

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 01 May 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 01 May 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120501-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Hago Dafalla – NCSG
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Avri Doria - co-chair
Paul Diaz - RrSg
Angie Graves – CBUC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Knight - RySG
Rob Golding – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber

Apologies

James Bladel -co-chair
Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG
Roy Dykes – RySG
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
Zahid Jamil - CBUC

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's IRTP-C call on Tuesday the 1st of May we have Hago Dafalla, Kevin Erdman, Michele Neylon, Chris Chaplow, Barbara Knight, Paul Diaz, Mike O'Connor, Avri Doria, Bob Mountain. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Gisella Gruber. Matt Serlin has also just joined the call.

Apologies noted today from Roy Dykes, Simonetta Batteiger, Zahid Jamil, James Bladel and Jonathan Tennenbaum. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Avri. And Phil Corwin has also just joined the call. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Thank you all for being here. First I've got to check on the statements of interest, SOIs. Does anybody need to talk about an update of their SOI at this point? Okay I assume all of us are keeping them up to date.

Okay in terms of the agenda review the first item we had was the ideal process for change of control sub team update. Now Simonetta is not here but there has been - Marika did produce a summary of those that did reply so it's probably worth walking through that and then basically I have a question to ask at the end.

Then, Number 3, was the data gathering sub team update. Now Bob gave one at the last meeting. I'm not sure what remains to be discussed on that. But that's the next item.

Then there's getting back to the discussion of the charter questions, B, C. And then finally something - and I want to keep the process conversation as brief as possible based on the request of this team - but is to discuss the timeline for delivering the initial report including outstanding items of the initial report and, you know, considering whether we go to more meetings, longer meetings, slip the schedule, are going to make the schedule as it is.

And then there's next steps, confirming the next meeting. Any questions, modifications, things we should add, drop or change to this agenda? Seeing no hands we'll move forward with it.

Okay so on Number 2 the ideal process I wonder, Marika, if you'd be willing to walk us through. I see that for the most part we have three people though at one question we have four who contributed answers. One of the questions that comes up - and I'd ask people to think about it as Marika is coming through is are we not answering because the questions are too hard and we need more time to think?

Are we not answering because we don't have a strong opinion and we just as soon the sub team make a recommendation based on what's already been discussed? Do we assume that we really don't know how to decide and the initial report should list the two options and get feedback externally? Think about those things and sort of ask afterwards. In addition to if anyone wants to react to the answers given.

Marika, are you willing to walk us through these?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm happy to do so. And I think both as Michele and Paul are on the call they have provided responses we'd just like to encourage them to, you know, they should feel free to jump in if they want to add something or clarify anything that they've responded.

So basically what I did I grouped together the different responses per question. Today we've received input from Roy, Michele and Paul and Barbara provided some input to one of the specific questions. If I did miss anyone else's responses, you know, just let me know and, you know, we can update this table as needed. And so the first question related to the, you know, the terminology for the process - and we had some discussion on that as well on last week's meeting.

And I know that there's - one of the comments I think on last week's meeting those that were on the call, you know, seemed to agree that, you know, we should - instead of calling it a change of control we should maybe refer to it as the change of registrant as it would be easy to understand what we're actually talking about and possibly consider using prior and new registrant when talking about, you know, the two different parties involved in such a process.

Roy responded that he agrees with the name change of registrant and he actually suggests that using a gaining/losing registrant, which is currently also used for registrars in the transfer process. To Michele that all sounded good. And Paul indeed wanted to have a clarification on whether we were talking about, you know, changing of registrant, which I hoped had been clarified by actually using change of registrant instead of change of control.

And he also asked questions why gTLD registry operators are being considered in the process flow as in his view change of registrar if that also occurs then it's - follows the transfer and the IRTP rules.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: I see Paul has his hand up so...

Avri Doria: Yes, I see Paul. Paul, go ahead please.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, thanks, Avri. It's Paul Diaz. Look, I'll just make my point at the beginning because the same issue flows through all of my responses. With this one fully support what Roy is saying; I think it should be clarified as - use the word registrant for change, that's fine.

But beyond that I'm just left wondering - I've not been actively involved in this working group but all the discussions or at least the propositions that registry operators are somehow going to be involved in the vetting process here is really just counterintuitive to me. And I think if I can put words in his mouth Michele agrees with me (seeing) later on.

Fundamentally all of this stuff really seems to be about - or it should be at the registrar level simply because the registries are not in a position to make the determinations necessary about registration rights to a name. Those relationships, the business relationships, are with the registrar level.

