

**IRTP C  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 22 November 2011 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 22 November 2011 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-c-20111122-en.mp3>

On page : <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#nov>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Attendees:**

Avri Doria - interim co-chair  
James Bladel – interim co-chair  
Mike O'Connor – CBUC  
Rob Villeneuve – Registrar SG  
Jonathan Tenenbaum – Registrar SG  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Barbara Steele – RySG  
Philip Corwin - CBUC  
Chris Chaplow – CBUC  
Zahid Jamil – CBUC  
Bob Mountain – Registrar SG  
Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair  
Jacob Williams – Individual

**ICANN Staff:**

Marika Könings  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apologies:**

Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG  
Rob Golding - Registrar SG  
Paul Diaz – Ry SG  
Alain Berranger - NPOC

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 22nd of November. On the call today we have James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Mike O'Connor, Jonathan Tennenbaum, Chris Chaplow, Kevin Erdman, Avri Doria, Bob Mountain, Barbara Steele and on the Adobe we have Jacob Williams.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We also have apologies from Matt Serlin, Rob Golding, Simonetta Batteiger and Alain Berranger. I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning or afternoon or evening to the folks of IRTP-C. Wanted to remind everyone please to submit your statement of interest if you have not already done so and to make sure that folks are using the new statement of interest system and sending in the updated statement of interest according to the new format which I understand has some new questions attached to it.

So if you haven't already done that - done so please do that before our next call. And I think Glen said that she would happily reach out to those individuals who are still on an old SOI to make sure that they may not be aware so Glen would reach out and send a personal reminder to them.

So with that we can jump into Item Number 3 which is the update on our development of our work plan. And there was some chatter on the working group on that - on the mailing list and I apologize for not keeping current on that; I was working on the training agenda which apparently I skipped on the agenda there sorry about that.

So Marika, maybe you can show us - give us an update of where we are. And I know that Mikey put up some documents and there were several comments so if we can bring us up to speed on that we can discuss.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So I put up on the Adobe Connect an updated version of the work plan. This actually hasn't been circulated on the mailing list yet. I did share it with Avri and James and Mikey who volunteered to serve as a little sub team to look at this.

And basically what I did is just, you know, capture some of the notes that came from Mikey's overview which was very helpful listing some of the deliverables and basically highlights, you know, for each of the blocks of working group meetings, you know, at the state of each of those we would review the deliverables and the work plan for that specific set.

And I've tried to identify for each of those blocks likely deliverables. What the working group might want to do is try to add more specific dates to each of those deliverables or that might be something that, you know, you might want to do at the start of each block then you'd, you know, when there's a clearer idea, for example, how many comments have been received so it's easier to make an assessment of how many meetings that is likely going to take.

So you'll find that up on the screen. I don't think I made any other changes to this at this stage so I think I'll leave it at that.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika, and thanks again to all the folks that were involved in that. And, Avri, you're in the queue.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. Yes, I definitely appreciate, you know, all that Marika and - got done. And also I wanted to mention that you were trying that experiment on editing. I had a couple changes I tried to make to it and didn't succeed. But I think it's in good shape for, you know, putting out for review to the larger group.

I tend to agree with you that at the beginning of each block is probably the good time to have a short thing where that block is reviewed as people

discussed last time and we get deeper into the items that have to be done and perhaps even try and do the sub-week division of the schedule. But I think it's a great start and thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. I agree I think we're probably at a point now where we can put this to the working group and put it under the last call for edits and go forward with this work plan. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. This is Mikey. I think one of the things that we might want to do - I too tried to edit and I just couldn't get going so I didn't make any changes.

But, you know, I was looking at Marika's draft sort of jumping ahead in the agenda a little bit but the draft of the public comment announcement or actually I guess the real one. And in there there are a whole bunch of sort of discrete little things that we could drive into our work plan if we wanted to.

And I wasn't sure - this is sort of project management lore more than anything else and so I don't feel real strongly about this. But it's often good to have a few steps along the way to arriving at a deliverable so that we don't accidentally get down to the wire and say holy cow we need to do five steps in order to get here and we haven't thought about what those steps are and we haven't given ourselves time to do it.

