GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
10 February 2009 at 15:00 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 10 February 2009. 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-20090210.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Kevin Erdman - IPC
James Bladel - Godaddy

Absent Apologies:

Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC
Michael Collins - Individual

Staff:
Olof Nordling - Director, Services Relations and Branch Manager, Brussels office
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Margie Milam - Snr. Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Glen DeSaintgery: The recordings have been started.

Paul Diaz: Great, thank you. Glen, could you do the role please?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, certainly Paul. On the line we have yourself, Paul Diaz, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, and Sebastien Bachollet has just tendered his apologies that he has another conferencing call.

And for staff we have Olof Nordling, Marika Konings, and Margie Milam. Have I left off anybody?

Paul Diaz: Remember Barbara offered her apologies for this week.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's right. And Barbara Steele has offered her apologies.

Paul Diaz: And I've not heard from anyone else, but hopefully they'll be able to join us shortly.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, nor have I.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Well for those who are on the call, thank you for your time. Let's dive into it. I just need to note I have a hard stop at the top of the hour so we'll try and get through this promptly today.

I hope you've all seen we've had some exchanges on our list. Not least of which, most importantly I should say, is Marika's first draft of our final report. That's going to be the focus of the call today.

Would want to note as we get into this, if you would all please be thinking about - I think Marika's done a very good job of capturing the inputs that we've received and the comments from the open period, and we're trying to be very sensitive. There have been criticisms of past working groups -- not this one -- past working groups not necessarily fully incorporating public comments that are received.

Again, I think Marika's done a very good job here trying to capture that, highlighted for folks and whatnot. But as we move through the sections and look at the text that's been suggested, please keep in mind given

what's been said, whatever positions, if they were yours or your constituencies, you know, that we are fully capturing that so that we're trying to be as inclusive as possible.

Would also like to, you know, just quickly go over what one of the comments that was received - forgetting his name, Patrick from the outside expert - we had Barbara Steele from registry constituency bounce them off of her colleague, Scott Hollenbeck, the expert who joined our group from one of those calls several weeks back. Just to - sort of a sanity check - for those of us who are not very technical experts, to make sure what was being suggested was, in fact, accurate -- that Patrick's comments were accurate.

We've seen the exchange back and forth. Bottom line is, they more or less were. However, we'd like to highlight and - James, I won't put words in your mouth or don't mean to steal your thunder - but essentially the - I think James' final comment on the list was accurate in that what Patrick has offered is great food for thought. However, it might not be really well-focused on the work that this particular working group is trying to accomplish.

The comments were a bit broader, I believe, than the focus or the mandate of our particular group. And as such, again I go back to I think Marika's done a fine job of capturing those comments. But I'm not really sure that the proposed inclusions that we've reached necessarily need to be changed in light of those additional comments; again, since they are a bit broader in scope and not conforming to the mandate of the charter of this working group.

That's my view. Anybody feels differently, please let me know. And in particular, if you do feel differently, let's figure out how we can change our text so that it would fully accommodate everybody's views and opinions.

James Bladel: Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: James, please.

James Bladel: Thanks. I just wanted to point out that Patrick made some fairly lengthy comments and my response was directed primarily at one aspect of his suggestion, which was the using the off info code for contact objects. So I didn't want to throw any babies out with bath water or anything like that, or, you know, lump all of his comments together in my response. It was really just that one particular component of his comment that I was addressing, so...

Paul Diaz: Great.

Marika Konings: And if I can maybe make a comment as well, because rereading the comment he made on the EPP functionality, I realize as well that his suggestion would actually only work in the thick registries operating EPP and not the thin ones as they don't have the register and contact information. So that might limit as well the other options he proposed as one of the alternatives that the group didn't consider.

James Bladel: That's exactly right, Marika, and I think that there was maybe just a cursory mention of that in my response, but maybe that deserves to be fleshed out a little bit more. But, you know, Patrick's comments around

the IRIS protocol and things like that I think are valid and interesting and should be included without any qualification in our report.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Marika Konings: The group feels as well that the things he discussed on the off info code and the EPP should maybe be mentioned in the summary of the issues the working group discussed or reviewed, instead of only in the public comment section.

