

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 24 April 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 24 April 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120424-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
James Bladel -co-chair
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Hago Dafalla – NCSG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Roy Dykes – RySG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Angie Graves – CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Rob Golding - RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de St Géry
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Paul Diaz - RrSg
Michele Neylon - RrSG

Coordinator: Thank you. The recording has now started. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the IRTPC call on the 24th of April 2012. On the call today we have James Bladel, Mikey O'Connor, Barbara Knight, Bob Mountain, Hago Dafalla, Simonetta Batteiger, Matt Serlin, Philip Corwin, Roy Dykes, Angie Graves, Kevin Erdman, Chris Chaplow. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Michele Naylor 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 Rob Golding has just joined (unintelligible). Thank you and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning everyone, good afternoon depending on your time zone. Welcome to the IRTPC PDP Working Group call for April 24, 2012. As per our custom, we have two matters of housekeeping first up. Does anyone have any updates to their Statements of Interest? Please indicate so by raising your hand now.

All right and secondly, does anyone have any questions, concerns, or suggested adds to the agenda, which you see in the right-hand column of your Adobe screen and what was circulated on the mailing list earlier? If so, please raise your hand.

And nothing for that. And we have someone typing. If you could, please mute your line when your microphone is not active. Thanks.

Okay, so as you can see, our agenda is posted. Marika circulated that yesterday, thank you Marika. And based on just my peripheral involvement with some of the efforts of the two sub teams, I think we have a lot of material to cover this week and I am starting to wonder if we are going to get through our entire agenda. We may get through 3 and 4 and then have to stop for the hour.

So let's kick that off first off with maybe to start with Simonetta and see if she can update us on the Change of Control Sub Team. Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteieger: Yes, well we had one more call with the sub team this past week and spent a lot of time there on this one particular issue and the process that we kind of raised on last week's already, whether or not an auth code should be used or the existing auth code should be used for this change of control authorization about - a second and separate parameter should be used in the EPP protocol for that.

And Mikey spent a considerable amount of time on actually summarizing the issue so that we can take the summary and provide some input and information to the registrars and registries to let them tell us whether or not they think it's a good idea to do all of this. to do multiple things with the same parameter or if we should be designing a process that uses something else as a transfer authorization (credential), and you see those up on the screen in front of us right now. Maybe Mikey because you wrote this - not only your passion and initiative that went into this, you can walk us through it.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I would be happy to do that, James. Is that okay with you?

James Bladel: Yes. Yes, I just wasn't sure if you were on the line.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I was fumbling around with the mute button. Let me just walk through this little ditty that I wrote.

I think that - well let me just walk through it. as you can see, there is this idea of giving a piece of data more than one meaning. And this harkens back to my days when I actually worked for a living and actually a lot of this came out of the work that I did in the manufacturing sector where manufacturing companies get into all kinds of managerial trouble when they attribute

multiple meanings to either the same data element or the same value of a data element.

And so one of the things I want to preface this with is this is really more a technical reaction than a policy reaction, but I think that if we don't pay attention to the technical issue in the policy discussion, we run the risk of creating some problems down the line.

So with that, then I went ahead and stole the definition that Paul had posted to the list literally seconds before I started writing this, in which at least according to the ICANN Web site, the auth info code has a meaning. One meaning that it is the authorization or confirmation of a transfer request.

Now one of the tricks to that is well what do you mean transfer? Do you mean transfer between registrars? Do you mean transfer between people who control the name? you know so there is some ambiguity there, but I think that the intended meaning was transfer between registrars and we can circle back to that because I think that's the key to this thing.

And I'm fine with a definition that that's narrow. I get like I say uncomfortable when the definition gets broader because of sort of two things. one is the multiple meanings problem and so I go and steal a little stuff from Wikipedia there that wasn't very well written so I quoted it, but I did acknowledge that that's not the way I would have written that sentence.

You know and I think that this is sort of my technical reaction, which is you know this is just bad data practice and a good database administrator or somebody who actually knows how to do this for a living I think would agree with me.

And then you know point to the fact that I think this overloading is perhaps already taking place as people are using auth info not just for the indication of a transfer request, but they are actually using it as a semaphore to indicate all

kinds of things. And without doing a whole bunch of research, it's hard to know, but as we overload that data element, but think that we create a number of problems.

The other is the difference in the way that people treat it in terms of the length of time that it is valid, and you know we've had a fair amount of discussion about when they get created and when they get updated. Sometimes these auth info codes have a very long life, other times they have a short life, and to me, that is the same kind of problem. since we don't have clear definitions around this, we leave ourselves open to creating some trouble.

