Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 21 September 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 21 September 2010 at 1400 UTC. 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-b-20100921.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Michele Neylon **–** RrSG Chair
Paul Diaz - Registrar SG
Matt Serlin - Registrar SG
Robert Mountain - Registrar SG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Barbara Steele - RySG
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Michael Collins – Individual
Oliver Hope - RrSG

Staff:
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG
Rob Golding – Registrar SG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Anil George – IPC
James Bladel - Registrar SG
Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)
Glen de Saint Gery
Margie Milam

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's

                    IRTP call on Tuesday, the 21st of September. We have Michele Neylon, Mike

                    O'Connor, Michael Collins, Barbara Steele, Paul Diaz, Bob Mountain, Oliver

                    Hope, Matt Serlin. From staff we have Marika Konings, myself Gisella

Gruber-White. We have apologies from James Bladel, Kevin Erdman and Anil George. Please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. And also Chris Chaplow will be joining us in five minutes. Thank you, over to you Michele.

Michele Neylon: And just another update on that. Rob Golding - he's going to try to join the call within the next 15 minutes and wants to send on his apologies if he doesn't manage to join the call that is.

Okay then, good afternoon everybody. Oh yes, (Simonetta) as well has sent her regrets earlier. I'm not sure if that was captured.

Gisella Gruber-White: Captured now (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. I'm not sure. We - is there anybody else we're missing? Is anybody aware of anybody else that we're missing that we may have forgotten about? No? Okay. Perfect.

Okay then. The agenda for today as you can see is we're looking - going to continue looking at denial reasons number six and seven which is the things we were discussing last week with ICANN staff. Just to also inform you that Baudouin Schiombe has just joined the call.

Then if we can, just go back to discussing the concerning idea, then if we have enough time we can have a look at reviewing some of the comments. So with respect to denial reasons six and seven, and whoever's got the really loud line could you please - button on your phone. Thank you.

With respect to denial reasons six and seven, anybody have any further thoughts on this? Any further thoughts on denial reasons six and seven?

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: I think a lot of us are...

Michele Neylon: No. Paul Diaz...

Mike O'Connor: I think a lot of us are reading...

Michele Neylon: Paul Diaz, Paul Diaz, Paul Diaz has an opinion. Paul please go ahead.

Paul Diaz: For what it's worth Michele. You know, I appreciate and want to reiterate again staff's joining us last week taking time of our their busy schedules and do appreciate the points that they made and is subsequently been made on the list. I am certainly open-minded to the idea of, you know, reworking six in the ways they suggested to try and address certain things.

For seven, I'm sorry, I still have a hard time because they keep making - I think a number of us are making the explicit assumption that a name in lock status in the assumption is that it's in an EPP consistent lock status, but that's an assumption.

That needs to be either specified if we're ever to drop number seven and it needs to be made explicit elsewhere because unfortunately we all know how things work in the ICANN world. Unless it's made explicit, somebody's going to find a way around it.

So, you know, for - as we continue to move forward, I'm open-minded in support of what staff has suggested that we look to address these issues elsewhere but, you know, want to make absolutely certain that we don't create the unintended consequences that we start pairing things back and then wind up creating further headaches for ourselves either in future working groups for transfer policy or just doing our business in general.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to make the point that I think, you know, in the statement that staff has made and also the different email contribution, I think, you know, our point was really neat. If denial reason seven is deleted, it should be replaced by something else needed to specifically to address was Paul was stating.

I don't think it was ever the intention to purpose deleting denial reason seven without any replacement or any other reference. But I think it was mainly the opinion that on their (red curn) you said it really doesn't fit as, you know, it's - I think I've explained it.

In practice, there's no way to deny a transfer that hasn't or cannot be initiated. So, I just wanted to, you know, state that for the record.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: So, I'm looking at a very - this is Mikey. The very first point, appropriate balance needs to be found between security and consumer choice. And I'm just curious how on earth we're going to do that. How are we going to know that we've found that point?

I'm not disagreeing. I think it's a good idea. I'm just not sure how we go about it.

Michele Neylon: Anybody? Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. I'll make the same point I made to (Pam) last week in that the emphasis staff of a particular compliance seems to be putting on consumer choice I think is somewhat anachronistic. You know, the IRTP, the current policy that we have when it was created in 2004 was very, very specifically dealing with portability.

