IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 08 May 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 08 May 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-20120508-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - CBUC
James Bladel -co-chair
Hago Dafalla – NCSG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Roy Dykes – RySG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Angie Graves – CBUC
Rob Golding - RrSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Avri Doria – co-Chair

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Paul Diaz - RrSg
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Alain Berranger - NPOC

Coordinator: ...to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any

objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 8th of May, 2012. On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel, Angie Graves, Chris Chaplow, Avri Doria and Roy Dykes. We have apologies from Bob Mountain, Matt Serlin, Paul Diaz, Kevin Erdman, Alain Berranger, Barbara Knight, Philip Corwin and Zahid Jamil.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. 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.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And I think Jonathan Tenenbaum just joined the call as well? Jonathan, are you on line?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. He just joined Adobe Connect but he's not on the line yet.

James Bladel: Oh thank you. Good morning and welcome to IRTP-C for May 8. As per our usual if anyone has any statements of interest changes or updates please indicate so by raising your hand at this time. Seeing none is anyone - have any edits or suggested changes to the agenda that's posted on the right hand column of your Adobe Connect stream? Okay thanks.

Well welcome everyone and again apologies for missing last week's call. It sounds like it was a good one. And I definitely thank the co chair, Avri, and staff for helping out in my absence especially given the fact that it was fairly late notice and so I apologize for leaving everybody in the lurch like that.

Marika has sent around not only an agenda, which you see there, but also kind of a to-do list of items that are remaining between now and our interim report. I'm sorry our draft initial report.

And I know that there's a number of folks absent that have to do items attached to their name. So want to just kind of start by discussing the timeline for delivering this report, how that's going to mesh with the meeting in Prague and how we expect that will play out, whether or not we believe it is time to accelerate our work.

I know nobody wants to go to extended meetings or 90-minute meetings however we also I think are in agreement that nobody wants to be doing this - or working on this working group in November and December so I think it's a bit of a tradeoff there.

So let's just kind of take a step back here. We have by my reckoning we have about - let's see here, we have the 15th, 22nd and 29th of May and then we have I believe another let's call it two weeks in June so we have about five weeks remaining and of course the last two of those will probably be a run through of the initial report where we go through it section by section.

So want to emphasize that we have a very short period of time to get to a point where we can review an initial report and then get that published and get that discussion started for the Prague timeframe.

So does anyone have any thoughts on this timeline? Does anyone feel strongly that it is time to accelerate our work here a little bit and perhaps for these next five weeks go to a 90-minute session with the goal of having a deliverable in advance of the meeting in Prague? Avri, your thoughts?

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. I guess to start with I'm not sure how an extra 30 minutes a week on this particular meeting will get us closer to the report. We are doing a lot of the work - well I say we - I'm not actually involved in either of the two groups that are doing a lot of work off, you know, the general meeting.

Those people are already meeting, I assume, most weeks for some amount of time. They're certainly doing outside work. So I see the necessity of

completing those things, of getting them into the - into the group. I also - we have this long list of outstanding items and the initial report. And there's going to be various people working on various things.

And just like, Marika, you and I had a sort of check in, where are we at, what do we need to do meeting last week. And I would almost suggest that it would be better to keep our meeting at this point, still in an hour, unless we find ourselves busting the edge of every meeting, which we don't, of important substantive things still to be said but that we have a coordinating group of people that are actually doing stuff and have writing assignments and this and that to sort of go over our status perhaps a half hour a week on another day as we did - I forget whether it was Thursday or Friday that we did it.

Now when we get to the point of doing the walkthrough of the document where they'll be substantive because we'll be marching paragraph by paragraph that is time consuming. And at that point we may actually want to switch for two weeks or so to a double meeting, you know, two meetings.

But I'm just not strongly in favor of tacking on 30 minutes to this one in the hope that that gets us to the decision faster. Because what we seem to be doing now is sort of looking at the work done in the subgroups, asking a couple questions and sending it back to them. And if that's the model we're using, which I think is a good model, I don't - I just don't see 30 minutes helping. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. I mean, I think that's a fair point. Perhaps when we do get to the run through it might make more sense to extend those calls because a half an hour there might yield more of results or more progress than it might when we're just working through some of the sub team groups.

Michele, you're up next.

Michele Neylon: My comment on it is very - is much simpler. I can't speak for everybody. Personally I can't make a - commit more time to this or any other working groups. So, I mean, extending the call I'd be dropping off.

James Bladel: Also a fair point. Thank you, Michele. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I kind of want to echo what Michele was saying now and add an observation. For me a once a week one-hour call is doable. Having this workgroup call and a separate sub team call and being a member of both sub teams, like a couple other sub team calls continuously week after week after week is really difficult for me to reconcile at my work. So it's challenging for me to make the time.

So then also on top of this - extending this call is kind of getting to the point where I am at my limits of what I can do outside of my work and my personal life with just this workgroup as I'm not getting paid for this at all; this is kind of like my hobby on the side like for most of you guys.