So then I go into just a series of possible meanings that may already be out there, and I think there is no way to verify this except to indicate that you know there is anecdotal evidence that this kind of thing is going on. and then I go into a little list of troubles that that my cause, mostly because I'm really interested in securing these processes. These are security kinds of issues.

And then by that time, I was getting pretty tired, and so my options aren't terribly creative. I came up with several options. One is to just not do anything and overload it some more, which I'm cranky about. I think that's a bad idea, but you know I can be overruled. Maybe I'm just - I sometimes do get out in left field. And so if I'm way out in the middle of nowhere, I'm happy to be corrected.

I think that a couple of ways to solve this - if I were a database manager, I would say well I either create a new data element for transfer of control. So now we have auth info reg for changing registrar and auth info control for changing control. Another way to do it would be - and this might be a better way to accommodate the varying use of auth info. It would be to still create on more data element, but have it be a typing element. You know an auth info type.

This auth info code is type registrar and so it's valid for a change of registrar. This auth info code is type control and it's good for a change of control, and

you know you can then imagine a boatload of type codes in there, and that way you would only have to create one more data element in the EPP scheme and you could use it to do all sorts of things. Another would be to specify that this semaphore is only valid for a very short period of time. the trouble with the time thing is that that doesn't solve the overlapping use of the same auth info code for a multiple transactions problem, and so I'm less keen on that.

I think it would also be quite a bit more disruptive to existing practice, but again, this is way down in the tech weeds and I'm not sure that we even want to go there except to say no we're not going to use auth info code because we don't want to reengineer the use of auth info code in all of the places that it currently appears.

So that is kind of the list and I had a little list of you know things to think about - data integrity, process integrity, costs both to registrants, and registries, and registrars. And then I kind of wind up by saying you know I think that this is really quite close to the heart of the change of control issue, especially if we continue to overload auth info even more.

So there is my rant. Hopefully, that helped and I will hand it back to James.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey and we really appreciate the thought and effort put into this, and I would encourage everyone who hasn't had a chance to review it. I think there are some important concepts in there.

Simonetta, did you want to continue?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well my problem with - I was just looking at what we need to get out of a sub group that designs and drafts for the process, and we came up with a first draft and we came up with a list of questions that went to the mailing group. it was sent by Marika I think on Friday morning last week, and then we

followed it up with putting more flesh on this one in particular question on how this credential should be looking like.

And I think at this point, I'm unsure if the sub team should continue to work or whether for the questions that we have identified if we need to come up with another survey or outreach to the registrars and registries so they give us information that we need. I'm not even sure we have the knowledge to answer these questions in the work group right now, so I'm using to you James and the rest of the work group to get some guidance from you as well on what you think or how we should proceed.

Because I don't know if with where we are right now it makes much sense for Michele, James, Mikey, and myself to keep going back to this draft and starting to try to do anything with it because we don't have the information we need to proceed I think.

James Bladel: Thanks Simonetta and I think I agree with you. I think that the work - the sub team has reached a point where it has come back with a menu of options. I think Mikey has identified one, I think there are a couple of others, and there were a few if I recall from last week's presentation of the survey results. There were a few that were also relatively evenly divided as far as the lack of consensus.

So what I would recommend at this point is I don't know if we need to formally go back to the different stakeholders at this time, but maybe - I think we have a good cross section of expertise already on this group between the registries and registrars.

I'm getting a pretty bad echo now, but - can we make sure you are on mute please (so I hear that echo). Anyway, if we could please - I'm sorry. I can't speak. If you are not speaking, could you please be on mute. Thank you. So, okay, so I'm getting no - they are looking into the echo.

But anyway, I think that this working group needs to - has reached a crossroad as Simonetta identified and we need to put these questions out. I think that we possess the expertise on the group and that we can address the questions on the group or at least make an attempt to address these questions. Between the various registry and registrar reps I think we have the background necessary.

Does anyone have any concerns about that approach? Simonetta, what do you think is the best approach to laying out those choices, those open questions in a way that the working group can tackle them?

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm not sure. Maybe those questions should go back to the working group because we put the questions to the mailing list in the form of two emails. Would you like us to combine this into one more saying this is what we need input on, because I'm not clear what else we should bring to the work group to ask the questions. They've been asked I think.

Maybe we should just review it here on the call one more time. Marika, maybe you could bring up that email that you sent us Friday as well so we can take a look at this so everyone is clear on what the questions are.

