

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 07 February 2012 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 07 February 2012 at 1500 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-jig-20120207-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Alain Berranger - NPOC
Avri Doria - co-chair
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Barbara Knight - RySG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Rob Villeneuve - RrSG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Roy Dykes - RySG
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Bob Mountain - Registrar SG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Paul Diaz- RySG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Angie Graves - CBUC
James Bladel -co-chair

Jacob Williams - Individual
Matt Serlin - RrSG

Coordinator: The recording has now started.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yeah, I'm going to basically go through a review of the agenda that'll be followed by the roll call. This gives people a few more minutes to get into the roll call.

We've got a - the next item is continuing the review of the public statements and stakeholder group and constituencies that have been received. It's my hope I think that we're near the end of that and that possibly can be finished today. That was certainly the laid-out schedule for that.

Assuming that happens then we'll basically review the work plan for what is next then go into a beginning review - I don't know how time will go today in terms of completing it, reviewing the mine map approach that had been set out for the Charter Question A, looking at that in terms of the work plan, looking at that in terms of what has been learned and discussed and the review of public comments, amend it (all) and go through that then confirmation of next meeting, next steps and any other business.

Any comments, corrections, changes, etcetera, on the agenda? Alain, I see you put your horn on did that you mean you wanted to raise your hand or is that...

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: No, Avri, I don't know...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alain Berranger: ...my sound is maxed but...

((Crosstalk))

Alain Berranger: ...maybe it's my problem. I can barely hear you.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry, well maybe I'm just not shouting hard enough in the microphone.

Alain Berranger: Oh that's - that's great.

Avri Doria: Okay, I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't ignoring a comment. Okay...

Alain Berranger: Okay no that's great.

Avri Doria: Okay if I've got no comments on the agenda - I see no hands I've got no alternates. Okay great. Nathalie, could you do a roll call at this point? Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Sure, Avri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTTP-C call on the 7th of February, 2012. On the call today we have Alain Berranger, Barbara Knight, Avri Doria, Mikey O'Connor, Bob Mountain, Simonetta Batteiger on the Adobe, Chris Chaplow equally on the Adobe, Philip Corwin and Kevin Erdman.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Jacob Williams, Matt Serlin, Angie Graves, James Bladel 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, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And as ever I want to remind people that if you need to make an update to your statements of interest please do so and flag it to the group. Thank you.

Okay, Marika, where exactly did we leave off? I admit that at the last - end of the last meeting my attention strayed and I'm not really sure exactly if I remember exactly where we left off on the discussion.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We left off at Comment 9.

Avri Doria: At Comment 9. Okay...

Marika Konings: Page 6.

Avri Doria: Right then I guess beginning with Comment 9 is a good thing. Will you take it through as you have been - through to now?

Marika Konings: Yes sure.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Marika Konings: So Comment 9 still relates to I think Charter Question C and the question on whether or not to require IANA IDs. And it's a comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group that said it's generally agreed that registrar name changes often do make it difficult to ensure that the correct registrar is identified and use of the IANA ID may be helpful in confirming registrar identification.

It is reasonable to think that all registries do maintain the IANA ID for each registrar in their registration systems.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Does anyone wish to comment on that - on - I mean, it's sort of a statement of fact as they see it. I guess the question I have is when they say it is reasonable to think that all registries do maintain the IANA ID for each register in their registration system is that indeed the case that all do or do we know or is there a way of knowing? Barbara, please.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara.

Avri Doria: Please, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Okay so basically all registries have monthly reporting that's due to ICANN. And within those monthly reporting there is a per registrar - I don't know how to describe it - per registrar activity report if you will.

And within that report registries, you know, provide the registrar name as well as the IANA ID. So given that it's pretty clear that someone within their system all registries would be maintaining that information.

Avri Doria: Okay they just don't necessarily have it in the places where they would need to be using it for these functions?

Barbara Knight: Exactly. And part of that is because most registry operators will support not only gTLDs but ccTLDs. And as you may know ccTLD registrars are not required to have ICANN accreditation so therefore they may not have an IANA ID or what we call (GUR-ID).

So, you know, based on that that's what has really driven a lot of registry operators to move to using a proprietary ID instead because they have those for all registrars that are in the system and performing transactions.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Barbara Knight: Sure.

Avri Doria: Does anyone else wish to comment on Number 9? Okay. And I don't see any necessary working group response here because it's really a statement about what happens and expectations. I don't know is there a working group response to this other than to acknowledge the point? Okay.

So which case I guess then, yes - yes, Roy, please.

