

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION**

Tuesday 31 January 2012 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JIG meeting on Tuesday 31 January 2012 at 1500 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jig-20120131-en.mp3>
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jan>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees

James Bladel -co-chair
Avri Doria - co-chair
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Barbara Knight - RySG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Rob Villeneuve - RrSG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Matt Serlin - RrSG
Roy Dykes - RySG
Rob Golding - RrSG

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies
Paul Diaz- RySG
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Bob Mountain - Registrar SG
Zahid Jamil - CBUC
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Angie Graves – CBUC

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP C call on the 31st of January 2012.

On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, Barbara Knight, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel, Avri Doria, Rob Villeneuve, Matt Serlin, Chris Chaplow and Roy Dykes.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself Nathalie Peregrine. We have apologies from Paul Diaz, Philip Corwin, Angie Graves, Bob Martin, Jonathan Tennenbaum and Zahid Jamil. And as for (Luig) she (unintelligible) (Shamina Patarica) might join us late.

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

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the IRTPC Working Group call for January 31, 2012.

And per our standard operating procedure I wanted to ask if anyone had any reviews or updates or changes to their statements of interest?

Okay. And the second item is to ask anyone if they have any additions or changes to the proposed agenda which is listed on the Adobe Chat and was circulated on the mailing list, if you have any items you'd like to change there please speak now.

And silence is consent in both of those regards so thank you for that.

This call is effectively dedicated to the review of the comments received and the stakeholder group statements received.

And I believe if I'm not mistaken -- and Marika could probably help me here -- we are probably - it would not be unrealistic to think that we could complete the review of these comments during this call. But let's see how far we can go and let's see where the conversations take us.

So Marika can you help me and help the group here remember where we left off last week?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So basically I think where we left off is comment five. You already see some notes in there but they - those were added based on the initial run through we had.

I just would like to encourage everyone to review actually the other notes, you know, when I send out these updates just to make sure that it tracks the working group conversations accordingly.

And also note that I've tried to incorporate in each of these lines as well the recommended action based on the conversations we have had. So if people have any concerns or any comments on, you know, what I've added there, you know, please let me know and I can make changes accordingly. So basically I think where we left off is Comment 5.

James Bladel: Thank you. And had we completed Comment 5 or we were kind of in the midst of it or I think we probably completed it?

Marika Konings: I said the note there basically come from the initial run through we had. So I don't know if that's indeed, you know, sufficient or whether there's anything else the Working Group would like to discuss?

I mean as, you know, as it says there, you know, some remark that it would be helpful to, you know, receive further input on why the denial reason is actually applied by registrars.

And so a recommended action could then be indeed to, you know, survey registrars or request for the input or I don't know if there's a discussion that you would like to have now or ready on getting some input on that question or whether there any other elements that need to be considered with regard to this specific comment.

James Bladel: Okay, so it's probably worthwhile to spend a few minutes then revisiting Number 5 and making sure we have that one buttoned up before we move on to Charter Question B or if there's any new Charter Question A relevant comments that folks would like to tack on before we move on.

So Charter Question 5 if you could read that for us it looks like it's the registry comments.

Marika Konings: Yes Comment 5 relates to Charter Question A. In relation to reason for denial Number 9, since some transfer disputes are raised as a result of a registrar's practice of locking down a domain when modifications are made to the registrant details the registry stakeholder group recommends that additional clarification be added to specifically state that registrars are prohibited from restricting transfers for 60 days after changes to registrant details.

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

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. And I just posted Reason for Denial 9 in the Chat just in case there were some folks who were unclear or, you know, don't refer to these necessarily by numbers.

So we'll open up the queue then, any other comments or thoughts on this?

I think that we did discuss that Reason for Denial 9 and possibly also relating to Reason for Denial 8 were often used by registrars to kind of establish at least an initial sponsorship of a domain name whether it's first created or it's transferring in from another registrar. These are transfer prohibition periods or cooling off periods usually about 60 days.

And the thinking here is that there would be a - the change of control function may have its own items, may or may not have its own moratoriums built into it and therefore may or may not be subject to Reason for Denial 9, Reason for Denial 8.

I would want to point out however as representative of a registrar that the particular practice that's discussed in the registry comment is predicated on Reason for Denial 6 which is - it's slightly different.

That is expressed written objection to the transfer by the transfer contact. So I don't know if - and I think Barbara's on the call.