James Bladel: That would work.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Give me one second. I need to find that email and then bring it up on Adobe Connect. I mean there were I think two responses on the mailing list I think from Paula and from Barbara on some of the questions if I recall well.

James Bladel: Okay, so that means the rest of us and myself included have some homework to do on those questions.

So while we look for that, again, thanks Mikey for your work on this. There was another point of view on this issue that I think had also some validity, but

certainly didn't feel as passionate about it as Mikey did. I mean I don't think it was necessarily an opposing point of view. It was just similar considerations with a slightly different outcome.

So here is a message from Marika and the sub team. As you can see, there are a few open questions here. there are six open questions. We did receive a note I believe from Paul and was it Barbara?

Marika Konings: Yes.

James Bladel: And then Mikey I think responded to this thread with the document that he posted that we just went over, so you know Simonetta do you want to - I can walk us through these since I know you have some audio issues. so I can walk us through these questions, but I think that we need to get these resolved because this is where the working group has - the sub team has hit its boundary.

So the first one is - I think it should be relatively straightforward. We need to finalize terminology. We talked about change of control, change of registrant, losing/gaining registrant, old versus new registrants. I think that it's based on our discussion in Costa Rica. It seemed like we were kind of purviewing around this idea of old versus new just because that was simpler and easier to translate.

Does anyone have any strong feelings about old versus new or losing versus gaining? Can we settle that one at least today do you think? Bob, go ahead.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, I think a couple of weeks ago I raised a concern about old and suggested maybe previous or prior instead of old. I think that's the only - and there was some discussion about that, but that would be my only suggestion. I'm just not sure old is perhaps the best term to use here.

James Bladel: Thank you, Bob. I do remember that now and certainly the prior registrant could be a young person, so let's take Bob's consideration into account here and call it prior versus new. any concerns or objections to that previous and new? some variation of those I think would probably be fine.

And when we say change of control versus change of registrant, I think that change of registrant implies a change of control. I'm thinking about a (men) diagram here, but does anyone have any thoughts about this? Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just noted in the discussion that we had in preparing for a meeting with the ccNSO, they didn't understand at all what we were meaning with change of control. When we told them it was about a change of registrant, then they were like is that what you are talking about.

So from a communications perspective, the term change of registrant might be easier to understand for people what this actually is about instead of change of control. So that would be you know my only comment.

James Bladel: I tend to agree. I think while change of control might be more technically correct, change of registrant is more accessible and makes the topic more easily understood. I see some hands up on some agreement in the chat room, so we will go with Matt next.

Matt Serlin: Yeah, thanks James. I was just going to agree with what Marika had said and then what you just agreed with. That I think change of registrant is much more simpler for folks to understand rather than change of control, so that would get my vote.

James Bladel: Thank you, Matt, and I see some green tics agreeing with our agreement, so Mikey can you weigh in as well?

Mikey O'Connor: I think the one thing that we need to address if we say change of registrant. I don't have strong feelings about this, but recognize that that's confusing because it could mean change of registrant info like address, or a zip code, or a phone number, or it could mean change of the controlling registrant. So it's almost like you need to describe what kind of a registrant change you imply.

James Bladel: Yeah, so changing the registrant entity versus the registrant contact data. is that what you are saying, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, exactly. Yeah, that's precisely the problem. so maybe another word in there like controlling to stay carefully away from owner, which raises all sorts of other flags. You know I just think that change of registrant isn't quite precise enough.

James Bladel: Okay, Matt (further thoughts).

Matt Serlin: Yeah, this is Matt. Yeah, Mikey, I mean I see your point. I guess maybe what we just need to clarify is what we mean by change of registrant. Like James says, there is the actual entity name. so if Matt Serlin has a domain name registered at you know 123 East Street, and I moved to you know 179 North Street but the registrant name is still Matt Serlin, then that I don't think would be considered a change of registrant.

However, if I sell a name to Mikey O'Connor and you know I want to change the registrant from Matt Serlin to Mikey O'Connor, then I would think that is a change of registrant. And there are several ccTLDs that operate just in that manner that you can you know update the address and the phone number information, but you cannot update the actual entity name whether it be an individual or a company name.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Matt. I think we are (violently) agreeing with one another here. there are some concerns and some confusion. I think Mikey in some respects when we go away from change of control and go towards change of

registrant, we accept some degree of imprecision in exchange for ensuring that this is understood by as wide an audience as possible.

I do want to - we have five more of these and we still have an easy half hour of sub team B update here or sub team A. I'm not sure if it's A or B, but the other sub team definitely needs to weigh in as well, so I want to see if we can move onto any of these others here.

Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm sorry guys, but I am not keen on building imprecision consciously into policy. Sorry.

James Bladel: But we can't define it (one there end of)...

Mikey O'Connor: Imprecision. Yeah, but the problem is not in the narrative; the problem is in the application out in the world. And that's part of the reason why we've got this overloading with auth info is that the definition seems quite clear, but the use of this stuff isn't.

And I think if we build an imprecise term consciously into our document, we are making a bit of a mistake. I won't belabor this, but you can belabor it now or you can belabor it later. I'm not keen on imprecise stuff going into these documents.

James Bladel: And Mikey I think what - I think Marika is expressing something a little more articulately, but something similar to what I was thinking. That in the policy, we can have a definition section and this is just the label that we use, but we can define the label just like you know some of my earlier attempts at writing software in the early part of the policy and then move to the later part of the policy where you know that label has been used you know to refer back to the definition.

I don't know that we have to build it into the label is what I'm getting at. Does that make sense? So at the beginning of the policy, you could say for example, definition - change of registrant entity. You know a change of the entity that controls the domain name registration, change the fields, name, organizations, you know maybe email address or something like that.

And you know indicate which field you would determine constitutes a change of controlling registrant entity and then - because we even have to get a little more precise because ICANN doesn't define anyone as a registrant. They use the term Registered Name Holder, so we would have to be even more precise there.

So we build that all into some sort of preamble and then for the remainder of the document and for the remainder of the report we would say change of registrant, referring back to that definition. So I think that addresses your concern Mikey in that it squashes out the imprecision, but it leaves the label accessible so that it's understood.

Anyone have any strong thoughts on this? I see Barbara with a checkmark, but other than that, silence. I thought that was going to be an easy one, folks. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to go down a can of worms because we still owe Bob Mountain quite a bit of time here.

So can we put a pushpin in this email? Marika, maybe we can resend this to the list and say we need folks to weigh in on these six questions. These are the loose ends - the (ideal process) sub team. Based on the survey, these are fairly evenly split throughout the working group and we need to you know arrive - we need to bring these six in for a landing.

So if you can kind of put your thoughts on each one of these as well as any reasons why you think it must be one way or another or will or will not work, we will get those back to the list. Preferably by next week's call we will have some discussion on this.

Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I would be happy to just add in you know a couple of notes on what we discussed today and just noting that you know on today's call the working group seemed to favor this approach. Or if you disagree, you know (shout out) on the mailing list just to take note of what we discussed today.

James Bladel: That would be fine, especially the one that we got with the previous and new registrant.

Okay, changing gears here for a moment, if you recall, the Data Gathering Sub Team headed by Mr. Mountain designed a survey to submit to registries, registrars, domain investors, registrants, and other folks or interested parties in the community. That certainly was distributed. We gave them an extension until Friday, and these responses have now been collated and are ready, so I would like to turn this over to Bob for a - I'm sorry Bob, but can we try to shoot for about 20-22 minutes here as an overview.

And we will - if necessary, we can cover this again somewhat next week, but we really have to - I guess we are up against a deadline for agenda Item #5, so Marika would like us to spend at least three minutes on #5. So Bob, if you can, take it away.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks, James. This is Bob. Yeah, I can absolutely cover it fairly quickly.

As James mentioned, the survey was closed yesterday. We did get 101 responses, so thanks to everyone for your efforts to encourage responses and thanks, Marika, for pushing this through. We did get it out to an entire ICANN list of registrars as well as the Registrar Stakeholder Group and Registry Stakeholder Group.

I'll go through quickly the survey. I won't cover it in great detail; I'll just buzz through. Give you the - the jump team met yesterday and we went through our sort of high level observations so I'll share those.

What I would ask that if everyone could take a look at the survey responses, get any observations you might have back to me and then what we're going to try to do is by next week's meeting or by next week, no later than the end of next week, present the findings report where we'll finalize the survey and sort of put it to bed and circulate the findings to the workgroup.

So if everyone's okay with that I'll go through again quickly and at a high level what we found. First of all on the respondents we did have a very good turnout and the turnout we thought was very balanced. The blend of registrars seemed to be both small, mid-tier and large. We also had seven registries responding which we thought was appropriate.

The team felt, on Question 5, that we might benefit from a little bit of sub-segmentation so to separate out the registrar respondents and then determine what sizes they were of registrars. So we're going to try to do that. If it's just too mind-bending we might not. But hopefully we'll be able to spreadsheet-jockey our way through that. We'll certainly report out on that.