James Bladel: My inclination is to keep all the comments together because we don't want to lend the impression that anyone that was commenting - we don't want to blur the line between what the comment forum generated as ideas versus what ideas were discussed during the working group. So I would say let's keep them separate, but I yield to the preference of the group, if we feel like this one deserves a little bit more of a highlighted placement within the report.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, for what it's worth I'm inclined to agree with James. I think it's good to do what we've been doing, keeping the comments - you know, they're in their appendices. It's there, untouched, everybody can see. I wouldn't to necessarily highlight any one particular group's over the other.

                And if we, you know, can capture the general sense -- for example, the discussions about IRIS maybe where we currently treat that in our text, we want to expand on some of the ideas to include Patrick's suggestion. We could do it there because the group collectively is discussing that particular issue, but we're not necessarily underscoring okay, so and so said this. And...

Marika Konings: Would an option be that I just put maybe a pointer, like further comments on like both the IRIS and EPP have been made in the public comments section, see Chapter - I don't remember which number? Would that be a way to point to them while not including them actually in the working group discussion?

James Bladel: I like that idea, Marika, if wherever it's contextually appropriate we put a pointer or a mention or a footnote and say, you know, this subject was also raised by several individuals in the public comments section, please see Appendix whatever.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, that seems like a very good suggestion, Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll make - I'll put some in there where I think it's relevant and then the group can review it in the next draft of the report and see whether I've put them in the right places or not.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Sounds good. I just received an email from (Mark). Hopes to join us, running a little late, been dealing with other issues. One question for the group right now. You know, I think we - by - well, with Sebastian dropping out I don't even think we have a quorum right now. And we don't have any participation from the business constituency which has been a very active participant so far to date.

You know, I don't think that means we don't do anything at all today, but I would suggest any changes, any edits in the text and whatnot, you know, we'll want to - we can make those, but make sure that we

give all of our other colleagues an opportunity to respond, probably on the list or on next week's call.

And with that, you know, I guess the question for the group is given the draft that Marika's prepared for us, I'm hoping everybody's had opportunity to look at it. Is there anything right now stands out? People feel we really must change, make some changes? Or are people comfortable with the, you know, suggested text?

Certainly we're going to go through it carefully line by line. But again in the absence of the full group, I'm a little reticent to start digging in line by line at anything, because we don't have even a quorum -- full representation -- today. I'd hate to make changes and only have to kind of go back over everything again in a subsequent call or on a list.

So just a high level, are people comfortable with the draft that Marika's provided? In particular, summary of the comments we received? The way that the report is currently laid out? Is this working for everyone?

Man: Yeah.

James Bladel: Yes. Yes.

Paul Diaz: James, great. Thank you. You know, again, as I led off I think it's great. I understand we will have in the subsequent draft is one other section with like the group participants in attendance. Correct, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. Glen sent that out early this week and I think we need to make little changes to that, so I will incorporate that as well in the next version.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Apparently just for everybody that's one of the expectations, you know, working group's final report. So it will probably follow where we have all of our names listed and there will also be a graphic just showing, you know, attendance, basically an attendance record for the report.

Marika Konings: Would the group like me as well to make a first draft of the final conclusions/recommendations section which, as I understand it, there are not going to be any further change to document, would basically reflect the preliminary conclusions?

Paul Diaz: If nobody's weighing in, Marika, I think it's worth taking that first shot. Again, it's probably going to be better for all of us to have something to work off of. It's always easier to edit than to create, and - yeah, hopefully we can have the fuller attendance at next week's call. But if between now and then you could take a crack at that, we'll have something to really dig into on our subsequent calls.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Paul Diaz: All right. Again given - it's unfortunate but given the attendance level today, as I say I'm not inclined to go through and start going over the new text, the proposed text, line by line. Just because I really don't think we have full enough representation to make those sorts of edits.

                 One question for those of us who are on the call, though, if we can jump out to Page 17 in the draft. This is in Section 5, our deliberations, and it was in the first subsection. We were talking about EPT.