And also I am a little - this is only my second workgroup that I'm a part of but the last one we didn't really the split of getting a lot of the substance work done in sub teams versus in the main call. So as we shift more and more work into these sub teams work there and then another half hour of like coordinating how we want to move forward and yet another sub team what's left to talk about in this call on Tuesday.

That's kind of an observation and a question for me is like I am - I'm just wondering what the purpose of this call is we're just giving each other updates and then all the work happens elsewhere. I don't know if this is a good or a bad thing but I'm just looking at this and this is different from last time.

And being in charge of one of those sub teams is also - it's taking a lot more work than just this hour on the call. You have to think about, okay what do

you put on the agenda? How do you coordinate? How do you get people to find the time slot where they can even meet outside of the (unintelligible) that I kind of have blocks for the workgroup.

So it's challenging for me to make all of this work. I'm looking at all this list of things that we still need to hit. I really don't know how I can be stepping it up even more so that we can meet the June deadline.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. I think that that's good feedback, everyone, and it sounds as though that the idea of extending these calls certainly doesn't make sense particularly at this time while we are still focused on the work of the sub teams and may make a little more sense as we go down the road and actually start editing the draft report.

Michele, did you have something quick because I wanted to dive into the outstanding items here and just kind of run through - there went his hand, okay.

What I wanted to point out was - and I believe, Marika, was this list - it was circulated to the whole group I believe if I recall correctly?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This was circulated together with the initial report. It was attached to the email.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay so I can point out there's a few items here that we can report some progress on. For example on the attendance information and that's something that's not really falls to this working group; that's something that Marika and staff are going to put together for us.

The language from ccTLDs - I have something that's in draft form I will be circulating to the mailing list by the end of the day today so I'm just looking for your comments. And all this really is is a description of the information that is contained - and there's a lot of it contained in that appendix chart where we

discussed with the ccNSO we discussed a change of registrant and we also did some investigation with some of the registrars who were active in the ccTLD space like Blacknight and Mark Monitor.

We have a couple of items here that talk about expected impacts. I believe that expected impact is necessary but it might be something that we may put placeholders in the initial report. My thinking is that it's going to be very difficult to do an effective job that's gauging the effective impact if our recommendations are still fluid and still a moving target.

And I think that the bulk of the material for expected impacts are going to be derived from the comments received on our initial report and the feedback we received in the workshop. So I almost want to put a little star next to those three items, Marika, and say that we might want placeholders at this point but I don't know that we can intelligently or at least comprehensively say we have an understanding of the impact at this point.

There are a couple of other items there for gauging consensus. There is an open item for the registry, Page 21. And then we have recommendations for A, B and C. There is one item there for reviewing the locking procedures - Reason for Denial 8 and 9 of the existing transfer process which actually I believe, Marika, became Reason for Denial Number 7 and 8 under the new policy language because we deleted one effective June 1.

So really I don't think it's as daunting - when we break it down like this I don't think it's quite as daunting as it may look here. But I recognize there's still quite a lot of open items but I do believe that it's something that we can continue to check off of our list here as we move forward.

We've got a couple of folks left on the - in the queue but I want to just say one other thing. The big outstanding issue - and my understanding was it occupied a lot of the discussion last week - was this concept of whether a

change of registrant is a new process, new policy, new documents, you know, standalone on its own right or whether it is truly a part of the IRTP.

And I think that opens a lot of interesting questions either way and their pros and cons to a lot of different approaches. I don't know - I guess I put it out to the group; do we want to, A, try to solve this? B, float some ideas out there and see what kind of a response we get? Or, C, just pose this question to the - to the comments and to the workshop?

I think there's really kind of a spectrum of ways that we can proceed on this one. But one of those three is probably the most appropriate path forward. So with that I'll stop speaking here and go to the queue. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay what was I thinking? Right. Oh yes. The - I'd agree with what you were saying about the impact thing. I mean, we might be able to come up with a couple of potential - what's the correct word? Impacts isn't the correct word. Consequences?

Simonetta Batteiger: Consequences.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, consequences might work better as a word, so impacts just sounds wrong - possible consequences of any kind of policy. But it really, as you said, James, it's going to be in public comments, meetings and things like that that people will raise those kind of issues. So I would be fully supportive of putting in some kind of placeholder language be that, you know, to be added later or something. I don't know if we can do that but that would seem logical to me. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, Michele, before I go to Mikey I want to put you on the spot a little bit with that response. What - are you referring to the impacts of our recommendations on those items or are you talking about the separate policy versus a combined policy issue?

Michele Neylon: I'm talking in general.

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: I wasn't speaking specifically about this - about the entire debacle that arose last week around whether the change of control thing should be part of IRTP or part of something else. I'm talking more in general terms, you know, that if as part of the guidelines and whatever the hell they're called you need to include some kind of impact assessment type thing on any form of policy then what I was saying would refer to that.