On Question 6, in your opinion should the FOA be time limited? The majority said yes. So if you look at that one it's 71% were saying yes. However in the comments a disproportionately larger share of the comments were the opposite way. So people who were writing why it should not be were more than the people who just said no.

What that meant to me is the people who feel no might feel a little bit more strongly about it. There might be a little bit more impact or forcefulness in the people who were saying no than the people who just said yes. And you can see there were quite a few comments written after that for your review; I think 25 in total.

Question 7, if you voted yes what would be the appropriate time limit? Most of the people thought it would be 30 days or less. And we did have actually some changes to that so I think one person who responded one year had asked to have their - changed to 30 days based on current practices. So the vast majority are looking at a fairly short period of time, 30 days or less for that.

And now - then we move onto Question 8. If you are a registrar do you already time limit the FOA yourself? And almost half of the people already do. So while many are saying we should many are already doing that themselves. And so the benefit of having it mandated would be not so important for those folks.

Question 9, why do you apply a time limit? There was a range of responses there. And to be honest I did not identify a common theme or strong buckets as far as that. So we'll - that one I guess we'll just look to get some input from the group and maybe look at that a little bit more carefully.

Again as I'm rattling on here feel free to raise your hand in the - on the Adobe Connect if you'd like to jump in.

Now I thought Question 10 was very interesting, have you ever experienced a problem with the transfer for the FOA not being time limited? The vast majority said no. Eighty-seven percent in fact I believe is the right number said that they had not experienced a problem because of the FOA not being time limited. Eighty-eight percent - sorry, (no) latest numbers.

So while many people are saying we should not many people are saying they've ever experienced the problem so I thought that was interesting.

Question 11, have you heard about problems? So, you know, not experienced yourself but heard about someone else and a much smaller number had experienced that, 4%.

There was some additional correlation requested on Question 11 so we'll try to get to that if we can before we issue the findings report.

Let's see and in Question 12, if you answered yes how often have such problems occurred in the past 12 months? And it was fairly small number; most people had not at all or very, very few problems.

The transfer - you can see Question 13 seemed to reflect the registrars themselves and the size of the registrar so I think that was fairly consistent with the responses we got up front.

In terms of 14 now we're getting into some editorial, other downsides. And most people felt they would not be however the ones that did object felt that there was increased complications and increased costs involved with doing this.

One of the sub team members pointed out yesterday that the standardized change of control might address this if we put sort of the two sub groups together then perhaps the increased complication of cost - not necessarily isolated to this and - where it might be part of a larger effort.

Moving on. Point 15, if there is a implement - or requirement to time limit FOAs do you think that it would be, you know, what's the scope of the effort? Seventy-four percent, approximately, felt that it would be minimal or some. So most people aren't anticipating this to be a huge effort and the minority felt it would be a significant effort.

James, just a time check; how are we doing so far?

James Bladel: You're doing great. I'm watching the queue and it's clear so far so thanks, Bob, we can continue.

Bob Mountain: Okay great. All right so Number 16, are there other things we should take into account? There were, you know, again a wide range of responses; some actually funny. And they were I think more or less reflective of the previous input. And we'll take a closer look at that to see if we can bucket out any responses and categories.

Moving on to Charter Question C, this was the one involving whether or not we should standardize on IANA IDs or some how modify the use of IANA IDs in combination with proprietary IDs.

You know, the problems here, as it was pointed out, was people don't always remember their proprietary ID and market share stats and things like that are harder to determine when you are using one or the other but not both.

So in Question 17, are you - have you experienced or are you aware of problems resulting from the use of both? Most people said no. Based on the printout - maybe not the most up to date but about 18%, according to the numbers I had, were - had said they did have problems. So most people aren't saying they do have - they're having problems but, you know, some are.

Question 18, what are the benefits? In terms - I think the one common theme I spotted on Question 18 in terms of responses - and we got a ton of responses but most people thought the simplicity would be the benefit there. And we'll, again, take a look at that a little bit more closely for the findings report.

Should there be a requirement to only use IANA IDs? It was pretty much split a little - slightly more saying yes but, you know, somewhat more of a third saying yes and somewhat less of a third saying no and the last - the

remainder saying no strong view either way so this one really seemed to be kind of all over the map.

Question 20, if you responded yes what do you think the effort would be? And the majority, 77% or 78% felt it would be minimal to some effort but most people are saying it's not a huge amount of work to do it.