Roy Dykes: Hi, good morning, sorry I'm late. I just joined. And so, Barbara, I may not have caught what you said that we talked about offline? Did I miss it?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. We haven't gotten to that point yet, Roy...

Roy Dykes: Okay.

Barbara Knight: ...so I think it's probably going to be in one of the future comments.

Roy Dykes: Okay, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Roy Dykes: Sorry, I'm just getting caught up.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So okay so we'll leave 9 basically just as a comment to acknowledge in that there's no real response for this group to make to that other than I guess generally agreeing that, yeah, they have it but I guess perhaps also acknowledging while they may have it they do not necessarily have it instantiated in their system framework in a way that makes it immediately useable.

Does that - would that be a correct way of putting it? I see Barbara agreeing. Okay if there are no other comments on that one then move onto 10.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So these are basically comments that relate to some of the more detailed questions that we asked in the stakeholder group template. So the first question there was in relation to Charter Question A, the issue report notice that the data of - on the frequency of hijacking cases is a pivotal part of the analysis.

A mechanism should be explored to develop accurate data around this issue in a way that meets the needs of registrars to protect proprietary information while at the same time providing a solid foundation for database policy making and data on legitimate transfer activity benefitting from the current locking policy wording needs to be collected.

And the Registry Stakeholder Group response to that specific question: Registries do not have a comprehensive view of hijacking cases as very few cases ever reach the registries for action. It is agreed that data relating to the frequency of hijacking instances is critical to understanding the extent of the issue.

The Registry Stakeholder Group is hopeful that registrars may be able to propose a mechanism by which to gather and provide information in the manner that will protect the proprietary nature of the data.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Do we have any comments, questions, elucidations on Point 10? Yes, Bob.

Bob Mountain: Hi, thanks Avri. This is Bob. I guess the question I would have is I know one of the reasons that it's been - there's been some concern about collecting hijacking data has been sort of opening up or giving the hijackers some ammunition or insights into how the system works or whatever.

I guess I'd just like to propose a question where if the information is collected in the aggregate is that in fact going to help the hijackers or by, you know, keeping it, you know, at some level aggregated or, you know, or anonymous. Is that simply just going to give us data that we can work with to identify the scope of the problem without necessarily giving the hijackers information that would hurt us? That's all.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any comments to that? Yes, Mikey. Please go ahead, Mikey. Either that or you're on mute.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, sorry, I was very eloquent but it works better with the phone not muted. This is Mikey O'Connor. I don't really have a direct response to Bob's question. But one of the things that we've been working on in the DSSA is a fairly elaborate protocol to protect confidential information.

And I mostly just wanted to alert this group that we'd certainly be happy to share that and that that model might be a good way to handle this information in such a way that we could get pretty detailed information but protect that information from broad distribution and thus maybe mitigate that risk that Bob is asking us about.

You know, we did - the sharing information provides ammunition to the bad guys discussion is a thread that's run through just about every IRTP working group back to the dawn of time. And so that's the reason it's in there.

And I think that one of the things that we could do is rather than confront that assumption directly maybe just work on mitigating the risks of that in the way that we handle the information.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, Mikey. As part of what you said is there a recommended action that we learn from the DSSA groups what you're referring to and have a more detailed conversation on that? Is that one of the things you would recommend we do in terms of following up this issue?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that it would be easy for us to share the protocol. And, you know, at a minimum we might take a look at it. So, sure, yeah, let's put that in as a recommendation.

Avri Doria: Okay well...

Mikey O'Connor: That sounds like a good plan.

Avri Doria: Okay. I see - I was basically just trying to interpret what you were saying. Simonetta, please.

Simonetta Batteiger: One thought I had about this is - and I know we discussed this at length in IRTP Part B. And I think one concern was from certain registrars that they wouldn't have - want to be known for being a relatively larger or lesser problem in regards to hijacking cases because I think there is assumptions that certain registrars have more or less hijacking cases than others. And it would be bad press for whoever happens to be one who has relatively many of them.

But I thought one of the items that would have been very nice to know is just the number of cases so one thing that would be put together as part of IRTP Part B would eventually kind of provide some of that data.

But I was wondering if there was like trusted entity that for example may be the Registrar Stakeholder Group has someone who's kind of like a liaison to us who could collect just like from I don't know maybe the top 30 or 40 registrars in the world just how many cases did you have so we can get a sense for how often does this happen that a domain name gets hijacked versus how often does a domain name legitimately transfer.