If you want to put me on the spot with respect to this entire IRTP thing my view on it is if it's part of our charter then it's part of IRTP and I think there's - and that's it and we can just move on. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Michele. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. I think that what we are up against is a scope question. You know, we're getting down close to the Prague deadline. And I think if I could turn the conversation just a little bit I'd say that both of those things, the impact stuff and the separate policy discussion, could be deferred until after this report as a way to reduce the scope of the work that we need to do by Prague and I'm fine with that.

But I don't think that that's necessarily the best way to do the work. I think that it's an expedient way to do the work given that we're up against a tight deadline. I think this group has probably got the best knowledge and the best understanding of these issues.

And in a perfect world I would like to see answers to both of those things in the draft report because I think that's part of the reason why we surprise the community so much is because we don't put these things in sometimes and

then it, you know, changes a lot in the next iteration and people come back and say holy cow, what were you thinking?

And so in a perfect world I'd like to see at least us take a stab at both of those things in the initial report. But if we have to leave them out I'd rather call it leaving them out because we're trying to hit a date rather than because we're not the best people to do it.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. And I tend to agree - I'm putting myself in the queue here just speaking as a - just a member of the working group. And I tend to agree with Mikey pretty strongly. I think that we need to put something out there and say this is the - this is the draft findings; this is the draft recommendation; this is the draft position of this working group.

We're not married to it, you know, if we get some strong pushback either on the public comments or, you know, from the community in Prague or from the GNSO or the Board or somewhere else in the community I think that certainly be willing to take another look, revisit some of these things.

But I think Mikey had it best when he said we need to at least take a stab at these or sub them out - these sections - even if there is an acknowledgement that they're not complete or that they're subject to change.

So I think, Simonetta, do you mind if I go to Marika first?

Simonetta Batteiger: No go ahead.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I was just wondering whether the working group would also consider just - I think especially looking at a Charter Question A just indeed putting forward what the recommendation is for that process. And I - actually just - or say look, you know, we've discussed whether this should be

part of IRTP or separate but, you know, that's something where we would like your input on.

And similarly with the impact of the different recommendations there might be indeed based on the discussions that the working group has had some indications on, you know, for example if you look at, you know, should there be the IANA ID.

I mean, based on the survey, you know, some have indicated that there might be some, you know, implementation factors that need to be considered. So the working group can maybe mention those but then specifically highlight that those are areas that the working group is looking for further input on during the public comment period and will then further consider those as part of the development of the final report.

So in that way at least you, you know, highlight or touch upon some of the issues that you, you know, think might be, you know, involved in an impact assessment but at least open the way for further input on that.

And also on the Charter Question A you basically, hopefully, you know, wouldn't distract the conversation of the working group further whether it should be separate or part of the IRTP but focus discussion really on, you know, how should that process look and then, indeed, leave the decision on, you know, the scope or where it fits best to a later stage and allow again, therefore, for public input on the question.

And, you know, maybe as well a determination from the Council whether, you know, it would be considered out of scope of it's recommended as a separate policy or whether, you know, it should just part of the IRTP as well as a sub section or separate chapter to the IRTP, for example.

James Bladel: Yes, thank you, Marika. I think that's - and I've seen that done in previous working groups and review teams where we put a document out for

comments with the preamble directing the commenters to some specific open issues or open questions that we would like feedback on.

And I think that that's a - that's always encouraging because it helps target the feedback to some of the areas where the working group is looking for some blanks that need to be filled in.

Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: There's not much more to add to this. This was exactly what I was wondering as well; can we just include the question of - that - or include that we - the result of that at some point coming to the question is this a part of IRTP really or should there be something like a transfer policy where IRTP is a part of and this new thing is a part of too. And maybe the alternative would be to say now this is a subset of IRTP.

And the third alternative is it's completely own thing. I don't know, something like that so that we should - can just like highlight that we were thinking about this and we would like to have input about it and then the Board or whoever else might be best suited to make the final decision kind of at least now what was the question, what were they thinking and why did they get there.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Simonetta. I wanted to respond just more as a member than anything else. I think those are good points. Two things, first off I think that if we decide that it is a joint policy then definitely IRTP needs a rename at minimum. It starts to be - look like something like a transfer and change of registrant policy or something like that.

Secondly just something you mentioned about the Board or the Council making a decision. I think that we should bear in mind that at least in the spirit of the policy development process if not the reality those bodies are looking to this working group to make concise and comprehensive recommendations for them to either approve or disapprove.

But I don't know that they want to be - I'm trying to word this carefully here. I don't know that they want to take a strong or an active role in actually creating a policy. I think that they are, again, more of a policy management body rather than a policy development body.

So I think that we need to just bear in mind that the authority and the responsibility for actually making these - decision lies with this group before we go to Council and Board. So I just wanted to just clarify that. But go ahead with your response, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well my question that is - and I have to apologize, I didn't even read the transcript from last week's call yet; I didn't have time to do this yet. But is - was the discussion such that you feel that we cannot come to a recommendation on how this should be resolved?

