IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 17 April 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 17 April 2012 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-c-20120417-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#apr

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
James Bladel -co-chair
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Hago Dafalla – NCSG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Alain Berranger – NPOC
Roy Dykes – RySG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Avri Doria - co-chair
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de St Géry
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies
Paul Diaz - RrSg
Angie Graves – CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 17th of April, 2012. On the call today we have Alain Berranger, James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, Hago Dafalla, Simonetta Batteiger, Bob Mountain, Roy Dykes and Kevin Erdman.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Angie Graves, Matt Serlin and Paul Diaz.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Man: Thank you.

James Bladel: Good morning. Thank you, Nathalie and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the IRTP-C working group call for the 17th of April, 2012 and tax day here in the US for those of you who are still procrastinating, you've got a few hours yet to get those done.

As you can see in the right hand column of the Adobe chat room for those of you who are online we've posted the agenda. And we have a few items here to cover. We have quite a number of small items that we need to check off today and then we can move on to some of our larger topics as well.

So first up as per all our normal procedure does anyone have any questions, comments or additions to the proposed agenda? Seeing none the second question is does anyone have any updates or modifications to their statements of interest? And on takers there as well. Thank you.

And our first item of substance is a update from each of the two sub teams. The first one is the data gathering sub team which would normally be updated by Bob Mountain. However Mr. Mountain has informed us that he has a really

rough connection and has asked Marika to provide the update for that sub team this week. So if you're ready, Marika, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the survey that the data gathering sub team developed went out last week. I think several sub team members sent it out to their respective contacts. But it also went out to the Registrar Stakeholder Group as well as the Registry Stakeholder Group who distributed it internally. And we also sent it through an ICANN mailing list we have to all accredited registrars to get input.

So the status today we actually - I think we gave as a deadline today for people to complete the survey. We've received a total of 56 responses, 52 of which were completed by registrars, two registries and then there's also five identified themselves as registrants and two after market. And just to note people could, you know, have multiple types of responses so there are people that probably are registrars and also registrants and registrars but also after market providers. So overall 56 responses which I think is a really good turnout so far.

There is a request especially I think from the perspective of the Registry Stakeholder Groups - representatives on this group if they can maybe encourage their members to complete a few more responses as we only have two at the moment. And I think it would be helpful especially if you look at the IANA question to get some additional input there from registries.

I think the next steps for the sub team are to, you know, once the survey closes tomorrow I'll prepare a report on the feedback received. And then the sub team is planning to meet next Monday to try and, you know, analyze the results and hopefully report back to the working group with its findings on next week's call. And that's it.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika, for that update. And Simonetta and I think - are thinking the same thing which is that if we're still waiting for a wider response

from the registries and there's really no action to be taken on this survey results until next week is there any harm in extending the deadline for a few days to give some more registries a chance to respond?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean, I think it's more a question of, you know, are they planning to respond? Because if they indeed they are planning to respond I don't think it's an issue to, you know, give them a few more days as it won't take that much time to prepare the report.

But if at this stage we know there are not going to be any further responses, you know, I guess the sub team could also take the time then to, you know, digest the results received to date. But at the same time we could already prepare a preliminary report if needed.

So it's, you know, I think Bob already says, you know, he's happy to extend it until Friday. So maybe we can get a note out then to the different people we send it to noting that it's - we've extended the deadline so hopefully people will, you know, take the time to provide some additional input.

James Bladel: Okay thank you and thank you, Bob, I agree. And I think extending deadlines is certainly what we do at ICANN especially recently. I see Roy would like to comment as a registry representative. Roy.

Roy Dykes: Yeah, no I just wanted to echo that in fact on behalf of Neustar I have not responded yet and that's because I was doing a little bit more research with our technical team. So having a few extra days would be helpful.

The other thing that I will do is if once we know for sure that the window will be extended I'll send another note to the Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group letting him know and get - make sure that he gets the word out to the rest of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Roy. So I think what we're hearing is that there's no harm in extending this a few more days - through Friday - according to Bob's recommendation. And that the registries believe that at least one registry and possibly more could benefit from a few more days in terms of increased responses.