Many registrars were frustrated with practices in the industry that were basically holding registrants hostage at incumbent registrars, and clearly changed the policy in such a way to make it a lot easier to move names around. But again, that's six almost seven years ago now. And I think that, you know, in the interim that security has become a bigger concern for more people.

So to Mikey's point, I'm not sure exactly what the balance will look like, but personally I'm far more interested in the security aspects than I am in the consumer choice because I think the consumer choice issues have largely been dealt with in the marketplace. So we - they're not as big a problem as they were six, seven years ago.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have anything to add? Any comments? Any input? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I think I'm going to chime in right behind Paul. Certainly my interest in this is much more focused on security and ensuring that transfers are successful. And so I think we need to kind of keep this topic in our forefront of our mind as we go through this because I think that may be where a fair amount of the dispute will arise.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just wanted to emphasize as well in response to Paul's point that, you know, even though I'm sure many issues have, you know, worked themselves out based on the market as it is, it is still the number one area in which ICANN received complaints.

And, you know, I'm aware a number of those issues are related to registrants not being aware of how the policy works or reseller related issues. But I think Compliance has provided data as well that shows that there are some areas

where, you know, there are issues and that hopefully can be clarified and indeed make it more consumer friendly in that sense as a result.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Any other comments or faults on this? No? Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Michele, Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. I was just thinking a second ago, again a lot of this is to education and making sure the registrants or their contacts understand the procedures. But then if I remember rightly on the call yes - last week, Compliance told us that the percentage of registrars that didn't comply with the unlock was actually higher wasn't it? It was about 13% or something like that.

It's just occurred to me (unintelligible) what happens in those cases is it where ICANN gets in contact with the registrar and they so oh we're sorry, we'll comply or does the old just become a statistic and nothing happens?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry Chris. What is your question? Are you asking how ICANN would process a complaint in relation to a domain unlock being refused?

Chris Chaplow: Yes. And then what happens I suppose the question I should have asked last week. I didn't think about it, but that's a natural following isn't it with that 13% sitting there. Is a letter of intent...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: So what you want - so what you want to know is what does ICANN Compliance do with complaints received from - about registrars? Am I right?

Chris Chaplow: And then what happens. So let's say after one email if 11 of the 13% say I'm sorry we've had a communication problem and then the issue gets resolved or is there a long, you know, long scenario of problems of which the registrant is stuck not being able to change their registrar or what are they going to do with the domain, or what...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Does anybody want to try to address Chris query? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: Well I haven't - I have no data. But maybe to refine the query just a little bit, it would be really interesting to know whether Compliance tracks the outcome of the complaint or whether they just write the complaint down. So is there sort of three layers -- complaints, big list, we've got that, action taken, that would be nice to know`1 and then final disposition or outcome so that we can see how effective the process is.

And, you know, to Chris' point I think if it turns out that ICANN is taking a bunch of complaints and writing them down and then nothing is happening, that's a different problem to solve than if ICANN's getting a lot of complaints and they're all getting resolved 100% satisfactorily for the complainant. So...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Well okay Mikey, just to kind of answer it because there's nobody from Compliance on the call, we have been in contact with Compliance several times in the past in relation to issues regarding, well how can I put this, issues surrounding domains for clients where they have been unable to get EPP keys or unlock key, unlocked domains, unlocked etcetera, etcetera.

And generally speaking, we found that they worked with us to make sure that the client was satisfied. It wasn't just kind of thanks for your thing and no further was heard about it or whatever.

Mike O'Connor: Did - Michele, did they - do they keep track of those statistics?

Michele Neylon: I know can't - I can't speak to that. I, you know, I've no idea how - what they record and don't record.

Mike O'Connor: Yes. I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Mike Connor: I think that's Chris' question. Marika, could we ask the Compliance gang whether they keep track of this sort of results statistics?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean just to - I don't want to - Michele was saying, you know, the way indeed Compliance and I think also for example the Registrar Liaison Team works is that they have a ticketing system.

So indeed when an issue comes in, it gets a ticket number. It then gets assigned to, you know, the relevant person who deals with the ticket until the issue is closed. So I think, you know, it's not that they're piled up, but basically the person looks at it, and it might be that indeed there's a response team well saying look well, you know, ICANN is not the body that you need to go to. This is where you should go to resolve your issue or indeed, you know, we reach out to the registrar and try to find a solution.