And so just as we walk through all of these questions I keep seeing registry as one of the potential sources of making a determination. I'm just kind of left at a loss where does the working group think registries have a viable role in all of this?

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I see three of us are now in the list. And I put myself in the list because I wanted to make a content-related comment. One of the problems I also had as I was going through was indeed the - what are registries doing here.

But there was one comment that I saw in Michele's that I also think about. It's in the cases of future communities or even supported gTLDs of old when there is some notion that one has to be a proper applicant to become a registrant - an applicants - or a proper prospective registrant to actually get something how is that dealt with by the registrar when it is the registry that needs to give that determination in some way and that is all done in the other way.

And we had talked earlier about there needing to be a caveat somewhere that says if community or support is then...

Man: Gaining...

Avri Doria: ...magic happens here. So I just wanted to bring that that has been part of my confusion in looking through this and saying how are we dealing with that? Okay take myself out of the list. Oh okay Michele, you're next.

Michele Neylon: Good afternoon. I just wanted to - well speak to a couple of things. First of all Avri's point, I mean, that could be summed up by making some kind of simple reference to the registration rules rather than, you know, as long as the person - as the entity or person still qualifies for the domain name rather than specifying under the circumstances for that.

Yeah, the other thing as well just for those who may or may not have seen what I was talking about with this thick thin registry thing any of the existing processes, procedures, policies, whatever you want to call them, around this entire change of control, change of registrant concept the only ones that exist at present of course are ones that have been used within the ccTLD space.

And what I was trying to get at in my email - and I'm not sure whether, A, people read it or, B, whether it was clear - it was very clear in my head but when I put things on paper or in an email it might not be.

You know, that the registries get involved there because they have a relationship with the registrant and the registrar whereas when you're dealing with say VeriSign for example VeriSign have absolutely no idea who is behind blacknight.com as in the domain name.

All they know about is the domain was registered on a specific date, it has an expiry at some time in the future. And they can see the name server changes

over time. That's it. They know nothing further about it. So there's no way for a registry operator to get involved in this entire thing because they literally wouldn't know.

And again they're not the ones who are kind of acting as the gatekeepers to any changes in the Whois database; it's the registrars who are doing that. So I think we just need to be careful in trying to remove that confusion. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks (unintelligible). Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri. It's Mikey. You know, two points; one, I think part of the reason that the registry stuff got into the flow chart was - it was sort of historical. We got that out of our charter. In the charter it said oh you might want to go look at some of those ccTLD registries for ideas.

But I think Paul's onto something when he says in that paragraph - I mean, there's a very simple way to address change of control and it would be in the negative. It would be to say do not use the IRTP in change of registrant transactions period. Just make it really clear.

And then in a way you could step back at that point and say well do we need to make policy at all for a registrant change at the registrar level or do we just leave that up to the registrars but we make it clear in policy that this combining of change of control and change of registrar is not acceptable from now on.

Because in a way what we're trying to do is fix a problem that's caused by using a process that's designed to do one thing, to do something completely different. And maybe the way to solve this is just to say don't do that and then solve it some other way; we don't care. So there's a way out in left field idea for you.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I guess - okay, I don't see any other hands up. I'd like to first of all make two comments. One is this questions asks about terminology of the process.

And I think we've all come to agreement on part of it which is, you know, in terms of using the term registrant and in terms of, you know, gaining and prior I think were the we've used. And I'm wondering if we could take that particular issue off the table and say at least we've got one thing that we don't need to keep coming back to.

The other issue that I think we have is running through all the questions. Does anyone object to sort of saying we've agreed to prior and gaining registrant and we can leave that alone writing the report, etcetera? Are there any negatives on that particular one and at least one thing's knocked off? I see no one objecting. Obviously, you know, when we review documents later people can bring issues up again but for now let's call that one closed.

On your issue, Mikey, of sort of dirempting or forcibly splitting apart IRTP and the change of registrant. I've heard you speak of it. I'm not sure I personally agreed with the reasoning but I'm not arguing that at the moment. But I'm wondering is then the notion - I haven't picked up whether that was a notion that most of the group accepted.

And one thing that occurs to me is that if we say change of registrant is not IRTP then the question that goes begging is do we need to decide for a policy of that. And the question I would also ask is are they so different? Is the initiator of this so different that two different processes really aren't intricately related and therefore should continue to travel together? Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri, it's Mikey. You overflowed my buffer so I may not get to...