Was it so opposing or do you still think that the discussion was just not finished yet and we just need to spend a little more time talking about it so we can come up with a - I mean, I just outlined three alternatives; I don't know if these were covering what you were talking about last week or is there other alternatives?

And then can we at least get to a priority or ranking or saying we think this is the best way forward because X, Y, Z is the question I guess for everyone who was on the call last week.

James Bladel: Yeah, and, Simonetta, just before we go to Avri, I missed the call as well so maybe the folks can shed some light. But that was my takeaway as well is that there's really three paths forward here.

There's the same policy, there's a, you know, there's the completely separate standalone policy and then there's more of a hybrid approach which is we combine the two but we do some reengineering of the language in IRTP to

account for both under this new master transfer policy. But I'll leave that to the rest of the group. And perhaps Avri can shed some light on that issue and what was covered last week.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Thank you. This is Avri. I think that was opened last week was the discussion between your A and B. And, you know, whether it remains the single or not. And I thought that the notion was then that Mikey was going to bring this back to the sub team and basically talk about assumed that it is separate what might the issues be? How might it look?

The third option that you've brought in of the hybrid is one that I think has been evolving since the meeting - evolving being the word is the US press today. So I think that that has been building. I don't know that we actually discussed (of) three options in last week's meeting.

What we also discussed in the last meeting was the notion of getting as much done as we could before the initial but that some of these things brought up questions that were charter scope basis and so take it as far as we could in the initial and in Prague frame the question to the Council on the issue and let them give us some feedback.

And I think that's where we were at. I think it's been developing a bit more. I don't know if Mikey had a chance to go back to the group and sort of say, listen, you know, let's try this and let's try and document what it would look like. But that was the idea. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. And I think it's simple enough, Simonetta, to outline those three chocolate, vanilla, strawberry type options and put some pros and cons attached to that and then send that around to the group as well. I think that's something that I can also make sure that that gets done before our next call.

Okay so let's - let's see, that's the first half hour of our session today where we talked about schedule and the sub teams. So - but I do appreciate that. I think that this is important to keep us on track.

If we could let's just briefly move on to the discussion - sorry, just a moment, I dropped my microphone. We could briefly move on to some updates from the sub teams. And I recognize that there probably has not been much in the way of an update from change of control sub team. But there was a document sent around by Bob that - perhaps we can take a quick look at here.

And Bob unfortunately sends his apologies so he's asked if anyone can help. And I think Marika has volunteered to take us through this as best she can. So, Marika, if you could could you sort of walk us through the data gathering sub team? This is their final findings report. It looks like it's in the form of a slide show. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. But I'm also happy to defer to Jonathan or Roy as both of them were also on the call last week during which Bob presented this as well. So if either of them prefers to take the lead on this I'm more than happy to let them do it.

James Bladel: Jonathan, Roy, any takers?

Roy Dykes: No, I think I'm good to, you know, I think I probably wouldn't do as good of a job so I'll defer here if that's okay.

James Bladel: Okay so let's - Marika, maybe if you can get us started and then if there's any point of clarification that Jonathan or Roy can raise as we go along.

Marika Konings: Okay. So what you see on the Adobe Connect - and was also circulated by Bob yesterday - is basically a slide deck that summarizes the results of the survey that the subteam conducted.

This has also now been incorporated as an annex to the initial report, and the key findings are included in the body of the report, as some of you might have seen.

So on the Slide 1 you basically see there the main findings, what the subteam derived from the feedback received, so we can - for the executive summary - and I don't know if you want to go in a lot of detail, because all the other slides basically, you know, provide the background to all these - all of these findings.

But I think that you can see that there was a, you know, we got a good response, 100 responses received from both Registrars and as well as Registrys and some others focused on Charter Questions B and C.

In relation to the question on the FOAs response was received that the majority felt that FOAs should be time limited. Most respondents felt that a time limit on the FOA would improve security, but at the same time the vast majority of respondents had not experienced or heard of problems from a - from current non-time limited FOAs.

It might be worth noting as well that at the same time a majority actually currently does impose a time limit on FOAs. When asked about the expected scope of effort if there would be a requirement to time limit FOAs, the response was - the majority of responses was between the minimal and some effort.

In relation to the Charter Question C on IANA IDs, the majority of respondent indicated that they hadn't experienced any problems from the use of proprietary Registrar IDs, but at the same time the majority felt that standardization would simplify domain transfers.

Many respondents were skeptical about whether ccTLDs would consider adopting IANA IDs in their correspondence with Registrys. And respondents

to the survey were actually split on whether to require Registrys to use IANA IDs exclusively.

In relation to the question on the effort involved to standardize IANA IDs should there be such a requirement, the feedback was that that would require a minimal to some effort.