Question for the group. I just want to make sure that we're all of the like thinking here. The additional comments that were offered by this outside expert, Patrick. He was suggesting an EPP command called Domain:Info as a possible source of exchange. Trying to make sure we're all in agreement with basically that the point that James made on the list, that while these alternatives that have been suggested are well and good, the sharing the information is still done overwhelmingly by email, and that is the concern here.

I guess what I'm getting at is that the text as we have it captures the idea that there are some alternatives, but we have a fundamental weakness in the overall system. And it's beyond the mandate of this group to say, you know, everybody needs to start using secured email, encrypted email or something like that.

So that if there are any takeaways from the public comments, any suggested changes in the text and whatnot, just want to make sure that we're all in agreement that it's good to highlight these thoughts as we have in the draft already.

But that fundamentally on this first question about exchanging registrar and email, since it's going to entail use of email that, you know, we're constrained in how much we can do and therefore, there's no real recommendation to move forward because email's insecure and it's beyond the mandate of the group to try and require the use of encrypted emails.

Is that - am I still thinking, you know, capturing the group's thinking on this? Or, you know, perhaps we need to refine it based on what we've seen as peoples' views have changed or anything like that.

James Bladel: Paul, this is James. Are you mainly addressing the top third of Page
                  17?

Paul Diaz: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: And I just called that particular page out just to make sure, use it as a
                  reference point with a view towards the comments that were received.
                  As you noted, they were pretty extensive. Marika summarized them for
                  us and that's included in the report now. But in general, even after
                  going through all that, while we may nod our heads and say, "Hey,
                  that's a neat idea," or "That might work, something to consider." We've
                  made such notes in our draft text that there are things that could be
                  explored.

                  Of course there are costs and time issues and other things like that,
                  but fundamentally on our first charter question, fundamental problem
                  said exchange of this information often entails use of email which is
                  inherently insecure. That's still the group's view, correct? And therefore
                  any of these other suggestions need to be very - need to be taken into
                  account with that weakness in mind.

James Bladel: Right. I think it's important to draw the distinction between the channel
                  of communication versus the payload of what is being communicated.
                  And I think that there's some - excuse me - there's some good
                  thoughts here on that, you know, hey, it's off info doesn't have to be an
                  all or nothing proposal with the domain.

You can establish and use off info codes or passwords or whatever you want to call it with contact objects and registrar objects and things of that nature. But it doesn't really address the problem of transporting that information securely and in a way that authenticate it.

And as I think we said a couple of different places here, that proposal also is irrelevant when it comes to thin registries which don't have that data to begin with.

Paul Diaz: Right.

James Bladel: So I think that maybe drawing the distinction between the channel of communication versus the information that's exchanged is what we were kind of getting at. And it's a good comment. I hope no one took away from my response that I didn't think it was valuable or worthwhile. In fact, quite the opposite. I thought it was pretty enlightening. I have to have a couple of conversations with our developers here. But ultimately I think it just kind of skirts around the problem that we identified in this section.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And Kevin, in general this - your views haven't changed? Positions haven't changed?

Kevin Erdman: Yeah, I think so.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Again and, you know, as we over the course of the next week whatever updated text Marika gets out to us, as we look ahead to going forward, going through this in more detail on next week's call, wherever we might be able to supplement our text with some of the thinking from Patrick, then we should do so.

But I guess the point is always to keep in mind that all of that is kind of constrained by the communication channel we just described. And our inability, or as we say in the report - I mean registrars, for example. We take the view that this is, you know, market-based solutions.

Registrars can get around this by using encrypted email. Yeah, that would improve the security and enable a secure channel of communication. But that's a market-based decision. That is not a policy prescription. And, you know, again to mandate that everybody has to use encrypted email is well beyond the authority of this particular working group.

All right, folks. You know, again given our small attendance on the call, I'm thinking that it probably makes more sense to end this week's call a little early and to look forward to the revised draft that Marika will work on. Hopefully, you know, we'll have full attendance at next week's call and we can go through line by line.

