caitlin and I popped a couple suggestions into chat for next steps on this. What we'd like to suggest, and of course, shoot us down if this doesn't sound right, is we ask that folks who are advocating for a fast undo and think that it's potentially something that has a viable path here in the working group to put some pen to paper and bring that to the working group before our next call so that the group can look at that and determine whether that's something to do. And we can always ask people on this call right now, please raise your hand if you would like to be one of the pen holders for this before we

close the call. So, that's our suggestion to make sure that we have a concrete path for moving this discussion forward. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Emily. Yeah, and great ideas. So, anyone, a couple maybe pen holders that want to drive this gap, the undo idea through—and again, it would be great if we could get it in the next week. So raise your hand if you've got the time. And if you don't and you still want to do this, just let the group know how much time you think it's going to be needed. So, anybody interested in providing it back to the group? Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, I'm not going to put out a fully baked process here but it's more like a collection of ideas and discussion points that may lead to a solution. We need to discuss this in detail to find a way forward that is acceptable to all parties, and therefore drafting a fully baked proposal, I think is premature.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, thanks Volker. Yeah, and I agree. I don't think that— obviously, the hard part is the creation here and everybody's typically a pretty good editor, but I think that what we're looking for is those creators to come forward and draw those outlines, draw that flow chart that says, okay, disagreement, no response. These are the possible next steps. This is solving this or not.

And again, to your point, Volker, yeah, we're not looking for a fully baked solution. We're looking for that concrete path of getting

toward a solution. So, again, anyone interested in doing that, great. Please raise your hand and we can get that documented. And again, otherwise, if we don't have anybody driving this, it's not going to move and we're going to be left with status quo, so. Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: No, just raising my hands for something for the list.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, Volker. Okay, we're over time. So, great discussion today. Again, I think the small team is going to focus on the informal process, this gap process. We'll look to Volker and others to drive that forward a bit. And again, I'm not looking for a baked solution. Just the outlining of how it can happen and then we can fit all the pieces into that. So, I think that's the important part. But thank you all for staying on two minutes long. And we'll talk to everyone next week. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]