And I think normally that works in a way until, you know, the ticket is closed that, you know, either the issue's resolved or the person who complained is, you know, pointed in the right direction or satisfied with the solution provided.

So I'm, you know, I can check what kind of, you know, statistics they keep but I think apart from, you know, categorizing and, you know, making sure that tickets get closed at the end of the process, I'm not really sure how they measure otherwise.

I can check if they measure like, you know, address by compliance or address through, you know, contacting the registrar or, you know, directed in through a different channel because not relevant to ICANN issues or something like that. So, you know, I can look into that.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mikey and then Chris.

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: Marika, I...

Michele Neylon: Just for the record, just for the record, sorry Mikey, and just for the record Paul Diaz just put on the chat that he thought - he didn't think detailed follow up stats were kept, that just that something was or wasn't resolved. This was - he says - also says this was something that was on the to do list and justification for increased compliance (bud just). If you remember, we discussed this sometime back. Mikey...

Mike O'Connor: Yes.

Michele Neylon: ...then Chris?

Mike O'Connor: Yes. And I think that basically, you know, the last time we really got into this with Compliance, a subset of us wrote a memo to ICANN encouraging that and, you know, supporting a budget increase. And I think that given the outcome of the budget process, it might not be a bad idea to think about keeping this issue sort of on the forefront because without metrics as to what actually happens, we don't really have a way to know A, how effective the policy is today nor do we know where we need to focus in order to improve it if - or even if it needs to be improved at all.

So, you know, I think Chris is on the right trajectory here. And then Marika I think to the extent - if they just come back and say sort of what they said

before which was well we don't really keep track of that, then we - that's one outcome that we can take note of and maybe write something about.

But if they come back and say that their outcome categories is - are as broad as the ones that you're describing which is basically, you know, we solved it, somebody else solved it or they went away, we might encourage them to narrow that a bit and start keeping track of how they solved it and who took what action because the trouble that we run into in the policy making process so much is that we get stuck because we don't have good information on which to make policy and I think this might be a good example of that.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Mikey. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Just to reiterate really, it's to try and get a feel for the depth of it, whether we're talking of lots of little problems that are solved quite easily by Compliance or problems that have got such a depth, they really take a lot of work and - to get solved.

Michele Neylon: Good. Okay. And I just put myself on the queue. Just to echo this thing about the data, we are constantly being asked to look at various aspects of support of ICANN policy that impacts on the RAA based on the supposed existence of problems. So it would be helpful if we had actual data as opposed to oh my God there is a problem but no real details.

Okay. Any other thoughts on this subject or shall we move on? Okay. We move on. Bob, you're all by yourself.

((Crosstalk))

Bob Mountain: I am but it's okay. I'm a big boy.

Michele Neylon: You're not really. You're not really. Anyway, you're - but you're not tiny either. So what are you - do you have any thoughts on this?

Bob Mountain: I do. Yes. Bob Mountain speaking. Yes. I guess so. You know, this - we had a - just to level set everybody, we had a proposal which was that (Tim Eneta) and I would reach out to some people that we identified representing the various cohorts to get that after market perspective on ETRP.

Some folks have voiced some concern about that, primarily I believe the reluctance is to go out with a survey like this strictly to the aftermarket cohorts. So understand that. And, you know, I've volunteered a couple of other suggestions. One which is to go out with the survey as it is now with the - and gather the data. Use that as a, you know, one point of information.

However, with the option to expand that survey to people who are not in the aftermarket perspective or not in the aftermarket at a later date, that's certainly one course of action.

The other course of action is to expand the cohorts so that it would include others that are not aftermarket and do it all at once. I, you know, personally I'm fine either way. I'd like to get something going sooner rather than later. We've been, you know, obviously talking about this for quite a while.

So I think, you know, plan, you know, Part A would certainly be the fastest. We have the cohorts identified. We have the contacts identified. We're ready to go this week. But, you know, if there are concerns, I'd like other recommendations as to what people, you know, if there was two courses of action that I've laid out, you know, don't work, then one of the others, but I'd love some suggestions on what people think we should do as opposed to the plans that we've laid out. So I'll turn it over to the group.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Bob. Thank you. Any thoughts? Any input? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I'm actually fine with either of those plans. I think that one approach to this, as Bob says, is to go quickly out to a narrow cohort,

bring back the data and make it clear that it's from a narrow group of people, that it's not a, you know, it's not a total sample of the total ICANN community but rather it's a conversation with a group of people that's very concerned about this.