And so I wasn't sure how hard to push that. You know, I'm just tagging along on this one but I think there could be a fruitful discussion, again it might be in the sub group rather than the whole group, to sort of break these deliverables into okay well to get to this deliverable we need to do this, this and this and then strip those into dates before the deadline for the deliverable. So that was my only reaction to it.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. In response to that I tend to agree but I also think it's too early. I think one of the things that I did try to change in this was next week is the not the finalization of the work plan it's really the publication of the work plan. The only time it's final I think is at the end of the project.

I think that if you look at the first chunk of work it's establish approach to tackling the question so I think that plus perhaps some view of the comments and the types we get. So I think that the establishing approach will give us the first notion of a further work breakdown that we can add to the later parts of the schedule. To do that now would be sort of I think jumping ahead.

And then later noticing the degree of commentary we get both from the community at large and the constituencies and stakeholder groups would give us a better indication on which things look hard and are going to need a lot of discussion because there's a lot of divergent viewpoints and which things look like, you know, it's fairly straightforward and it's just a question of getting it said correctly.

So I think you're absolutely right but I think that's one of the strengths here is that by having these sub-chunks we can get into the more detailed planning once we know a little bit more. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Avri. Bob, you're next.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks James. This is Bob Mountain. My - I've got a fair bit of experience with project management and the more - my only comment to Mikey's point is that the more granular you get the more work it is to keep up with all the changes.

So it's real important that you strike that balance and also that - and I'm not sure if the sub working group has assigned someone to just be the project plan updater or if that's a shared task. But I've found in the past that it's really tempting to really get detailed on the milestones because it's absolutely true

that you're, you know, the more detailed you are the less likely you are to have a big slip at the end.

But, you know, I might suggest if we are going to get more granular that we have, you know, somebody assigned to be the project management template - the keeper of that document. So that's my only suggestion.

And, oh, by the way, I'm happy to get involved in that rather than just being the one to, you know, kind of throw out ideas so.

James Bladel: Well thanks, Bob, appreciate that. So where are we headed here as a group? I mean, I think I'm hearing two basic camps here; one is that we kind of increase our level of detail to make sure that we don't miss any dependencies and that the deliverables don't sneak up on us.

The flip side being that flexibility in the project plan is probably going to be an important trait because we won't know in advance what the response - level of response or comments we receive and as Bob says the more detailed the work plan tend to generate more overhead and project management.

I tend to kind of fall in the line of flexibility. I think that what we have in front of us is pretty close to a work plan. In fact it's probably just as detailed if not more so than any work plan I've seen in an ICANN PDP at the outset. And, you know, I think therefore I'm happy or comfortable going forward with this and then, you know, dialing up or ratcheting down additional details at each, you know, at the block level if that's necessary.

So, you know, what are some final thoughts here? Do we want to put this to the list and start a discussion there?

Avri Doria: You have Marika and then you have Avri and Mike in queue.

James Bladel: Wow did I lose my - did I lose my connection because I just show Avri. But, yes, okay, Marika. Thanks. Avri, actually, can you run the queue until I figure out what's going on with my end?

Avri Doria: Sure, okay. So then I'll put Marika first then myself then - and then Mikey.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Avri. So this is Marika. So indeed I, you know, I tend to agree with what James said. The reason why we're discussing the work plan now and I think, you know, it's one of the new features of the GNSO working group guidelines where working groups are, you know, required to provide a work plan at the start of their work to the GNSO Council just to give the GNSO Council an idea of the expected timelines.

And I think for that purpose there is no need to go in further detail than what is currently here. Of course in addition the working group might decide that it wants a more detailed plan and, you know, that might be done, you know, for every set of meetings where you indeed go into detail of, you know, what is begin done and what you need to do to prepare certain steps and that might be on a separate track.

