

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 31 July 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 31 July 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-20120731-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - ISPCP
James Bladel –RrSG co-chair
Roy Dykes – RySG
Hago Dafalla - NCUC
Angie Graves – CBUC
Philip Corwin – CBUC
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies

Alain Berranger - NPOC
Zahid Jamil – CBUC
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Bob Mountain - RrSG
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Rob Golding – RrSG

Coordinator: Please go ahead. We're now recording.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the IRTP-C call on the 31st of July. And on the call we have got Hago Dafalla, Mikey O'Connor, Angie Graves, James Bladel, Kevin Erdman, Matt Serlin, Avri Doria, Philip Corwin, Simonetta Batteiger, Michele Neylon, Jonathan Tenenbaum, Chris Chaplow.

And for staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. Marika, as you know, is on holiday. We have apologies from Zahid Jamil and from Paul Diaz. I think that's all.

Thank you, James, and over to you and to Avri.

James Bladel: Thank you, Glen and good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to IRTP-C for the 31st of July, 2012. And as Glen mentioned our normal staff assignment, Marika, is hopefully enjoying herself on an extended holiday and she is ably replaced this week and for the next couple of weeks I think by Mr. Berry Cobb.

And for those of you who don't know Berry he is a great person to work with. We've been working with him going back to I think some of the early RAP PDPs. And while I may personally have some misgivings about ICANN as an organization certainly don't doubt the quality and character of the people that work there. So welcome, Berry, and thanks for your help with this effort.

So as per our normal routine here I'd like to first ask that everyone please review the agenda that was sent by Berry to the mailing list

yesterday as well as that appears in the right hand column of the Adobe Connect screen. Today's primary objective is to continue to review the public comments received in the comment forum and through the workshop that we held in Prague.

Any updates, additions or changes to the agenda? Okay we'll move forward. Any changes, updates or modifications to statements of interest? And no hands, great.

So let's move onto the meat and potatoes of our comment review which is currently displayed in the Adobe Connect screen. I don't have the ability to scroll. Is that just me or - oh now - there it goes. So it's alive now. And I thought that if memory serves I thought that we left off on Number 8 rings a bell but let me just check - take a quick look here and see if that - Berry, do you remember where we left off?

Berry Cobb: Hi James. Yeah, this is Berry. You're right, we did leave off around Number 8 but I'd like to remind the working group that the public comment period did close on the 25th and the ALAC did submit their comments and they're now loaded into the public comment review tool. And if the working group will allow I'd like to go ahead and start back at the top so that we cover a couple of these gaps and then we can pick up from where we left off on the last meeting.

James Bladel: Sure. So they were kind of - those responses were interleaved by topics so that we have some - like I see Number 2 and, yeah. I think I understand what you're saying here so yes let's - can you take us back to where the first ALAC comment appears and walk us through from there?

Berry Cobb: Very good. This is Berry. So starting on Row 2 the ALAC comments were about four paragraphs. These two paragraphs are kind of in the general nature and then I imagine that the working group will just acknowledge them. And then some of the more details are broken out across the other recommendations.

So the comment from the ALAC supports the general direction that the IRTP-C PDP Working Group is heading specifically the ALAC strongly supports all measures that will reduce the possibility of domain hijacking while still providing legitimate registrants the ability to change registrars.

The next two paragraphs are referencing the other recommendations. And then basically lastly the report could benefit from a clear overview describing the change of registrar and registrant processes.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Berry. That's more of a general comment. It sounds supportive of our work thus far with a note. And I think that they'd like to see better detail. Any comments or questions regarding that bit of feedback before we move on? The queue is clear so take it away, Berry. Where's the next one? Oh I'm sorry, Michele, go ahead. I guess I was a little too quick there. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: You have to remember I was distracted by the beauty that is the new Skyfall trailer. This thing about the - the report could benefit from a clearer overview describing the change of registrar and registrant processes. I think that needs probably to be addressed in some way.

I mean, - but I think there are two different things. I mean, how much detail should we go into? But obviously we need to provide something here; we can't just ignore it.