Avri Doria: I'm sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: ...all your questions. Just remind me of them. The first one is no, I don't think that the group was in any way in agreement about what I just said. You know, I think there's actually quite a strong disagreement. And Bob may want to chime in on this too.

I think certainly speaking for Simonetta - Simonetta (are) sort of on opposite sides on this in terms of where our thinking is at. And so I think that were she on the call she would be arguing precisely the opposite case that I am. And I'm not a real good advocate for it so I won't. But just in answer to that question, no, I don't think there's agreement there for sure.

Remind me of the next ones because I was busy formulating...

Avri Doria: Basically the next question - and we could go on on that later was basically there's two parts to it. One is if the group were to follow your suggestion would that be sort of asking the question - and therefore do we design another policy process for change of registrant? If we've all of a sudden says there is no controlling policy on how change of registrant is done.

And the second one was aren't the processes closely enough linked where using the same process does make sense. And it isn't overloading but is rather a case of two processes are related, are sufficiently similar where the same process can be used. And so those were the two questions I asked.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so this time I was writing things down. In terms of new policy I think that's one of the interesting splits in our snapshot that we - where we polled the group. I think we're pretty evenly split on that.

I'm in the new policy camp and would argue that side. But I think that particular question was right down the middle. And the reason I would argue it is the answer to your second question which is I think that these processes are actually quite different in that part of the - what may be most of the reason

why this is so problematic is that we are overloading a process that's not designed to do what people are doing with it.

So I think that, at least for me, we're sort of right at the nub of the debate right now. And I think there are pretty good cases to be made on both sides.

Avri Doria: Michele. Thank you, Mikey. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Hold on a second, I'm trying to think how else we're going to put this coherently. I think I agree with Mikey. Woo-hoo. Changing who a domain name is registered to or who is in control of the domain name might happen at around the same time as one changes registrar.

And what seems to happen at present in many cases is that the domain is transferred from Registrar A to Registrar B without a change or an update to the registrant but assumes it lands at Registrar B the registrant is updated. At least that's my understanding of how I think it seems to be working for most people. And that's fine because you have two separate things happening.

I don't like the idea of commingling a change of holder, a change of control, a change of registrant, whatever you want to call it, with a change of registrar because the statistics show that ICANN is already getting a huge number of complaints around domain transfers.

All I can see is making this more complicated, adding more to it would lead to greater confusion, more headaches for everybody and that means ICANN, registrars, registries, registrants, everybody. I can't see any benefit to it. So I think it needs to be something that is separate.

Now if - as a registrar I can implement something on my side; Bob is a registrar as well, he can implement something on his side, so can Matt, so can - well actually that's the only registrars here on the call today but never mind.

You know, registrars can put in some kind of thing on their side. And if we have an overall policy or guidelines or whatever for doing that well so be it. But I don't - I wouldn't like to see the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy being further complicated by this.

Now that doesn't mean that you cannot have the two because I understand that for Bob and Simonetta and other people being able to change a registrant quickly when you acquire a domain name is key. And believe me, I buy and sell domains too so I understand that. But, you know, the two - just mixing the two together I don't like. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Bob, please.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks. This is Bob speaking. Yeah, I think - I think, you know, based on what we saw the current process is pretty awful and inconsistent, you know, between, you know, between different registrars. It's just really hard to figure out.

I wouldn't necessarily go so far either as to say it should be, you know, addressed within IRTP because I'm just not sure what the track record of success in, you know, legislating user experience on something like this would be. So, you know, I guess I'm sort of on the fence as well.

I do think that the process does need improvement though. I think there's a huge amount of room for improvement. But I'm not necessarily committing that it should be addressed, you know, as part of this process. You know, I think that's one area where I just need a little bit more, you know, education on what has worked successfully in the past and what has not.

But, you know, I'm happy to kind of follow that up offline if that - if people think that would help.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Matt.

Matt Serlin: Thanks, Avri. It's an interesting discussion and I was actually all set to be - to voice my disagreement with those saying it shouldn't be part of IRTP. But actually I think the more I listen the more I sort of see the point. I guess my question - and maybe, Marika, it's a question for you - is if the workgroup decides that change of registrant is not within IRTP boundaries then what would be the process?

Would we, you know, could we make a recommendation to the GNSO that, you know, a specific policy around registrant changes be created? Is that something that would be a path forward?

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Marika, please, you take it first.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So responding to Matt's question I don't think there's anything (stopping) these groups in making such recommendations as saying well this is, you know, the policy we recommend but we also recommend that it's not integrated into the IRTP as we think for, you know, clarity sake.