Maybe I don't know if that's a material change to the - to this comment or if that's - or if that applies equally to Reason for Denial 6. And I hate to put you on the spot Barbara but if you can clarify that would be great.

Barbara Knight: That's okay James. This is Barbara.

And I think it probably does apply more perhaps to 6 which actually isn't under discussion. But we do get questions at the registry level many times.

If it's a request for enforcement that's specifically indicating that a domain is not being allowed to transfer a lot of times they're indicating that it's because there have been, you know, perhaps a change of registrant data. So that's what we were trying to address here. Does that help?

James Bladel: Yes thank you. Sorry I couldn't get the mute button off.

And, you know, I'll go ahead and speak now on behalf of the register. We have this practice, the 60 day transfer loss after changes to registrant information.

And we do base that on Reason for Denial 6. It is our assessment a very effective anti-hijacking practice. Because as we've noted this, changing the information in those three fields, the registrant name, registrant organization and registrant email address can be a significant security vulnerability.

And we are looking at some changes that were recommended coming out of IRTPD which is the previous instance of this - the Transfer Working Group Series which modifies Reason for Denial 6 significantly.

And I think in some respects if Comment Number 5 is addressing Reason for Denial 6 that might be something that is actually going to be changing here fairly soon.

But we have the chair of IRTPB. Mr. Michele Neylon is first in the queue so I'll turn it over to him. Michele.

Michele Neylon: You're going to butter me up with that aren't you?

Just, I mean just for the record that James is speaking in his own personal capacity of - as an employee of a specific registrar as opposed to speaking for all registrars just so we're clear.

James Bladel: Correct. And I think I stated it maybe not clearly.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Not (unintelligible) I'm just - James, James, James, I'm not arguing with you. I just want to emphasize the fact that your comments are specific to your old employer's position.

James Bladel: Correct.

Michele Neylon: So whereas my comment would be I understand and appreciate and empathize and sympathize and everything else with James's position, I think this is the root problem that we're trying to deal with in this working group.

Well one of the root problems is the fact that at the moment there is no concept within ICANN policy to deal with a change of control of a domain name.

And I think that needs to be rectified because we see stupidly complicated arguments which cost us time, money and mainly headaches. And the money parts the cause - is what gets me.

If I'm selling a domain name for six euro I really don't need to have 500 euro of legal costs trying to sort out some stupid dispute between two third parties.

Anyway, I'll let Chris go. Thanks.

Chris Chaplow: Well before I say...

James Bladel: Thanks Michele and - I'm sorry, go ahead Chris. I did want to apologize if I was not emphatic enough that I was speaking in capacity of the registrar so a registrar, not all registrars. Go ahead Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you, Chris Chaplow speaking. Before I say what I was going to say with that marvelous lead-in from Michele it is true that I sometimes as a businessperson do - I'm surprised about how much work registrars can do to sort out problems for the sake of the six euro financial gain.

So just say that on record from the business side in personal capacity I suppose, not business constituency.

What I was just going to say was actually a story just from I was having dinner with another - somebody else the other night who just bought a domain from somebody.

And the domain was registered with GoDaddy. It had been - the other party had opened a GoDaddy account on his behalf, pushed the domain into it and then sort of said well there's your domain.

And he found himself also caught in the 60 day lock because he didn't really know anything about it. He was just telling me about the 60 day lock.

And well so yes, so I know a little bit about that. So that was - and of course he hadn't - in that situation he hadn't accepted any terms and conditions of anybody.

He was able -- I'm right (unintelligible). He was able to change the DNS. So for him it was a bit academic. And to be quite honest he wasn't too bothered about it. So I just thought I'd share that with the group.

James Bladel: Thank you Chris. Barbara was in the queue but she dropped her hand so looks - oh, I see her comment in the Chat that Michele (unintelligible) comments.

So I just wanted to add just a few things. And this is again emphatically from the position of a registrar and just the registrar that I am employed by, not all registrars.

But the first thing is is that Marika has posted the new language for reason for Denial 6. It was the output of the IRTPB Working Group that is - has been approved by the Council. I believe it's now on its way to the ICANN Board and will probably be implemented sometime soon that addresses some of the meat and potatoes of this issue head-on.

And so I think that, you know, one of the - perhaps one of the working group comments here is that, you know, it's - we would love to maybe take a look at this issue in the context of the new policy which we probably will be expecting some time around the time we all get on the plane for Costa Rica.