So then maybe looking at the rest of the slide this basically just provides, you know, as I said the data that support the findings that the Working Group - the subteam gathered.

So basically this slide shows you the breakdown of respondents', you know, different affiliations. Also, you know, this slide shows you the domains under management and, you know, confirms there's a broad range of respondent sizes so we hope that represents a good coverage of the different players involved.

Again here it's on the, you know, question, "Should a FOA be time limited?" And, you know, a majority is of the view that it should be, 71%, but 30% - 32% either, you know, had not strong opinion or didn't feel there was a need to do so.

James Bladel: I have a question.

Marika Konings: Yes go ahead.

James Bladel: Can we go back to that one moment - go back to that previous slide? I just noticed here that we say 32% but we have 71% and that's 103%. I'm not - I see 29% I guess.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'm guessing that might be a typo.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: I'm assuming...

James Bladel: Or maybe you were just drawing from two different sets, but I just wanted to point out that, you know, as a newcomer to these charts the first thing I would say is 32% and 29%.

Marika Konings: Right.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: I'll check that. So then Question 7, "What would be an appropriate time limit?" I think Bob derived from here that like 80% of respondents felt that the time limit should be 30 days or less, and this includes the specific responses that we received under the Other category.

And on the question, "Do you currently time limit FOAs?" 46% of respondents said yes, 44% said no and then you had a non-applicable and others.

And here we did a - I think a cross-verification on those that, you know, did say that they time limit it, that they actually use a time limit of 30 days or less of the 94 respondents that indicated that they do time limit FOAs at the moment.

James Bladel: I have a question about that slide.

Marika Konings: Yes.

James Bladel: And we have a binary question here, yes or no, and then we have N/A and other. Should we combine N/A and other or should we, you know, is it no response?

I don't - or it doesn't apply or something? I just - I guess I'm not really clear on why we have two non-yes/non-no questions or responses.

Marika Konings: We need to look back at the actual responses that we received under Other.

James Bladel: Yes. Maybe there's a way we can describe those two categories so that they can be combined.

Marika Konings: Right. I don't know if in Other it's like, you know, maybe we sometimes do in certain cases or, you know, but not always or I don't if that's, you know, possibly the sum of the other categories.

But I'm happy to check back on whether those should indeed be combined as a not applicable or nor or yes.

James Bladel: Avri did you want to shed some light on this?

Avri Doria: I don't have light on that although the little bit I looked at at the data at one point when I was able to see some, I think generally saying not applicable or even not answered is radically different than other, especially when people have written in something later to say what their other is and would strongly suggest we do not combine them. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, well that's maybe a possibility. I guess I appreciate Marika checking in on what the Other means in this case when someone has a yes/no question. It seems like yes or no or not applicable would cover the whole universe of responses, but maybe I'm just...

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. If I look at the comments because I pulled up the actual report, so indeed one response is like it's based on client circumstance, so it's not a yes/no but it's, you know, an other.

James Bladel: Sometimes.

Marika Konings: So the other one - yes, another one says, "We do not yet register FOA using extensions ourselves but are in the process of implementing this. In other words we cannot FOA a mail for every transfer process."

And another says as well, "We're not officially begun to register a domain name and when any issue happens, for example name is logged, the process must be restarted."

So it's - I think some might be a response, right. They're not exactly clear and some indeed are in the process of implementing it or, you know, do it based on circumstances. So it's a, you know, some...

James Bladel: Okay, so in some circumstances.

Marika Konings: Right.

James Bladel: Yes. Okay. All right, thanks. And I don't - I didn't mean to belabor it. It just seems like a little interesting - Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. No, I think that this is always something that as someone that works a lot on putting together questionnaires, when you're doing a binary yes/no and you expect that most of the world does have a yes/no, you have to account for the people that don't see the world - see it bifurcated that way and they have other ideas and then also they're not applicable. I think they are two completely different concepts.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay, but thanks for looking into that Marika and your comments Avri, and let's just press forward.

Marika Konings: So here are some of the comments that were received in response to the question, "Why do you apply a time limit?" so preventing fraud, security, you know, correct lifecycles so a couple of, you know, comments here to basically

illustrate why people currently apply a time limit on FOAs. Then the question on, "Have you ever experienced...?"

James Bladel: Sorry to stop you once again. But when we see that comment I remember we had a lot of comments and they were very, very detailed. And I guess does anyone - and maybe I'm being overly paranoid here, but does anyone have any concerns with summarizing comments like this or should we say that they're a summary of comments?

Just want to make sure that once we start, you know, summarizing them someone might feel like their piece was summarized out and that - I don't know and I don't mean to make a mountain out of a mole here - mole hill here.

I just want to make sure that if we're going to summarize them we should probably say it's a summary. Michele, your thoughts on this or on something else?

Michele Neylon: No I'm - I tried to actually give you thoughts on the things you're discussing James. My poor little brain can't handle much more than today anyway. My thoughts would be yes, make it clear that it was summarized.

