

IRTP C TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 17 January 2012 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 17 January 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-irtp-c-20120117-en.mp3>

on page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Attendees:

James Bladel –co-chair

Avri Doria - co-chair

Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Barbara Knight – RySG

Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG

Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG

Rob Golding – RrSG

Bob Mountain – Registrar SG

Zahid Jamil – CBUC

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Erick Iriarte – NCUC

Alain Berranger – NPOC

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Angie Graves - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies
Philip Corwin – CBUC
Paul Diaz- RySG

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings are started and all lines are open. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Hi. This is Avri. I'll be chairing the meeting today. Made a slight change to the agenda. One of the things that we weren't doing was reviewing the agenda.

And one of the things I started doing in another working group I'm in that seems to be working well is putting in a review of the agenda at every meeting but putting it in right at the hour or as close to it as possible while people were still drifting in and before we did the roll call so that if you really wanted to add something or change the agenda you would be there on the minute.

But...

Man: Hi.

Avri Doria: ...still allowing the chance for people to get in slightly late and be there for the meet. So anyhow so the first thing on the agenda is review the agenda. And I just sort of explained if people find this an offensive thing to do, you know, it can certainly be changed back to not reviewing the agenda or doing it after the roll call.

Then we'll go through the roll call, updates of any statements of interest. Third item is discussion of the updated detailed work plan that has been updated on the site and in fact that's what's showing on the screen now if people have any issues with it, make further changes. Otherwise that's what we'll say...

Man: Have a good day.

Avri Doria: ...we're working on. Then the fourth part was the meeting planning for Costa Rica. There's a couple options that need to be weighed. And we need to start moving towards a decision so that Marika can make reservations, etcetera.

Then there's the review of the public comments and beginning on the stakeholder group and community statements received and that discussion goes on until near the end of the meeting when then we just basically do a confirmation of the next meeting, look at what's next steps, where we're at.

Does anybody have any issues or questions about this agenda, any corrections that need to be made to it? No? Okay so then we'll go with that as an agenda for today. And thank you for putting up with me and my, you know, obsessive need to review agendas at the beginning of the meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Nathalie, can I ask you to do a roll call at this point?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course, Avri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 17th of January, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Avri Doria, Alain Berranger, Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, Barbara Knight, Angie Graves, Erick Iriarte, Zahid Jamil, Simonetta Batteiger, James Bladel, Rob Golding and Bob Mountain.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Philip Corwin, Jacob Williams 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. I think we also have apologies from James.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. James is actually on the call but he's on...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Oh he is on the call, oh okay. Sorry, oh yeah now I see his name there too, my word. Okay so then looking - moving to the third item which is the updated work plan. We went through it last week and discussed it. And I made a couple changes to it based on the discussion including the second revision of having two 31-Januaries in a month, removed that.

Does anybody have any issues or questions about the agenda as it stands for this next period taking us up to the face to face meeting in Costa Rica? There is a little bit of - another update we'll probably do to this in the 7th February meeting in terms of when we start looking at Item A and start figuring out how we're going to structure that discussion. May add some more detail to the - to that discussion if we get there.

So does anybody have any issues with that or leave that as the calendar we'll work to for the next month or so? Okay I want to ask also at this point before moving on are people generally comfortable with this way of dealing with a sort of rolling working agenda of getting greater clarification as we move forward or as anyone sort of been bothered by this way of doing it and wish we were doing it otherwise?

I see a check from my partner in co-chairing. Okay thanks. In which case - and a couple checks from Mikey and from Simonetta. Fantastic. And none of those red marks. Okay great.

So then the next thing if no one has anything else on this - nope, cool. The next thing is the IRTP Part C meeting planning for Costa Rica. And after the conversation that we had last week we basically found ourselves with several different options and variations.

And James, Marika and I discussed it a bit more afterwards in terms of three meetings seemed a lot; how could we combine to two meetings, what were the various options. And then Marika, you were also looking into what was possible and such and so I wonder if you'd be willing to sort of, you know, lead us further into this discussion on what in reality our options seem to be. And we can take it from there, is that okay?

Marika Konings: Yeah, that's fine. So this is Marika. So I think we discussed a couple of different meetings that will take place in Costa Rica and one of them I mentioned at actually the start of the call is typical that different working groups provide an update to the GNSO Council on the status of their work. And that's scheduled - or tentatively scheduled to take place on Saturday morning.

That's open for working group members to attend but normally it's the chairs that basically provide a short update to the council and allow council members to ask questions that they may have.