James Bladel: Well I don't intend - I don't think the intention was that we would ignore it. I thought that it was more of a general comment that was going to be expanded later. My reading on this was that by establishing a clearer change of registrant process we would highlight the distinction between - or the differences between that and a change of registrar process. But maybe others have a different read on that. Go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think the tricky bit is that we need to figure out which parts of that process we can actually document and which differ because there is, you know, one of the things we learned in that exercise where we went through the processes is that there's pretty substantial variability in there.

So I tend to agree with Michele. I think we ought to highlight that and say something along the lines of we agree and we will try and document the common portions of those processes. Because if we try and document them all I think we're going to get into a quagmire.

James Bladel: Okay. I see Michele is agreeing with that. So do we want to make a note here that that is our intended response? Berry and then I guess Mikey and Michele would you want to take a swing at putting together an outline of what needs to go here in our report?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, this is Mikey. I'm not sure I'm ready to sign up for actually doing the documentation of the processes. That's - I think that's a big piece

of work. I think we need to acknowledge it and set that as a task for ourselves. But I'm not quite ready to be the person that does it.

Michele Neylon: And for the record neither am I. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Okay. So how would, you know, Mikey, Michele, anyone really on the group how do you recommend that we proceed? Should we, you know, is this something that everyone believes that is absent from our existing report? And if so the best way to fill this gap would be to, what, to, you know, I hate to punt it over the wall to staff. It sounds like maybe something that could benefit from a sub team between now and the final report publication. That's just one idea if anyone has any other thoughts. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I just - I think that it's adequate for - at this stage us to say - like we've been saying in some of these other ones - yeah, good idea, we acknowledge that it's a good idea. We agree that it should be done and we will do it. End of comment.

You know, if you look at the one on Number 7, for example, we say that this is an issue that'll need further consideration as it refines - as the working group deliberates and refines its recommendation. I think that's sort of what I was thinking we would do here. It's the business of getting signed up to actually do the work. I can probably join that group, but I don't want to commit to it right now because I'm in the middle of another gigantic non-ICANN project that's taking all my time.

James Bladel: Okay. I'm going to put myself in the bottom of the queue and go to Matt.

Matt Serlin: Yeah, thanks, James. Yeah, I mean, I agree with Mikey. I, you know, I see Michele's point about addressing it. But I just don't know if it's, you know, with all the other work we're trying to tackle if it's reasonable to think that we could provide a meaningful descriptive overview of the, you know, entirety of the change of registrar and/or change of registrant process across, you know, the entire community not only of ICANN-accredited registrars but also the number of different change of registrant situations that we've already kind of talked ourselves through some of in this process.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Matt. Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, Chris Chaplow speaking. I would be - like Mikey - happy to join but not lead a sub group if we decided to do that. I've got a big project as well like - non-ICANN project. It's called work actually.

But it also - if we did such a thing it might be worth bringing in the person who wrote the comments on that little team and get them, you know, those other great ideas, you know, give them a shovel and get them to start digging as well.

And maybe somebody in ICANN communications department who's already done some work in the start and, you know, the newcomers area and all this sort of thing. So I think if we did something that's the format of the group I could vision. Thanks.

James Bladel: I put myself in the queue just to point out that I don't disagree that this would be a beneficial task I just - I worry a little bit about kicking the can down the road because there's really not that much road in front of us. So if we're going to identify this as a major task that's on the critical

path for our final report then we need to be planning how we're going to knock it out.

And I think to Mikey's point the difference between this and Number 7 is that this one I think is a little bit more involved than Number 7 which probably just involves, I mean, realistically Number 7 involves maybe some time on a teleconference and maybe a week's worth of exchanges on an email list and that's done whereas this is a more comprehensive documentation project.

So I guess, you know, let's think about what we can do to address this. I hate to point fingers but I would note that we have a couple of folks on this call from the aftermarket folks who maybe have some more first hand experience with this issue especially the differences between all the different registrars that was - some of this work may have already been done to some extent in that it was part of the presentation that we had when we had our Transfer 101 seminar or primer that we put together when we kicked off this effort.