And if that ratio turns out to be it's like 0.001% of all cases then that tells you something versus if let's say the ratio were 5% of all cases that tells you something else. So I think that piece of data would be very beneficial for this group to have so we can kind of gauge the extent of that issue and it's not been something we've ever been able to establish.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So if I understand correctly - and because I wasn't an active part of B, I was just one of the lurkers, is that at some point in time IRTP-B if everything is approved and affected there will be this data. But at this point

there isn't the data. So is there some way we can get at least some notion, some specific, some what have you from a registrar liaison to - as input into this group so we know how serious an issue we're dealing with. Is that a - is that close? And therefore...

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...a recommendation would be making a request of the registrars for some liaising with this group on this information. Is there anyone from the registrars that can speak to the possibility, the probability, the likelihood?

I mean, I wouldn't assume that bad press would be something that would keep somebody from being willing to discuss it but then again what do I know about bad press? So is there anyone that would like to comment on that further?

Okay so we basically put down as a second recommended action is this liaising with the registrars to get some indicative information of how much of a problem it is. And perhaps we can work with that registrar liaison when it appears to determine exactly what kind of information is possible, is obtainable, without great fear.

Any other comments on 10? So I guess our immediate response to 10 would be that, you know, we understand that the problem has existed since before dawn and that we are looking at both - for both more information on the extent of the issue and information from DSSA and perhaps other groups if there are other groups who have solutions that while possibly not solving at the very least mitigate the issues.

Is that a reasonable summary for both response and recommended action? Okay seeing no hands either way - okay I see at least one green. Do I see any violently objecting reds? Oh yes, Chris, please.

Chris Chaplow: Sorry, Avri, I pushed the wrong button; it was actually meant to be an agreement so I'll just...

Avri Doria: Oh okay thank you. Thank you. And I see no reds on that. Any other comments on 10 before moving on? Okay thank you. How about the next one, Marika? Thanks.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So the next one relates to further information on the process that ccTLDs use to affect a change of control. And the Registry Stakeholder Group notes there that the Registry Stakeholder Group defers to the registrar community for feedback on this issue.

And just to note that this was something that we already discussed as well in one of our previous meeting noting that input from others including the ccTLD Registry should be explored.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So do we have any further discussion on this one at this point? In terms of recommended actions I assume that we've already done outreach to ccTLDs and that's an action recommended and I think perhaps already taken. Are there any other recommended actions that people would suggest? Any other comments on this issue? None.

Okay then we can move on with this one. In the next one the Question 12.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika again. So basically this relates - this in a similar way asking for further input and data and incidents in relation to Charter Question B and C. And here the Registry Stakeholder Group also notes that it refers to the registrar community for feedback noting that the Registry Stakeholder Group has little to no information relating to the age of FOA used in the transfer of domain names from one registrar to another.

And there we already know that as well that there would be of interest to get input from others in the community as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. Do we have any recommended actions on this one? Not at this time. Does anyone have a - does anyone have a comment on 12? So one of the things - it seems that there are several things to me that are looking for additional input from registrars, additional input from others at some point - and we've done separate reaching out.

There may be sort of a - oh okay, Bob, yes, I see your hand up while I'm rattling on.

Bob Mountain: Thanks, Avri. This is Bob speaking. Unfortunately I'm sorry I was unable to make the call last week, I had a conflict while traveling. But I did read the transcript and it looked like there was quite a bit of discussion, if I'm not mistaken, about this towards the middle of the meeting.

I guess the question is - on the topic of FOA - where did - it wasn't clear based on the transcript where we left it around the options of extending the FOA auto-renewing. I was wondering if someone who was on the call could perhaps clarify that just so I'm on the same page in terms of where we were - where we were to go next on that.

Avri Doria: As far as I remember - and maybe I lost it and Marika or someone else can correct me. I think it was a ranging discussion without a concluding point. And I think going to making the decision on what or where is sort of the next stage but I may be mistaken.

But I don't think any decisions were made on what to - I mean, on sort of the points themselves but more - or in the process of making decisions on do we need to do anything else; where do we need to go on these things. I don't believe...

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...we made a final decision that this group recommends X or Y. Yes, Bob.

Bob Mountain: Okay right, sorry, I took my hand down; I shouldn't have. This is Bob. The - so I guess is that appropriate then or is that where we're going to - this Question 12 is that where really this FOA is mainly centered? And is it next to get for the comments or should we have a subgroup go off and work it and come back with recommendations? You know, I'm just curious as to what we think the specifics on this one should be.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and that's sort of I guess similar to my question now. Since it's referring mostly to Charter B and C and we're moving up on A perhaps we do have a little bit of time to figure out what we want to do here and perhaps the recommended action at this point is your question.