In order to find out more about their concern and also hopefully find out some suggestions as to how we could do this in a way that meets their needs but also meets the needs that we identified in coming up with the thing in the first place. So I'm fine with that. If, you know, I think we would need to make it - we would just need to make it really clear that this is not necessarily something that we're automatically going to act on but that it's an important voice that we need to hear and understand.

I'm also fine with going out to a broader community, but I certainly understand Bob's concern that, you know, that's going to take longer both to go out because it's going to take longer to find the right people and also it's going to take longer to get everything back and it's going to take longer to analyze.

And we may not - we may actually get less clear feedback than if we just went with a targeted one. Is Matt on the call today?

Michele Neylon: Who?

Mike O'Connor: Serlin.

Michele Neylon: Who? Yes. Oh Serlin, yes he's there.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. So you're going to - I'm sure you're going to chime in too. But, you know, I was going to echo your points but I won't. So that's sort of where I'm at. I'm fine with both of those approaches Bob.

Michele Neylon: Matt?

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele and thanks Bob and Mikey as well. Yes, I mean I guess at the end of the day I'd be fine with moving forward in that manner, you know, as well. If it's - just to Mikey's point, just to clarify that it was, you know, that any feedback we get from this group is sort of caveated with the fact that it is from a very targeted specific group that we, you know, fully aware of the fact that it's not representative of the wider community in that, you know, we did this really to get one group's point of view.

The thing that I worry about is once the rest of the community sees that, are they going to then expect us to go out and get every other individual groups' thoughts and experiences. So I just wonder if we're going to end up right back in the same place in having, you know, spent the time that Bob and (Simonetta) have put into this and then going out to their specific group and then us getting that feedback and going through it and then exposing it to the community only for the community to say hey wait a minute, now you need to go out and talk to this group or you need to go out and talk to that group.

So I just - I don't know if it's going to buy us anything. I still think we might end up having to make this a broader survey at the end of the day. But in the meantime, yes, I'm fine with either as Bob explained.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?

Mike O'Connor: Well this is Mikey. I'm back in the queue. That's the second time up for me.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm going to skip you for the moment. I'll come back to you shortly Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Okay.

Michele Neylon: I'm going to go to Bob and then to you.

Bob Mountain: Oh okay. No I was just going to make one other point that if, you know, if the recommendation was to move forward with the cohorts identified now, one of the caveats was that the individuals who we've identified would not be, you know, would not be their, you know, the specific individuals would not be disclosed as part of this. Since this is all public record, we would, you know, refer to them as domain investor, you know, A or domain investor X or something like that.

So just to point that we would not be, you know, making the specific identities available for all these folks that we've got - that have agreed to talk to us.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Then Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Hmm. I have to cogitate about them asking the identities. I'm not sure I'm comfortable with that. But the point I was going to make is that...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: One thing Mikey - just one thing Mikey, we have done something similar in the past in other working groups with respect to surveys that were conducted with registrars.

Bob Mountain: Yes.

Mike O'Connor: Oh okay. Well let me...

Michele Neylon: And you're on - and you're actually on those working groups.

Mike O'Connor: You know, let me - yes. That's true. Okay. I think the main point I was going to make is that - is to Matt's point, which is I think that in order to inoculate ourselves against the problem that Matt's raising, which is that everybody else would then want to be surveyed gets back to the way we frame this. I think we have to be very clear that we're undertaking this survey in response

to issues that were raised during the public comment period by a very narrow group of people, and that we are not necessarily going to take their advice. You know, that's probably less diplomatic than we want to say it in the write up.

But, the concern - and I would - I have the same concern, which is that by only surveying one group and then having this information, we the working group are then compelled to follow their advice. And, I think we need to make it absolutely clear that we're not - that's not our intent. Our intent is to understand their issues better and solicit their ideas as to how to accomplish what we have pretty much agreed we want to accomplish in a way that meets their needs better.

But, if the framing doesn't make that clear, then Matt's absolutely right. We have to go to a whole community, because otherwise we're not doing justice to what we're here for.