So let's - if there's no objection let's go ahead and proceed with that then and extend that deadline, send a reminder out to a few of the folks that we - they have a few more days to get those in. Any other thoughts on the data gathering sub team update? Okay, thank you to Bob and Marika and the rest of the sub team for their work on this issue.

And we'll move onto Item Number 4 which is the ideal process or change of control sub team. And our fearless leader in this regard is Simonetta. Simonetta, would you like to provide an update?

Simonetta Batteiger: Sure. And I'm actually going to ask Mikey to help me with this a little bit. What we did last week is we started a draft of how this process could look like. And we captured a number of our thoughts and questions and open items along the way.

So what you'll see here is basically the output of that work. And I can just walk you through this right quick or maybe Mikey can help me do this as well. And we would love to hear some input and feedback from this group maybe through the mailing list or if you have an immediate reaction to it then obviously on this call as well.

But everyone should just know that this is Mikey and me just two people sketching together a first draft so obviously this isn't final. But it is taking into account what we have put together as our list of principles.

And so what we thought the process should have is that at the beginning both registrants authorized to change and the sequence doesn't matter; it doesn't

matter if the previous or the new registrant does this first it's just that both of them consent that there should be a change of owner on the domain.

Then some entity determines that both previous and the new registrant have given their consent to this. And this could be in the case of a thick registry - a registry function. And the case of a thin registry something the registrars need to do because they're the only entities who have knowledge about who the registrants are.

Then the credentials for the transfer are produced and transmitted to the registry by the present registrant. And we had a longer discussion about this and stayed away from the word auth code here because this in essence the credentials could be a PIN, a password, a string, a code or something like an auth code that when it's given is entitling the person who has possession of it to authorize a change of registrant.

And there was a longer conversation Mikey and I had whether or not we should use existing auth codes for that or if it should be a separate and new thing. And I think there's pros and cons either way to do this.

So once the credentials are transmitted - are produced by the previous registrant and then transmitted to the new registrant the new registrant enters these credentials to initiate the change of registrant. It changes over. And then both the previous and the new registrant get a notification that the change has indeed taken place.

And again we were talking about who should be giving this notification. In the case of a thick registry we thought the registry can do this because they know who was the previous and the new registrants were. And in the case of thin registries it would again be the registrar's responsibility to do this.

One thought that we had at the very beginning when we talked about this - the termination that's being made between both registrants that they have

both authorized this is that we thought that if it's between two registrars they should have this info back and forth and say hey this new registrant is saying that they want to authorize this (year's) auth code and the previous registrar would respond back and say okay.

And also the previous registrant has given the authorization to change the registrant over and here are the details so that both entities know who each other are. So that's kind of what we came up with as a first idea. And we'd love to hear your feedback.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. And thank you, Mikey. I think that this is a great - great outline here of - I think it's very comprehensive and it covers all of the things that we talked about in terms of what we call concepts or framework or whatever. I think that this is excellent. There's probably a few more details here or there that need to be fleshed out. But I mean, this is certainly an excellent roadmap.

So I'd like to open a queue then for comments on this - on this update and this draft of an ideal process. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: The only addition I wanted to make to what I just said is that we had a conversation about the difference and character between a form of authorization and an auth code. And in our conversation it became clear that those terms aren't clear.

So I think one piece of homework we have to do is we need to define what we mean with the credential piece and whether or not an auth code is serving that purpose and in what way an FOA is different from that. Because I had different ideas about this than Mikey had and I think we would all be better off if we had a good definition of that.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. I put myself in the queue if there are no other questions I wanted to ask a few. But first off I would say that this is my question in the capacity as a registrar.

And I should note, full disclosure, that I missed the last sub team call so I apologize if this is something that's already been covered. But the question would be relative to the auth code are we suggesting that there would be a separate auth info code?

So for example one - the existing auth info code would be called - just brainstorming here - would be called the transfer auth authorization code? And this new one would be something new like a registrant authorization code? And that the registry would not allow any updates to the registrant data unless that auth code was presented by the registrar? And it would, I assume, have to be the registrar of record.