You know, in terms of the information and the discovery or what that's necessary to make this - figure out how we want to do it. And do we want to, you know, do outreach for specific questions? Do we want a subgroup? I guess it would be interesting to hear - I see a couple hands - what the view is at the moment. Bob, you still have your hand up.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, I guess, you know, I'll certainly volunteer to participate or head up a subgroup, you know, if that's what people agrees is the right thing to do just to further flush this one out a little bit. I'll lower my hand. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. So from my perspective I just wanted to say that I do agree with Bob's idea to do a working group, you know, a smaller subset if you will.

And maybe it should be comprised of registrars who have the data who kind of know, you know, can put together some statistics on what the typical FOA age is and bring some of that information back to the group so we can kind of

see what, you know, in practice would be perhaps a reasonable period of time for a transfer to be processed based on, you know, FOA age or what have you.

And then from that we could go to a larger group to see what people's thoughts are. That's all.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. The only thing in that I would question - and I'm curious to see what other people say - is that while certainly the group would need to have registrars in it if someone that was not a registrar wants to be part of this subgroup because they had, you know, either deep understanding or deep impressions about what kind of information should be found would you object to that your formulation of a group.

And I see Mikey, Barbara and Bob. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri. It's Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. I think a lot of it depends on the nature of the group. If the group is an information-gathering group with a charter to bring back data for the rest of the committee, while I - I can't imagine that there'd be any restrictions on non-registrars participating just for sake of transparency I wouldn't think it'd be terribly interesting because it's mostly a data mining exercise.

If on the other hand the subgroup is really the subgroup to handle Charter Question B then for sure I think we have to have all sorts of people in there. And so I think one of the things we might want to do is be careful to charter that subgroup appropriately so that people know whether it's really necessary for them to participate or not.

If it's a subgroup that's told go off and find out the numbers and come back and tell us then I'm not terribly useful as a participant. But if it's go figure out the answer to Charter Question B then I think we've got a broader interest and base for participation.

Avri Doria: Yes - no thank you, yeah, no I understand. I think sometimes though there are just people that are into data mining because they're into data mining and may have an outside perspective that helps. I think this group is primarily the, as you put it, the data mining.

Okay I see Mikey's hand still up. One hand disappeared but Bob's is still up.

Bob Mountain: Yeah my - sorry, this is Bob. I guess my thinking - my suggestion was, you know, not just get some data but come up with recommendations on what the, you know, what the appropriate or some scenarios on how to solve this so I would think it would be a blend myself.

But if the, you know, group would rather just get some data as the first step, you know, I would certainly, you know, agree that it would make sense to have it be a more registrar-focused team. So that's all.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I got a note from Barbara in the chat that says I took my hand down as I agree with Mikey's perspective. It should be open to all if it goes beyond pulling data.

And I guess the point I was making is that - and Simonetta you're saying it should go beyond just the data to the solution or - because I was thinking it might be good to start with something that is pulling data that is open primarily to registrars but that others could participate if they had a need to and then to take a checkpoint on the data before moving onto actually doing solutions.

But I guess, Simonetta, you have your hand up.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think just from my perspective and I think Bob would have a similar experience with this. FOAs and marketplace scenario and then moving names from A to B they don't necessarily only get issued the moment

someone is actually doing the transfer; they might be something that's on file somewhere and has been there for a very long time.

And I know that at some of the corporate registrars like Mark Monitor and these corporations they also have FOAs on file for some of their clients for very long times. And they might not necessarily use them the same way as they're typically used.

So when we're looking at this FOA issue I think it would be helpful for everyone to understand all the different kind of use cases there are and what their purpose is so we can come to a good picture of what's going on with the use of FOAs and what needs to be taken into account there.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri. It's Mikey for the transcript. I think we're working on the right issue which is the charter for this subgroup. I think in no case should the subgroup be restricted to the registrars. If somebody wants to participate in the data mining I strongly support the notion that they should be able to participate.

It's just that I think in that case most of us probably wouldn't have a lot to contribute. But as Avri points out some of us are smart about that kind of thing and could probably help.

But Simonetta and Bob are talking I think about a broader charter subgroup. And I'm not sure that we really need to take that conversation down to a subgroup; maybe we do. But I think that that broader charter is really come up with the recommendation about Charter Question B. I mean, that's - that whole conversation it seems to me fits into the - to our primary charge as a working group.

So it might be easier for a subgroup to go off and come up with recommendations. But in that case I think lots of people get to be involved in that.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks Avri. Yeah, I guess, Mikey, I wasn't thinking long extended absence, you know, with much work to come back, you know, come back later. I think in IRTP-B I thought we had some success where very short iterations where the team would go off and just try and, you know, a subgroup - small team would just come up with some ideas and just bring them back very quickly, you know, short iterations.