Michele Neylon: True. Thank you, Mikey. Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yes. Thanks Michele. Mikey, I guess just a question then. How it - how is that positioned, or how are those expectations best (stet)? Is that part of the survey where you're communicating those expectations to the cohort? Is that the way that the data is communicated and reported back to the group? Is it both - you know, I think it's a great suggestion. I just want to make sure we - you know, we action that.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that probably the answer is sort of in response to all restaurant menu items. Yes, please. I think we do it everywhere. You know, I think we do it in the survey document, whatever that turns out to be. I think we do it in the announcement of that document. I think we do it in our own reports. You know, I think we have to do that framing sort as many places as we can just so that it's very, very clear, and that people have lots of ways to find that out.

Bob Mountain: Okay. Got it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any input or thoughts on this at this time? Okay. I'll take that silence to mean no.

So guys, how would you like - and girls to (reguise) (unintelligible) or guise as kind of you know, it covers both genders - how would you like to proceed?

Bob then Mikey.

Bob Mountain: All right. So, it sounds to me like there's no strenuous objection to going out with the survey, as defined now to the cohorts we've identified, with the proviso that we set and manage expectations at all possible touch points. What I would propose is that we revise the email that was to go out with a cut at the positioning that Mikey has suggested. We can - I can circulate that to the group you know today and get feedback. If the group is okay, once we've finished the feedback, then we're ready to go out to the cohorts you know, immediately after we finish the communication material.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you.

Mikey is giving us a tick, of which we will take to mean that he approves. Does anybody else have any other faults on this? Matt Serlin, he was getting tired of his voodoo doll and is now ticking and is giving us an approval. Sorry Matt, the voodoo doll was required. Bob Mountain is also happy. Okay, so we'll proceed. And so unless I hear some massive amount of criticism, we'll move forward with this. Bob will circulate stuff to the list later today or tomorrow, or something, and then we'll move forward from there.

Okay. Next item on the agenda is continuing the review of the commons. Marika, you have a much better memory than I do. Where were we in this, because I can't quite recall.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm just crawling down. I think we were at a Issue C - I'm trying to see which one was the first. Comment -- hold on a second -- Comment 33.

Michele Neylon: Comment 33, okay.

Marika Konings: Page 11.

Michele Neylon: Page 11. Okay. You have a much better memory than the rest of us.

Okay. Comment - questions - there's 33. We're into some of the comments from George Kirikos. So charter question thing, blah, blah, blah. Hold on. (Unintelligible). Okay. So, this was something that we were looking at, and (Pam Little) replied to George's query about voluntarily on the list in the last couple of days I believe.

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Do we need to - do we want to go into this now, or shall we wait until - shall we kind of take it that we've already discussed this quite a bit and mark it as noted? Noted, and also to reference (Pam Little)'s reply?

Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine with that. I think the only other thing is if we decide to take it up, we should probably wait until (James) is on the call.

Michele Neylon: Or some other representative of that registrar.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Could we just - so we just note that for the moment, and if we want to have further discussion, we should defer until such time as a representative

of the registrar in question is available to defend her position. (A second now).

So, this is in relation to the definition of a registrant. "It is important to be careful about how ones defines a registrant, because the label one attaches to a certain registrant might change. But, it's not considered a change of registrant." Which one of those two emails is he referring to? Do you know Marika? Because you've got - you've put two links in there.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean, the links are in there. Basically, his post to the public comment forum, because he...

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay.

Marika Konings: ...he posted several comments, in some he you know, referenced emails that he had sent to the mailing list, and some he posted - blog posts that he had written somewhere else. So you know, his comments you know are covered in those different posts to the public comment forum.

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay. Okay. Fair enough. Thank you. Does anybody want to make any comments or give any feedback on this? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Did we ever get a definition? Didn't we run into this problem ourselves, where we sort of said, "What is a registrant?" Did we ever pound that nail down and actually define one?

Michele Neylon: I think we've discussed it a bit, but I don't think we've ever fully defined this, unless somebody else can correct my recollection. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I recall well, I think James did put forward a suggestion, but you know, I don't know how far that went in you know, getting agreement from the group, or whether you know further discussion is needed on that. But, I do recall that at some point, I think he sent in some suggested

language that you know, might serve as a basis for further discussion. And, I'm happy to try and dig that out or check with (James) where that stands.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. It might not be a bad idea if we just were to follow-up on this. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. This is Mikey again. I think given that what we're doing on this list is just noting what we're going to do, I think what we might want to say is something like the working group agrees that this is a good idea and we'll pursue it, or something like that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any other thoughts on this? And Bob agrees.