So maybe we can cannibalize those materials as much as possible to get us started or at least compile an outline to get us a little bit down the road. So let me just - let's just put a pin in this one here and circle back to it as soon as we can. But I think that some of this work at least some of this may have been - already been mapped out for us and we can set up a sub team to sort of fill in the blanks as we go along and maybe flush out that skeleton a little bit.

Mikey, you're up.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Actually I'm going to read Berry's words because he's saying exactly what I said. So is the goal to create - to attempt to create a high level process flow similar to Rob Hall's domain lifecycle overview. And I think that's exactly right. I think that's probably what the ALAC is interested in as well.

Our report, I think, is confusing people right now because it's all in text and there aren't any diagrams that let people who are more visual understand what we're talking about and the differences between those things. So I'm not in any way lobbying against doing it. I just didn't want to get signed up to do it.

James Bladel: Understood, Mikey. And I think unfortunately a lot of folks are - a lot of folks are in the same boat. So okay well let's just put a marker here, Berry, if we can that we will need to circle back to this and it will be on our to-do list for the final report.

Berry Cobb: Got it.

James Bladel: And we'll do that with all of our free time at the end.

Berry Cobb: Okay...

James Bladel: So where's the next ALAC comment, Berry?

Berry Cobb: I think it's going to be towards the end.

James Bladel: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Right so I think you had mentioned Row 8 which was formerly Row 7 now that I added the ALAC comment in there which is referencing the adding of the 60-day lock might result in registrants. The action is that further consideration of the issue as the working group continues its deliberations. So we're actually on Row 10 is where we had stopped a couple of weeks ago I believe.

James Bladel: Okay because the - 8 is the new 9 and so we're actually starting off with Number 10.

Berry Cobb: Correct. So Row 10 - or Comment Number 10 is from the Registries Stakeholder Group. "The RySG supports the third option which permits the registrant to opt out of the 60-day restriction on inter registrar transfer after a change of registrant."

"It is the view of the RySG that this option, as outlined in the possible Step 5 of the proposed change of registrant process on Page 23 would be most effective if both the prior and new registrants are required to affirm their desire to opt out."

James Bladel: Okay so let's take a queue on that. And let me just unpack this comment here a little bit in my head. Thank you, Berry, for reading that through for us here but it looks like - it looks like what they're saying is that they're - that any sort of a 60-day restriction after change of registrant would be - have a voluntary opt-out process so the default would be a 60-day lock but if both parties to the transaction were to opt out then that would - then that would be removed.

And I guess - I don't know from this comment perhaps in context whether it's - that can be done in advance or that has to be done at the

time. I don't know if that was part of the consideration of the Registries when they formed - submitted this comment. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: This is Simonetta. So I am a little confused by this comment and I'm wondering if whoever submitted it really was clear on what the suggestion was. Because the suggestion was that the prior registrant can opt out of the need to confirm something at the point where the transfer is happening. But the new registrant how would they be able to - ahead of time do anything because in the sale situation they don't actually know ahead of time anything until it gets to the point where the transfer is supposed to happen. So they would then have to take action anyway.

So I'm not sure if it's (unintelligible) in this comment really makes sense or I'm completely misunderstanding something. But I'm confused by this comment.

James Bladel: I put myself in the queue. I tend to agree with Simonetta that the new registrant may be unknown at the time. Secondly I don't know that there is - I don't know that there is necessarily a security benefit to any kind of an opt out that includes the new registrant because wouldn't the hijacker automatically opt out of everything that they were trying to hijack? So, I mean, I think that I agree with Simonetta it may be a little confusing.

I hate to put you on the spot but, Roy, as one of our three Registry representatives here on the call I'm wondering did you - were you involved in the construction of this comment? Can you shed any light on the meaning here or the intention or perhaps if not maybe take that back to the constituency and see if we can flush that out a little bit?

Roy Dykes: This is Roy. James, thanks for asking. And you beat me to the punch because I was going to raise my hand. No, I don't recall the construction of this comment but I'm happy to take it back to the stakeholder group. And maybe Barbara knows. I think she had apologies for today.

