

**IRTP C  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 21 August 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 21 August 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-20120821-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Attendees:**

Hago Dafalla - NCUC  
Angie Graves – CBUC  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Chris Chaplow - CBUC  
Bob Mountain - RrSG  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG  
Phil Corwin - CBUC

**ICANN Staff:**

Berry Cobb  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apologies**

James Bladel –RrSG co-chair  
Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Paul Diaz – RrSg  
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG  
Rob Golding – RrSG  
Roy Dykes – RySG  
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair  
Oliver Hope - RrSG  
Marika Konings

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 21st of August, 2012. On the call today I have Hago Dafalla, Bob Mountain, Angie Graves, Kevin Erdman, Philip Corwin, Barbara Knight and Chris Chaplow.

We have apologies from Michele Neylon, James Bladel, Avri Doria, (Roy Dykes), (Rob Galling), Paul Diaz, Simonetta Batteiger, Oliver Hope and Marika Konings. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Glen De Saint Gery, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Nathalie. Welcome all. I appreciate you joining today. Sorry we're kicking off a little bit late. As you notice by the attendance, we're a pretty light crew today, but I think we have enough just to barely move forward and review the remaining public comments.

As you also have noted that James and Avri sent their apologies, so they asked that I go ahead and lead the call. The only thing that we'll be trying to accomplish today is just to complete the remainder of the public comments.

For those that aren't logged into Adobe Connect, we do have the latest version of the public comment review tool up, and we'll be starting around Row 25, which the two comments listed are in respect to Recommendation 3 about enhancing the form of authorization, or FOA for short.

So that's pretty much going to be our agenda today. Does anybody have any comments or questions before we get started? All right. So the first comment that we'll review is from (Michael Showhot).

He basically had stated that their stand on this issue depends on the details to be elaborated at a larger stage. But basically we'd recommend to avoid exception to the rule, if rules are simple and make sense. Does anybody have any comments in regard to that comment? Go ahead, Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, this is Bob. Yeah, I think, you know, philosophically I would agree with (Michael). You know, it's best to keep it streamlined.

I think in this case, though, we do have two fundamentally different conditions where one type of FOA, it makes sense to have it a non-expiring. And then the other, it makes sense to -- as we've all discussed -- have a short or a limited lifespan.

So I'm not quite sure how to reconcile the fundamental point on Recommendation 3, you know, with (Michael)'s comment, other than, you know, looking at the implementation and trying to streamline it to the extent we can. So that would be my comments on his point.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Bob. Yeah, I definitely believe - this is Berry. I definitely believe that that's a fundamental attribute that just about anyone on this working group told, to try to keep it as simple as possible without making everything too complicated, or especially certain multiple exceptions.

So unless nobody else has any other comments, I'll basically just state that the working group agrees with the comment. I've identified the two distinctions on the FOA, and basically no action with regard to the - other than the working group will continue to deliberate on the recommendation. Okay, Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, thanks, Berry. Just - sorry, just sort of starting to get off the mark here, read it through couple of times, and yeah, I think that's - my agreement with that is just a positive note in the sense it's a comment you can't really disagree with in its general sense. Yeah.

Berry Cobb: All right. Great. Thank you. Okay, moving on to the next comment. This is from the registry stakeholder group. This recommendation seems to relate more to a change of registrant than a change of registrar.

The registry stakeholder group is of the opinion that it would be more appropriate to address the need and the context of a change of control policy. Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks, Berry. This is Bob. I would say from an after-market standpoint that this definitely does involve a change in registrar as well as a change in registrant. The FOA is a fundamental element of the transfer of domains between registrars, generally also involving a change in - a simultaneous change in registrant.

But I would probably - either I don't understand Comment 26, or I would disagree with it the way I believe I'm interpreting it. But - because I do believe it does involve a change in registrar, certainly in the case of the after-market.

Berry Cobb: All right, great. Thank you. Barbara?

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. And I guess maybe we had misunderstood, I guess, the meaning of what is specifically being asked here. But I don't know. It just seemed to us that it was more relating to registrant details.

But, like I said, we may have just misunderstood that, I think, you know, to the extent - kind of back to 25, I mean I think that to the extent that we can avoid, you know, making as many exceptions as possible to rules, then I think that's a good practice.

So, you know, I think as we get into more discussion on this, we may have, I guess, more to add. But I don't know if we need to, you know, go into a lot of

detail relative to this, because we may have misunderstood the context of the question.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: All right. Well I think that takes care of Recommendation 3. If there's no other comments, we'll move on to Recommendation 4 and the comments that were there, which basically Recommendation 4 is the working group recommends that all registry operators be required to publish the registrar of record's IANA ID in the TLD thick Whois.