So I'm just trying to think from EPP perspective how that plays out. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Yeah, and that was exactly where our conversation was going with this. And where Mikey thought that it should be a separate code because it does something differently and he would like to therefore have this be a separate piece of information.

And I thought well if you look at what we meant with these credentials that's exactly what an auth code is currently doing. So we were trying to understand whether my idea of that this is what an auth code is doing basically being a PIN or password or a string on that when it's given entitles whoever has possession of it to change the registrant.

If that is what - how it works then we could use the same concept and we don't have to ask for the registries to start using a separate and second credential information piece. But if that is not how it's used then maybe it

becomes necessary. And this is where both Mikey and I are really looking to this working group and the knowledge in the group. And maybe we have to reach out beyond this group to get an answer to that question.

James Bladel: Okay it is an interesting concept. And I think that it is possible operationally to use the same code. You would just simply reset the code. It would be essentially a one-time password where whatever operation you were doing whether you were changing control or changing transfers that you would just reset that.

It is an interesting concept. I think that where I start to get a little fuzzy is that currently only the sponsoring registrar of record can make this change so they would have to be the - so that entity would have to submit the code on behalf of whoever had it.

And secondly in the case of the thick registries - I'm not really sure what their role would be in this because they would accept the code and check it and say yes it's valid. But since they don't retain any contact data that would be more of a - their role would end at that point.

So I think this is really interesting. And I think that it has a lot of merit. We just need to flush out some of these open questions. And I think from my personal perspective if we were designing a process from scratch on a blank piece of paper this is exactly the direction we should be heading in.

The challenge is to insert something like this into an active registry that someone like - and I know Barbara is not on the call but someone like VeriSign might say wow we have to create new fields for - I don't know how many million domain names that are active.

So I think that that would be something that would be worth discussing with the registries further. Simonetta, go ahead. And anyone else who would like to comment on this please weigh in as well.

Simonetta Batteiger: I would like to actually maybe suggest that we take this idea also to the registries and ask for their input and information on - and also the registrars to kind of like show this to them and say hey do you think something like this would work and where would it break down?

And on this credential piece I know that auth codes currently are also not always used the same way by each registry because I believe in the case of the dot Com the auth code is set by the registry at the beginning of the life of the domain versus in the case of the dot DE for example the auth code is only set once somebody is requesting a transfer. And it's basically doing exactly what this process design is asking for.

And then this auth code is actually the piece that expires after - I want to say three or four days so that that provides this time limiting security factor where on the person who currently is the owner of the domain basically triggers the setting of this auth code and then it's only valid for a little bit of time and after that time it's no longer good for a transfer.

So as you can see even from this example they're not uniformly used which would be another reason why Mikey's idea to ask for a separate credential piece has some merit too. So those are just my thoughts and we should ask for more input.

James Bladel: Okay. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just speaking to Simonetta's point about EPP codes all gTLDs work the same way as far as I'm aware in that the EPP code has to be - has to be provided at the same time as the domain name is registered. The dot DE or any ccTLD wouldn't be using pure standard EPP so how they handle it unfortunately isn't that relevant. Thanks.

James Bladel: All right, Michele, thank you for that observation. Let's - are there any other comments or questions relative to this draft process? I see that we have an empty queue. So what I would recommend as far as the next step - and I would ask for Simonetta or Mikey or anyone else to weigh in on this is that we submit this then to the mailing list for comment.

And that we then for next week can we identify those loose ends or those open questions that you mentioned, Simonetta? And we can maybe find out who would be the most appropriate folks or experts that could weigh in on those open questions. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think the question is already in the notes when you read on the right hand side like for example, you know, and the credentials are produced and (unintelligible) this thing that says choice, who sets the auth codes, thick registry versus thin. And so the questions are already in this now? The only piece that's missing is how are we going to get more information on these open questions.

James Bladel: And who do you believe would be the most appropriate? Would it be registries or registrars both?

Simonetta Batteiger: Probably we would need both of them to give us input because both of them would have a role in this so they should tell us whether or not they believe something like this could work.

James Bladel: Okay. So maybe by next week we could discuss with Roy and Barbara and I believe there's one other registry on the call, Paul Diaz, as well as some of the other registrars if we can weigh in on this for Simonetta and give our thoughts to these open questions. Does that sound like a good next step or are we missing something? Take the silence as consent.