Question 21, should there be a requirement to use it in combining with existing IDs? The - some, you know, somewhat of a majority said no that they would not prefer to do this. Some of the commentary here was perhaps the idea of grandfathering existing IDs. So there wasn't a need to change the people who are already doing it this way however the new TLDs would - or new registries would use - would standardize on IANA as potentially a compromised approach.

All right, winding down, Number 22, what would the effort be? And again the vast majority felt it would be minimal to some; not significant. And 23, what are the ramifications? The one common theme on this one was that the - this would be a real problem to get the ccTLDs to standardize on IANA IDs. You know, cautions like good luck getting the ccTLDs to agree to this was one I think (telling) comment.

And lastly, 24, are there any other considerations or thoughts. Again I thought that was fairly reflective of the prior comments, nothing really jumped out at me.

So that was it so again to summarize the - those are the - that's at a high level. Please send me your comments. We'll summarize for the final findings report and hopefully wrap that all up next week. And that's all I had so I'll turn it back over to James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Bob. And certainly appreciate you expeditiously going through the survey results. Folks, we went through this fairly comprehensively yesterday. And I would emphasize that there is quite a bit of good information here.

Sometimes the responses shine some clarity; sometimes of course they create more questions. I would strongly encourage everyone to take a look at these especially in some of these open ended questions where we just simply - the survey just asked for respondents to enter their thoughts or opinions. I think there's some good information there.

So we are looking then for the sub team to provide more of a narrative analysis or summary by next week. Is that what we're thinking about?

Bob Mountain: Yes, that's correct. I guess interpretation of the survey, yeah.

James Bladel: Okay. So here's the data and then next week it'll be what does it mean.

Bob Mountain: Yes correct.

James Bladel: Okay. So we have a few minutes here, about seven minutes, so I'll take a queue for anyone who has any questions or observations on the - on the survey. We want to try not to inject too much meaning into it at this time but if there's any questions about it or if you see anything that might be a problem please let us know now. Hi, Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: Hi, James and everyone, this is Barbara. So I think that when we're looking through the survey questions and results I think you're going to have to look more closely as far as which respondents are providing input?

So for instance with regard to the levels of effort associated with, perhaps, implementing the proprietary and the IANA ID scenario I think you need to really look to the registries and the registrars for input on that because they're going to be the ones that know what the impact to their systems are going to

be and what the level of development would be in order to make those types of changes.

So I think you may have to provide additional weight to those particular respondents because others who may be looking at it, you know, more from a periphery, if you will, would not have necessarily the level of detail and information that they would need to be able to truly determine what the level of effort may be. So I think you just have to kind of weight some of these responses accordingly.

James Bladel: Thank you, Barbara. And in fact that was a point that was raised during the sub team call yesterday. And I think because we have the raw data we were discussing that it could be possible to correlate the affiliation of the respondents versus their response for any particular question.

It's just a question of do we have to do this manually or is there a programmatic way to do that? And I think Bob has some Excel gurus taking a look at that issue now. So good point and it is one that we are catching at least trying to take a look at how easily that can be fixed or how easily that can be cross referenced.

Barbara Knight: Great. Thank you.

James Bladel: Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I want to agree with Barbara on this point. And I actually wonder if one learning from this survey should be that one thing that we should ask for as well if we ever do such a survey again and maybe we do one in this workgroup or a future workgroup will do one where we're asking a question that is very technical in nature.

And it's kind of the same thing with the question we have open with auth info field. The people who are really working on the technical side at a registrar or

at a registry would be the most valuable respondents to a question like this because they really know.

And I wonder if the recipients who got the survey link distributed through the ICANN policy work were a lot of the people who are on the policy side of things or on the business side of things and they just shoot from the (unintelligible). They don't necessarily really understand what systems level-wide these things mean.

So if - I think we just need to shoot for a way to also capture what type of a role is somebody and who's responding to something like this. And also if we know that we're trying to find an answer to something that's quite technical we need to probably specify this in our outreach to the stakeholder group that we want whoever gets this request for information that person passes onto the technical folks in their team to comment on because otherwise some of the comments we will get back will not be reflective of what the real issues might be.

James Bladel: Okay that's a good observation. And I think that we can't always assume that a registry or registrar is going to have that person who wears 27 hats responding to this survey. We need to make sure that if they have someone who is dedicated to that function within their group that they're at least relaying that survey to that person. But we should probably indicate that in the survey when we ask the question.

Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. I think one other thing that we should hearken back to is a series of questions that we asked right at the beginning which is what's the underlying reason to make this change? I'm looking at the notes that I took I think from our first or second call.