I think then we discussed as well the options of having meetings throughout the week. One of the meetings that was discussed was to see if it would be possible to meet with the ccNSO Council. I've actually sent a request to my policy colleagues to see whether that would be an option or not. But I haven't heard back from them yet so I'll follow up on that.

And in addition the working group discussed whether it would be neat to have a face to face meeting and possibly also a public session. So I think the options that the working group has to look into and I need to actually check as well with Glen because they did have a first meeting on the schedule for Costa Rica if it's still the case that, you know, public meetings are scheduled for Wednesday morning and Thursday morning which are the typical workshops slots.

So that option would be, you know, does the working group indeed see there is a need for having two separate meetings so a face to face meeting that's just for the working group and, you know, interested parties can attend but just as observers, and a separate public meeting which would be more about, you know, presenting the work of the group to the community and, you know, have an opportunity for input or questions and answers.

Or alternatively it could be as well a combination of those two; having a face to face meeting and possibly at the end of that session have 30 minutes or, you know, whatever time deemed...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...appropriate for comments or discussions with people that attend the meeting.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And I guess one of the - there was also a possibility of taking different variations as they came up. So I wonder does anybody have any viewpoint on these? Personally I think three meetings is a lot. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm just wondering if - what the main aim is we're having for getting out of this conference. And if one of our main aims is to get further feedback especially from people who didn't respond in writing I'm wondering what the best format is to get that feedback and what the best group is to maybe go to.

Because I remember Marika saying last week I believe do you want to maybe see conversation with one of the stakeholder groups and try to get on their agenda. I don't know if we should toss that idea completely and I didn't hear that's being repeated here. So I'm just putting it out there as a thought.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I guess one possibility would be trying to get various people to go in and get on the stakeholder group and constituency agendas especially

for those who did not send comments either because, well it could be any number of reasons why they didn't.

I know that for example within my stakeholder group it was just difficult to convince people that this was a subject that they had a position on and therefore that it seemed to just not get the impetus.

Whether that therefore would be represented in them being willing to even give over part of their precious time for constituency day to this but it's certainly worth looking at.

I guess I've always had the same question. I don't see any other hands at the moment. I've always had the same question, I think, about why have a public meeting at this point. Do we have anything to present?

If it's just to ask questions that some people have answered and many people haven't what expectation do we have that people would come and that it would be a worthwhile experience? So that was sort of always my view on that.

And the notion of having an open meeting of the group where obviously anyone was allowed to come, sit at the table, speak, participate and such could be a way to get greater interest.

I guess one of the things Marika had suggested was that it would also be possible in such a meeting to have both a workgroup and a public meeting but I wasn't quite sure how that would work in terms of room arrangement in that are you in a small enough room? Are you in a big room? How that would work.

Simonetta, I see your hand up again and I see Marika has her hand up.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, I mean, one way we could go about this is to actually proactively like reach out to certain people and invite them to come to this meeting in person rather than just putting it on the agenda and hoping that they read it and understand what we're trying to achieve there.

Maybe that could be a way to go about making good use of that quick presentation of maybe what is it even that this workgroup is really looking at because I'm not sure how much time people (take) to just basically read up on what other workgroups are doing and what's really behind the issues and the charter questions we're currently exploring because it's not necessarily completely apparent if you just read that and you glance over it I'm not sure you really understand what we're trying to look at.

So if we could maybe do a quick presentation of what it is that we're trying to explore and then bring those questions back up again and invite for further input but make sure that we personally invited some of the folks we want to hear from. Maybe that could be a way to get - to make the most out of an hour of time at that meeting.

Avri Doria: Before we go to Marika can I ask a clarifying question of you? Is this in terms of a larger workshop meeting you're speaking or in terms of a face to face working group meeting that you're speaking of?

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm not sure.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Based on past experience IRTP is not typically a topic that draws huge crowds to the meeting. I mean, we've had various workshops or open meetings and usually, you know, the same people that show up that have either participated in the work on previous occasions or people that have been specifically targeted.

So I think for room, you know, space-wise I don't think it will be a big issue if the meetings would be combined because, you know, the working group is not that large as such and, you know, there's always room for additional people to join.

I think usually those meetings are in the same room that the GNSO has its meetings in over the weekend so space has never been an issue before for any of the IRTP meetings as far as I recall.

I think what, you know, what Simonetta was suggesting has been done in some of, you know, previous working groups where indeed there would be for example two hour block or an hour and a half block where, you know, the first part would be dedicated just to the face to face meeting of the working group.