Okay well thank you, Simonetta and Mikey and thanks to the sub team. There's quite a bit of work here, as we mentioned. This charter question is

probably represents the majority of the work of this working group - this PDP and the sub team is I think carrying the lion's share of that burden so thank you for presenting this great stuff.

Next up on the agenda is our state of (play) (unintelligible) survey checkpoint. You know, whatever we want to call it we definitely don't want to call it a vote, we definitely don't want to call it consensus. Because I think that it's way too informal to - given those sorts of designations.

But it is, I think, useful to understand as we start to flesh out the structure of our initial report we should have a good understanding, a good handle on where the group is somewhat aligned, where the group is somewhat split, which issues are controversial still and require additional work and which issues maybe perhaps we're spending a lot of time on but we're all just violently agreeing with each other. And I think that that - in the context of those questions this is a useful tool.

I've reviewed some of the responses and I was surprised at some of the issues for - seemed fairly stable and other issues that I thought were fairly innocuous were actually somewhat controversial. So let's take a few minutes to go through these survey results that we've received so far.

And we will - if anyone has any thoughts we'll just kind of discuss as we go along. And then at the end maybe we'll circle back and say what does it all mean in terms of the structure of our initial report and where we need to direct our efforts going forward.

The first question was regarding Charter Question A, change of control. And again this is not a yes/no question, it's more of a which statement is closer to your position. And as you can see the group splits roughly - those who responded - split roughly nine to three in favor of some uniform change of control function.

And I think that that those individuals probably would cite the PowerPoint presentation that we saw very early in our work that demonstrated or illustrated a lot of the confusion around this subject. So that's a fairly - I want to say fairly solid response.

If we move down to Question Number 2, however, we are completely split down the middle from respondents on this. Question 2 describes whether or not change of control should be a standalone policy or whether it should piggyback off of the existing IRTP policy; whether it should be a component of an existing policy.

And I think that we're being - that the group - we need to discuss this issue and spend a little bit more time on the implications of both these choices. And of course we have a couple of folks who indicated that this is irrelevant because they don't believe that a change of control is necessary.

The third question is on this notion of balancing security versus portability. I think the response here is indicative that the current process is perceived to be one that is fraught with vulnerabilities and that there is an opportunity for the working group to enhance security without significantly diminishing the portability or liquidity of a domain name registration.

Question 4 is I believe the final question relative to Charter Question A which is who owns this process? Is it registries because they will have visibility to both ends of the transaction? Or is the registrar who owns the relationship with the context - both the old registrant and the new registrant?

So this is interesting to me because this is another one of those questions that's split roughly down the middle of the working group. So I think that we need to spend a little bit more time on this and figure out what pieces of information we may be missing or what open questions need to be resolved before we can say that we have achieved some level of agreement on this.

So any questions or comments on the first four items of the survey before we move on to Charter Question B? Okay the queue is clear.

Moving onto Question Number 5, Charter Question B. This seems to be fairly solid that there should be some limits on a form of authorization. I think that that is less clear on whether that should be a long duration or a short duration as we see from the next survey question here.

It seems like the short duration, 30-60 days, is - represents the closest statement for most of the participants. Although a significant minority also thinks that, you know, a longer one should be considered.

Question Number 7, and the final question relative to Charter Question C - I was actually surprised at how closely this was split; just my own little personal observation that I thought this was the least controversial of our charter questions and that just goes to show you that PDPs they're nothing if not surprising.

But here we see that the position that registries should uniformly use ICANN IANA numbers to identify registrars is the choice of more of the respondents of the survey but not much more, not significantly more. It's just - a fairly significant minority believes that this is something that we should just let the registries and registrars work out for themselves.

So this was an interesting exercise I think because it's identified some areas of work that remain. It's identified some things that perhaps we've spent some time on that at least as it stands today barring any new information either from constituencies or public comments or anything presented in the workshops, it seems like we're coming down fairly solidly on one side or the other.