And in those notes we had a bunch of questions or at least bullets that said things like well let's come up with some sort of justification, benefits, you know, why do this, what was the underlying rationale? Because this is one of those issues that's probably 10 years old and it may well be that the world has changed since this issue was initially raised.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Mikey, can I interrupt for just a second? There were two - are you speaking about time limiting FOAs or are we talking about IANA IDs? I'm not clear on what...

Mikey O'Connor: I'm on IANA IDs, I'm sorry.

James Bladel: Okay thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: And it seems to me that we need to do that piece of background work. And I think that one of the reasons that it's useful is for the team, for us, but I think it's also important to preface a survey like this with the reason why we're asking them.

Because otherwise I'm going to hand that to my tech people and they're going to say oh it's hard then they're not going to, you know, so I think one of the other things that we need to do is answer those questions that we framed for ourselves long ago. And then put that answer in the front of the questionnaire.

James Bladel: Okay can I ask Mikey that when you respond to this survey on the list could you maybe cut and paste that question specifically from our original conversation? I think it's on one of your mind maps where we discussed an approach document. Maybe Marika can help us find that as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Well...

James Bladel: I think that's a really good point. We don't want to lose that. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh it was really ugly going into the chat. I was hoping it would go into the chat.

James Bladel: Oh.

Mikey O'Connor: Never mind. I just tubed the chat. I'll post that along.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Mikey. And I think good catch there; we would have probably flown right past that. Rob, go ahead.

Rob Golding: Yeah, on the IANA number, I mean, there's two real reasons for wanting to use that. First is it simplifies contact with the registries from the registrar's perspective rather than having 84 different codes for 84 different registries.

The second is that in the communications they send out relating to transfer they often put the code in there and I've got absolutely no idea who 1170VP is. But I do happen to know who IANA number 1471 is. And that is a published list whereas the registries don't publish a list of who their customers are and what their codes are.

So it's impossible in some methods to say to a customer you are asking to move this domain to blah if we don't actually have a way of looking up who blah is.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Rob. I see that the queue is clear. We have about - by my count we have about eight minutes left. So wanted to first of all thank Simonetta and Bob and the folks on the sub teams. There was a lot of heavy lifting done since our last call.

And it looks like we're scheduled for another week of heavy lifting. And I think that that's good; there's a lot of progress going. And I think Simonetta has correctly identified that we may be hitting a certain point here where the sub

teams value or that the appropriateness of having a sub team solve all these issues is starting to reach a crossroads or reach an ending point so we want to make sure that we are helpful to that as a larger group and that we're providing the guidance and information that they need.

I do have to allocate about five to six minutes on Item Number 5 but Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I am actually unclear at this point. I don't know if it makes sense for the sub team - the change of control sub team to meet between now and receiving further feedback or if we have to get the feedback first and then maybe schedule something for later next week to get together as a sub team again because I don't think there would be much value in, for example, trying to get on a call tomorrow while we are still waiting on input on these questions.

I'm just - that is my understanding. If there's other opinions I'd like to know so we can find the best day to schedule the next call.

James Bladel: I think your observation is correct, Simonetta. For the idea process sub team it seems like the next - or the most immediate task is to get the larger working group to weigh in on those open questions that were distributed earlier and that are now going to be redistributed so much so that we will have an opportunity next week to discuss those as a larger group. So I think that you're correct in that we are probably on hold with the - that sub team until we have some feedback from the larger group.

Okay so looking at Item Number 5 - and it's very innocuous looking. It says ICANN meeting in Prague planning. And we've had some discussions whether that should be a face to face, regular meeting of the working group, an open meeting of the working group, a closed meeting of the working group or a workshop where we present our initial report.

I think regardless of what we decide on the working group we definitely need to have an outreach session where this working group presents its initial report and then engages all interested parties to - who may have questions or comments about the findings and recommendations.

So I think that's kind of a given for Prague. And I think we identified that very early in the life cycle of this working group. The second item then becomes whether or not that week in Prague will also see a face to face working group. For those who were in Costa Rica or who attended on the phone I think that that was a fairly productive session. And it flowed very nicely into that conversation that we had with the ccNSO.

So my thinking here - and we have to bear in mind that Marika is under some deadlines to get these time slots requested on the Prague schedule. So my thinking here is that we request the most that we think we will need and then if we decide that we don't need the face to face working group we can drop that at a later time and then that - everybody gets like - everybody gets an hour back in their day.

So what we came up with was Wednesday, which is - I don't have the date - I think it's the last Wednesday in June - we would meet in the morning from 9:00 to 10:00 am as a working group for a face to face meeting and then from 10:00 to 11:00 we would conduct an open workshop, community meeting, where we would present the interim report - the initial report and its findings and recommendations.