The second point I wanted to make was that I think that Michele's correct that this is one of the major holes.

And I think Chris touched on it as well is that the current change of control environment or the - in the absence of the void of this function in ICANN it would be no problem for example for me to create an offensive or infringing domain name and then go and just assign that to someone I wanted to harass like if I had some sort of a falling out with Michele and I wanted to cause him trouble.

So I could just go and put his contact information and his name. And has Chris pointed out in his example Michele didn't necessarily agree to accept the domain name or even to agree to any terms and conditions. It just now is suddenly associated with his name. And I think that we've seen this done in criminal circles as well.

So there's a - there's this void and this informality. And I think that, you know, that industry has done very well in innovating around that but it could possibly use some help from the policy side in clarifying what a change of control looks like, what it looks like, what are they required elements, whose - which parties authorizations need to be obtained and when and overall what a process like that would look like.

I don't think we can hope to generate something perfect that would eliminate all of these issues but I think we can go a long way to closing these loopholes.

I knew it. I used Michele as an example and now here comes the blowback from Michele.

Michele Neylon: No, no. I was just actually going to back to exercise an example which has nothing to do with transfers but all to do with how can I say it, unauthorized use of contact details in domain Whois.

About 18 months ago we found ourselves being - well we weren't sued. We were almost sued by Setanta Sports who are a TV channel that do sports oddly enough.

And the GA who are the Gaelic Athletic Association who oddly enough deal with Gaelic games like curling and are Irish - sort of Irish, football and other Irish sports and all because one - somebody had registered a domain name - - can't remember through which registrar -- doesn't matter -- and without our knowledge or permission had put our contact details into Whois.

So as far as the affected parties were concerned the domain was hours. We have no knowledge of us. That had nothing to do with us. But Whois never lies. For Whois is wonderfully, what's the word I'm looking for, reliable.

And, you know, forcing registrars to validate Whois and check for the Whois looks is valid will of course avoid all problems including people using contact details without permission of course. Logically I hope you get the sarcasm.
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. Sarcasm doesn't translate well I'm sure in transcription. But I think we get your point that this is, you know...

Michele Neylon: That's why said I hope you get the (sarcasm).

James Bladel: Okay. Well I think we've covered this one fairly extensively. We've exhausted the queue here. We've heard from a lot of individuals and some - I think some fairly good examples of why this is a problem.

I think one response that we should note Marika with Barbara's permission is that Question 4 dealing with Reason for Denial 8 and Question 5 Reason for Denial 9 both - especially Question 5 also touch on Reason for Denial 6 and that we should view any deliberations or recommendations from this working group in context of the new Reason for Denial 6 language which will be implemented later this spring.

Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. I'm being formal and I'm saying yes I do agree with that. That's fine. Thank you.

James Bladel: Excellent. Thank you very much.

Barbara Knight: Sure thing.

James Bladel: Okay so closing up discussion point Number 5 and then noticing that that is it for the hardest of our three charter questions the most difficult or - most complex charter Question A, does anyone else have anything they would like to add on the topic of charter Question A before we move on to the next section?

Okay thanks. The queue is clear. Let's move on to reason - or I'm sorry Michele. I didn't leave you enough time. Please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes sorry, I'm multitasking as usual. Sorry about that James.

Are you asking for comments in relation to Charter Question A in general or in relation to the feedback we've received on Charter Question A?

James Bladel: I think in general in that, you know, we have these comments, we have now discussed those five comments received and that we have proposed responses there captured by Marika in red as well as the one we just discussed in Charter Question 5, is there anything missing or anything you'd like to add to our review, you know?

Michele Neylon: Well I'll just throw this out here anyway. Just for the record I think that the lack of a change of control of is something that needs to be addressed personally because I think it does - it doesn't matter what comes out the far end be is a codifying of a lock of some kind or the codifying of a lack of a lock of some kind. But at least can we, you know, discuss this to death or agree or disagree.

But let's at least make sure that we've given us ample discussion and we've got a good wide, broad comprehensive, what other words am I looking for, representative range of feedback from as many parties who could be affected? And by affected I mean anybody who ever registers a bloody domain name basically?

Because I think the lack of this change of control leads to a whole range of issues. And then there's no reason why we cannot have a change of control function in my mind.