Anyone have any thoughts, questions, concerns about this? Again this is not meant to make any definitive declarations, you know, as to where the working

group is standing on these issues? It's mainly just a guidance to say we can proceed with this section of the report because it seems that we have reached some level of agreement on this.

Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, I just wanted - on Question 6 I just want to note for the record if there had been another option longer than - somewhat longer than 30-60 days I might have checked that but that was the time limit available. And the other one, until expiration of the domain name, that could be many years in some cases so that was just way too long. But I don't think we should be bound strictly that 30-60 days; there might be a case to be made for somewhat longer but still limited period in regard to that question.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Phil. And as the author of these questions I probably didn't do anyone any favors by including examples there of what the - what was intended by short or long. I agree with you, there's probably a very significant gap between short and long - the examples that were provided. But your point is taken.

Perhaps there's a middle ground there of one year which is longer than 60 days but less than those multi-year registrations. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: On that same item I am wondering about what the - there wasn't a choice for what the registrant would like to do. So for example some registrants would potentially want to give Mark Monitor their FOA indefinitely or a seller in the domain market might want to keep their authorization for a transfer open for as long as the domain is listed for sale.

So I don't - and that's, again, it kind of goes into this open question, I think, that Mikey and I were talking about. What does an FOA actually do? What is the definition of it? How is that different from maybe some separate credential piece that might not be valid that long?

And I think we need to think about that some more and actually come up with these definitions and provide clarity about what we really mean with this and what the function of it should be.

James Bladel: Thank you, Simonetta. I agree that we need some additional agreed definitions of what the FOA is doing versus like the auth info code or some other token or credential that authorizes these changes.

And I think that this question and this - a number of items in the survey have been highlighted as areas where we need to spend a little bit more time and do a little bit more - do a little bit more background preparation in order to ensure that they're effectively covered in our initial report.

Because if anything here is an open question with this group I think we can be fairly confident that when it goes out to the public comment or any kind of a workshop that the public will let us hear about that and will highlight those omissions. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. I just want to amplify what Simonetta said also to commend Simonetta on a very good summary of our conversation and a very fair representation of it. Great job, Simonetta.

But I think that these definitions of the FOA and the auth code may be right at the core of what we're doing because it could be that simply by changing the definitions and clarifying them we could address the issues in Question A and B without disrupting the policy a whole lot at all.

On the other hand if the definitions go another way then the policy is going to have to change quite a bit in order to accommodate those changes. And so unlike many working groups where, you know, we sort of say, yeah, yeah, yeah, we got to get us some definitions and stick them in an appendix at the

end of the report I think these two definitions are actually right in the mainstream of the work that we need to do.

And so I just want to amplify what Simonetta was saying about the need for some background work by a smart person or people to find out what the definitions of these things are now, where those definitions are stated as the first step on a - what I think is really, really important stuff for the working group. So there you go. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mikey. I put myself in the queue just to kind of add my voice to what you and Simonetta are saying. I think we need to get these nailed down. I don't know if that's something that we can work with with ICANN staff to get better understanding of these terms or these concepts or where the answer lies. But I think you're correct that we need to get these - make sure we're all level-set at these definitions before we can dive into what to do with them.

One thought that I had at least off the cuff was this idea that while an FOA as mentioned in the policy is specific authorization, auth info is I believe mentioned in terms of - it's a conditional, okay, like if you are using EPP to communicate with your registry then you should use this auth info this way.

So it's - if you - I think it implies that there are other ways to communicate with a registry on the low volume basis and that the auth info code would be optional at that point. I mean, I'm ending my statement with a question mark here because I don't know the answer. But it seems as though in that perspective that the FOA is a concept in the policy and the auth info is maybe a part of the implementation of that authorization concept.

But that's just me shooting from the hip. I think that before we proceed on some of these you and Simonetta are absolutely correct, we need to nail down these definitions. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: My question is if we - and it sounds like we all agree that it's important to get this definition done. How are we doing this? is this workgroup asking the process sub team to come up with a draft based on the understanding and thought that we have put into the current process definition?

Or would this workgroup rather do this work in the big group call? And I'm just trying to understand how we're going to get to this definition and when.