But I think for the purpose of, you know, what is required under the GNSO working group guidelines and what, you know, the GNSO Council would find helpful I think what it was currently here, you know, plus or minus some edits, I think this is the kind of information that they will be looking for.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks Marika. Putting myself in. All I wanted to say was two things. One, in terms of the maintaining of the list whatever we've got of the list I think as one of the co-chairs I sort of took on the duty of being responsible for that at the last meeting obviously working with Marika and Mikey who took the lead and I just ended up reviewing. But at the end of the day as one of the co-chair's responsibilities I was accepting that at the end of the day it was keeping it.

And in terms of both what Bob and what Mikey were talking about it's - I sort of see it as a spiral thing. I think I do- all the research projects I do these days are always spiral. And so we always have short term details scheduled and then we make another one and we basically spiral through the work we're doing.

And I think that's the same approach I'm kind of looking at this is as we get to a chunk we get more detailed about what happened during that particular spiral. Thanks. And, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine with that approach. The - I think the notion of sort of a short term look ahead - but I would think that we might want to look ahead a couple of months, which is effectively six or eight meetings just so we don't get caught by something that sneaks up on us and we suddenly go holy cow we've got a whole bunch of work to do here that we didn't anticipate.

You know, because for example when you look at the public comment thing, I mean, there's a bunch of well what are the processes that are used elsewhere to change control, how good are they, you know, we might have to document some of this stuff.

And I think it's just a - it's perfect that we've got the established approach task ahead of us. And I think that's the - that's a fine way to roll it forward. It's always a tradeoff because one of the things that we all expressed a fair amount of frustration about was how long the other one took. And a lot of the reason for that was because we sort of had to invent our work plan as we went.

And a lot of those tasks took a lot longer than we anticipated. So no real strong feelings here and I think the idea of looking forward some number of weeks, pick a number that you like, is fine.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Anyone else in the queue on this one? If not I think next week we'll have an updated version. People should talk about it on the list and, you know, we'll make any changes to it either I guess Marika will who's got the main document or Mikey and I and others that want to work on it in more detail will figure out how to actually use the new edit function that's in there.

And I got most the way but I just couldn't save my changes so we'll figure out how to get that working. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think, you know, it looks like that the new tool might be too complicated to make that work in that short timeframe as, you know, I think we all struggled. So I'm happy to take, you know, any comments that you or Mikey have and put that in the updated document and then maybe push that out to the group so they can review it and share any further comments...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...before next week's call. And hopefully at that stage we'll be able to finalize it.

Avri Doria: Okay great. Thanks. Anyone else on this topic? Okay, James, should I turn it back over to you for review of the SG Constituency statement templates?

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. Actually I skipped Number 2 so I'll probably have to circle back...

Avri Doria: Yes you did.

James Bladel: ...and just...

Avri Doria: Okay.

James Bladel: Yes, yes so my fault on that one. But just more of an announcement I guess on - or a status update on where we're at with IRTP training. A number of folks have expressed an interest in conducting some overview training. Marika sent out a Doodle. I think we've got a pretty solid response.

And I've put together some training materials based on, you know, some of the internal training materials we have within Go Daddy but also based on the new registrar training program that ICANN staff has developed.

So I've put all that together into a PowerPoint and Marika has set up a time or put out a Doodle. And I think the most popular time would be one hour after our meeting next week so beginning I believe at 1600 UTC on November 29.

So after next week's call if anyone is interested in just kind of getting an overview of the IRTP process and some of the terminology and the various steps and also what can go wrong with a inter-registrar transfer would invite you to stay after class next week and we will go through that training.

And I see Marika and, Chris, do you mind if I go to Marika first?

Chris Chaplow: That's okay.

James Bladel: Okay so thanks. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And just for those that might not be able to make that time the idea is of course to, you know, continue the recording of that call to make sure that those that are not able to join are able to review it, you know, at their leisure at some other time and listen to the recording and review the slides that go with it.

James Bladel: Thanks, good point. And especially because I put some really cool PowerPoint animations in there with arrows and little icons. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, yes. I've just - about the level of the training. Is it just a level that if we were on IRTP-B we would expect to know anyway so it's not for us or is it for anybody really?