Essentially, just so you understand the process, the final report that we will submit to the council for its consideration is not going - basically what you have in front of you is meat of that report. Yes there are some edits. There are some clarifications in terms of conclusions, etcetera, that need to be made. But what we have in front of us is what we're, you know, kind of polishing off, getting ready to submit.

So the hope is that, my hope is that, you know, the group next week, perhaps the week after, you know, that we can get through this text and effectively have that report ready for council for the Mexico City meeting. At most maybe we would need, you know, a little bit of time

shortly thereafter to complete. But I think we're very close to the end, and positions are clear. I think we've captured most all the views. A little bit fine tuning and we should be ready to wrap this one up.

So with that, if people have any issues, anything they want to raise now? If not, then, you know, I thank you for your time. I would ask please make every effort to be at next week's call. Look for the revised draft. Marika will push it out, probably post it on the wiki, push it out in email as she's been. And, you know, we can then prepare to go through that in detail next week. And ideally within the next two sessions wrap this one up and start thinking about PDPB or whatever else is coming down the line.

Okay. Yeah, and last call. Anybody? Any questions? Issues? Concerns? Marika, everything's okay with you?

Marika Konings: Yeah.

Paul Diaz: Flesh this out?

James Bladel: Paul or Marika, how many PDP groups will there be? Six? Or...

Marika Konings: We still have B, C, D and E.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, but five were anticipated, James, but communications I've had with council leadership - there's a suggestion that, for instance, the questions that were originally sketched out for (PDPB) - there's some flexibility in terms of what may or may not be addressed. It's kind of assumed that whatever was suggested by the previous group, that's what we will address, but...

Marika Konings: Already as well as some issues that have been pushed forward. For example, think on the denial of their two issues that have been pushed forward to PDPC, and there's as well one question that was raised in the context of the post-expiration domain recovery issues report that might be included, or might be recommended to be included in one of the transfers PDP as well that relates to the transfer of a domain name in RGP.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

James Bladel: And is it the intention to continue with these in a serial nature, one at a time? Or is there any thought to...

Marika Konings: I understood that was the initial idea, but I think the council's probably open, if there are any strong recommendations, to do one or the other before. I'm sure they're open to consider that.

James Bladel: I just didn't know if there were any concerns that five PDPs and, you know, we're probably looking at two-and-a-half, three years before we're finished through the entire set. And that's assuming nothing gets added to them during the course. You know, I'm just thinking from a practical standpoint if there's any - if that's going to pose any problem.

Olof Nordling: Olof here. And this was debated at some length, how this could be done. But there is another practical consideration and that is that there are - by experience when we launch something on transfers, we get limited participation but of very knowledgeable individuals. And those are not easy to multiply and enable some kind of parallel processing.

So I think the general assumption to start with was that we would have to proceed in a sequential fashion.

James Bladel: Okay. Well I didn't mean to reopen that discussion. I just - I appreciate the background info.

Marika Konings: Just a question here from me to Olof, because I understood as well in that discussion of grouping them together that it was done from the more easy issues to the more difficult ones. Is that correct?

Olof Nordling: That was one consideration, and but there were other considerations as well. And these have been chewed upon -- the various issues -- by the original transfers working group that was headed by Ross Rader for a time.

And so there were two dimensions, both the low-hanging fruit and those that are really very, very important. And I think the pooling of them was trying to make some kind of - first of all to find some logical least common denominator. And also to take those that were - well, be they important or less important, but difficult or very difficult to reach agreement upon -- to take them at a later set.

So a little of - a mixed bag of considerations that resulted in these five sets of issues in five different PDP projects.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Very good. All right, if that's it then I appreciate everybody's time. Again, look for the revised draft. You know, if Miss Marika can get it out to us, and please encourage and really request everybody try to make

next week's call so we can get through that, approve the text, polish it off, and, you know, wrap our PDPA.

Once again, thank you for your time and we'll talk to you all next week. Everybody take care now.

James Bladel: Thank you, Paul.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Paul.

END