It should be better to keep it as a separate policy. I don't think that's a problem because, you know, the charter question itself doesn't restrict the working group to, you know, making only recommendations or changes to the IRTP. I mean, even though it's the IRTP Working Group and the focus is on the transfer policy but a specific question asks whether there should be a separate process for change of control.

So I think there, you know, if there's a consensus from the working group to recommend that as a separate process I don't see any major issue with that at this stage.

Avri Doria: All right. Okay on the process issue I think - first of all what I'm starting to hear is that perhaps we have strong support one way and probably an

alternate viewpoint another way. And I think that's a fine thing to document in the initial report. I think we need to determine and, you know, obviously we need to determine it when Simonetta and others have seen it.

But perhaps it's worth casting it in the initial report and seeing where we go that we've got support, perhaps even strong support, but not yet consensus on a need for separation. And then we probably have a support for maintaining a situation where it's not separated and make sure that both of those positions are explained in an initial report.

I think then we can go a certain step further and perhaps recommend that either best practices or policies for change of registrant be considered. But I would want to get the - and this is speaking as a co chair - I would want to get - have our liaison, who I know is not here, and have the Council - but this could be in the initial report also - permission that if we wanted to actually look into recommending policy on change of registrant I would just want to get that confirmed with the Council first. I don't know how people feel about it.

But certainly making recommendations that it should be split, that it should be something separate is something that I could see this group certainly recommending. But as I say, I wouldn't go forward with creating a policy for it without a go-ahead; guidance, perhaps.

Any comments on that before we start to continue going through the response? Obviously I'm trying to find the issues at the moment to determine where we are, determine whether it's possible to get to closure, consensus on them or we move forward and what stakes we put in the ground for an initial report.

I see Mikey agreeing and Michele with hand up.

Michele Neylon: I'm a bit confused now.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Michele Neylon: What exactly do you want to ask the Council for guidance on exactly?

Avri Doria: Okay if this group is recommending that IRTP not include under its purview change of registrant then there's a possibility that for change of registrant are there policy decisions required? Are there best practices to be recommended? This group could certainly give best practices to be recommended. But I personally don't see the group as empowered at the moment - maybe I'm wrong - to come up with policies for change of registrants without...

Michele Neylon: I'd have to disagree with you.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Michele Neylon: On the simple grounds that the - one of our charter questions is around the entire change of control. So if the change of control is within our charter then surely dealing with the change of control is within our purview. I don't see how it can be within our charter and then not be within our purview to deal with it. That makes no sense to me.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I think you may be right. And I do see two sides to this. Yes, our charter does say change of control. Our charter also says IRTP. If we're recommending that this be taken out of IRTP I think it's reasonable to check with the Council to make sure that that stands to reason and that's something that could be put as a recommendation in the initial report and see what kind of feedback it gets.

That's why I can see an issue and I'm being safe. Michele, your hand is still up.

Michele Neylon: Mikey - no, that's okay. No I understand. I understand where you're coming from because I do - okay by strict definition IRTP is Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, fine. The problem I have is if it was out of scope of IRTP the Council has already screwed up.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and then they can fix their screw up. Mikey, please.

Mikey O'Connor: Following right on behind Michele I think that what they - I think the path we're on is the right one. And I think the Council didn't screw up. They asked us, well, what about that change of control stuff. It's clearly an issue that combines with the IRTP to cause troubles. Why don't you take a look at way to solve those problems?

If we come back and say well most of the troubles come from the combination and so our most fundamental recommendation is uncombined those two processes at that point we should check back with the Council because our charter really is bounded by the IRTP. And basically what we're saying is this isn't part of the IRTP.

And the only policy change to the IRTP might be a little sentence that says do not do change of control using this process. End of paragraph.

If I were a co chair I'd be right with Avri in saying technically at that point our mandate ends because we've been asked a question and the way we've answered it is outside this process. At the same time we've got a pretty good team, we've got a lot of expertise. We've got a boatload of knowledge. We've got all the history of all this.

It would be easy and much less resource-intensive to just ever so slightly expand our mandate to take a look at a separate change of control conclusion. But I wouldn't want to do that without getting a thumb's up from

our chartering organization. How about that for a different version of what Avri was saying...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Michele, does that work for you?

Avri Doria: And - yeah, okay, Michele has his hand up. Marika's was up but Michele was asked a question so please, Michele.