That is roughly analogous to the sessions that we had in Costa Rica where we met in the morning on Wednesday and then we met with the CNSO a little later in the morning.

So does anyone have any thoughts? I mean, hopefully no one has (seeped) in anything into their Prague schedule yet. Does anyone have any strong feelings about why this will or will not work? Or should we just perhaps

request it at this time and then if we absolutely need to make a modification later on we can at least pair it back from there.

But what we're requesting is two hours from 9:00 am to 11:00 am on Wednesday in Prague. Matt.

Matt Serlin: Yeah, thanks James. Let me start by saying that I'm horrified that we're already talking about planning for Prague. But I think what you described is fine. I think the thought about going for the most amount of time and then pairing it back if we need to is fine.

What I was actually sitting here thinking as you were kind of going through that is I think it was Barbara that had earlier said that, you know, we really need to make sure that we're engaging with the registrar and the registry folks on this stuff.

And I'm just thinking does it really - would it make sense for us to try to hold a workshop and do some outreach both through the registrar stakeholder group and the registry stakeholder group to get folks to proactively attend that session and actually be able to engage with those folks in person to try to pull out some of the information that we got in the survey and to kind of talk through some of the operational stuff that we've kind of been talking through here to really get a better understanding of what the implications of this stuff might be? Would that be something that we think would make sense?

James Bladel: Actually, Matt, I think that's a brilliant idea. And I think it's the benefit of having this on Wednesday which is the day after constituency day.

Matt Serlin: Right.

James Bladel: Where we can get on the agenda of those two groups and really any other groups and raise these issues as well as encourage the membership of those

constituencies and stakeholders to attend the outreach session the following day.

So I think that would probably fall - what we probably need is a volunteer from each constituency - so obviously I would take the registrar and then if only I had an Ex Comm member who was friendly to this idea that could help me out?

Matt Serlin: Yes, second...

James Bladel: I'm looking at you, Matt.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: That can help me out in getting on the agenda because I think when we get into these discussions of like RAAs and things like that, I mean, the agenda just goes out the window.

Matt Serlin: Yeah.

James Bladel: But - and then if we had either Barbara or Roy could raise this within the registries group if we had - like now that Mikey, for example, is an ISP he could raise it there and so on and so forth. I think that we can then identify going into the meeting on Wednesdays which findings and recommendations were most important to which stakeholders and that they would be there then to engage the working group.

So okay, Barbara, I think - I see your note here. I think that raising it at the meeting tomorrow - we don't really have anything to present though. I mean, maybe we can give them a heads up; is that what you meant?

Barbara Knight: Yes. This is Barbara. That's what I was just going to say, a heads up. And because I know that a lot of people's schedules get pretty booked up so just want to give them a heads up that we may be looking to do that.

James Bladel: Okay. And I'll do the same. And I would encourage anyone else who's not in the - who's in the non contracted party house or just has a more general affiliation that everyone please take this back to your stakeholders as well.

So anyone have any strong objection to requesting that time - that block of time - 9:00 am to 11:00 am on Wednesday? Besides those of us from this hemisphere that will be jet lagged I think that we can all live with that timeframe. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And no objections to the timeframe but just to note that, you know, it's a request I'll be making but it's not a guarantee of course that we'll get that timeslot; it also depends on other meetings taking place and, you know, the overall schedule how that's going to be organized. So I'll definitely put in a request and I'll keep the working group posted if there's any (unintelligible).

James Bladel: No see that's - no, we know that you will get - whatever you are asked for that you will get that and we have 100% confidence that whatever time you ask for will be delivered to us.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: That's not even a concern. But yes if - there for some reason if, you know, the President of the Czech Republic decides that he wants to hand out ice cream at that time and we find that we have a conflict that's just immovable then yes we should probably reopen the discussion.

Okay well as that is the top of the hour thank you, folks. We went through a lot of things. And I know that a lot of folks have expressed to me that

occasionally I will seem to be maybe moving a little too quickly but I just want to emphasize that our timeline is very short, that we have very few - our time on the calls is precious.

And I would encourage folks that want to cover these issues even more in depth or detail or have opinions maybe that aren't easily expressed verbally then I would say that we do have a mailing list and we should make as much use of that as possible. It's a really excellent tool and it also keeps a permanent record of what we'd like to say.

So thanks again for your contributions. And we'll circle back next week. Have a great day.

Bob Mountain: Thank you, James.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Man: Thanks everybody.

Man: Thanks, bye.

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

END