James Bladel: Well it's open to everyone of course. I would say that it probably, you know, 75%-80% of it would be redundant if you were on IRTP-B or IRTP-A. I also think that a lot of this is familiar to registries and registrars just because it's kind of a common business function that we encounter on a regular basis.

I think that for newcomers to the list who want to get a running start at some of the issues in transfers but don't necessarily use transfers maybe outside of personal function and if they have a good registrar they've never encountered any problems with the transfer process.

So I think it just kind of presents an overall - overarching, you know, view of the process that can kind of synchronize everyone's basic expectations of what they need to know. So I think, yes, to answer your question IRTP-B and IRTP-A will find a lot of it redundant.

Chris Chaplow: Okay thank you.

James Bladel: But not entirely without value I think. Avri, did you want to take Item Number 4 or do you want me to just...

Avri Doria: No I'm...

James Bladel: ...push on?

Avri Doria: ...fine with you sticking with it. We had talked about trading off places I just...

James Bladel: Okay, okay. So I just wanted to make sure that we were - wasn't stepping on anyone's...

Avri Doria: No.

James Bladel: ...expectations there. Okay so Item Number 4 is a review of the stakeholder group or constituents template. And I believe that we are - we have opened the comment period is that correct, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes that's correct. That's - the general public comment that was opened yesterday.

James Bladel: Okay so this is I believe directed at individual stakeholder groups and constituencies if we want to solicit specific feedback on a particular topic.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes that's correct. It's the requirement under the current PDP as well that the new PDP to specifically request input from stakeholder group and constituencies. I mean, on some occasions it will also submit those comments or, you know, at the same time to the public comment forum but they're also individually approached to make sure that they are aware and, you know, encouraged to provide their input.

James Bladel: Okay. And so looking over this document it looks like there's some introductory and background materials; we restate our charter questions and then we have a few - it looks like three bullet points down there which I could go through those quickly or we could add or edit those. I see Avri's in the queue so go ahead.

Avri Doria: I only had a quick question up front which is while we're sending this to the stakeholder groups and constituencies and we sort of had your proposal at the last meeting that each stakeholder group or constituency have a point participating, (unintelligible), whatever we wanted to call it it might be good to include a question to that effect in this; who from your group will be monitoring the - or will be participating, will be monitoring or something - adding a question like that to this before you got into details on the points that were there. Thanks.

James Bladel: That's a fantastic idea. I think if we could include that, Marika, before we dive into the issue-specific questions?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I'll just basically add a question maybe on the process then. So, you know, please identify the members or your stakeholder group or constituency that are participating in this working group or monitoring this working group. Okay?

James Bladel: Right.

Avri Doria: Right.

James Bladel: Fantastic. And then I just have a quick procedural question. We're sending this out to the individual components of the GNSO are we sending it out beyond the GNSO? Something I've encountered lately is just some discussion like let's say in, you know, in some circles that other advisory committees or, you know, folks in the other SOs are not always actively involved in the PDPs the way they would like to be. So I'm wondering if we could...

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I think this specific request goes out to stakeholder groups and constituencies. And we need to look to Glen. But I presume that she sent it to the chairs of the different groups. However like the announcement for the public comment period if I'm not mistaken does go out to the - I think it's the liaison list where I think you have the different chairs and representatives from the different groups within ICANN on that.

Glen, are you still on the call?

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, I'm on the call, Marika. And I can answer that for you. The call for comments went out to the constituency, stakeholder groups, to the Council. It was sent to the ALAC and it was sent to the GAC and it was sent to a very broad list which is called an African List where there are - which is mainly made up of participants from Africa but it's a very wide list.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. To add to that under the new PDP there's also the specific request or recommendation to make sure that outreach is done to other SOs or ACs that might have specific input or expertise in relation to these areas. So something that, you know, a working group might want to consider is to identify those other entities within ICANN that you might want to reach out specifically.

And either it would just be, you know, forewarning the public - the call for public comments or maybe using this template in a modified form and, you know, being able to maybe identify some specific questions. And, you know, one thing to think about for example is, you know, reaching out to the ccNSO as there are some specific questions asking for, you know, feedback on models that ccTLDs might be using.