James Bladel: Well that's a good point, Simonetta. And I thought, you know, we could possibly put staff on the spot here a little bit at least to get the ball rolling. I'm not saying that we're looking to them to solve this question for us but at least to kind of get the ball rolling and say what is the policy staff or ICANN legal believe these definitions of FOA and auth info code to be? And how do they play off of one another?

And maybe they can then also include the registry and registrar liaison groups in that discussion as well or even the technical groups within ICANN. So what does the group feel about at least kicking this over initially to staff and asking for their first thoughts and then whatever they come back with naturally as part of this working group we would pick that apart, dissemble it and put it back together in a way that this group favors. Any thoughts or concerns or objections on that?

Okay I don't see any red tick marks; I don't see any green ones either so I think there's an indication that this is as good an idea as any which in the absence of really a whole lot of...

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Michele...

James Bladel: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and I ticked green and it probably just isn't scrolling up on your screen so.

James Bladel: Yeah, I didn't see any green. Okay. So apologies to Marika but we're going to probably put this initially on staff's shoulders and ask for them to weigh in on the concept of definitions between these two concepts and see if they can get that conversation started.

And Marika has her hand up. Preferably she's going to solve it for us right now so go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I wish but indeed I agree I think this is probably more a question for the registrar liaison team. And I'm happy to take that back. Although I do suspect that they're probably going to refer back to the language that is in the IRTP. I mean, there might be other places where this is defined but I'm personally not aware of them.

But I've posted that language as well on the right hand side in the pod where it talks about auth info code and as well FOA. And this last paragraph that Simonetta has as well copied in the chat basically talks about the difference between the two so that might already help a bit in, you know, distinguishing the two concepts.

But I'm going to take the question back as well. And if there's anything further I can share I'll definitely do so.

James Bladel: Yeah, thank you. And I think that there's really no wrong answer here. We're looking for staff to provide us with their thoughts. And I lost my whole window there just...

Marika Konings: Yes I did that. I was just going to take my hand down but I pushed the wrong button so hold on.

James Bladel: But someone had raised their hand I saw just before it disappeared.

Marika Konings: There you go.

James Bladel: Oh there we go. Simonetta, go ahead please.

Simonetta Batteiger: I want to actually ask Mikey a question because, Mikey, you said if we
define it this way it would serve our purpose. Can you speak to that?

James Bladel: Mikey, I think...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the end of Simonetta's question.

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh I said you just said well if we were to define FOA this way and auth
code that way it could solve what we're trying to look at. So I was just trying
to understand if you could maybe just speak out loud what your thoughts
were there?

Mikey O'Connor: I don't know that I had a specific thought. I was just thinking that if auth codes
- I'm inventing this so I'm - I'm cautious. Actually I don't want to invent that on
the fly, Simonetta. I should really read these and see whether there's a way
to bend these around.

Because, you know, just to replay what Simonetta was very ably describing
my concern about credentials is when it's unclear what the credentials are
being used for. And thus credentials can be used for more than one function
at a time.

And if there was a definition that said an auth code is just a credential and it
can be used for lots of different things so that everybody is clear that it's just
a credential and it's not necessarily got a meaning beyond that then that
credential can be plugged into lots of different processes and lots of different
ways. But that also kind of implies that the credential has a pretty short life
because it can change its meaning.

That's a long convoluted thing that I need to sort of stare at this language and cogitate a little bit about. Sorry to ramble so much, Simonetta.

James Bladel: I think we all from your rambling, Mikey, and we all come away a little bit smarter. So well let's try and put a button on this particular topic and note that we have identified an area ambiguity and we have asked ICANN staff policy but also working with some of the other groups to start the conversation by providing their take on the definitions and the interplay between auth info and FOA.

And we can then have a more substantive discussion next time around or preferably on the mailing list about what these things mean to us and how they impact our ideal process but as well as that I think it also impacts the Charter Question B.

So with that I just wanted to ask if there's any one who - else who would like to offer any general comments on this survey and - before we wrap up this area here and move onto the next item of our agenda? So any final thoughts?