Now, this is a follow-up in some respects to George Kirikos's comment. This is from the registrar constituency stakeholder group. "In (reason) to both to our question being (C), the working group should develop a definition of the term change in registrant, as it is an important precursor to settling disputes between registrant and admin contact." Mikey again.

Mikey O'Connor: Partly, this is sort of a (sea) above. You know I think - I agree with this. I think that in addition to defining once and for all what a registrant is, we ought to nail this down as well.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Just to echo that. I also think if you can't define a registrant, you won't be able to define a change of registrant.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Chicken/egg type of scenario, or fill in with your own (perfect) choice.

Next item. "The working group should further explore the existing processes in place for trying to prevent hijacking attempts, as these could serve as best

practices to be recommended for adoption by registrars." Any thoughts on that?

Mikey again.

Mikey O'Connor: I agree, but only - I would refine this just a little bit in that the scope of this could get pretty (thrawed). We might want to narrow the question just a little bit to focus in on preventing hijacking attempts during IRTP - you know during the inter-registrar transfer process, rather than across-the-board. But in general, I think that's not a bad idea. You know, learn from best practices is often cheap and effective, so I could accept that one.

Michele Neylon: So maybe, something along the lines of yes, we agree. However, we need to be careful that we do not go too far beyond the scope of this working group.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Or just be mindful of the scope of the working group. Something like that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I had a question to the - in (relation) to this comments, and I think it follows on from a comment that Matt actually made on the previous call. Because in making that information available, doesn't that you know, make it as well obvious for hijackers how to go around it? So you know, how could that work, or how much details can you provide, you know before it becomes actually of interest to hijackers how they can actually get around it and you know, make use of that information?

So you know, I don't know if this for example links together as well, because I know other working groups have had discussions as well on best practices, and then you know how those could be built and shared. And, I don't know if this is an instance where you would look in best practices that will be you know confidentially shared for example, instead of you know publicly posted.

Or - I would be interesting to hear you know, the registrars perspective on that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any registrars like to jump in before I start picking on people? Matt?

Matt Serlin: Thanks, Michele. Yes Marika, I think it was my comment from the last call. And yes, essentially I do have concerns that you know if we start - if registrars are required essentially to start publishing their security practices, then it's essentially a blueprint for hijackers to understand what their systems are, what measures they have in place, and how to get around them and how to (social) engineer them and things like that. So yes, I'm - I think I would have to go - you know, I'm certainly not speaking for all registrars, but I would imagine that a high percentage of registrars would share that view as well.

And so, I'll play Michele and pick on other folks on the line, like Michele and Paul. So, I see Paul in the chat has agreed. It's just you know, having some sense of security being you know, behind the firewall is not only a comfort to registrars operationally, but also to our clients as well.

Michele Neylon: Well, I'll take that since you picked on me (massio) trying to get revenge on me.

Matt Serlin: Love that.

Michele Neylon: Sorry?

Matt Serlin: I said I'd love that.

Michele Neylon: What? That you tried to take revenge?

Matt Serlin: Yes. I...

Michele Neylon: You did fine. You did fine.

Matt Serlin: Well, you know. You get to wield your power most of the time, and the tables got turned for once. Good.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay. That's fine. Duly noted. Duly noted. And a new voodoo doll shall put together. And, I would be agreed, broadly speaking, with what Matt was saying. However, I would also be very happy if there was more sharing and pooling of resources between registrars behind closed doors, which would - because a lot of the problems that would affect us, would affect GoDaddy, would affect Network Solutions, would affect you know various other registrars. But, I wouldn't be too happy about sharing a lot of this information in broad daylight, because I think that -- as others have said -- that would be providing a blueprint.

                  Matt?

Matt Serlin: Yes. No, that's a good point. And you know, just to sort of pick up on what you said. Having some sort of you know - and I think there's - you know in the new RAA, there's something about a designated security contact for all registrars. But, what it doesn't say is you know, that those points of contact actually need to be responsive, and that there's certain thresholds that registrars - in dealing with each other, or dealing with the registries, or in dealing with ICANN have to be responsive.