So, you know, it might be considered as well what would be the best approach indeed just sending this out, you know, trying to see maybe if it would be worth having a conversation or participation from someone of those other groups to provide that kind of expertise.

So I think that's something for the working group to consider. But there, you know, the calls have already gone out broadly but there might be other ways indeed of highlighting some specific questions that might be of interest to some of the other SOs and ACs.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Marika. I'm personally of the opinion that once we get this nailed down for the other components of the GNSO that we then extend that out to

the other SOs and ACs and make sure that they're aware and interested. It's possible that they may not have any desire to participate on an ongoing basis. But we want to make sure that the opportunity is given to them.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think I'm agreeing with you. I think what we could just do is take what gets nailed down for the stakeholder groups and constituencies and then just add a cover note, you know, to the other SOs and ACs. And I would think we'd always want to include SSAC simply because you never know what's going to be an SSAC issue obviously if it's not an RSAC.

But so I think just adding a cover note that basically says this is what went out to our constituencies we'd of course be interested in getting your SO/AC's viewpoints if any on these topics in the same timeframe and just forward it to them and not bother to do something special but just, you know, a cover note. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes that works. Okay the queue is clear so let's very briefly, maybe in the next 10 minutes here, take a look at the three questions that we have. And those are the ones that are at the very tail end of this document. And I think everyone has the ability to scroll.

And let's take a look at those three questions down there at the bottom and see if there's any edits we want to make to those questions or if we feel like there's something missing we want to add additional questions. But, Marika, if you could start us off perhaps by reading the first one and then we'll go through these individually. But, you know, let's keep an eye on the clock I guess as well.

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. Just to clarify all these questions are basically lifted from the issue report as items that were highlighted needing, you know, further discussion or further input.

So related to Charter Question A the issue report notes that the data on the frequency of high jacking cases is a pivotal part of this analysis. Mechanisms should be explored to develop accurate data around this issue in a way that meets the needs of registrars to protect proprietary information while at the same time providing a solid foundation for database policy making. Data on legitimate transfer activity benefitting from the current locking policy wording needs to be collected.

And maybe to add to that I think this was specifically wording that actually specifically was developed as well by the IRTP Part B working group that, you know, brought forward this specific issue. So I think that's an issue that they've already discussed in that context as well that needing further data around that.

Do you want me to continue with the others and...

James Bladel: Okay. Well I was just going to pause there for a minute and see if there were any comments but if not - there we go, there's Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James, it's Mikey. I'm just wondering if we need to expand these a little bit. I mean, it made sense to me but, you know, I was part of the group that labored over every single word.

And I'm just wondering if somebody reading this cold - some of you who are new to the working group - I'd just like sort of a reality check from some of you do you feel like having read that paragraph you know what we're talking about? And if so great but if not I think it might be useful to have a little discussion about that and maybe expand this paragraph a bit. So I'd just throw that open to new folks and see.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. Does anyone want to chime in on the readability or understandability of that? Does that first paragraph there - is it providing

enough h context or enough background or is it just kind of, you know, ICANN lingo?

Avri Doria: Well (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, sorry, I was getting my hand up.

James Bladel: That's okay.

Avri Doria: Didn't get it up. I think it - okay I was a past participant in the last two. I think it explains - I mean, we're sending this to the stakeholder groups and constituencies where hopefully there's somebody in the group that does understand it. And if not hopefully they've got the facility to explore deep.

You know, perhaps the only thing I would suggest adding to any of these would be a reference if there is, you know, a reference to a previous report or, you know, place that, you know, the issue report notes okay so give a pointer to the issues report so that people can go back and read more context and more length if they wish to, you know.

So - but I don't know that giving more words will do anything to make it easier because every sentence could just confuse people more. So I think giving them a reference to go back and refer if they don't understand but I think they're explanatory. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Avri. Marika, go ahead and proceed with the second question.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the second question states that in addition to the ccTLDs described in the issue report that do have procedures - do have a procedure or a process for a change of control, .ie, .eu and .uk, are there any

other ccTLDs that have similar procedures or processes which the working group should review in the context of Charter Question A?