Okay seeing that the queue is empty we'll move onto Agenda Item Number 6 which is a schedule checkpoint in our work plan. And this is where we review the work plan that we've set out for ourselves and see how we're doing versus the schedule that we've established and see if we need to pick up the pace or if there's any loose items that need to be accelerated.

So looking at the work plan it looks like we all have scroll control here or at least I do. If we can scroll down I believe it's on Page 2 I see that we are on April 17, which is about two-thirds of the way down the second page. And at this point we should be wrapping up our discussion of Charter Question A for initial report and defining open issues if necessary.

I think that we have - with the draft process I think that we have an outline of what an ideal process would look like. But we certainly have defined a number of open issues and - that need to be addressed.

Looking forward a little bit we see from next week from the 24th of April through the 22nd of May, which is one, two, three, four, five working group calls, we are scheduled to be focused on deliberations on Charter Question B and Charter Question C while reviewing and constructing language relative to Charter Question A.

And then that takes us right up to a review of an initial report the 29th of May. And that can be released then for - we're looking at a publication deadline for Prague. And one of the questions that we discussed I believe a couple of calls ago was whether we wanted to release this report by the document deadline for Prague or come to Prague with this document in hand and sort of present our initial report at that meeting.

And I think, you know, without commenting too much on the remainder of the schedule between Prague and Toronto it seems like that, you know, either are probably viable tasks forward. It really kind of depends on how comfortable we are at the document deadline or whether we just feel that that's just too much of a rough product at that point.

But I welcome your thoughts and comments on this. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. I actually think that's one of the two concerns we should look at in terms of the report coming out. In terms of it - for example, with the report coming out it's okay to list those issues where we think we're reaching consensus, those where there are still, you know, a split opinion and then use the comments that we get from that to take it further.

There can also be value though if we think that some sort of open discussion will help to frame those issues better so that the group can come to more closure before putting out the initial report.

So I think one of the things it's not only can we get something written but is there value in using the meeting to see whether the face to face more open discussion can help us come to closure on any of the issues that remain somewhat separated. And I think that's a decision that we'll have to take as we get sort of closer to that deadline.

Because it's certainly possible to put out the document and say reached consensus on these, you know, have not reached consensus on those, strong support for the others, etcetera, and then use comments. But the more we can have an initial report with, you know, known levels of consensus the better it is. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. And if I understood your comment correctly I just have one follow up question. So do you believe that there is a point here in between today and May 29 where we have to make that decision on whether or not we are going to choose the June 1 or we're going to bring those open questions to Prague? And do you feel like - what do you feel is an appropriate...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

James Bladel: ...timeframe for making that decision?

Avri Doria: Okay I believe that the 15th and the 22nd of May meetings where we're reviewing the draft, we're reviewing where we got to and it's at that point we can face the question of, you know, what do we think gives us a more complete initial report? Do we send it out now because we're in pretty good shape in terms of what we understand and what we don't, where we agree and what we don't? Or do we think a face to face meeting with the public will move it further?

If we look at where we are on the 15th and 22nd and say, you know, I really need more of a comment period to come to any closure on this then we might as put out the initial report. But if we think that the meeting can help us close some of the issues then we shouldn't.

And so I think it's a fairly easy - well it's easy to say - decision, procedure that we've got there is what's most beneficial? But I think that those two weeks when we're actually reviewing what Marika was able to write based upon what we all said is when we can make that determination.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. And I would like to second that approach and identify those two weeks, the 15th and the 22nd, as kind of the stakes out in the ground where when we hit those points we have to make the decision of whether or not to release what we have as far as an initial report by the document deadline or proceed to the Prague meeting and introduce the report there. So perhaps, Marika, if you can capture that in our work plan.

I see that Marika and Simonetta both have their hands raised. And I don't know who came first so in those situations I would ask that we defer to staff and then, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that for the Prague meeting planning we've been requested to complete our meeting request by the 3rd of May or - so that's already approaching very quickly. So but at this stage I don't think that requires the working group to already decide, you know, what it wants to do; whether it thinks it will publish its initial report or whether it thinks it will have, you know, just a general discussion there.