I mean it's the details or something that people are petty better writing documents than me can sort out that can coexist with other activities be that aftermarket or whatever. There's no reason why you can't have the two.
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. And while you were speaking there I wanted to note for the transcript that a number of green check marks appeared in the Adobe room.

So I think that there is if not full consensus there's a strong consensus building for what you're saying is that the absence of this policy or the absence of this function within ICANN policy is a problem and it causes a lot of businesses and individuals a lot of frustration, heartache, and extended resources trying to cope. Is that a good word, cope with the absence of something like this and that we could possibly, you know, do this industry a huge favor by closing some of those voids.

Thank you. And if there are no other questions then I would ask Marika to move on to Charter Question B comment received Number 6.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So the Comment 6 relating to Charter Question B from GoDaddy practical limits on the effective term of a form of authorization should be considered.

Sixty days would be a reasonable time frame. To inform its work the IRTP Part C Working Group should gather and consider scenarios in which a registrar receives an FOA from the registrant but does not submit the transfer request to the registry.

James Bladel: Okay. I have a comment here in a personal/registrar capacity but I'll put myself at the end of the queue and open it up to comments. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. It's Mikey. I just want to support this idea and offer the suggestion that maybe 60 days is even a little too long because it seems like FOA isn't a - is a transaction that's pretty tired to transfer event.

I had - I don't think I'm taking Bob's name in vain I see that he's not on the call. Bob Mountain and I had a conversation about FOAs and the aftermarket.

I note that I think Simonetta is not on the call yet either. And the issue that Bob was raising with me was that the aftermarket's current process really

depends on a long FOA period so that they can affect the transfers at an indeterminate time in the future.

And my suggestion was that rather than having an extremely long FOA interval where the domain is essentially released in a way, why not introduce the notion of an FOA renewal or even an FOA auto renewal that a customer who's using the aftermarket could opt in on and thus the aftermarket could still essentially have that release but it would be specific to a customer who wants it rather than the other way around which is right now everybody is essentially vulnerable to an unexpired FOA.

So I think that there is a way to navigate through this in a way that we can accomplish the goal of tightening this up a bit without paralyzing the aftermarket.

And I just wanted to sort of rattle all that off because I noticed that Bob and Simonetta are both not on the call today and wanted to express their - at least Bob's concern. I don't know whether Simonetta shares it. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you Mikey. Anyone else care to weigh in on this topic? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Actually yes I do. Oh God that's hardly comes as a surprise though does it?

I - it's heartening to hear support for a short FOA from Mikey. I'm actually really glad that he gets that, the concept why a couple of us identify this is an issue. And thank you Mikey.

I also I am conscious of the fact that, you know, for - that as Mikey said, some aftermarket companies work on the basis of the FOA kind of having this ridiculous long expiry and everything else.

However as I said with relation to the change of control surely that's a question of how the policy is worded.

Because at the moment you have this (iconesk) FOA and you'd swear to God it was only possible way to agree anything between two parties.

Now I know this is going to come as a shock and a horror and is going to shock some people but, you know, ICANN it does not override contract law as far as I'm concerned.

If I've got a contract with my customer and I'm in Ireland, they are in Ireland or in Europe then that's going to have a lot more weight in an Irish court than something from some random organization in California.

So I mean the fact that the FOA is there and it works in a particular way is fine but maybe it's time to have a look at how the FOA system currently works and maybe there is an appropriate way to actually deal with this in such a manner that both - those of us who are primarily dealing with, you know, SMEs or small businesses who just want to move domains around the place and those people who want to transact and buy and sell domain names in an aftermarket they can coexist too.

I just think, you know, there's no reason why in my view you can't have both if you word the policy correctly. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Michele for your comments. And I'll just go ahead and weigh in here on behalf of GoDaddy. And we submitted this comment.

I understand we recognize that some aftermarket systems require or would prefer I think a longer or more indefinite open ended form of authorization.

I think that we have identified this has the potential to be a vulnerability. I think that the timeframe 60 days is sufficient.

I think we can make - certainly we could debate valid reasons and justifications why it should be shorter or longer. But 60 days aligns it with all of the other cooling off periods, grace periods, prohibitions, locks -- whatever we want to call it. So I think that that helps to just kind of establish some consistency.

The only other point that I wanted to make on this one here was that, you know, I think that having some limitations on FOA can be done in such a way that it's not incompatible with current aftermarket practices.