And more than anything just a small focused team to come up with suggestions which could then be discussed at the larger group. So I think that's what I was thinking just based on my experience with IRTP and what seemed to work there.

Avri Doria: What I would like to suggest and see if this works I think there's - seems to be general support on there being a subgroup on it being open but of course restricted to people that have something pertinent to say or do so it'll be mostly registrars.

What I'm wondering if we can't just sort of in that quick iterative style say that the first item that this group is going to work on is the information gathering problem and come back with suggestions of how and what in terms of the information, and at another point then have that group, perhaps that same group or that same group expanded, once it's filled a first step of gathering the information, then move on perhaps to discussing, but basically the whole group having looked at the information and saying aha, there's interest in solutions for this nature, for that aspect, for that, you know, result.

So would it be acceptable for people to do that, to put together a small group of pertinent, involved individuals, mostly registrars but others possibly, to basically start with the information gathering, come back to this group and then see where it goes from there.

Does anyone object to doing it that way, I see agreement for agreeing to it. Any reds for thinking it's a horrible way to proceed on the step-by-step - okay, so - okay, thanks. And I heard at least Bob volunteer, thank you.

I see no red, so that's good. I see a hand up. Marika, sorry, I missed your hand because I had the slider down, sorry.

Marika Konings: No, no problem, I just actually - this is Marika. My question actually - would this group then start it in parallel of discussions on the other charter questions...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...and I know we spoke as well and we'll probably go back, I guess, to the mind map where we discussed before about the approaches for the different charter questions. I'm wondering as well if it's worth, you know, going back there to see what we said there to see if that aligns with what we're discussing now of creating this new sub-team and I just don't understand then as well how that would then fit into our discussions of all the other issues that we are still covering, as this is just the first step of actually looking at the comments that were received.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think one of the reasons why I was suggesting that it just work on the information gathering was I was thinking of it as a parallel activity for some people, thinking it was something that may take time to figure out and to actually gather. So I had been thinking of, but you're right, we can certainly look at how it fits in. So I guess there's a recommendation that we do this, but we need to go back to the schedule as you're sort of indicating, before we

indicate - not perhaps when it starts, but when it should be ready with an answer by, and then it gives it, as a group, time to figure out how it wants to get it done.

Does that make sense? So in terms of the recommended action, its first step is gather information by a small group and we'll figure out where that fits in with the schedule as we move along. Any other issues on 12?

Okay, moving to 13 and 13 is our last, what a lucky number.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. Question 13 is asking for - we ask your input on the use of proprietary IDs versus IANA IDs, and this is a comment I think we already briefly touched upon in our previous call, because the feedback from the Registry Stakeholder Group is that at least two registries have been identified as using proprietary IDs instead of the IANA-assigned IDs. In the case of at least one of these registries, proprietary IDs are used in all registrar-registry communications.

The primary driver behind the user proprietary IDs via - versus IANA IDs is security. The registries that currently use proprietary IDs have indicated that the use of proprietary IDs aids in the prevention of mining of WHOIS data based on publicly available IANA IDs. There would need to be a compelling reason for these registries to transition to the use of IANA IDs as the level of effort involved would be significant given that all systems would be impacted.

In addition, it was later added that in certain cases, registries deal with registrars that also sell ccTLDs, for which there is no IANA ID. And in those cases it is considered more efficient to have one single proprietary ID.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think we sort of did cover that when we discussed 9. I hear myself echoing. So I think - is there anything new to add on this point other than the (unintelligible) - could somebody who has me on echo please turn off their phone? Thank you.

Okay, so is there anything - yes, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara, for the transcript, and I just wanted to note here that Roy and I actually were able to get together with some representatives from other registries as well and have a conversation surrounding this. And I don't know, Roy, do you want to do the summary of that or do you want me to go ahead and just summarize it?

Roy Dykes: If you wouldn't mind, but I have your notes up here too to make sure everything's covered.

Barbara Knight: Okay. So basically, the conversation we had was surrounding what it would take in order to, you know, try to move from a proprietary ID to a - to the IANA IDs, should that be deemed something that is critical to being able to operate the registrar's business. So in that conversation, I think we all agreed that, you know, any time we're looking at development efforts on the side of the registry, we obviously have development and roadmaps for development that go out, you know, in some cases many quarters, and I know in the case of Verisign, I can speak personally from that. You know, we go out 12, 15, sometimes 18 months, you know, from a development perspective and just getting things on the roadmap.