But it just means I need to put a stake in the ground and, you know, request a meeting time and probably write, you know, in very general manner what the working group, you know, thinks it will be doing. But I can do that in general terms. And what we've done in the past is then just create a wiki page on

which we can then post the more detailed information as we get closer to the date.

So one thing the working group might want to think about is, you know, what date and what time would suit everyone best? Does the same time as we had in Costa Rica suit everyone? I think we had the Wednesday morning slot. And that's usually a time that is open for workshops or working group meetings.

Alternatively I think normally Thursday mornings are also open for those types of sessions. So if there's any kind of specific, you know, input on that, you know, please let me know so I can take that into account when we complete our meeting forms.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Marika. And Avri has posted in the chat that perhaps - similar to what I was thinking perhaps that we need to secure that timeslot whether we present the data, the document, or not just because regardless of whether it's been released or whether it's the first time we're bringing that document to the public we can go with that document.

And we can always use the time for a face to face as well similar to what we did in Costa Rica. So I think that in either case securing the time slot on the Prague agenda is probably beneficial.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I was going to ask...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...a clarifying question because I think Avri is actually talking about two different meetings so one public meeting and one working group meeting. So it would be good as well to get, you know, confirmation or clarification on that because that will require either, you know, requesting a longer slot so it could be a, you know, that I request a slot of two hours so where, you know, one

hour is the working group meeting and one hour the public session or two different meetings on different days and different times.

So that's something that, you know, the working group might want to consider, you know, what it wants to do. And I see Mikey is asking an afternoon slot but I think it's really hard because a lot of the afternoons are actually taken up by, you know, public forum, GNSO Council meeting so I'm afraid that might be challenging.

James Bladel: Yeah, we don't want - and even if we got it really, really early in the morning, Mikey, you could just have a late night. So Simonetta has been waiting patiently and then that will be our last comment for the day. So go ahead, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I have two questions. The first question is do we know what's currently missing for us to be able to produce the initial report? And if that list is known are all these items planned to be addressed in our work plan? So I think that's something that maybe Marika and Avri and you can collaborate upon.

And the second thought is does it matter that we have good consensus on the I terms that we put in that initial draft or should we just put out a draft and label it as such in any way? And it would then just be a matter of how do we - and what type of information are we trying to get out of that Prague meeting?

And the other thing that I thought was that we should definitely try to get on the Registrar Stakeholder agenda for Prague so that we can be there and present information there so there is no way they can tell us afterwards that we had no idea what kind of a process you're drafting here and when we should have given input.

James Bladel: Right no I think that that is definitely something we need to do is get on the registrar's radar early - as early as possible and hit them with this topic as often as possible so that there are no surprises. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, on the consensus I think it's important to try - and this is really the thankless task for the co-chairs and Marika especially but for the three of us - to try and - because one of the ways you know when you've reached consensus is when you've stated this is where we think you are and everybody shouts oh no you don't.

And you get to basically refine it until you say this is where we think we are and everybody leaves it alone. So I think it's important to start taking those initial estimations in the initial report. It's also something that makes other people react.

So in others words for us to say the group seems to be arriving, you know, the group that's inside that box seems to be arriving at a consensus on this if you just tell people that we're discussing Option A and Option B they may go ho-hum. If you tell them that we're going towards consensus on Option A then that may raise their alarm flag.

So I think it's really important as part of the progressive refinement in terms of finding rough consensus to, at an early stage, for the three of us to guess where it's at. And of course the poll is part of that. But to sort of guess where it's at, be brave enough to write it and then have you all - and everyone else say no, no, no that can't be. And that's how we get there. So thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. I agree with that. We'll probably need to wrap up for today. I think that to your point and to Simonetta's question I think we're just now starting to identify those holes or those gaps. And we can then start to propose language to fill them with the understanding that they're drafts and they're intended at this point to provoke a response.

Okay so thanks again, everyone, for your time and your - for lending us your opinions and expertise. I think we are making solid progress especially want to thank the sub teams that are working in between the calls to fill out some

of these open issues and of course identifying new ones. So thanks again everybody and we will see you on the same channel next week.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Simonetta Batteiger: Thank you. Bye.

Phil Corwin: Thanks. Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Ricardo), you may now stop the recordings.

END