I think Mikey, you know, put out a couple of ideas, for example the auto renewing FOA or the opt in, doing all the renewing FOA.

And maybe I think if I'm paraphrasing what I heard Michele saying that maybe rather than having a universal form that everyone enters into with an FOA ICANN could prescribe a - that each register have its own FOA so long as it complied with a certain the required elements.

But then that would make it a little more compatible with local law although I think that's possibly a recipe for a lot of confusion.

And then finally the only other part here was just that I think in our thinking with the aftermarket was that if someone listed a domain name for sale and had not received any interest or offers within 60 days then that would be not only an opportunity for the aftermarket service provider to renew the FOA but also to reengage that particular customer and find out, you know, what's going on with that name, is not being categorized appropriately or it is not priced appropriately or whatever.

I mean these are business decisions but I think it - you know, I think it - the case could be made to the aftermarket providers that having a regular check-in for those customers who are not seeing a lot of activity on their listings would possibly be a good thing.

So I'll drop my hand for there and go to Michele and then Michael afterwards.

Michele Neylon: Well there's a couple of things. First of all yes, James just raised a very valid point. You don't want to end up with a situation where, you know, an attempt to fix one problem causes a whole range of other problems.

So if every single registrar was able to have a separate FOA I can see that causing more problems than anything else.

What I was trying to get at was more along the lines of just, you know, maybe revising, reviewing, tweaking how the entire FOA thing is done in such a manner potentially that, you know, let's say for example if I as a domain or domain investor depending on, you know, calling him what you will, if I want to put a few domain names with the marketplace and have an FOA with them, you know, tied to - for much longer than 60 days that I should have the option to do that.

I'm not saying that every single FOA is going to be different but if I as a registrant wanted to enter into that kind of agreement with a registrar then I should be able to do that.

There was another point, damn. Oh the - no, damn sorry, can't remember now. I had it I lost it. I'll cede to Mikey. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks. Go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. I just want to react a little bit to your last thought James. I think that one of our goals should probably be a pretty sparse conversation about the FOA.

I wouldn't want to get into a place where we're suggesting to an aftermarket provider that they ought to talk to their customer on any given interval.

One of the business practices that's fairly prevalent although this is - I am speaking in total ignorance because I've never done this, but my understanding is that domainers will list domains with an aftermarket provider sometimes for years in hopes that it will sell since those names appear in the quote, premium domain listings on other registrars.

And so the expectation on the part of the domain holder and the aftermarket provider is that some of these domains will sit in that inventory for a very long time before they sell.

And I wouldn't want this policy process to get to that level of detail in the conversation. I think that's something that if we can write the policy in a way that - my point to Bob was that it would be helpful if there was a way to use automation to solve the problem that the aftermarket providers have rather than trying to build it into policy and then build policy that's sparse and clear enough that it's easy to automate too but then stop.

I think we get into complicated areas if we start to talk about how often aftermarket providers ought to talk to their customers. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. And just to be clear I was kind of using that as an example, not necessarily recommending that that be language that would be included anywhere in the recommendations or the reports, just more part of our deliberations.

It looks like Michele has remembered his point from before so go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes I'll keep this brief. It's unfortunate that neither (Bob) or Miss Simonetta -- I normally don't have problems pronouncing her name -- aren't on the call today.

I mean one of the things that, you know, Mikey I touched on, I think James might have touched on as well, is I mean you can easily end up in a situation where a domain is listed on multiple marketplaces and sits there for a very, very long time.

I think, you know, the - and something that it would be helpful to get some feedback from the people in aftermarket to see how they realistically handle this.

But I mean, you know, domain names change hands, they expire, people reregister them. I have seen situations arise across various marketplaces where I would go to add a domain name to an account to discover it was already on somebody else's account but, you know, just have never been cleaned down when it expired or changed hands.

So, you know, it's just something that, you know, it would be useful to know how they're handling those kinds of things I think. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. And since we typically discuss domain name lifecycles in one year intervals as they auto renew it's interesting that all - or one to ten year lifecycles it's interesting that in some cases the FOA is being held open longer than the typical lifecycle in the domain names.