And then the second part would be kicked off by indeed a little kind of overview of, you know, this is what the group is looking at, you know, these are the issues that we're dealing with, these are some of the specific questions we have. And then basically open that open up for people that have come to attend that meeting.

I think if the working group would decide on such an approach it's just very important to communicate that clearly on the schedule to really make clear that, you know, that first 45 minutes is for the working group itself to, you know, go through the issues or whatever is on the agenda and that that X time that's when the open part of the meeting starts.

In such a way it would also allow - if it turns out that only, you know, a few people show up or there are just very little questions for the group that the group could then decide just to take that extra time and continue it, you know, its normal deliberations and, you know, work through its agenda.

So that allows for some flexibility as well because, you know, at this stage I guess it's not really clear whether we have anything ready to share with the

broader community for feedback or whether it's more of an update and, you know, is there anything you would like to contribute to what we're doing so far so.

Avri Doria: Okay great. Thanks. I see Michele's hand is up. Yes, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I mean, basically what Marika described there, I mean, that's what we did in IRTP-B a couple of times. I mean, we had a kind of a meeting of the group and then a kind of open to the floor anybody who wants to pitch in with thoughts, questions or whatever and could do so.

But I also think it's very important to actually try to explain to people what the hell we're doing because acronyms like IRTP don't mean a lot to anybody. And once you start getting into the detail that we unfortunately have to get into most people get lost by the wayside fairly quickly. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Have those meetings been successful? I'm assuming they have been for both you and Marika to be recommending that. So - and I haven't - I don't remember attending them so have they worked successfully? Has it worked successfully, for example, to put the meeting before the open part? Should the open part go before the meeting part? Did you do handouts with the acronym...

Michele Neylon: I mean, okay the problem, Avri, is a very, very simple one. During an ICANN meeting there are a lot of things going on. So if, for example, you end up with IRTP going right up against Rod Beckstrom and Co holding a press conference because they've just made some announcement then, you know, your attendance is going to be impacted.

And we've had that happen in the past where I think at one - I think it was - I can't remember if it was IRTP-B or whether it was PDNR or one of the other ones we ended up where we were straight up against I think it was the conflict of interest meeting which of course a lot of people wanted to go to.

I mean, the thing is this is that if you can try to get - encourage as many people to go to it as possible, you know, in other words we're facilitating that feedback from the community because without the feedback from the community we cannot understand whether people, you know, really care about this or is it just a couple of us who actually give a damn then, you know, it makes it very, very hard.

But, you know, the other thing as well is that you shouldn't assume that there's going to be loads of people who are going to turn up. You might end up in a situation where you have your working group members and the rest of the people sitting on the chairs are ICANN staff.

So you just have to work from that, you know, the basis that it could just end up where it's just a short working meeting where maybe you can go through a few things. And, you know, if there's nobody there well, I mean, so what; you cut it short, I mean, that's fine. But at least you were there for people if they didn't turn up.

You know, you can - I'm trying to think of the analogy, I mean, you can bring a horse to water but you can't make them drink. I don't know what the analogy is about meetings but, you know, the idea being you can give people the opportunity to go to a meeting; you can force them kicking and screaming to attend.

Avri Doria: You can't even make them listen. Okay I want to try and bring this to a close. I've got Simonetta and then I think I'll try and sum it up where we're at. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm just wondering if we could quickly come up with kind of like a short list of people whose input we would want to seek and then really make it a point to ask them to come.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Simonetta Batteiger: Because I have a feeling that we - well we didn't get a ton of feedback period and I really would want to make sure that if there is something that people actually care about once they really understand what it is that we're working on that we're getting their input early and not after working through a whole cycle of more meetings until we are in Prague.

And then people start to understand and all of a sudden the discussion takes a completely different bend with information that if we had sought out that feedback earlier we could have incorporated earlier as well and then be done quicker with our work.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just one last point I wanted to make is that, you know, by the 3rd of February the only thing I really need to know at that stage is basically, you know, is there a preference for a time/day to meet and how long the meeting should be so I can fill in my request.

With regards to the agenda the working group will have a little bit more time to think about that. And, you know, if you indeed decide to have one meeting, but, you know, are still struggling on how to divide that up I think there's some more time and it can be done closer to the meeting.

Because what we typically do these days especially for working groups as it's really hard by, you know, the 3rd of February to decide what you'll be doing in the meeting in March because it all depends as well on how much progress is being made, you know, in the time in between.

What we usually do is just create a wiki page and include that in the agenda or in the schedule as where to people can find more information. So what I need to know by the 3rd of February is indeed number of people you expect,

the time and if there's a preference for a date, you know, noting that there's no guarantee if that will be given because it depends on a lot of other factors as well.