Furthermore the working group would be interested to receive feedback on the experiences with these or other ccTLD procedures or processes for a change of control as well as identifying potential benefit and/or possible negative consequences from applying similar approaches in a gTLD context.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. Sorry, Marika, I was reading Avri's name on the list and thinking Marika. I apologize for that ladies, I didn't mean to cross wires like that. Any feedback or question there? Michele, our ccTLD genius.

Michele Neylon: I don't know about genius. There's no turkeys involved. Is change of control defined anywhere? Look, I know it's defined on the issues report and all that obviously because I was involved in it. But in this document is change of control explained anywhere or is just given...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Not really. I mean, I scrolled up to Question A from the charter and I - yes, I think you're right; we can benefit from a little...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I mean, what I would do in that case is, you know, just simply put something - change of control and then give an example, i.e. change of registrant without necessarily change of registrar and, you know, in .eu parlance what's the - it's a trade.

I mean, there's a number of things we could do; just something just to give it a little bit more - whatchamacallit meaning as it were because at - I've just put - the only thing I would be afraid of here is the change of control- well that doesn't really - it doesn't make - I could see more people asking what the hell

do they mean by change of control rather than if we just gave some examples and defined it. Thanks.

James Bladel: No that's a good catch, Michele, I think you're right. I think it's a little thin. And it looks like Rob on the chat window is volunteering to help define that on the list.

Michele Neylon: Well done, Rob, it's nice to see the Canadians getting off their rear ends and putting in some input. Thank you, it's appreciated.

James Bladel: And just remember they have a Thanksgiving too where they I think also eat turkey so be careful...

Avri Doria: Different time of year.

Michele Neylon: I thought they would just beat each other up with hockey sticks.

Rob Golding: Yes, our Thanksgiving is in October so we just watch the Americans from up here.

James Bladel: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm just wondering if it's in our charter to actually create that definition. And so maybe we want to be careful about defining it in advance.

James Bladel: Well I don't know that - at least my understanding from Michele's concern is that change of control is a little too ambiguous what we're looking for. So it's not that we need a definition of a transaction necessarily it's we're asking a question about a topic and we're not saying specifically what that topic, you know, what it is that we're asking the question about. At least that's how I understood Michele's concern.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I get that but I think that we need to write this language in such a way that we leave the working group some wiggle room in terms of actually arriving at the final definition of the term change of control.

James Bladel: Okay so what do you propose that we would say something like, you know, what - in your assessment what...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think Michele was on the right track when he says, you know, for example, blah, blah, blah. But I think we need to make it clear that one of our tasks is to evaluate a bunch of inputs and among other things come up with a definition for ICANN. Because this is the first time that this concept will have gotten driven into the, you know, into ICANN policy, right? So...

James Bladel: Mikey, what if we referenced the equivalent functions like we listed a couple of ccTLDs here like .ie and...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: ....eu and .uk.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: What if we referenced, you know, link to their processes and say, you know, is there an equivalent process or, you know, what do you - you know, I don't know...

Mikey O'Connor: Is a process equivalent to these, I mean, the charter question is is a process like those appropriate for the GNSO - for the GNSO policy and then link to those examples. I'd be a lot more comfortable with that than actually trying to write a definition of change of control in this context because I think it's going to take us a while to do that.

James Bladel: Yes, good point. Michele, would you be willing to take that on and gather a couple of links to examples from some of the ccTLDs and send those to Marika?

Michele Neylon: I can probably get you a few links for them. I mean, ultimately the - I kind of understand where Mikey is coming from but I wouldn't want to take it to that extreme because in IRTP-B we identified that this was a potential problem because we - several of us we discussed this at some length that, you know, part of the issue was, you know, the change of control concept because there is no policy that there is for some ccTLDs.

Now we didn't go into a huge amount of detail as to what exactly that was but we kind of understood - my understanding was that we all kind of understood what we were talking about. So I'll dig out a few links and give them to Marika anyway and we can just take it from there. Thanks.