Michele Neylon: No, Mikey as ever you've managed to sell me on something. Thank God you're at - you're retired because if I have to go up against you in sales I'd be very upset.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool.

Avri Doria: And thank you, Mikey, for obviously saying it better than me. I was envisioning getting permission to work on it as opposed to saying out of scope; we quit. So I thank you for correcting. And I think it's something that we would develop in the initial report as our recommendation is they should be separated.

We see the following aspects in the separation and we recommend that you let us finish up the work on it. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just as a reminder I've put the charter in the chat. And, you know, as (unintelligible) said like, you know, it is focused on the IRTP although the question of change of control and if you look at the issue report already identifies as well that currently there is nothing in the IRTP that, you know, addresses that issue.

So, you know, I think an easy way out of that is indeed is to address that question in the initial report. But the working group is also expected to provide an update to the GNSO Council at the Prague meeting.

So I think there's a really good opportunity to maybe there, you know, face to face, explain what the working group is doing and thinking on this issue and indeed confirm that the Council is okay with the working group going forward even if that means that the recommendations that might come out of that are not for a policy to be part of the IRTP but in order to avoid confusion for that specific purpose to have it as a stand alone policy if that will be the outcome of the discussions.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. That sounds very workable to me. Okay now we've spent a little bit of time jumping into 5. But I really - as we've been walking through this trying to sort of resolve the strands of it so I have a good vision. So should we walk through the rest with the presumption that there is support, perhaps even strong support, we'll figure that out once we've written something and perhaps come back to the group and say how many people can't support this, what wording change do you need to support this, etcetera.

But at least support now for separating the issue. And if we look at the rest of the comments here - now I also noticed that we're at 34. I know Bob said he only needed 5-10 minutes for an update. And we're sort of continuing discussions on B and C as we're going with these issues. I don't think we'll get time for that. And then there is the timeline and we've been interweaving that topic in as it were.

Okay, Marika, can you go to the next one with the - oh yes, Mikey, sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Avri, this is Mikey. You know, with the conversation we just had it's...

Avri Doria: You don't think...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...such a profound change of course that you might want to just throw this one back as very valuable feedback to the sub group and let the sub group digest it rather than grind through all the rest of these on this call. Because I think - I think that we've gotten an awfully good course correction from what we've heard so far.

And that might free up a little more time on the call for the rest of the stuff. It's just a thought. Either way is fine with me but...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...because if it is a separate process, you're right; if it becomes that then we do obviously eliminate or double up, probably, on the semaphore used to - or the token used to enable action.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I mean, I think that...

Avri Doria: Okay is there anything further in the roles of thick and thins or have we covered what needs to be? So I think you're right in terms of clarify, define difference between auth info code and FOA in order to determine which serves as credentials for what. I think that's bound up in this.

And so how about in the - although Michele did speak some to this already, the thick and thin registry relations providing - is this something that should be deferred until that's been considered? Yes, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Again, you know, just - I'm rolling through the whole document. And again delighted to visit with you on the phone about it but we could - I think - well, Michele is on the sub team with me and so Michele, if I'm taking us off in a place you don't feel comfortable with whack me.

But I really think that if we step back and say no, IRTP is not to be used for change of registrant then almost all of these other questions become moot because now we would not touch the auth info code, we don't have a lot of these registrar/registry questions because we would basically be saying the IRTP stands pretty much as it stands today with one sentence that says don't use this process to change registrants. And that drops almost all of these other questions into an answer.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay so perhaps does it make sense - I see Michele's hand - does it make sense then - then people ask - to send this back to the sub team asking for two things, sort of a statement of the - what positions are being supported and perhaps culling out of this some of the recommendations that are in here for how a change of registrant should be handled.

Because part of this discussion here, when people are talking about the distinctions and what can be used for where, is sort of the presumption of how the change should be handled without being specific. So I see Mikey agrees. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Okay my head's beginning to hurt now.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Right.

Avri Doria: ...your other chair back next time.

Michele Neylon: No, no, it's okay. I think I understand what Mikey is getting at but I think I disagree with him, I think; this is assuming that I actually understood what he was saying. So I'm a bit confused now.

If people feel that the entire change of control thing could potentially be out of scope of the working group - and this needs to be checked with the GNSO - then that probably needs to be done before anything else. At least I think that's where - I think that's what I understood as being what...

Avri Doria: That wasn't what I was saying.

Michele Neylon: Well I'm confused then completely.