And secondly, unless the comments that we've received are incredibly long why not just show the full text of the comments in an appendix or somewhere so if people actually want to go off and have a look at the full thing that they can?

So, you know, reference the summary because nobody wants to read the entire thing if you don't need to.

James Bladel: Yes right.

Michele Neylon: And then just shove the full text into an appendix, so best of both worlds as far as I'm concerned. Thanks.

James Bladel: Did I see a tick mark from Avri and go ahead Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I agree with what Michele just said. I think that's a great idea and also if there is a summary and let's say for example if the second point in order to prevent fraud is - was mentioned eight times and maybe to have a correct lifecycle for the transfer was only mentioned once, that you just put in brackets afterwards how often that comment or that idea was voiced, and then maybe rank them in order so you - so people get a - an idea of how often did people say they do this in order to prevent fraud versus they do this in order to have the correct lifecycle for the transfer or, I don't know, so that it's more transparent which of these ideas was the main reason why someone did something.

James Bladel: That's a little bit of extra work but I think it mentally improves the value and readability of this report. I agree Simonetta and maybe we can just capture that Marika and we can take that back to Bob's team.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. I mean, and to this specific question we got 48 responses. And just to note as well that I think this report is intended to be a summary and I think, you know, that, you know, maybe we need to explain that further in the report.

But the full report with, you know, all the responses, all the comment will also be available and we can link that because I think it's easier to probably post or, you know, include it as a link and have that on the wiki, because that report itself is already 29 pages because it basically, you know, verbatim copies and all the comments that were received.

I think what this, you know, the summary tries to do or this presentation makes it easier to do digest the responses and able to, you know, link some

of the questions together so it's easier to understand, you know, how the subteam got to their findings.

So I think that's the idea behind this presentation but I think in no way we're trying to, you know, hide from the public the full response to the surveys. So, you know, anyone is welcome to review those and make sure that they match up with what we tried to cover here.

But I think Simonetta made a very good point on trying to, you know, correlate some of these comments with the number of time that same comment was made. Who is that speaking? Can you please mute your line?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Can you please make sure that everyone is on mute if you're not speaking? Thanks.

Marika Konings: So basically I think we can go back indeed and look at the comments and see if there's an easy way to correlate if there are indeed more people saying the same thing and, you know, indicate that. So I think that shouldn't be a big problem.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And thanks Simonetta. I think that was a great suggestion. Okay, if we can push on then to the...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Can I ask that whoever is speaking please go on mute, whoever's speaking in French?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Operator can you please mute the line that's causing interference? I think they have already muted the line. So the Question 10 was basically in relation to problems experienced and I think as indicated before, you know, 80% of - 88% of respondents indicated that they've never experienced any issues with not - FOAs not being time limited.

But I think it should be noted at the same time that, you know, we saw before that half of respondents did indicate that they are already time limiting, so we're not sure if there's a correlation between the fact of not seeing issues and, you know, half of Registrars already or of respondents are already time limited it currently.

And as well I think this includes as well some of the comments that, you know, in relation to 12% that did indicate there was an issue identified in relation to this.

Then we had - also had a question asking, "Have you ever heard about, you know, problems from others?" And 96% of people responded they hadn't. Again here on the 4% there's some comments there that were received in response to, you know, that did say that they had heard of issues.

We also tried to link in, you know, the frequency of problems and domain name transfer volumes so that's, you know, so we basically - I think the conclusion derived from here was a small percentage of transfer volume if you compare.

Then there was a question, "Are there are downsides or - downsides that people can think of to time limiting FOAs?" and 70% responded that no, they couldn't think of any concerns.

The people that did respond yes - most comments there were concerned about time limitations impacting legitimate transfers and increased complexity in the process. James I see your hand up.

James Bladel: Yes just noting that the text in the box seems to be missing a verb or some direct objects or something at the end of that sentence. I think maybe if we could ask Bob to finish that thought.

I think it's, "And the process due to time limited FOAs," or something like that but it seems like something's missing.

Marika Konings: Okay, I'll note that. Question 15 basically just notes that the effort involved with time limiting the FOAs based on the feedback received has said, you know, the majority is between, you know, minimal and some effort.

Then some other considerations - I think these are more, you know, practical issues - some suggesting just eliminating FOAs altogether. Then moving into Charter Question C, the use of IANA IDs versus proprietary IDs, again the first question was, you know, "Have you ever experienced problems from proprietary versus IANA IDs?"

Eight-two percent of respondents indicated no, 18% responded yes. Those that did indicate yes, you know, they have heard complaints that looking up proprietary IDs can be cumbersome, would be vastly easier if IDs were standardized in one place, no per Registry.

Half the time we can't easily check to see who the Registrar is, just unnecessary confusion and no big deal to work around, but why do we have two systems? Registrys should be forced to use IANA systems. Michele?