So, you know, I think if I can just kind of bring us back to a conclusion here it seems like there's this understanding that time limiting an FOA is not necessarily incompatible with aftermarket practices and that, you know, we are - it sounds like we're in agreement that the aftermarket, the needs of the aftermarket for a long FOA, as well as possible and perhaps even indefinite is not necessarily shared by all of the individuals the vast majority of whom are not participating in those types of activities so that it seems like that we're coming down on the side that perhaps we should institute a - some limitations on the timeframe on an expiration date or best if used by date for an FOA and

that the new language could be constructed in such a way that the aftermarket folks could still continue their existing practices.

Comment Number 7 is essentially identical to comment Number 6. However it leaves out one key thing which is it does not recommend a specific timeframe and instead defers to in this particular case defers to the registrar community.

And I think I believe it might have been Avri that in our first run through these comments pointed out that it really should be more of a cross community multiple stakeholder approach to determining that time period rather than just registrars. And I think I as a registrar I agree with that.

So unless someone has a substantive comment on Number 7 that feels that perhaps that I've been too hasty in saying that it's essentially the same as comment Number 6 were there any other comments questions or thoughts on this subject Charter Question B whether or not FOAs should be indefinite or have some reasonable time limits established for their use?

Okay well as we suspected once we got past Charter Question A these things would go relatively quickly.

So moving on to Charter Question C, Marika if you could start us off by reading Comment Number 8 please?

Marika Konings: Of course so this is Marika. So Comment 8 from GoDaddy, GoDaddy anticipates that this might become a greater burden for all registrars with new GTLDs when hundreds of new GTLDs are active in the DNS.

A move to uniformity employ IANA ID numbers in GTLD registry systems would therefore be favored to the extent practical.

James Bladel: Thank you. And, you know, just introducing Charter Question C I think this is something that I don't want to presume but I think in - the general case this is something that is really between registries and registrars.

It's very much an under the hood technical operation as opposed to something that has a direct impact on other stakeholders.

The reason I say that is because in my opinion, and this is how we identify ourselves when we're communicating both verbally and technically with the registry.

So, you know, I don't know and this might seem pretty dry and actually kind of boring I think to folks in other stakeholder groups but hey, you know, I'm open to being surprised.

Michele go ahead and comment on this one please?

Michele Neylon: I would almost 100% agree with you -- almost. But I take it a bit step further.

There are actually - I would actually see it as being if there was more uniformity in this particular area it would allow us as registrars to offer a better level of customer service and remove some of the confusion in the messaging that we are obliged at present to present to registrants, in other words our customers.

Because, you know, for example in the last week I've had a number of emails into my inbox saying that a particular domain name was being transferred from one registrar to another.

We were the losing registrar which was fine. That didn't bother me but I have absolutely no idea who the gaming registry was. I couldn't see that because all I got was the registrar ID.

And there is no easy way for me to take that registrar ID and check it against anything. I have no way of knowing who the hell that register is.

The only way I could do it might be to use, I don't know maybe Google it and maybe somebody somewhere has accidentally posted that ID somewhere in public?

Yes it's just, I don't know, I'd love to hear from a registrant as to why they think this is a bad idea. So I'm all ears. Thanks.

James Bladel: I had a thought but I'll save it until after. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. I'm on the bus. The thing I wanted to say is that I think that the stake that registrants have in this is quite a bit along the lines of what Michele just said which is that we as customers also have a stake in reduced errors, more accurate transfers, you know, easier customer support because we're the ones on the receiving end.

So I think that when we do our write up we should not write this up just as something to take care of the needs of registries and registrars because really we as customers benefit just as much from an improvement like this.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey and that's an excellent point and something I overlooked that while it's maybe difficult to drive a straight line between this issue and the benefits to registrants there's always the benefit of just cleaning up the overall transaction environment so that there are fewer errors, fewer confusion, less vulnerability to people to be manipulated by those in the know.

So I just want to close off with a couple of quick points here so I put myself in the queue. And this is just speaking in a personal capacity.

The first one from Michele is, you know, it did occur to me Michele that you could wait until after the domain name was transferred and then do a Whois look up and see which registrar that was and then build your table over time.

But I agree with - in the absence of a secret decoder ring it's impossible to tell that on the spot which really in some ways raises an interesting question.

Suppose that you had visibility into transfer out requests and knew which registrar was requesting that would that - let's see here, suppose that a registrar wanted to have a different set of - or interpretation of transfer policy for one competitor versus another.

If I had it out for Michele because we had some disputes on how and I want to see all the transfers that we're going to him does this somehow obfuscate those transactions such that I cannot discriminate against transfers that were going out to Michele?

