

## **Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting**

### **IRTP Part D PDP Meeting**

**Saturday 13 July 2013 at 17:10 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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

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

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Coordinator: Excuse me this is operator. Like to inform parties today's conference is being recorded.

If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you.  
You may begin.

Jonathan Robinson: We're good to go, right. Over to you James for an update from - and Mikey from the IRTP Part D PDP working group.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan. James Bladel for the transcript and my co-chair Mikey O'Connor. And it's late so we're going to be very merciful.

We're going to rip through these slides, give you a status update. We're not asking I think for anything specific or any particular issues for feedback.

But opportunities there for questions. But we'll try to keep this moving along.

So this is the fourth and final instance of IRTP of the series that was begun sometime in 2009. And I think there was an issues report was in, you know, was put out when I was in college or something like that.

So it's been a long time coming but we are finally at the end. And the working group was started in February and we aim to have it wrapped up by the end of this year by the Buenos Aires meeting.

We have not received a lot in the way of initial public comment or any other feedback. So we've been using the constituency statements to the issues report.

I'm sorry is that right? The original issues report? Right. Original issues report that was submitted from the business constituency and the registry.

So thank you for that or we'd have nothing to talk about. Here's the charter questions.

I'm not going to insult you by reading them to you. But the first just briefly deals with reporting requirements.

The second involves how to handle hot transfers where a transfer's occurred multiple times -- how to undo that whole chain of transfers. Charter question C is opening up dispute process to registrants, not just registrars who currently are the only ones that are authorized to initiate that process.

Charter question D is making information available to registrants so they know what their dispute options are. Charter question E talks about special penalties for violation of IRTP.

And Charter question F talking about the - and this was something we inherited from a previous working group that was do we still need forms of authorization in this era of (unintelligible) codes. So I don't want to jump too

far ahead but, you know, we're finding that the last two in particular are not all that controversial.

After some discussion of the feedback received and on the working group the - we're starting arrive at an early consensus. And the answer is yes and no.

More to come in our initial report of course. This is ICANN.

We're also just kind of looking at some broader issues. For example just, you know, the overall usefulness of the existing transfer dispute resolution policy, TDRP.

In the entire history of that policy we have only just a handful of instances that it's been used. And certainly that's not reflective of the domain names that have been managed or fraudulently transferred.

So something is disconnected there. It's not being used.

Either registrants don't know about it, they don't like it, doesn't work, whatever. All those issues are on the table.

And then we're - and I may pick on Mikey a little bit here to help me remember. There were some issues that we uncovered that we thought were something that we had discussed in previous working groups that we felt were kind of being resurrected in this one.

And then the thought would be do we want to revisit that issue. Do you remember?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey for the transcript. I think what has happened is that because this session is - this series of working groups has gone so long other events have transpired.

So for example the RAA has changed a lot. There are things like uniform reporting requirements for who is data, etcetera, etcetera.

And there is a list -- we've written it down. I haven't got the coffee in me to get it back in memory.

I was trying to but it - talking didn't work.

James Bladel: Well and one of them is that in IRTPC for example there's a recommendation for a process for change of registrant, not change of registrar. Does this need a dispute process, you know?

Does the existing dispute process need to be modified to account for that? I mean these are questions that we're looking at.

Going forward we're looking for an initial report to come out soon -- probably about the time everybody goes on vacation. And the final report in Buenos Aires.

And Mikey just had his moment of inspiration.

Mikey O'Connor: Well it's an - it's not a recollection it's an inspiration. And the thing is that this is the last in the series of IRTP PDPs.

So if there's anything in the transfer process that's bothering anybody in these constituencies this is probably the time to bring it forward so that we can talk about it. So we may when we do the - I'm thinking - kind of doing this on the fly.

But we may when we ask for reactions pose that as a question. Because we are sort of hoping that we're the very last, last chance at this point.

Marika's got her hand up. I knew I'd get a bite out of her on that.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I was just strongly caution against that approach. You're just starting to introduce issues now that weren't, you know, covered in the issue report and where, you know, people may just start throwing out ideas and suggestions.

I think in all reality with all the change that we're going through eventually there will be another review. And I hate to say it of the IRTP.

Because you know that still big changes are coming and we will need to review how those are working. And it may just be a, you know, there may be a staff kind of review where we look at, you know, what are the number of claims we're getting or have a kind of survey.

It may not necessarily result in another series of PDP. But I think we need to be realistic as well that at some point we'll need to review.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll read your stuff. No.

James Bladel: I was going to say if it comes to that I'd just suggest we throw it out altogether and start over. Because having reviews upon reviews is just - so.

That was my last slide. So applause for a five minute and 47 second update.  
Question?

Mikey O'Connor: In keeping with our constant stress on doing these faster.

James Bladel: Questions? Do you want to take the queue?

Jonathan Robinson: No. Well thank you first of all for both the work and the working group and the efficient description of your progress to date. Any comments, questions, other input?

James Bladel: I can't believe we're going to get out of here like this.

Jonathan Robinson: I would have thought they'd be unhappy but they look secretly a little happy with the fact that they're not being taken to task on any of this. All right.

Well then thanks very much James and Mikey. And we'll move then on through the agenda.

So catching rapidly up we are now going to hear from the standing committee on GNSO improvement. But let's for the moment stop the recording.

END