James Bladel: Okay.

Roy Dykes: So what I'll probably do is start with her and/or Paul and then go from there to the Registries Stakeholder Group.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Roy. We really appreciate that.

((Crosstalk))

Roy Dykes: ...more information at the moment.

James Bladel: Okay, all right. Meanwhile we'll continue on with our discussion of this but recognizing that Roy is going to just follow up here. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I would just add to the pile of questions to take back to the Registries one of the things that confuses me about this comment is that in the current construction of the process we are limiting inter registrar transfers to the same registrant on both sides and separating the change of registrant from that process. That's the whole point of what we're doing.

And what they're doing is putting those back together again and saying that a change of registrar can also simultaneously change the registrant. And I'm not sure if that was just because of a misunderstanding but in the current definition of what we're doing the registrants would be the same.

And so they could presumably opt out of the 60-day thing on both sides of that transaction because they're the same entity. So it's - I'm equally puzzled but for different reasons. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mikey.

((Crosstalk))

Roy Dykes: That's noted, Mikey. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay. Excellent, Roy, thanks. You're quicker on the draw than I am. So, Michele, you're up next.

Michele Neylon: Just adding to the pile this is just making sure that the Registries Stakeholder Group understands that we're all a little bit confused by their comments. Thanks.

James Bladel: Well, I think we've beaten up Roy enough on this particular question. Certainly his colleagues from the Registries constructing a comment like this and then apologizing for this call that's not really fair but we appreciate Roy taking this back and see if we can get some clarification on this. I think that we really would appreciate that - a little bit more context.

And I don't think it's necessarily, you know, a negative comment; I think it's just we want to understand it a little bit better before we disposition that. So, Berry, can we move on then to Number 11, which is another comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group?

Berry Cobb: Yes. "In case where the domain name is registered to an organization or a company instead of an individual the registrant may no longer be employed by the organization which could complicate the process by which the prior and new registrants affirm their desire to opt out of the 60-day restriction on inter registrar transfers. It was suggested that in these cases an authorized representative of the organization or company be permitted to provide their elections to opt out."

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Berry. Let's start a queue on this as we unpack this comment. And it looks like Roy is up first. Go ahead, Roy.

Roy Dykes: Yeah, this is Roy for the transcript. Is there a way, James, to understand who within the Registry Stakeholder Group submitted these comments? I'm a little embarrassed to ask because presumably I should perhaps know. But when it just says Registries Stakeholder Group it's unclear to me - because there's probably a short path for me to find out or to go back to the original submitter. But if I don't know who it is it's probably a longer path.

James Bladel: My impression and Berry can correct me if I'm wrong if we can pull up the actual comment that was submitted. But my impression was that these were submitted on behalf of the Stakeholder Group so they may not have an individual's name attached to them. I know that the Registries' comment procedures are a little more formal than some of the other stakeholder groups.

Okay Berry has our answer. Submitted by Chuck Gomes. But, you know, I think they could have been constructed by other authors as well. So maybe that'll help start the process of tracking some of these things down.

Roy Dykes: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: And then they have a list of who voted there as Michele points out. But so they do have a more formal process over there I know than, for example, Registrars.

I put myself in the queue to chat about this one a little bit only because this is a common occurrence within our company so I'm putting a Registrar hat on here for just a moment.

We often have situation where a company will contact us to state that the individual who made the - listed as the registrant for their company domain name is no longer with the organization and that they would like to either move it to a company account or move it to another individual's account or, you know, in some cases change or update that data.

And I don't want to get in too much detail here because I'm going to get the details wrong but we do have a process established for this. It doesn't involve that individual submitting a - some substantiating documentation to indicate that they are acting on behalf of the business.

And I think that perhaps there's something from that process that can be borrowed and made sufficiently generic to apply to all situations. So I will take it as my action item to go back to our team and get some details on what we do which may also be public in our help files. And see if there's anything there that we can use to push off on and address this question.