So the first comment is from (Michael Showhot), and basically the comment is, yes, there seems to be consensus on this in the working group as well. I think maybe that was probably a comment from the public session. I'm not really sure that there's anything that the working group can respond to that other than agreeing or disagreeing.

All right, we'll move forward. This next comment's from the registry stakeholder group. They support Recommendation 4 relating to Charter Question C, which recommends that all gTLD registry operators be required to publish the registrar of record's (IENE) ID in the TLD LDS.

However, the registry stakeholder group recommends the removal of the designation of thick in the LDS reference, as the registrar of record information would be available in all versions of Whois.

Man: Yes, sorry, Berry. I'm not seeing the next line. It's not scrolling from...

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry. Yeah, that's my bad.

Man: Oh, okay. Thanks. I just - again hoping it wasn't just me.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so any comments from the group on this? I think for the most part it seems like that there more or less is consensus surrounding this, and I wouldn't suspect that the working group would object to just the specific designation of a thick Whois. I'm not speaking for the working group, but that's my gut feel. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: If I'm picking this up right, it's asking to remove the word thick from the recommendation in the last - at the end of the recommendation there.

Berry Cobb: That's correct. Unless there's - I don't think that there's an issue with the comment. But if what is stated here is in fact true, that the IANA ID can be visible in a thin model as well, then there shouldn't need to be the distinction.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, correct.

Berry Cobb: And Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. So yeah, that's exactly right. I mean the registrar of record is the registrar of record, and that's going to be visible in all Whois, regardless of whether or not it's thick or thin. It's the registrant details that are currently not available in thin registries.

Berry Cobb: All right, great. Thank you. Okay, let's move on to Comment 29, and this is from the registry stakeholder group. They support a modification of this recommendation to also stipulate that all gTLD registry operators existing and future shall have the option to utilize and publish proprietary IDs, so long as they also publish the IANA ID in their TLD rules. Barbara?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So just to elaborate on that a little bit, we wanted to just make sure that just because a new gTLD is new that any registry operator that is supporting those new gTLDs would still have the option to have proprietary IDs, because we don't see that going away given that, you know,

a lot of the ccTLDs, for instance, do not require ICANN accreditation of a registrar in order for them to be able to register domain names in the TLD.

So we would anticipate that, in the new gTLDs as well as the existing gTLDs, that proprietary IDs would still have a purpose and a usefulness.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: So there's no conflict there between 29 and the recommendation, as I read it.

Berry Cobb: Barbara?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So I don't think that there's a conflict at all, because so long as the IANA ID's are published across the board, the only thing that we're saying here is that registries should also be able to continue to use proprietary IDs and they could make those available as well.

So it's basically just giving new gTLD registry operators the same requirements, if you will, as the existing gTLD operators would have, and giving them the option to use both the - I'm sorry - the IANA ID as well as proprietary IDs, so long as they make both available.

Berry Cobb: And so - this is Berry. So basically we had that already noted, though, just to ensure that this note continues forward with the recommendation. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes. I'm just trying to recall back to Prague when we did the presentation of the report. And Chuck Gomes said something. I'm struggling to remember what it was now, but it was to do with these IDs. It was to do with the ccTLD space. And we all looked at each other and couldn't quite be sure if he had a point or what was already covered.

I'm just wondering, has that been picked up somewhere? I don't see it here. I can't quite remember what it was without looking back on the transcript. So

it's just - I don't know, a picking-up point really, that if anyone remembers that.

Berry Cobb: Go ahead, Barbara?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So I don't recall that particular comment, but I'm fairly confident that it does go back to the fact that in the case of ccTLDs, as I mentioned, registrars or companies are not required to have an ICANN accreditation in order to be able to distribute ccTLDs.

And in cases where a company may be distribution a ccTLD but not a regular gTLD, which would require ICANN accreditation and which would therefore have an IANA ID, you may have some companies that registry operators are working with in the distribution of ccTLDs that would not necessarily have an IANA ID, which therefore makes the use of a proprietary ID critical to the operation of those registries.

So I think that's the point that Chuck was probably trying to make. Does that make a little more sense?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here. Yes, that was it, isn't it? So we're asking that you publish your IANA ID if you've got one, obviously. Because if you haven't got one, you can't.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. That's correct. That would be my understanding of that.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Berry. I was on mute. Any other comments with respect to 29? Then we'll move on to 30, which is also from the registry stakeholder group. As with any recommendation that would require development effort and modifications to systems to implement, the registry stakeholder group notes that registries

must be afforded adequate time to implement Recommendation Number 4, so as not to negatively impact existing development roadmaps and cycles.