Avri Doria: What I was saying is that first of all saying what needs to be done and does it need to be separated from IRTP is certainly within scope. I think that giving a set of recommendations in the initial report of if it is separated, you know, what kind of problem is it and what are the parameters of that problem is within scope.

I think it's probably within scope to keep working on it further and make concrete recommendations but that I think needs to be confirmed with the Council.

And I think giving the Council both a preliminary issues report - not an issues report - preliminary initial report that breaks down the discussion, shows what we've got, shows that we've got support for this, you know, we had consensus on what we call things, we have support for A, B and C. We have alternate position for D and E. We recommend the following. And we want clearance to keep working on it as a separate process.

And so presuming that we've got permission, that it's not out of scope, but that we just need to go back to the bosses and say hey, you know, are we still in scope? We think we are but we want to check with you.

And since the timing works out well for that if, you know, at this point we're trying to focus on getting an initial report that takes the work that's been done, gets it down, gets it said, shows where the various support levels are on

things and then gives it back to the community and the Council and says this is where we're at, this is what we think. Cool to keep moving on?

Mikey - I don't know whether Mikey or Marika was first. Marika, I'll call on you, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm also, I think, with Michele, slightly confused because I was under the impression that the sub team was operating on this ideal process regardless of whether it would be part of the IRTP or as a separate process.

Because if I look at the different steps that are there now, you know, even though it maybe uses terminology that's part of the IRTP it's not linked as such to the IRTP. I mean, just because there are similarities or different, you know, is there still considering whether to use the auth info code which is also used in the IRTP that might be a similarity.

But I'm slightly confused as to - and I hope Mikey will clarify that in his response why he thinks, you know, this would need to go - or changes the whole course of thinking or the work that the sub team has been doing because I thought we were just looking at, you know, ideal process and the working group would decide at the later stage indeed whether that would fit within the IRTP and whether there would be a combination possible of change of registrant and change of registrar at the same time or whether there would be really a need to, you know, only make those as two separate standalone processes and no linking between the two whatsoever. So I'm confused.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Thanks. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry, since the confusion is largely due to my attempt to save us time I apologize. Here's the thought I had which is I agree, I think the sub team still

gets to go off and think about an ideal process for change of registrant. And we'll go ahead and do that.

But we've just gotten a big piece of input because one of the biggest clashes on the workgroup is the overloading of the auth info code and FOA. And if indeed what we're saying is don't use those for change of registrant that answers one of the bigger clashes or at least sharpens the clash in the working group. And so what - in the sub group.

So what I was thinking is that the sub group's gotten an awful lot of really helpful feedback out of this conversation today. We should take another stab at our work and come back to the group leaving aside the whole checking in with the chartering council discussion.

So all I was trying to do is save us some time on this call. And I've completely confused the issue and wasted your time instead and I apologize for that.

Avri Doria:

Mikey, I don't actually think you wasted time because I think I understand. And what I would like to suggest - I see Marika's hand just went up - what I would like to suggest and that we end this topic now - is that the sub team take this back, review the strong support or support statement for separation and then do - if separated this is the ideal process that we would recommend.

And I'm wondering whether it's even possible to come up with that statement soon enough, like within a week, so that it's something that could be placed in an initial report.

I didn't intend to go to the Council until Prague. When there was an initial report out - of course I have to talk to my co chair and Marika and such. But I wasn't intending to go - ask permission today about the sub team tomorrow. It was just because I'd really like to get what's been understood and what's been sort of acceptable down.

Marika, your hand went down. Mikey, your hand is still up.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, it's a new hand.

Avri Doria: It's a new hand, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And this is in answer to your question which is I think we're actually pretty close to being able to describe in rough outline what the ideal process is. But the sticking point is really about some of these definitional things and whether or not to overload FOA and auth info codes.

And I think that taking the separate process premise back to that workgroup that we could come up with certainly something in a week if, you know, so I think the answer is sure, we can...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...come up with something pretty good pretty fast.

Avri Doria: Of course you're not Simonetta in charge of the group so I don't want to presume.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Avri Doria: But I'd like you to take that and come up - and it's a what-if scenario. It's, you know, it's the blank sheet of paper scenario saying okay let's assume that there is strong support for separation; how does that follow and...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Avri Doria: ...work it through and bring that back to the group for the next week and see if it's something that has support.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think we can come up with a pretty good stab at it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay. So hopefully others - are people okay with me moving off this?
It's now 14 minutes before the end of the meeting. Okay.