So I'll take that as my action item and then go down the queue then to Michele.

Michele Neylon: Sorry I had myself on mute. Okay I'm actually reading this and I'm having a little bit of difficulty understanding the issue. Because if the domain name is registered toward organization or a company then the organization or the company, as far as I'm concerned, is the registrant so I don't see that as being an issue. I don't see why that is an issue.

So, I mean, from our terms of service if the - if the actions are taken on behalf of a company we consider the company to be the client and therefore by extension the company is the registrant as a legal person as opposed to an individual person. So we wouldn't really care who the contact is on the domain name. So I'm a bit confused by this.

James Bladel: You know, that's a good point, Michele. And probably worthy of a longer conversation preferably...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Now the thing which can cause problems would be if - let's say for argument's sake that you, James, come along and you register a domain name with us as James Bladel as opposed to James Bladel

LLC or Go Daddy whatever - so you do it as yourself. And there's no clear way for us to see that there's any association between you as an individual and a company. Then that makes it more complicated.

But let's just say that there's a - everything is done in the name of a company but it's tied to one specific person in the company we would consider the account belongs to the company.

James Bladel: Well so let me just kind of share a little bit of light here. We collect both first name, last name and organization. And I think what we have seen or what I have seen - I'm not speaking on behalf of the company, just my personal observation - is that individuals will come in and they'll register a domain name and they'll say, you know, it's Joe and then it's Smith and then it'll say organization.

And instead of entering an organization that actually exists they will enter the organization that they are aspiring to be so they'll say like Joe Smith Enterprises or something like that.

And what they don't realize perhaps in that mechanism is that they have perhaps confused the registrant issue a little bit by stating, for example, that Joe Smith Enterprises as an entity controls this domain name and that Joe Smith is the authorized representative of that entity as opposed to what I think they intended to do which was to leave it into personal - individual's registrant.

So it becomes an issue when they want to take that entity name away and then just move it over into a personal registration. And I think that, you know, we could spend a lot of time in the weeds here but, you know, I think - let me take a look at what we do and then maybe we

could do a compare and contrast with some of the other registrars on the group and figure out what, you know, if there's a specific recommendation that needs to be made here.

Because it is an interesting, I think, topic, you know, the deeper we dive into this it gets a little more tangled. Mikey, you're up next.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James. It's Mikey. I kind of typed this into the chat but I think one of the - this comment suffers from the same problem as the last one which is once again they're combining change of registrar and change of registrant. In this particular one I think the right wording should be that the registrant may no longer be employed by the organization which could complicate the process by which the registrant affirms their desire to opt out.

So, you know, I think that this is back to the point that the ALAC made. We are confusing people because we haven't described the distinction that we're drawing between the change of registrar and the change of registrant. And so even folks like Barbara who have been on the call are putting these two things that we're trying to tease apart back together again.

And it kind of reaffirms what the ALAC said that, you know, we really need to make this distinction between those two things. So I think this is another one to sort of hand back to Roy or, you know, maybe hand to Barbara because I'll bet that she's the one that sort of led the charge on this in the Registries and see if we can get that cleared up too.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. Avri. Avri, you may be on mute.

Mikey O'Connor: Really on mute.

Avri Doria: ...we have the long recording on when you come back and talk mode so it's really difficult once you do it. Sorry.

So this is Avri. I just went through an interesting one of these on the number side interestingly enough where because what we find is on this Doing Business As, which is what we're talking about here in some of these cases the laws on it vary a lot.

For example in some of the US any Doing Business As requires a registration. In Rhode Island it only requires registration if you're going to use it to open a bank account and to do financial dealings otherwise you can just declare it.

And I got myself in a muddle with (Aaron) over a number registration - a legacy number registration. And the way it got resolved in that case was asking me to go to a notary public and notarize that indeed I was using this as a DBA as an independent professional and I swear this is true kind of stuff.

So I think there's going to be a big variation in ways that this can be adequately dealt with both within the legal policies, business policies of registrars but also within the legal existence of the registrant.