But that would give the working group a bit more time to really think about the structure of the meeting and as well indeed others to be approached or invited to attend. And so that gives you a bit more time to think about that and, you know, have - let weigh in what has been done in the meantime and making progress on the issues and then whether is to share it with the community.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Well listening - and I want to close this one - listening to the discussion and reading what went on in the chat I think it's fairly clear that we are looking at this hybrid meeting. I heard no one speak to the, you know, to the regular workshop.

It wasn't covered exactly but I would think that it would tend to want to be after the constituency/stakeholder so the Wednesday or the Thursday. And I think Barbara should write this up and send it out to the list just to see that it makes sense that people have talked about it being a 90-minute block. We can go later into the, you know, how it's subdivided.

I think the outreach point was made a couple times that outreach could be done personally by people. We also had the idea mentioned of perhaps visiting stakeholder groups and constituency meetings for brief discussions to fill them in a little on what the issues are to try and pull the interest to see that if there is something it's been brought in.

So it looks like we're nearing a view on it, you know, and does anyone object to that view? Does that view seem to be what other people think it is that we sort of reached a nearing consensus on?

In which case I'd say move on with that probably it's worth one of us writing it up on the list just to make sure that of the people that didn't attend this meeting that we do have sort of a - an attendance requested type of meeting just to make sure that there isn't an issue. But I think that sort of is as far as we need to get at the moment. Any last comments on that before I move on? Last questions? Okay not seeing any.

Then the next part is the review of the public comments. There's the reference to the public comment tool. I saw what that there was only one public comment and there was a consensus of it and I don't know anything yet about other than what was mentioned at the last meeting about how many stakeholder group or constituencies and whether we had more than one.

Marika, would you like to introduce us into this discussion?

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. So what you see up on the screen is the public comment's review tool. And what I've done is basically taken the different comments that were submitted. So as I said there was one comment to the public comment forum from Go Daddy. And there was one stakeholder group statement received so far from the Registry Stakeholder Group. So those are reflected here in this overview.

What I've done is basically broken the different comments down along the lines of the charter questions so that's hopefully easier for the working group to review the different comments.

So the idea would be that the working group goes through each of these comments, formulates a response in relation to the comment and also decides whether there's a recommended action based on that comment noting that, you know, in some cases there might not be a recommended action or working group response might be as well, you know, that a certain comment is noted.

So that's basically how it has been set up. I don't know if we're still getting other comments. I did reach out to some of the other groups but at this stage I'm not aware of any other comments being forthcoming. But it would be easy to add them to the review tool as needed.

Do you just want me to start with Comment 1 and...

Avri Doria: Yeah, unless somebody thinks otherwise. I would think that doing a first walk through of the comments and then going back to the discussion of comment by comment. But just to make sure that we've sort of got a complete picture to start if that makes sense to you?

Marika Konings: Yeah that's fine. As James can't speak I'm happy to cover the Go Daddy comments but I don't know if Barbara maybe wants to cover the registry ones or do you prefer me to go through all of them?

Avri Doria: I think it's up to the person - if the person would prefer doing it it's fine. But as you did the synthesis of them it might be just as easy for the first, you know, introduction to them be the sort of neutral synthesis and then follow up.

Marika Konings: Okay I'll just kick it off then and I'm sure someone will intervene if they don't agree with my summary. So the first comment is from Go Daddy and basically notes that transferring domain name registration between registrants is inconsistently handled by registrars and other service providers.

And it therefore recommends that the working group should seek to strike a balance between domain name security and domain name portability and it specifically writes to Charter Question A.

Then the second comment is from the Registry Stakeholder Group and they expressed their support for conducting a more detailed study of the best practices used by the various country code TLD operators.

The Registry Stakeholder Group in this third comment is also supportive of the working group recommending that appropriate best practices be implemented by gTLDs in this area.

And they also acknowledge that since registrars owned a relationship with the registrant and the change of control is directly related to the registrants only the registrars should actually be permitted to affect a change of control. And they highlight that this should also be the case in relation to UDRP directives.

The following comment also comes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. With regard to Reason for Denial Number 8 many registries have a systematic restriction on the transfer of domain names within 60 days of the creation date.

And as a result of that it's the view of the Registry Stakeholder Group that measures are already in place to reduce fraud in the early days of the domain name's existence. And no further clarification is therefore needed to the specific reason for denial.