Bob, can you give us the - an update? You said you had a 5-10 minute I think you said 5 but of course 5-10 minute...

((Crosstalk))

Bob Mountain: Yeah, sure.

Avri Doria: ...probably one minute. I went an order of magnitude bigger, apologies.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, no worries, Avri. This is Bob. Yeah, there's not really much to tell. I didn't receive any further feedback on the survey after it went out. So I'm probably 85%-90% done with the issues report. And I'll get that out certainly before the end of the week.

And one of the other items we had was the possibility to do some correlation to further clarify the data. And I'm happy to say the format that Marika gave me was very, you know, made it easy to do that so we've been able to do some further correlation which hopefully we'll shed some more light on the findings from the survey.

But, no, we're in good shape. You should all see it in the form of a PowerPoint within the next couple of days. That's all. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. So any questions or comments before quickly moving on? Okay that was really just a minute.

Okay then the next thing we had was where are we at on B and C? And in terms of coming up with answers. Jumping first to C - it seems to me and I

don't know if I'm right, it's another place where we have support on both sides of the issue.

And I'm not sure how much movement we've seen between a requirement - between requiring that registries use the IANA ID and recommending but not requiring or something. Is that a correct assumption on my part of where we are at the moment that we're as split on that as pretty much we've ever been? Or am I seeing it wrong? Mikey, first hand, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Where we wound up right at the very end was - let me first speak personally since this isn't - this is an issue that I don't personally feel very strongly about. And one of the things that was in our notes was that we were going to go off and sort of figure out the benefits and not so benefits of doing it one way or the other.

Figure out impacts, see if there's, you know, sort of do a little research on this. And we sort of skipped that step. So I pasted those notes into a list that went out - or a posting to the email list just before - just after the call last week and didn't see any motion in that regard.

So I think the way I would characterize at least where I'm at is I don't know, tell me more. I don't have strong opinions one way or the other. I think we need to do a little bit of research on the pros and cons of this thing. And I don't think we've done it yet.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks, Avri. This is Bob. I guess in response the survey that we ran came back with quite a bit of - if you look at the commentary there's a lot of detail there. And it was interesting because the quantitative responses were not as strong as the qualitative responses.

So when I went in and really read the comments there were a lot of people who felt very strongly about this that the proprietary IDs are, you know, very ineffective, creates a fair bit of overhead, lack of transparency, lack of simplicity.

So after reading that I probably feel a little bit more strongly about this than I did before. So I - maybe we want to take another look at that section and I think that might prompt some further, you know, further thinking on that topic.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean, at the moment actually listening to you and listening to that I would probably alter what I said to sort of saying it looks like we have strong support but significant opposition using the terminology that people have in terms of that that there certainly isn't rough consensus on it yet but that there does seem to be strong support for the use of the IANA.

And perhaps that's way to write it up initially and see how it moves along on that. And, yes, further discussion, further data, as Mikey asked, might be good.

I see Marika and Bob still has his hand up. And I saw one green check, I'm not sure who.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think just a reminder to everyone as well when, you know, when we're moving forward with the initial report when we start looking at the designations for consensus or, you know, level of support that - and the report is also expected when there is for example a strong support, significant opposition position that names are assigned to who is which camp.

So, you know, people should already start thinking that, you know, when indeed these calls come up for where you stand or where you sit on these issues that at the end of the day we need to document that as well in the issue report. So it's important that, you know, we think about what position you support so we can clearly, you know, write that up and document that.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. Do we need that in the initial or do we need that just in the final? I don't remember.

Marika Konings: I think it's both.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Marika Konings: But I can check that.

Avri Doria: Because what I'm doing now, by the way, is taking my first guess and allowing you all to yell at me and tell me I'm wrong because that's the only way I know to find out where we are on support. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Had myself on mute. No and just to illustrate the single proprietary IDs I pasted in after removing the domain name and just replacing it with XXX with a lot of Xs.

I pasted in the kind of email notification that you get when proprietary IDs are being used. So just for the transcript an email from Affilius regarding a dot Mobi transfer out. Domain name colon, whatever the domain name is, dot Mobi, action transfer offer approved, requesting registrar and this now is where it really breaks.

R122-Mobi; I have no idea who that is. I have no way to knowing it. I cannot look it up. I can Google for it and maybe if it happens to be the same ID for maybe Go Daddy or Network Solutions it might turn up in Google results but I have no way of knowing who that actually is.

So, you know, that's the kind of notification. I know that the registrant is - that's an internal one on our side but I have no idea who the requesting registrar is.