So it is an important issue and there does need to be some way of making that connection even if it's only swearing that it's true in front of a notary. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Avri. And I think that that aligns for the most part with our process as well where we ask for some sort of legally defensible documentation of association between the individual and the entity. Go ahead, Simonetta, you're next.

Simonetta Batteiger: Yeah so I have two thoughts on this comment. First of all I think the - what this comment might be aiming at as well is this open feedback item that we had of what actually is the registrant in the record and therefore which field when we change them do require to participate in this process briefly or versus which fields in the record can you change without having to go through any of our process.

So they're making this point that think about this not just as people but also think about organizations in that regard. So I think that piece we should take from that comment.

And then I also wanted to respond to Mikey with this - with this idea of that we are working on tearing apart the process and these two pieces of registrant's change and change of domain name between two registrars.

And I think we have never really had a - I'm not sure if this group is on the same page with that issue really - be two separate pieces versus it should be one thing. And in real life out there in the world for people who don't think about the policy piece as much in their minds this is one thing.

So I'm just - I want to raise this point and caution that while we may, in our heads, think that it is legally more clear or policy by ideal if it's not the same thing we might really confuse people with this. And that's

something we should take into account. And maybe we need to have another conversation about that topic too and see if there's consensus within the group that it should really be two separate pieces.

Or if we are going in the wrong direction here and we're getting all this feedback including this comment from the Registries Stakeholder Group that clearly points to the fact that they think of it as one thing and it should not be two separate pieces. So those are the two things that are my reactions when I'm reading this comment.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. I think that brings us to the end of the queue here. And it looks like we're - I'm not sure that we're arriving at some common destination with this comment or if we're just kind of all putting our thoughts on the table here for consideration and for taking this topic into a number of different directions.

What is our takeaway here? I think that we definitely need to mark this for future discussion. But what are the blanks that we need to fill in? Does anyone have any specific or narrow suggestion on what piece of information we need to go back and get or what open questions need to be discussed and addressed by this question?

I think, you know, if we just focused it on the opt out of any kind of a 60-day restriction I think that that can then be folded into the discussion of whether or not the 60-day restriction is warranted and what it would look like, etcetera, etcetera.

But I think this bigger question of the interplay between the individual and an organization that he or she may actually be representing is

perhaps complicating our disposition of this comment. So I'm looking to the group here; any thoughts on where we go with this one?

We have a blank queue. Berry, maybe - oops, I'm sorry, I see Mikey has got his hand up. Go ahead, Mikey. Solve this for us.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think we've got a couple of choices. One is we could take this as an educational opportunity to write up something that, you know, teases out the puzzlers that we've found in this comment as topics for further work. You know, clearly the use of the words "new" and "prior registrant" you know, as you can see from the lively chat that's going on is an indication that so far we've confused people which I think plays into what the ALAC said.

And I think what the ALAC was saying was please make what you're doing clearer. And if we're confusing the Registries that's a pretty strong endorsement of that comment it seems to me. So we could just take this as an educational opportunity.

We're skating on the edge of saying well this is too hard. Let's not tease them apart. I would get pretty worked up about that. So, you know, my immediate inclination is to follow an educational opportunity course with this particular one.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. Berry, not to throw this onto your lap but how much of Mikey's comment and the preceding deliberations were you able to capture? And can we formulate that into an action plan?

I know I had my one piece which is to go away and come back with some description of our process. But beyond that does this fold into

two conversations about the 60-day lock and then the conversation about the, you know, the ALAC being - and now I guess the Registries being confused or comingling the processes? Any thoughts on that?

Berry Cobb: Hi, James. It's Berry.

James Bladel: I'm sorry I see you have something in the chat but then my chat just scrolled up so, yeah.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I did capture basically the high level thoughts of the discussion here on the call. And basically there are two action items; one to you, James, is to go see your company's internal processes and what can be offered up to the group.