The Registry Stakeholder Groups note that in relation to Reason for Denial Number 9 since some transfer disputes are raised as a result of the registrar's practice of locking down a domain when modifications are made to the registrant details the Registry Stakeholder Group recommends that additional clarification be added to specifically state that registrars are prohibited from restricting transfers for 60 days after changes to the registrant details.

And to the extent that a new policy is developed to address the change of control function that that policy should also - could also address any specific restrictions or impacts that a change of registrant details would have on inter-registrar transfers.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. What I wanted to do now is take a pause and ask if there are any either clarifications or questions about what was posted - not getting into the discussion yet but so much just making sure that what's there is clear and clarified in questions. So does anybody have anything? I see nothing.

Okay then moving onto Question B.

Marika Konings: This is Marika again. So in relation to Charter Question B Comment 6 from Go Daddy; practical limits on the effective term of a form of authorization should be considered. Go Daddy suggests that 60 days would be a reasonable timeframe. And to form its work the IRTP Part C working group should gather and consider scenarios in which a registrar receives an FOA from the registrant but does not submit the transfer request to the registry.

The Registry Stakeholder Group notes that support for the concept of time limiting the FOA but it defers to the registrar community to determine what reasonable time limit should be for that.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. On - any questions or clarifications on that? If there aren't I have a question on the comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Okay and I see Rob Golding has one so I'll defer mine until after Rob goes. Please, Rob.

Rob Golding: I didn't mean to interrupt you.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Golding: Actually it was just regarding Point 5. I was just making sure that what was read out and what was typed up was exactly what was said. It says that the Registry Stakeholder Group recommends that additional clarification be added to specifically state that registrars are prohibited from restricting transfers for 60 days after changes.

Now unfortunately some registries are locking the domains after updates to the domain. And also wasn't the policy something to do with the IRTP-B where we said that after a change of registered name holder we should try and stop transfers for at least a certain period of time in order to maintain a definite change of control versus a change of admin contact to transfer it away.

So was the Comment Number 5 specifically state registrars are prohibited from restricting transfers correct?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Michele, is your hand raised as a response?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Avri Doria: Please.

Michele Neylon: No, I mean, following up on Rob's query there, I mean, first of all as Rob said, I mean, under the current policy we as registrars have the option - we don't have to but, I mean, one of our recommendations from B was that it would become an obligation that following a transfer between registrars, in other words and intra-registrar transfer, at the moment we have the option to stop a domain from being transferred to another registrar.

Several of the ccTLDs have certain checks and balances in place when there is a substantive change to a registrant. So if you start tinkering around with what the registrant details - well, I mean, in many cases you actually can't, I mean, you can only make certain changes; you can't make the really big changes.

And ultimately as far as end users are concerned whether the domain is a dotEU or a dotCom or a dotUS they don't really care; it's a domain and they might be using it for their business or they might be using it for their personal

whatever. You know, confusing people further because there are subtle and but unnecessary differences in policies don't really help anybody.

The other thing as well is when you have registrars of a certain size where they control a significant market share an internal transfer is in many respects almost identical as far as users are concerned to a transfer between registrars.

You know, so I think, you know, it's something that needs to be discussed and looked at much more closely. And I would have serious concerns about how - about the Registry Stakeholder Group comments on this matter.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Okay this is Barbara. So basically the question that has come up and from our perspective we were looking at it as a registrar to registrar or intra-registrar transfer not an - not an internal transfer, if you will. To the extent that, you know, the registrars are fine with that then we wouldn't have an issue with it.

But I will say that, you know, we do get complaints that the registries relative to a registrant making a change to, you know, maybe some non-material data points on their Whois and as a result of that the registrar does lock the name down.

So it's been a little bit vague. The feedback that we've gotten even at the second level domain dispute resolution is that the intent was that registrars would be prohibited from restricting transfers; that they could not deny a transfer as a result of registrant detail changes. And so that's basically what we were looking for.

Now to the extent that everybody is comfortable with people making changes then, you know, we obviously will honor whatever is decided. But I do think

that there are some points for clarification that need to be made here because it doesn't specifically state it but in practice that seems to be what the intent has been because when we've had to, you know, send these onto a second level dispute resolution provider, you know, they've ruled that registrars are not permitted to restrict a transfer based on a change of registrant details.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Simonetta, was your comment still on 5?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes.

Avri Doria: My comment is on 7 so if yours is on 5 I'd say you should go before me.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay. This is Simonetta. So my reaction to this is it looks like there is obviously disagreement about a statement. And it might be helpful also for our meeting in Costa Rica if we could find some of those reasons why people are saying these things.