So depending on what all is touched by the development effort, just getting it on the roadmap and implemented, you know, tested and implemented, the whole nine yards, you know, it could take up to 18 months for implementation. So, you know, obviously that's something to take into consideration. I'm not saying no, we shouldn't do it if there is a valid reason to do it, but we do need to recognize that the implementation window would need to be long enough to allow all registries to comply with that.

Further to that, I think it would be very helpful because in order to determine the level of effort, we really need to know very specifically what it is that the

registrars, which reports would be impacted, which communications would be impacted in order to define what those requirements are. And then, again, gain that level of effort. So that's just the feedback that we got in the initial conversation that we had about this in the smaller group last week. So Roy, does that pretty much sum it up?

Roy Dykes: Yes it is. I think you covered everything nicely.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I have Simonetta with her hand up. I have one quick question on this. Is this a sort of ad hoc group that's going to continue talking about this or was this, like, a one-shot, let's have a conversation on this issue, just to understand how it fits into ongoing efforts, Barbara or Roy?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. To the extent that we need to have further conversations, then I think everybody that, you know, joined Roy and myself on that call would be available, because obviously we all have a vested interest in how this comes out. So while we don't have a regularly scheduled meeting time to the extent that we need to engage that group, you know, there is a willingness to participate in that in order to get the information that's needed.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Mikey was first.

Avri Doria: Mikey, oh sorry, I keep having the slider off, I apologize. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Absolutely no worries, Avri. Marika, you might want to make the participants box a little bit taller. That slider does cause a problem because people can't see the whole list and so they can't see people raising and lowering their hands, so that'll help that.

I want to make sort of a parallel point to the one that we made on number 12. I think we're confusing the conversation about this request, which is really a

request for data, with the actual charter question. And I think just like 12, what we might want to do is kick off some sort of parallel subgroup type effort to gather the data just to find out. Because that's, you know, that's really what this is about is getting that specific information pulled together, you know, who is using what, so that we can feed that information into the broader question.

And so while I think that Barbara and (Roy's) comments are great, I would suggest that they're not appropriate here. They're appropriate back up underneath the actual charter question and that the way to tackle this is pretty similar to the way that we're tackling the FOA issue, that we may want to have a little group go off and first job is to pull some data together. And then as the group gets closer to making the iterative policy recommendations, that the group gets broader as the rest of the members of the Working Group can actually participate and contribute.

Avri Doria: I see Barbara agreeing, thank you. Simonetta? Oh yeah, I did check if there was anybody else.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think one other data point therefore just trying to figure out what is the information we need to know on this one would be to find out from those registries who are offering their services as ICANN providers for the new gTLD applicants, what their intentions are in relation to the IANA IDs. Because I think the main concern from a registrar's point of view came up with the fact that there might be hundreds of new registries joining the ecosystem that may or may not use IANA IDs and it would be desirable for registrars in working with all these new entities that it is one common approach to the issue. So I think if we could collect and ask specifically those registries like Verisign or NeuStar or AusRegistry and all the others that were out there offering their services to the new applicants what they are intending to do, that might be a helpful data point for us to have.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So there's nothing - I see an agreement from Mikey. So it's not something that - for all the times I've read the new gTLD Applicant Guidelines, there's no requirements on this going forward on the new registries, is that correct? This is not something that was preempted by the application guidebook writers with an existing solution. Simonetta, your hand's up again?

Simonetta Batteiger: Firstly, I don't know, so another piece of data we should just look up is in there anything in the guidebook that speaks to this already?

Avri Doria: And I'm terribly ashamed of myself for not knowing, since I sometimes think I've memorized that book and could refer to it as, you know, (unintelligible), but I guess not on this issue. So okay, so I get the impression that there is also a level of support for the notion of putting together another small information gathering team that would work in parallel and basically have as a goal having the information by the time this Working Group - if I'd look at it from a scheduling perspective, it would be by the time we were ready to start charter question C, then hopefully the information would have been gathered and could be presented as part of that discussion.

Simonetta, is your hand up again? Or did...

Simonetta Batteiger: I mean, one thought I just had is just from a timing perspective, these new applications are going to start setting up their operational setup as early as fall or maybe Q1 of next year. I don't think we're going to be done with the work this Work Group is doing, so if the topic is one that registrars care about a lot, then maybe just on an informal level, letting the right people know. And again, that would probably be the back end service providers for these new applicants that it might be a best practice, because if you want to have access to the registrar channels and sales outlet that you use IANA IDs, that could just be a piece of feedback that we could informally give to those folks, because I don't think we're going to be done and wrapped up and having everything gone through the Board before this becomes an issue.