Seeing no comments, I basically - or no hands raised - Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yes, should we ask - this is Bob. Should we ask for what adequate time would mean, just so we can put some - just have some kind of, you know, understanding of what that would entail? Or what sort of lead time the registries would require for this?

Berry Cobb: Barbara, do you happen to maybe have kind of a rough answer to that?

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So I think that's going to vary from registry to registry. But, you know, I think if we look at historically the timing that has been afforded between the time that, you know, modifications are adopted and the time that they become effective, then I think that should, you know, be a pretty good window.

I'm trying to think. It seems like -- what was it?-- November of last year, or maybe it was even later than that, that the modifications that were proposed by IRTPB were adopted. But they didn't go into effect until June of this year. Berry, do you know what the timing of that was?

Berry Cobb: Yes, that was - it was at least six months. So you're right, for sure, that it definitely came out around November of last year. And I think that it was June 1 or 30 of this year.

Barbara Knight: Yeah, I think it was June 1. So, you know, I think that if you're looking at at least a six-month window, I think that's, you know, that's probably reasonable.

But I think that, you know, to the extent that you could provide some latitude for registry operators who may have a longer roadmap or software development, you know, window that, you know, so long as they are able to

provide a time frame within which they would be able to comply, I think that's reasonable and is what, you know, the stakeholder group, the registry stakeholder group, would look for.

Berry Cobb: I agree. That's got that noted. All right, we'll move on to Comment 31, which is from the ALAC. And the ALAC supports the requirement to have all gTLDs use the IANA registrar ID in addition to proprietary ones, if desired. Basically I'll just note that the working group acknowledges the comment and agrees, unless anybody else has any other comments.

All right. Moving on to Row 32, this is from the public workshop in Prague, and it's our last comment. It says - this is - I don't know who the source is. One of the things that surprised me is that EPP never defined registrars as an object to be queried.

So it occurred to me that it would make sense to have this option, because obviously in a registry database, registrars are first-class objects where they exist and can be queried. So but there is no way to query for them through EPP.

Anyone make sense of that comment? It's a little fuzzy for me. I'm not seeing any hands, so I will take the action to go look through the transcript and maybe I can find out who the source was and put a little bit more dialogue around the context of this. And we can review it at the next meeting.

Essentially we've completed review of the public comments. There is one other action that we had listed up here, which is kind of the same source. I had to go back and pull the transcript to put some context around it, but I think it'd be more appropriate to wait till more participants are here to review those two actions.

So for the most part, that completes the review. Looking at our work plan, basically we have the 28th of August through the 2nd of November to

continue to deliberate the open issues identified, the recommendations that have been put forward.

I think there's one other major action that the working group agrees to, and that's about somehow documenting, at a high level, what the transfer process is, and more specifically honing in on the difference between change of registrar versus change of registrant.

Basically the deadline to have the final report complete is the 9th of October, so that the GNSO council can deliberate during the Toronto meeting. So that's basically all that I have for today. Does anybody else - Bob?

Bob Mountain: Yeah, Berry. And so are we looking for a sub-team to do that project? Or has that already been created? Or where are we on that? This is the additional information on registrant versus change of registrar?

Berry Cobb: Yes. A while back, I think that was several meetings ago - looking at the wrong document. Sorry. If I remember correctly, Mikey had created kind of a first draft of a visual process representation of the transfer process. I don't think we've created any sub-team specifically.

I'll take note that we make it a specific discussion item for the next meeting. But I believe we at least have a working draft to mold from, and I'm not sure whether James and Avri will want to create just a little sub-team to get that formed, or if they'll just want to go ahead and keep it within the main working group. But I'll make sure to take that down as an action to discuss for the next session.

Bob Mountain: Okay, great. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: And actually now that I'm looking at the recommended action, I think it was discussed that we would create a sub-team, and most likely Mikey will review that.

So I'll make sure - and hopefully he'll be able to make the next call, and he can walk the working group through what he has created thus far, and then we'll get the sub-team formed to complete that one.

Although I'm not sure, I think one of the main dependencies here is for the working group to nail down the true difference between change of registrant versus change of registrar, because I think that that would influence any kind of high-level process diagram in that regard.

Okay, does anybody have any other comments or suggestions before we close up for the day? All right. Well I appreciate everyone attending. Hopefully we'll have a bigger party next Tuesday, and everybody have a good week.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks a lot, Berry. Take care.

Woman: Thanks, everyone.

Woman: And to you, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tim). You may now stop the recording. Thank you. Bye-bye.

END