So I hear Barbara saying that registries dislike the fact that they're having to deal with the complaints as a result of certain registrars locking down a domain name.

Now there's probably a reason why a registrar wants to do this. And then it would be helpful to understand why a registrar is trying to do this so we can kind of weigh the reason for why this is happening and find out what a reasonable approach should be.

And obviously maybe also seek some input from the people that are affected by that, mainly the registrants, and kind of like here is some of the upside and/or frustrations they have with the current approach so that the working group has a better foundation to discuss a question like this.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I think the only comment I would make on that one is I don't know that we need to wait for Costa Rica for that discussion. I think once we

go into the discussions on Charter Question A, you know, we may get there. But you're right, that is a good thing to put on the question.

On a personal hat and it's not a co-chair hat on 7 I guess one issue that occurred to me - and perhaps this is a non contracted party knee jerk reaction to deferring to the registrar community to determine a reasonable time limit for the FOA.

And just sort of would want to comment that I would think that it - to defer to the, you know, the working group, the community at large and that that length of an FOA in so far as it does affect registrants' ability to do things becomes a place where we not only defer to the registrar community but that it basically includes more than just their concerns in terms of that deferral.

Yes, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm afraid I have to disagree with you. I mean, the thing is this is that, you know, policy development should be based on facts and everything else. However, you know, we - both the registries and the registrars are the ones who deal with the FOAs. Registrants have actually little or no visibility of them and wouldn't need to have any visibility on them.

I mean, if you want to get feedback from the community, get feedback in general terms but when it comes down to FOAs I wouldn't see how a lot of the community are qualified to make any real substantive input into this. And I can actually see it leading to more confusion rather than anything else. Sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Kind of have to disagree with you there, Michele. I think there's two types of users. I think you are correct for the person who never - or who doesn't do a lot with their domain names. They might not know what an FOA even is and they are completely confused by the current process in any way.

But there is a large number of people who frequently deal with transfers and owner updates at the same time. And they are very aware of the consequences a time limit would have on FOA and the pros and cons of an approach like that. So it would definitely be interesting to seek the feedback of those people that deal with this on a day to day basis.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Simonetta stole everything I was going to say so I'll just say like she said.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I always love that kind of answer. And Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, I'm exactly where Mikey was; I was going to make the same point so I'll just support Simonetta's comment.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So obviously there's a further discussion to be had on 7 as we move forward. Any other comments on the Charter Question B comments? If not, Marika, back to you for C.

Marika Konings: Yeah so this is Marika. Comment 8 from Go Daddy relating to Charter Question C. Go Daddy anticipates that this might become a greater burden for all registrars with new gTLDs when hundreds of new gTLDs are active in the DNS. A move to uniformly employ IANA ID numbers in gTLD registry systems would therefore be favored to the extent practical.

And then the Comment Number 9 from the Registry Stakeholder Group. It is 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. They also note that it is reasonable to think that all registries do maintain the IANA ID for each registrar in their registration systems.

Avri Doria: Okay any comments on - questions, clarifications on 8 and 9? Okay. And then moving onto the next block.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So the next blocks basically relate to the specific additional questions that we asked in our - in the template that we provided to the constituencies and stakeholder groups.

So the first one relates to frequency of hijacking cases; so the registries note that 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 a manner that will protect the proprietary nature of the data.

Avri Doria: Any comments? Clarifications? Questions? Okay I see a message - I have not been following the chat very well. I see there were several comments on earlier ones. Just to note that Go Daddy did not respond to these. Did that mean that Go Daddy did intend to follow up with a response or just - I see some typing - and we can get back to - no okay. So it's not that we're expecting something.

Okay so I see no hands up on wanting to further comment, clarify or question. Going to 11 - it's again - that one's a quickie. It's another defers to registrar community for feedback on the change of control issue. Let you read it.

So I guess I don't understand this one. It's basically on the question of the ccTLD feedback and similar procedures deferring to the registrar community on an interest in their other practices. I guess I don't quite understand the

comment from the registries that if the registrar community is not interested in the ccTLD feedback then we shouldn't get it? Yes, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Yeah, this is Barbara. So basically because it's the registrars that own that relationship and the change of control function for a registrant, you know, who would basically defer to, you know, the registrar community and what they would see as appropriate perhaps best practices to put forward based on what the ccTLDs are doing.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I can raise my hand I guess. Once again ask the same question I was asking in that all of these practices that have affects on the registrant that to some extent whatever practice - so would it also be worth knowing what affects the various ccTLD's practices on change of control had on their registrants and how did that play out.