Michele Neylon: This has probably been answered already. I'm sorry. It's just I was quite taken aback by some of the replies, so the question that pops into my mind is who on earth responded to this questionnaire?

Marika Konings: You can see from the initial, you know, the first pages like the breakdown and as well the size. I mean, we do have the names and affiliation but we

basically said that we wouldn't publish that publicly, but we do basically have, you know, the size of Registrys and Registrars that responded and they're...

Michele Neylon: So they're all only Registrys and Registrars who responded?

Marika Konings: Right, and I think there might be some aftermarket, people could self-identify so there, you know, might be some aftermarket and I think some identified as Registrants.

But, you know, looking through the list I think that we sent the survey out mainly to, you know, Registry Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group and also it went out to the ICANN Registrar mailing list, which includes all Registrars.

Michele Neylon: Right. Okay. Well all Registrars who are members of the Stakeholder Group.

Marika Konings: No, no, no, all ICANN accredited Registrars.

Michele Neylon: Oh that list. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Roy?

Roy Dykes: Yes, as far as the makeup Michele it - the vast majority was Registrars but there were - a few Registrys responded.

Marika Konings: Okay, so if we then move on. Question related to the benefits of using only IANA IDs or IANA combined with proprietary IDs, the majority of the comments indicated that standardizing on IANA IDs would improve simplicity and transparency of domain operations.

A minority questioned the justification of making a change to the existing method, and a small minority felt that the current approach provides the benefit of more information. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Actually this was a comment in reaction to what Michele just said. And I have a - I'm wondering what is throwing you off and I also - thinking back to the very beginning of the Work Group we flagged very early on that it's going to be challenging to get feedback from the people who actually use the process, the Registrants.

And I think in seeing how many people responded to the survey, I think you're completely right in saying who even responded to this. And I don't know if making this change without attempting to get more feedback from the people that actually need to use the process, meaning the Registrants who actually try to transfer a domain name, is a smart thing. I don't know.

Michele Neylon: Simonetta, since you've mentioned me, I mean, I don't particularly like wearing a seatbelt. They're not the most comfortable of things, but I also know damn well that I could break my neck if my car was involved in any form of collision if I wasn't wearing a seatbelt.

So, I mean, my problem with some of these comments are that, you know, this - making - if you make domains too portable then you're going to - definitely going to increase the issues with hijacking and other issues that could arise.

And yes, that might make it a little bit harder. I mean, it's just this thing with like the entire concept of people saying that they want to remove FOAs and various other safeguards, which aren't particularly strong safeguards anyway but they're something. It just - it shocks me. It really shocks me. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Simonetta and Michele and we certainly should not necessarily dive into the meat and potatoes of all these issues here, as we're just kind of reviewing a report.

So unless we feel like the data is not really lined up with the responses, I think we should, you know, resist the temptation to redesign the survey. I didn't - it's just I'm not saying that's what we're doing.

I just - I wanted to make sure that we're keeping on track here. Go ahead Marika if you can continue. Or Simonetta did you have a response? Your hand is - there it went. Okay.

Simonetta Batteiger: No, I don't have a comment on the content of those, but I do feel that this process ultimately affects Registrants and we haven't really gotten their input yet.

And I don't even feel that they might be the ones who said they don't want to have FOAs. They do want to have some safeguards in the process as well. We just have to - we've so far not really gotten their feedback period, and it's not a question of redesigning the survey or something.

But we don't have a lot of respondents who are Registrants at all, and that was a challenge that we said at the beginning of the reach out that we are going to have and it - and looking at who has responded is still a challenge.

And I see your question Michele, "Isn't this what we have public comment periods for?" Yes and no but if I'm a Registrant out there who is using this process, I'm so far removed from the ICANN world.

I have no idea that there's currently a public comment period open on something that is actually affecting how I deal with this process at all. So if we could brainstorm ways to find some input from that user group as well, I think that would be a good thing.

And it's not about trying to push an agenda here. This is just I am looking at this process and at the respondents to this questionnaire and that user group is missing.

So being a product person myself, if you design a process for someone that's supposed to use it and then you don't get any feedback from those users, I don't think that's a good thing. That's - that was my thought here.

James Bladel: Just to weigh in on that, thanks Simonetta. I - and I don't think that you're wrong. I think that you raise a very valid concern. I think that this is something that we have heard just generically.

This is a concern that we hear in a lot of Working Groups and Review Teams. In fact the WHOIS Review Team conducted a very sensitive consumer survey, you know, to try and get the - just kind of the opinion of the average person on the street or the average Internet user about WHOIS and how it's used and the consumer opinion we were trying to research.

I think it's very challenging when we talk about the - just the disparate groups and the wide variety of users and folks who would be possibly using this process.

My response is that we make this as, you know, public as possible and keep as many avenues for open participation as possible, whether that's workshops, public comment periods or, you know, raising this when we're in our day jobs, whether we're presenting to other non-ICANN groups or industries or associations and making sure we're raising awareness of these issues that are occurring within ICANN.