James Bladel: And I know you were in the queue probably for something else but can we defer to Marika real quickly here?

Michele Neylon: No that was what I was in the queue for.

James Bladel: Oh okay fantastic. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I actually wanted to suggest maybe including the language that is currently in the issue report. And I guess that, you know, refers back to as well some of the questions we were saying it might be helpful just to refer to what is in the issue report currently.

And what is there now is like it was also noted that the IRTP is widely used to effect the change of control namely by moving the domain name to a new registered name holder in conjunction with the transfer to another registrar.

For example in the domain name aftermarket it is not uncommon to demonstrate control of a domain name registration through the ability to transfer the domain name registration to another registrar following which the registrant information is changed to the new registrant. Nevertheless the concept of change of control is not defined in the context of gTLDs.

So I'm wondering if that, you know, clarifies by providing some examples but at the same time it highlights that there is no agreed upon definition in gTLD-land.

James Bladel: It works for me.

Avri Doria: Wait a second. Where can I raise my hand? Can I raise my hand? I can't find my window...

James Bladel: Go ahead, Avri. The queue is clear, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, that seems to me like a lot to put in. I guess I, I mean, we're trying to make the question - I once again recommend giving people a document and page number reference for where they can go to get into any of the issues maybe even a line at the top saying, you know, please (unintelligible) the issues report for further clarification on any of these.

But to start including that level of discussion I think - I don't know that it helps and makes things more confusing. But to refer to it I think is good. I don't know. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Avri. Michele and then I want to kind of wrap this up to where we were...

Michele Neylon: Yes, I'll keep this brief. I know - I'll keep this brief. I mean, the key problem at the moment is you have the term change of control without any real context

at all. You don't know whether - it doesn't specify what the hell it refers to; that's the key problem.

So providing something it's not necessarily a change of registrant because the thing is this it's like what is the change of control? Is it the change of use, is it the change of who has power over it? There's a whole bunch of different things. And at what point is a change of registrant considered to be a change of registrant?

I mean, we can agree on certain things but we never - as far as I'm aware, now I could be mistaken, I mean, there's no actual clear definition that I'm aware of which clearly specifies under ICANN policy what the hell covers the registrant when you get into which Whois records we're dealing with.

You know, is it the email address that's key? Is it the organization? Is it, what, I there's certain things there. But the key thing here is it says change of control and I (don't) think say even adding change of control of the domain name - of a domain name or something would help to clarify it a little bit.  
Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Michele. And I see Avri agrees. Can we quickly move onto the third question which I think is just more of a catchall? And I'll just - actually, Marika, if you don't mind I'll just go ahead and read through that where it says in relation to Charter Question B and C the working group would be interested in further input or data in relation to the incidents of this issue to determine its scope and the most appropriate way to address it.

And I think we're talking here about the expiration date or best if used by date on a FOA and whether or not registries would benefit from using IANA IDs rather than proprietary registrar IDs.

So that's just kind of a - we have a, you know, I think this working group, if you look at our charter we're very unbalanced; we have one very large, very

complex question and then we have one kind of medium question, then we have one question that seems fairly straightforward.

We'll go to Barbara here really quickly. But I just wanted to ask if there are any questions that anyone feels are missing from this list of three? So, Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Steele: Thank you, James. I think relative to the third item, relative to the streamlining of the process by using the IANA ID from our perspective as registry operators it would be helpful for us to know specifically what areas or if there are certain reports or information that registrars are getting or, you know, if it's an EPP command or what have you that they're getting a proprietary ID versus an IANA ID and specifically where it is that we would want to have IANA IDs.

Just because it's not clear to me - I know VeriSign as a registry often uses a registry ID - or I'm sorry, an IANA ID. And so it just would be helpful to have more information and background so that the registries would be able to determine exactly what impacts from a development standpoint would be required in order to try to accommodate it.

James Bladel: Would you be willing to draft some additional sentences onto this question?

Barbara Steele: Sure, I'm happy to do that.

James Bladel: Because I think that's a good point is, you know, where are you encountering these proprietary IDs and, you know, I think that's an excellent point that we need to flush out.