And so again I guess I would think - and this is probably a comment of mine on almost every issue where the registries defer to their partners in the contracted house if these issues do go further and have registrant affects that also need to be taken into account.

And, Michele, it's yours.

Michele Neylon: Avri, this is the thing where, you know, look you've got to recognize that we're the ones who are dealing with the customer service issues that either the lack of clear policies and processes has and, you know, the impact when there is a clear policy and a process.

So, I mean, the things is this; the reason why it makes sense on many levels for us to be the ones to actually give some feedback is we know what our customer service staff run into in terms of problems because we're seeing a large number of complaints about a particular way of doing things or we don't have any complaints about a particular way of doing things.

I mean, the problem when you throw this back to the supposed community, which I still think is a terrible misnomer in many respects, is that you're going to get back feedback from a very, very small narrow group of people who are basically domain investors who have a large significantly vested interest in domain names. And they're not ordinary registrants.

Which actually ends up kind of defeating the purpose of what you might have originally intended. It'd be more interesting if you could actually get feedback from, I don't know, from ALAC in general; that would be useful because supposedly ALAC represents the kind of normal end user.

But I'm very wary of this kind of general feedback thing because you'll end up getting feedback from some domainer who has invested millions of dollars in domain names and who likes to be able to flip them quickly and easily. It's not the same as getting the feedback from your average registrant who makes up the bulk of domain names that are actively registered. The thing is that the average registrant doesn't really care as long as the damn thing works.

Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. This is Avri, personal comment again. I certainly did not mean to say that the registrars' viewpoint shouldn't be gathered. And I think you make a really good point about reaching further than just the non - the commercial non contracted parties to the non commercial non contracted parties and indeed to the user community.

And I think that - I totally accept that as an extension in terms of not just deferring to the registrar community but deferring to the larger user and registrant base both commercial and noncommercial. I think, you know, certainly just getting the view of one kind of registrant was not at all my intent but was basically saying there might be a wider set of people, users and registrants whose opinions do need to be gathered. Thanks.

Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I hear Michele and I think he has a very good point in that it is a lot harder to solicit feedback from someone who might not be a professional domain investor. But I think it would be worthwhile trying. And maybe we would have to spend a little bit of time thinking about how we would get that type of feedback.

And maybe set up a survey that could be sent out to people who have just transferred a domain name or do something like that and filter for people who don't own a lot of names but only own very few names. I think it would be worthwhile trying to get their feedback; if we can't get it that's another story.

But I think that's ultimately the people who will make use of this policy is the people who will try to get a name from A to B whether or not this is the professional investor or someone who is just for the very first time picking a name for their Website and happens to pick one that is owned by someone else. So I think it would be worthwhile trying to get their feedback although I agree with you that it's hard to get.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think one other thing that I'd like to raise is - and this is mostly directed to Barbara - I think we probably want to be interested in feedback from the registries too. I think - especially in the CC world the roles of registries vary quite a bit.

And I think that it would be good to not let them off the hook quite so readily. You know, I understand the notion of deferring but I want to hear from them because I think they have an important perspective on all this.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. Mikey, by no means are we saying we don't want to participate at all. But, you know, again the registrars do on that relationship so, you know, I think we do need to rely on, you know, as Michele said the feedback that they get from their customers, I mean, they know their registrants, they, you know, they get that feedback.

So, you know, while I appreciate yes we should open this up and a lot of people should have input and feedback into it, you know, I think that we, you know, we really do need to rely on, you know, the registrars to kind of put the voice of their customers forward when they're trying to figure out what is going to be a viable solution for, you know, changing, you know, a change of control, a change of registrant data on a domain name.

You know, as far as we as the registries are concerned, yes, we will definitely participate in the conversations and bring forward, you know, any experiences that we've had and, you know, we're happy to participate in that. But I do think that, you know, more weight probably should go to the registrar community on these.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Just to respond to Barbara. I don't disagree with any of that but I think that the conversation is headed in the right direction; absolutely don't want to ignore the registrars, don't want to get Michele mad at me. Hell, that's a big lose/lose deal.

But at the same time I think that there are a lot of voices that are useful to hear much along the lines of what the point that Avri made about the broader community. And so I just don't want us to lose the opportunity to get as many smart people in this conversation as possible that's all.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Are we talking about gTLDs or ccTLDs when we're talking about registries? Because this is I think where there's a little bit of confusion. I think when Barbara is speaking you have to remember she's speaking from the perspective of a gTLD registry within a group of gTLD registries who have purely financial arrangements with their - with registrars.