                  And so, I'd be very supportive of the things that we put in place that were -- to Michele's point -- more behind the scenes. So, if I have a registrar you know, that we have a name that's been hijacked and moved to this registrar, you know I should be able to get someone responsive that understands you know the business that can look into the issue and work to get it resolved in a expedient sort of way. That's a completely different thing to me than you know, publishing all of our security stuff. So, I'd agree with you. Shocking.

Michele Neylon: Oh, my God. The end is nigh. Matt Serlin from MarkMonitor agrees with Michele. Oh, my God. Anybody else have any other thoughts on this?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I think the way we summarize this conversation is to acknowledge the fact that we do the - that we as a working group do not want to publish a blueprint for attackers. At the same time, we want to understand the processes, so acknowledge that George has got a good point. And that understanding those processes could benefit a number of registrars, especially registrars who are not as advanced in terms of security.

So you know, I think that what we might want to say is George raises a good point. We have some operational difficulties in ensuring that security is not breached while we explore it. And maybe, look at some models like the (Essack) model, where you know they keep quite a lot of information...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: But, that's actually a comment from the registrar group, not from George Kirikos.

Mikey O'Connor: Pardon me?

Michele Neylon: This comment is from the registrar group, not from George Kirikos.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. Sorry about that.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Well, all the better. Then, I agree with the registrar group.

So anyway, you know I think that what we have talked our way through is the notion that yes, we want to pursue this, but yes we also want keep the information out of the public eye, and we need a mechanism to do that.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Perfect.

All right. Next comment we had. I remember this. This was from Rob Hall, who brought up the matter of abolishing locks all together, during the Brussels meeting.

Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I don't think he said abolish locks all together. I think he said that the technology has changed so that now with EPP essentially being the controlling technology, some of the locks related policy issues are no longer relevant. And, I think that a good example of that is the conversation we had last week with the staff, where when there's an EPP lock, a registrar can't even initiate it. So I'm not sure he said get rid of locks all together, but rather step back from the different states of the technology and figure out which of the things in the policy are obsolete.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Barbara?

(Barbara): This is (Barbara). I do hope you didn't say that, you know completely abolish locks, because obviously there are some circumstances when we're required to, in essence, lock down a name to prevent any additional changes from happening to it while perhaps a dispute is pending. So, that's my only comment. That there are still circumstances when you know by law or by process, that we would be required to lock names down.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Paul Diaz?

Paul Diaz: Yes. Thanks Michele. Just backing up with both Mikey and (Barbara) said. I wasn't exactly clear on what Rob was arguing. Remember, he was basically having an ongoing battle over the phone with George, and they were speaking over each other, and it was kind of a mess. And, I have a feeling that we're probably paraphrasing too, to a fault, when we say abolish all together. I don't think that was his intention.

More towards what both Mikey and (Barbara) are saying that as long as it's within the existing EPP compliance system, you know the other things don't need to exist. The problem is when you have those super secret registrar locks that nobody ever explains how it works and you have no way of finding out until you try and move the name, that's different. But, the idea of wholesale doing away with locks is basically a non-starter. But, I don't really think that's what he was arguing.

If this is an issue for anybody, I would suggest that you know, we reach out to Rob. I mean, he's provided working group assistance in the past. I'm sure he would be happy to clarify his position.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else want to throw themselves under this one?

No? Okay then, as we're coming towards the top of the hour, and I'm afraid if we go into something else, we could end up running over very, very easily. What I would suggest we do is that we look to picking up from here on the next call, and we will also look forward to a lovely email from Bob at some point.

Does anybody have any other matters that they wish to raise at this juncture?

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe that's the kit you need? The How to Construct a Voodoo Doll kit.

Michele Neylon: Well, I'm - I couldn't possibly share my secrets on doing that. Because remember, it's an Irish voodoo doll.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Michele Neylon: Yes. But very important. This is (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Never mind. Maybe we could put that under (SX Sub-Rosa) blanket as well?

Michele Neylon: It's a thought.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay, then. Anybody have anything else? If not, then we will be - well then, we will adjourn until next week, and we'll see how many people manage to make it onto the call next week.

Okay, have a good week people. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

<div align="center">END</div>