Barbara Steele: Great, thank you. I'll send that along to the list.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes just to answer that question, I mean, it doesn't - VeriSign actually use IANA IDs it's just that some of the other registries don't. And they send - like VeriSign in all their email notifications and elsewhere refer clearly to the registry by an ID that is something useful.

But say for example with a transfer we might get an email notification with a proprietary ID which we have no way of knowing - we have no way of checking what the hell it refers to.

And also as well some of that stuff wouldn't be - a lot of it wouldn't be exposed fully via anything programmable so we end up displaying on the - what the hell did you call that page - the FOA page - it probably has a proper name - we end up just displaying something completely useless like, you know, the actual proprietary ID again because we can't pull back the actual registrar name whereas if you're using IANA IDs then we could. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Michele. And let's, you know, I would ask please makes sure that you submit that when we start collecting comments on this because I think you have a specific - an operational experience on there that's - I'm not even aware of where we encounter these myself. I might have to go back and talk to some folks on the operation's side.

So I want to kind of wrap up this area here. And I do have a hard stop at the top of the hour in about 12 minutes - and just talk real quickly. We have Question Number - or Agenda Item Number 5 which is discussing the approach for tackling charter questions.

I think that's probably a longer conversation and something that we don't have a lot of time to dive into today too deeply. We can certainly discuss this on the list and I'm sure it will come up as well as we start to receive public comments and feedback from the constituencies and stakeholders.

So I'd like to skip ahead to Item number 6 which is the results of the Doodle poll that Marika sent out which seemed to indicate a strong preference for the existing timeframe, which is I guess sort of through inertia, become the IRTP timeframe which is Tuesday the 15th under UTC.

The only concern I think that I've - remember on this one is that Avri has indicated that she will at best be able to hit 50% attendance; she has a standing obligation, you know, every other Tuesday. So I just wanted to confirm that this is kind of - this is the time and date that works best for the majority of the group and see if there's anything that we can do or any accommodations that we can make for Avri if this is the timeframe.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

James Bladel: Yes, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm also working on trying to make my standing obligation earlier. I don't know if I'll succeed. It used to be earlier; it got moved to this time spot and now I'm trying to get it moved earlier because I see that, you know, I'm definitely in a minority. So, you know, because the majority is definitely for keeping this time it's obvious. So I'll try to move it but otherwise I will miss probably the first half hour if not 45 minutes of every other meeting. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, and again we will make sure that we can do everything that we can to accommodate on this end as well. And I agree with you, Avri, in the chat that Item Number 5 is a perfect place to bookmark and kick off our next meeting.

Okay so Avri, did you have something else...

Avri Doria: Oh sorry, no I just forgot to lower my name...

James Bladel: Oh okay.

Avri Doria: ...once I got it.

James Bladel: All right well we have - by my count we have eight minutes to go. We have a clear queue. We've gotten through our agenda. I wanted to just put open to the floor here that there's nothing else that we would take our action item to the list and circle back here next week.

I do not see any objections here in fact I see some agreements so let's go ahead and do that. Mikey, I see you've got a question there can we chat about that on the list there or maybe we can talk to Marika about the Doodle poll. I think there were staff conflicts at an hour earlier which is one of the reasons why that wasn't an option. But I may be misremembering that.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika just messaged me on chat that you have a conflict so maybe there's miscommunication.

James Bladel: Oh I think that that is also true.

Avri Doria: Right, you had the earlier conflict and Marika had the later conflict.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...earlier and an hour later. At each of the hours one of us had a conflict.

James Bladel: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Rats.

James Bladel: Okay well let's - too many working groups, exactly, Bob. Let's cut it off for today at that point and let's go forward with the action items. Thanks a lot for a very productive meeting, everyone. And really appreciate all the activity

that's going on on the list. I think that that's - that's key to a healthy working group having all those things happening in between meetings. So thanks everyone and have a great day and for those of you in the US have a great holiday.

Barbara Steele: Thank you, James.

Avri Doria: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...enjoy your turkey.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: See you, James.

James Bladel: Bye-bye.

END