Whereas when you're looking at the ccNSO and the ccTLDs who in many cases have this nailed and have lots of experience doing it the entire relationship is completely different.

Like I as an individual, and forget about what I do for my day job, I cannot go to VeriSign's Website and register a dotCom domain name with VeriSign; I can't do that. I can however do that if I go to a lot of the ccTLD registries. And, you know, this - the ccNSO members have a lot of experience of various types of activities which oh my God also happen to impact people in gTLDs.

And there's going to be more and more of this cross pollination between the two groups as things move forward because, you know, if you stop - if you want to avoid SOPA, just as a silly example, then you can go off and move your stuff - move your domains into dotEUs or some random ccTLD theoretically at least.

But, you know, the point I'm trying to get at is that, you know, I think, you know, one of the problems I've seen is where in the GNSO people tend to forget about the ccNSO and the ccNSO has a huge amount of experience. And they've covered and thought about things a lot. And it's because their structures and everything as to the way they do things are so completely different. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I think there's good stuff that we're going to come back and discuss here so I won't add anything at this point. Can we go through 12 and 13 just to make sure that we've finished the read-through for today? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. In relation to Charter Question B and C where we also requested further data. The Registry Stakeholder Group here also defers to the registrar community for feedback linked to Charter Question B since the Registry Stakeholder Group has little to no information relating to the age of FOAs used in the transfer of domain names from one registrar to another.

And Comment 13 that relates to Charter Question C where registries and registrars were asked to provide specific information as to where proprietary IDs are currently being used. And the response of the Registry Stakeholder Group is there 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 registry/registrar communications. The primary driver behind the use of proprietary IDs versus IANA IDs is security. The registries that currently use proprietary IDs have indicated that the use of proprietary IDs aid 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.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. And I actually had some further feedback that I had received from some of those registry operators that are currently using proprietary IDs.

One of the other things that they had pointed out as the reason behind why they're doing that is because, you know, obviously they're dealing with a lot of - a lot of registrars, if you will, that may also be selling ccTLDs.

And so from a consistency perspective, you know, ccTLD registrars are not required to be ICANN-accredited so they would not have an assigned IANA ID.

So from their perspective they're using these internal proprietary IDs so that they can identify the registrars across the board in their systems using the same ID since in all cases, as I said, the - some of the ccTLD registrars are not necessarily ICANN-accredited with an ICANN-accredited - or an assigned IANA ID. So that was some additional feedback that I had received actually after we had prepared these particular statements.

Avri Doria: Okay. Michele, I'll give you the last word before I close up the discussion for today's meeting and then I'll take a couple minutes just to wrap up. Please, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Woo-hoo I get the last word.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I talk after you.

Michele Neylon: Oh so it's not the last word. God, you're no fun, Avri. Now just coming back to you on this point, Barbara, I mean, the thing is I find explaining how and why they ended up doing what they're doing is fine and wonderful and it's helpful to a certain degree.

But the point is that while okay in the case of Affilius who I would presume is the entity who actually gave that feedback, since they're about the only one I can think of who would be able to, if they want to have their own - let's say for example if an ID is let's say eight characters long.

If they want to use four characters for the IANA ID plus four characters for some internal thing let them because then it's still - as long as we know which

part of it is the IANA ID that's grand. And then they can have the other four characters for themselves.

I mean, the thing is that registries are perfectly happy to change how things are generated when it suits them. And if their contract allows them to do that without having to consult registrars they'll happily do it. So, you know, the shoe is on the other foot.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I think we had a good first talk through on this. I think there's obviously a couple issues where further discussion on the comments and further.

I would also like to recommend that any of the folks on this call who come from stakeholder groups and constituencies such as me who did not have comments take this synthesis back to their respective groups and see if they do have some at least second order comments to make that can be brought by those people into the conversation at the next meeting.

So I'd like to recommend that at the next meeting, when we will have our regular host back running the meeting, that we sort of go back through the issues, find out the places where there are either issues of further discussion and work to be done perhaps coming up with techniques for finding ways to collect further information, clarifying any differences that have come up and we basically take the next step.

We may be able to finish on the comments in the next period. Hopefully we'll get some of the comments from our advisory committees, etcetera, who have not yet submitted comments that we can also go through.

With that I thank everybody for the meeting. I thank you for putting up with me as chair. And we'll have the meeting same time, same details I assume next week. Thank you, Marika, also for the work done to put this into the public comments review tool. I love this tool. I think it's great. Thank you all.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Avri.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Avri.

Bob Mountain: Thanks everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Sam), you can now stop the recordings. Thanks.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END