Avri Doria: Okay, I see Mikey agreeing with that. So I would think that that kind of recommendation, if it was going to come out of this group and sent to the GNSO though, would come when we were actually discussing (fee) and had gotten some information. So while I think you're right, this group won't have finished and gotten approval from GNSO and the Board by then, I think we probably will have gotten to the fee discussion in time, although I'm not sure. Yes, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey for the transcript. There is a history in the IRTP of another way to communicate. We had an issue come up with the budget several IRTP's ago, where a subgroup of us informally wrote a memo to the budget gods, I can't remember who, saying that although we hadn't finished our work, it was clear from what we were doing that it would be good to allocate some budget to improve the systems in the compliance operation.

And we just formed a gaggle of ourselves because we were out of whack with the schedule of the IRTP. But almost everybody in the Working Group at that time signed it and, you know, if schedule means that we can't pump out an actual recommendation in time for what Simonetta is proposing, we might consider that kind of thing instead.

Avri Doria: We have as June 1, our initial report. If we need to do something sooner, I think we still have time. I don't know, would June 1, once we've got our initial report, be too late for such a recommendation?

I mean, we're barely into application review at that point. And so assuming that we're on schedule by the time IRTP - the initial report was due, in time for Prague, we should have covered the issue. Or would that be considered too late for this? Yes, Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I think it's fine to have our recommendation or an initial recommendation by June 1. But knowing also what Barbara and Roy have shared in terms of

registry roadmaps aligning and things like that, and knowing from my own experience being a product manager here at Sedo, I would just always prefer to know things as soon as possible. So even if this is not, like, a formal statement going the direction of the registry (unintelligible) providers, just to kind of, like, even if it's just a description of what we're talking about and giving them feedback, that registrars would like that as soon as possible, I think would be nice for them to have as a heads-up.

Avri Doria: Okay. So in terms of this issue - yes, Roy, please.

Roy Dykes: Yes, I think all the comments are good but I think it still goes back to what Barbara was saying earlier about having an understanding of the additional information and the specific requirements of, you know, what messages are being passed here, what communications are being used and reports are being generated. So I think there's a little bit of - it might be a little bit of chicken and egg here, but I think it's still having an understanding from the registrar's perspective of what's being, you know, what the IANA ID is being used for.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So if I understood correctly, what you're saying is, and I have been thinking of carts and horses, is that - I'm echoing again - is that first we should gather the information and then we should decide if we're making either an informal or a formal or any sort of recommendation. Would that be a correct interpretation?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. I - does anyone object to gathering the information before we think about making a recommendation? No objections, do I see any hands? Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to point out, of course, if this Working Group decides in the end of the recommendations that are then adopted by Council and the

Board with appropriate voting (unintelligible), that will of course also be combining on the gTLDs if they would fit the, you know, consensus policy description. And also I had a question on, you know, I know it's very important to get the information out early, but I do wonder whether, you know, registries would start implementing this or putting this on their roadmap before it would even be adopted by the Council and the Board. So I think it's very important indeed to socialize with them at least, you know, make sure that they are aware that this might be coming, but I would be curious to know if registries would already start making plans for that even if it wouldn't have been adopted yet by Council and Board.

Avri Doria: I would assume statistically, from the way development plans go, at least some would be thinking about it just because it was possible. Yes, Barbara?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So I think that's something that we would have to go back to the, you know, Registry Stakeholder Group just to get some feedback on, you know, obviously as Avri was saying, it will vary registry by registry. So we can get a general feel based on feedback that we can guess, and Roy and I can go back and do that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So I think we're coming out of this with - I guess there's two things. One is there's the recommended action that we start a background information gathering sub-team, what have you, again, open but it will primarily be registries, but - I would assume, or maybe it's registries, I really don't know who it would primarily be, but open again. That will start with the information gathering.

I think something we need to keep in mind for when we discuss it is that when we're discussing a recommendation, if we're discussing a recommendation that something needs to be done, that recommendation would have to include consideration of implementation and deployment time as has been indicated by the registries. And yes, that takes into Simonetta's account, is given that reality, perhaps we will want to make a recommendation sooner

than an informal recommendation, sooner than the end of the Working Group. And I think even stating that within the response serves as an initial flag that indeed there may be a recommendation coming at some point, we understand the issues, we need more information, and be warned.

Does that work? I know you guys couldn't see my hand waving while I was talking, but does that sort of work as a sort of response and an action on this one? I see a green check from Mikey, I see no hands, I see a couple more checks.

Okay, any other comments, last comments on 13? Yes, Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, this is Bob. So I guess in general for both 12 and 13, are we going to form the subgroups now or are we going to do that next meeting or offline?