I mean that's just, I don't know the answer. It's just something that popped into my head while Michele was speaking.

The second thing is wanted to point out is that, you know, I think one of the key elements of our comment here is that we can live with the situation today that with one registry our ID number is ABC 123 and with the next registry it's XYZ 987.

And, you know, these are computers, they can handle these things. These systems are fairly sophisticated.

But it's just going to become more and more tedious and unmanageable in the new landscape which we expect to be populated by a larger number of registries.

And then thirdly I just wanted to offer up here I know we only had one registry representative on the call but I see another - other registrar representatives who are a little quiet here. And I want to give them an opportunity to weigh in on this issue, Charter Question C and see if there was any - if they had any strong opinions one way or the other.

I'm thinking now, you know, we can encourage Matt and Rob some of the other guys to raise their hand and oh, let's see how it works. Okay, so Matt raises hand. He's in the queue but he is behind the...

Matt Serlin: I preemptively raised my hand because I knew...

James Bladel: Awesome.

Matt Serlin: ...you were going to call me out.

Michele Neylon: You know, sometimes...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...always pick on (unintelligible) I think it should be encouraged.

James Bladel: You know, sometimes you have to go and shake the tree somehow...

Matt Serlin: Yes, no I knew my time was coming. No thanks James. And I think by and large I agree with GoDaddy's comment.

I think - and I guess Mikey's as well actually for everyone's benefit registrar, registry, end user, ICANN, to be able to use a uniform ID across all registries really makes a lot more sense.

And you're right, Barbara is the only one on the call but I can't imagine that that would create a huge obstacle for the registry operators at...

Michele Neylon: Guys, guys, that's twice you said that Barbara's the only registry on the call. That's factually incorrect.

Matt Serlin: Okay settle down.

Michele Neylon: Roy is also on the call. He may be very, very quiet but he's also on the call and he's from Neustar.

Matt Serlin: Yes, no you're right he is. Okay so maybe...

James Bladel: Good point.

Matt Serlin: ...we'll pick on Roy next. But I don't...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: We should pick on Roy. I think we should pick on Roy but that's just me.

Matt Serlin: I don't imagine that would create a huge headache for the registries to implement. And if we're going to do something like that James to your point, we should probably do it while there's a smaller number of registries before there's several hundred of them.

James Bladel: Okay. Agree Matt. Michele you're next and then I wanted to point out that Rob Golding posted something interesting in the Chat box as well. So after Michele's comment we'll raise that as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And oh look Roy's put up his hand. Woo-hoo. The - now the thing I was going to - just one thing to say. I mean to James's thing, you know, if it was there would it lead to registrars doing anything special?

Well no, because if you see a spike in transfers out to a particular registrar ID you probably will go sit down work out who the hell it is and try and work out if it's something you need to worry about.

So to answer your question no, it wouldn't have any impact. What it - but it - I can't - under the contract there's no way for us or anybody else to treat any registrar any differently.

You know, we have to allow transfers to flow in and out, you know, based on our normal business procedures and processes.

I mean there are certain things let's say for example with respect to Whois access, you know, if a particular registrar starts pounding your Whois server and you have no idea that it's - that these are legitimate requests then, you know, you might end up blocking them accidentally. But that's more down to network security than anything else. Thanks.

I'll cede to Roy who's going to speak for the first time on this call. Woo, go Roy.

Roy Dykes: Hello everybody. And for those of you who don't know me just a real quick background on myself.

I've been here at Neustar for just over eight months. Before then I spent 2-1/2 years leading the core product management or core services or product management at Network Solutions.

So I have a little bit more of experience on the hosting, email and security side than I do on the domain site but I'm quickly coming up to speed.

Relative to the IANA ID I need to do a little bit more research. And I know that Neustar and also affiliates do use a proprietary ID and not the IANA ID.

So and my understanding just from the surface which is why I need to do more research is that it's a nontrivial element to move over to just the IANA IDs.

But let me do some more research and try and come back with some more substantive comments on this particular item next week.

James Bladel: Thank you Roy. And actually a question for Roy and for Barbara, if you guys could maybe perhaps work together offline and for next week give us an idea of what the impact of this proposed change would mean for registries?

I think that that was something hopefully we were looking for in the Registry Stakeholder Group comments and I don't know if there's anything conclusive and there.

So maybe that would be a thought is how difficult is to - how much would it would involve change from sort of unforeseen consequences I guess are we missing in our discussions?