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No way of knowing.

Avri Doria: So I take that to mean that you're on the side of those that - the strong support for the IANA standardization.

Michele Neylon: Yeah and one of the problems I have with the questionnaire was that it kind of - it was kind of quite binary. So I think - look, if the - I don't really care whether IANA IDs are used by themselves or in combination with something else. All I care about is that I don't end up with gobbledy gook.

If I have an IANA ID and it's in there and I know that the first four digits are the IANA ID or the last four digits are the IANA ID I can decipher it. Whereas at the moment I have no way of knowing who the hell they're referring to. I have no way to parse it; I can't do anything with it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Michele Neylon: And of course this is used in lots of different places. I mean, ultimately if you don't transfer domains around the place a lot you probably don't really care, which I understand. But for somebody like me I get these notifications about a transfer out. If it's a high value domain name in the case of some of the dot Mobis which are on our accreditation, we had several millions dollars worth of dot Mobi domains associated with our account.

The last thing I wanted was to get one of those being transferred out without the domain holder's authorization because sure, we might have been able to get it reversed, we might be able to clean it up but the liability issues for us, well, could have wiped us out basically. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Chris, and I'd like for you to be the last word on this one.

Chris Chaplow: Oh thank you. Chris speaking. Michele, just out of interest on the case you just mentioned if you contacted dot Mobi would they tell you who the registrar was?

Michele Neylon: I haven't - Chris, I haven't contacted them. I mean, if I have to contact the registry every single time then the entire thing becomes completely unworkable.

Chris Chaplow: No...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No, but, I mean, would they answer me...

Chris Chaplow: ...would that information be known?

Michele Neylon: I suspect it would be known; I suspect it would be shared. Because VeriSign for example - here, I'm going to say something nice about VeriSign. VeriSign in their notifications that they send registrars clearly state who the losing and the gaining registrar is in their emails.

So I'll get an email saying what ever the hell dot Com requesting registrar, Blacknight Internet Solutions Limited, losing registrar, eNom or vice versa. And, you know, I can see those because the thing for us is if we suddenly see a whole load of domains being transferred to - I don't know, some registrar that I've never ever heard of then there might be something strange going on.

Whereas like if I look at the emails coming into us, I mean, there'll be domains coming in and out of Go Daddy, eNom, Network Solutions, register.com, all the big guys, and they're going in both directions. I see the ones from VeriSign and I read them and go oh yeah, that's fine, that's normal.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, thanks. Interesting point.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks - thanks, Chris. Okay with - your hand is still up; do you have another comment or?

Chris Chaplow: No sorry, I'll bring it down.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Okay with three minutes left just quickly on the - and I'm not going to open the floor on it at the moment - but it does look like we're tending towards near consensus on having some limit but a very divided field in what those limits should be although perhaps that's close.

So it seems like there's a little bit more discussion there. But I think that that one is approaching a rough consensus though it needs more discussion on exactly what we're having our consensus on.

In terms of the timeline I don't want to have the conversation for scheduling another meeting now. I'm suggesting that, you know, that the co chairs, Marika, and perhaps sub team chairs get together and look at the timeline and come to the group with a recommendation either during the week or at the next meeting of exactly where we're going with the timeline, with the reports, with the request to the Council, probably communicate with our liaison which I guess is Zahid, is that correct? And then...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...you know, come back and keep working through these issues at this point to really try and nail down where we are in the consensus cycle. And as we've talked about things a lot we may find places like Mikey flagged that I need some more information here to be able to tell you what side I'm on on an issue that I'm not all that into and so identify those spots. And I'm sure

Marika has already gathered lots of them, for example, this one is in this phone call.

And then start going back to those where we stand, making sure that there's a clear statement of where the various positions are, who's got the various positions and then put out the initial, bring the community and the Council back into the discussion for their viewpoint and then get back to work on it.

So that's what I'm suggesting. And that, you know, we do some work over the week in terms of timelines and such to get that straight. Hope that's okay with people. Anyone want a last word on it or anything else? We've got a minute left. Sorry for doing a forced march through this one; I see one check in the green dot.

But I believe we're getting at that point of force marching our way to at least this initial getting it stated where we're at. We're at the hour. I see no hands. I thank you all for putting up with me today. And talk to you next week unless we're on some other call before then.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks a lot, Avri.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Mikey O'Connor: See you soon. Bye-bye.

Matt Serlin: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Ricardo). You may now stop the recording.

END