The second thing is I always hope that Registrars in particular are not making a distinction between their interests and the interests of their customers. I know that as a representative of GoDaddy and the affiliate Registrars, I try to put myself in the mindset of our customers rather than just the company, because a company that comes and sees itself as having differing interests than those of its customers probably won't be a business for much longer.

So I think that that's another way to safeguard that. And then the third thing is we need to - if we encounter these issues I think we need to reach out to ALAC and not in common some of these folks of these organizations within ICANN that are designed to bring those concerns.

They have their own shortcomings as well but at least we're doing our due diligence and making sure that they're aware of these things. So those are just my brainstorms but I think that we can certainly - if you would like to take an action item coming up with ways that we can broaden those - the coverage or I guess the marketing term would be the reach of these issues and making sure that we're getting as much variety and feedback as possible, I think that's - that would certainly be a welcome thing to the group, yes. Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think what we're running into a little bit here is the kind of trouble that I talked about earlier, which is that we're getting down to a very aggressive deadline and uncovering things that we probably haven't done yet, you know.

I'm busily rummaging backwards through the mind map of the work plan and, you know, we have a bunch of stuff that we said that we wanted to do about - in these two topics that we haven't done yet.

And I'm sort of with Simonetta on this one. I think that we need to be careful. When we launched this data gathering thing we were doing it primarily to get information from the provider community.

But I don't think that we intended this information to be the only source of direction for the group, right, and so I think now we have to sort of step back and say, "Hold on a minute."

We're maybe using this information in a way that's different than the way we set out to gather it, and that may be where this issue's coming from.

James Bladel: I agree Mikey that we wanted this survey - the data to inform the group. Can you be more specific when you say we're not using it the way we originally intended?

Mikey O'Connor: Well the way this reads one could say, "Oh, well okay so the policy direction is blah." I'll leave it that vague, but in fact it's not. In fact this just informs us.

And now if you look back to those work plan notes -- I apologize for how bushy they are -- I think that one of the things that we said we wanted to do is exactly what Simonetta's talking about, which is to get out to the Registrant community, you know, both the high volume Registrants and the lower volume ones somehow and get their views.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. Marika you're up next.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just want to note that - because some were asking did we, you know, reach out to the ALAC and we did. I mean, we reached out to the ALAC, the ccNSO and the ASAC at the start of the process, you know, putting forward to them the charter questions and asking if they had specific questions.

Of course - or specific input. Of course we also put out the - we had a public comment forum at the beginning where, you know, we also asked the world to provide input.

But I think, you know, then who was making the point but I guess, you know, the real input we'll be getting is once we have an initial report with suggested recommendations, because I think that's where it becomes, you know, much easier for end users to assess like, "Okay, so this is what you're thinking about," and, you know, asking them the question, "Should we use IANA ID versus proprietary IDs?"

Most people say, "Oh well, I didn't even realize that, you know, those things are being used." But if, you know, we explain in the report that, you know, these are the issues it might be causing and they are - for these reasons we're recommending this, I think it becomes a lot easier for the public at large to make certain recommendations.

And, you know, I don't think we would've gotten probably that kind of input, you know, putting out this survey. But I think it's the recommendation that will trigger that input and will help the Working Group to have, you know, the combined picture of the feedback received from Registrys and Registrars, as well as, you know, end users and/or other parties that are affected by this.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Marika. And I noticed that we just turned to the top of the hour and some of our attendance is - everybody's pulling the ripcord here. So how many more slides do we have? Are we near the end? Are we at a point where we can wrap up?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. There's still a couple of more but, you know, if I can just, you know, ask everyone just to look through this and if there are any other items you identify, you know, things that are not correct or you think should be clarified, you know, just share it and, you know, I can look at that together with Bob and then the other members of the subteam to, you know, to, you know, finalize that.

But I think indeed, you know, the subteam has basically done its work or I think that how the subteam sees it. This is their report and now it's really for the Working Group to decide based on these findings, you know, how to go from here.

James Bladel: Right. Good point. The subteam is coming back with findings, not recommendations and I think that's an important distinction. So where we want to go with these, how we want to apply them is I think still what we need to discuss.

So can we then put this - these changes that we had captured to - in a response to Bob's message for him and for the Working - the subteam and the Working Group as a whole, and then ask everyone to review the report, especially the last few slides before our next call?

And then perhaps Marika you and I and Avri can meet offline again just briefly to just go over this action item list here and what we've decided and update that as well.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. And just one point maybe on the other subteam, because I'm assuming that the ideal process for change of control needs another call or I don't know if Simonetta's gone or...?

James Bladel: Yes I think that's correct. We need to do that so I'll ping - I'll send that out to Liz.

Marika Konings: Okay great.

James Bladel: Okay thanks everyone and for those who stuck it out, and we'll reconvene again next week. Watch this - watch the mailing list. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Simonetta Batteiger: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James.

END