But thanks Roy and welcome. And I see that Michele is here but as usual we will defer to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just wanted to point out as I did in the Chat as well that there's actually further input from the Registry Stakeholder Group in Comment 13 relating to this issue. And that talks about why you need two registries.

And as I understand - if I understand Roy correctly it's Neustar and affiliates are using IANA IDs and their they do point out that there has to be a, how did I put it, there would need to be a compelling reason for these registries to transition to the use of IANA IDs as the level of effort involved would be significant given that all systems would be impacted.

So there's already some feedback in that specific comment which we might want to consider in relation to this discussion.

James Bladel: Thank you Marika and good point. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes this is just very...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: (Unintelligible) last comment for today.

Michele Neylon: No this is really, really brief. And it's great to have fresh blood in the working group and it's great that you're going to be - that you're speaking up and long may this continue.

Because the more you guys, the rest of you people speak up then the more, you know, those of us who just yap or (who) talks to the wall can, you know, stay quiet.

Just Roy just this is by way of clarification. We're not asking to replace a proprietary ID with the IANA ID. That is not what is being asked at all.

What we would like to see -- and somebody else can jump in and disagree with me if I get this wrong -- is that the - that whatever ID either includes the IANA ID or be based off the IANA ID in a manner which makes - which is parsable, machine parsable basically.

So that let's just say for arguments sake our IANA ID is 1448, our internal affiliates or Neustar is - ID is Edsel 1 that that would morph into something which includes 1448. And it wants to have some kind of proprietary, a Neustar thing then so be it.

But the 1448 this would be something that, you know, other registers be looking and go oh 1448 that's black knight, thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. I would point out that the - while that's an excellent thought and something that we should consider and capture in this - that the strict literal reading of our charter question is proposing a replacement at least in my interpretation.

It says something about registries use IANA IDs for registers rather than proprietary IDs. So it seemed to me that they were proposing a replacement.

But I agree that there could be especially for incumbent registries could be using a system that you proposed where it contains the ID and then requiring the use of IANA IDs for new registries as they come online.

Michele Neylon: Well James that's probably - if the wording gives that impression then that's Marika and I may have maybe slightly at fault for that.

I think the two of us kind of drafted some of that wording I think. I could be wrong. Marika might correct me.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. This actually comes from the initial IRTP Drafting Team that came up with the list of items. So for this one at least I don't think we're too (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay thank you. We are just a few minutes left. I see Mikey has - is in the queue. We'll let him speak and then after that we'll just kind of wrap up the meeting. So take it away their Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that there are ways to rephrase this. For example, one option might be to say that the process could be streamlining by a requirement that registrars include IANA IDs in transactions rather than replace.

And that could even be - I'm worried that what's being proposed might cause all registry databases to renumber existing processes which I've never done this in the registry space but I did a lot of work in manufacturing companies.

We tried really hard to avoid renumbering all the parts in a manufacturing operation. That is a huge process.

And rather than specifying how that ID gets included maybe we just take it as an implementation detail to say, you know, you can - if you want you can renumber all your IDs to include it or you could include it as another field in the transaction or something.

But I am very sympathetic to Rob's point which is if we're forcing, you know, a registry to renumber the IDs of all of their transactions that is a big deal.

So I think we need to be a bit careful in how we frame our suggestions there. That's it. See you.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. And I agree that we need to be clearer whether we're discussing replacement or augmentation.

And I think we can also - I don't know if this was said or if it was just something I was thinking about, but we could also have a slightly different implementation, these guidelines or requirements for incumbent registries that exist now versus those that, you know, those - the coming wave that we expect which is where I think we anticipate the operational challenges will be with the status quo.

So with that comment we'll note that we are now I believe on Charter Question 9 with looks like about four or five more to go.

Apologies that we did not get through this review tool today. It was probably a little too ambitious on my part. Sorry for that.

The next meeting will be same time, same channel one week from today and we will wrap up this discussion then.

So great deliberations and discussions everyone and that's not coming from me. There we go okay. So...

Man: Great sale, how lovely.

James Bladel: Yes I don't have such an effective radio voice. So anyway thanks everyone. Have a great week.

Please review the mailing list and if you have any thoughts don't hesitate to contribute them. I think the mailing list has been a little quiet lately but that's just a personal editorial. So thank you and have a great week.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

Woman: Bye.

END