Avri Doria: I would suggest that we take the formation of a subgroup to the list and that basically - I mean, certainly anyone here that wants to volunteer and says I'm a 12, I'm a 13, you know, should do so. But I think given the number of people who aren't here now and such, so I would recommend that, you know, people that want to be involved volunteer now but we take it to the list and that we confirm it, as it were, at the next meeting. Is that an okay approach?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, I think it makes sense, you know, Avri, but I might suggest you, as the Chair, you know, kick it off with an email off list...

Avri Doria: Sure, yeah.

Bob Mountain: ...just to get the ball rolling.

Avri Doria: I'll follow up on that.

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Avri Doria: So yes, I've got an action item. I don't know if we track action items, but I've got an action item.

Bob Mountain: Okay.

Avri Doria: I've been also chairing a group in the At-Large part of the world and they're very strict about keeping a list of action items that we all have to follow, and it's actually an interesting difference to the way Working Groups work on two sides of the organization. But anyhow, yeah, I've got an action item.

Bob Mountain: Okay, I don't mean to be presumptuous to assign one to you, but I...

Avri Doria: Oh no, that's quite all right. I actually like the notion of the Working Group coming up with action items for their chairs, their editors, their staff report. I think it's helpful in moving things along, so great.

Anything else, now? Anybody have any comments that they were pent up about in any of the questions 1 through 13 where they had an additional remark that's not been captured that desperately needed to be captured before we call this particular part of the exercise done? Yes, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: You - this is Mikey. You triggered it when you said pent up. I especially appreciate the way that you have captured our ideas and transmogrified them into specific concepts and words and phrases, so I just wanted to get on the record with an atta-boy on that, I thought that was fabulous.

Avri Doria: Okay great, and I think Marika has been doing the lion's share of that. Yes Marika, you have your hand up?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I would just like to encourage everyone, like, you know, following the addition of the notes from this call, (unintelligible) revised version and just encourage everyone to review the notes and - because those normally get included as part of the record of, you know, the initial and

the final report. So we need to make sure that (Anita's) captured the discussions accurately as well as the recommended action items, so that's something you all can look out for on the (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So I will call that item closed. I don't see - actually I don't have it in front of me, I don't see any other hands. Now we have only four minutes left to the rest of the meeting so we don't get too far, I just want to basically start with the quick overview of the work plan as it stands.

We obviously will not get to the reviewing the mind map approach for the charter question. I'd like to put that as the starting point of the next meeting and basically, Mikey, hopefully you can be ready with your software. I went to bring up mine today and found out my 30-day trial was over and if I want to play further I've got to pay them big bucks, so at the moment, I don't have a license.

Okay, so what we had coming up was first of all, document review for Costa Rica. I don't believe we have any documents. Is that correct, Marika, that we're putting forward?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, I think that is correct. The only thing we might want to work on, but it doesn't necessarily need to meet the meeting or the publication deadline, is that a note for the meeting with the ccNSO, I think it would probably benefit the meeting if, you know, we can come up with a clear description on what we're looking for and what our intent is for that meeting.

That's for the ccNSO. It's a new concept as well, you know, meeting with the GNSO Working Group, it's not normally the way they work, so I think we - that's something we might want to work on the next couple of weeks.

Avri Doria: We have that on agenda - or a comment - does this comment worksheet that you've been putting out, does that get sort of formalized? And I know not published as an ICANN meeting note, but certainly published as a Working

Group document and does it get passed to the GNSO at all, is the question I'd like to ask. If so, I don't know if we need to do anything other than to point at it, but that was something that I would bring up. Yes?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I don't think usually we share the review of comments with the Council, it's just included as part of the record when we, you know, publish the initial reports.

Avri Doria: Okay, and I assume that's fine with everybody in the group, that we just keep that as a visible - openly visible but not a reported document. Okay, well with one minute left to go, basically we'll be going into the work plan for Item A and a review of the map at the beginning of the next meeting. But at this point I think that's it.

Our next meeting is next week, same time, same place, correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay, any other last comments for today? I'm sorry I took a little longer than planned to get through these last questions but I think we closed it up well and I think that unless there are any pending issues that come up during the week, we start with this next week. And I've got an action item, put out two separate emails on separate sub-teams that will be starting to do information gathering related to questions 12 and 13 and comments to 12 and 13.

Any other last words? In which case, thank you all. Have a great rest of the week and I'll talk to you next week when I expect it will be (James) chairing again. I may or may not make the meeting because I'll be at IGF meeting in Geneva, so I may not be on next week's meeting. Thank you all very much.

Man: Thank you, Avri.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Avri.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri. Great job.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Avri Doria: Thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

END