Secondly I think in reference to Roy's previous action about going back to the Registries Stakeholder Group for a little bit of clarification. And then certainly the comment (being) out of this is that there is confusion out there in the community by teasing apart these two separate processes overall. But I think for the most part we just have actions to go try to seek out more information and then circle back to this when we address other actions.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. That's as a good hit list as I've heard thus far so I appreciate you helping us keep that straight. I saw Roy's hand go up and then go down. I guess - does that mean, Roy, do you agree with Berry's to-do list or did you have something you wanted to add to that or...

Roy Dykes: No, this is Roy. He captured it. I think there's - as we've said several times now confusion over the process here and specifically around registrar change versus registrant change. So I think...

James Bladel: Okay.

Roy Dykes: ...Berry captured it appropriately.

James Bladel: Excellent. Thank you, Roy. Thank you, Berry. We appreciate that. Okay let's move then to Number 12. It looks like we've got about 12 minutes remaining in our call so let's see if we can get through this one. Berry, if you would read us through the comment? It looks like it dovetails with a comment that we've already touched on with Number 4 but maybe we need a refresher real quick.

Berry Cobb: That is correct which is actually now Comment Number 5. And we reviewed that two weeks ago I believe which was a comment that was started by (Michael Showhat) regarding the question of which updates constitute a change of ownership. The action out of that is further consideration of the issue in light of the comments received on 4, 5 and 11 as the working group continues its deliberations.

But specifically the comment from the Registries Stakeholder Group is since the registrant and admin contact email addresses are used as a method to validate the legitimacy of a transfer request it is recommended that the note on Page 23 defining the change of registrant as an update to the primary contact method among other updates be revised to specifically indicate an update to the registrant and/or admin contact email address.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Berry. And I think that you're correct that this does build upon the issues that we've touched on in Comment 4 which is the new Comment Number 5 but is asking us to be specific when we say primary contact method.

I think that the Registries are correct; the primary contact method is probably not clearly defined and we should be a little more clear in that. So can we just maybe make a note to revisit that - the use of that on Page 23 and really anywhere else that appears in our report and make sure that we are being precise in our language. And then the rest - the balance of this comment I think will be covered under our deliberations of the other questions.

Any thoughts - any queue here I see as - and getting smaller so we must be putting folks asleep like that (JPRS) commercial. Okay let's move on then to Number 13. Berry, if you would please.

Berry Cobb: Okay Comment 13 also from the Registries Stakeholder Group.
"Relating to the second note on Page 24 of the initial report the RySG supports and strongly recommends the use of auth info codes as the change of registrant credential to validate the authorization of the registrant to effect the change."

"The original intent of the auth info code was its use to authenticate any type of domain updates - example, transfers, name server changes, registrant changes, etcetera. However while it may be used for any type of update to a domain name registries and registrars may need to do additional development to implement its use to authenticate other types of updates beyond its current implementation as a mechanism to authenticate transfers."

"Given this should this recommendation receive wide support and ultimately be approved both registries and registrars must be afforded adequate time to implement such changes."

James Bladel: Excellent, thank you, Berry. I remember that this was - and I notice we only have about 9 minutes remaining in our call. If I remember this was a really interesting discussion where I believe one - I want to say one perspective was espoused by Mikey which was that from a data design perspective, data modeling perspective, we don't want to overload a particular data field.

And another view was presented by Simonetta and which was that we already have this code - this key code which is the auth info code that we could be using for other purposes. And I think Barbara did some research and came back with this notion that the original intention of the auth info code was that it was required for any changes to the domain name registration including contact changes or anything else.

I'm going to put myself in the queue real quickly here and just, you know, weigh in on this as a registrar. I think that this is interesting. I think that we could certainly go in this direction. We have recently - I don't want to give away any secret sauce here but we are working with some other TLDs - specifically country codes - that refer to the auth info code as the domain name password.

And the domain name password is required for a number of different functions including some of those that are listed here. So I think that that is consistent with this proposed use.

I would add to this comment that not only would registries and registrars be afforded adequate time to implement these changes but there should also be some guidance given to registries and registrars about what sort of events would trigger - what sort of events would require the use of the auth info code and what sort of events would trigger the generation of a new auth info code.

So for example, you know, an auth info code should not be preserved when a domain name changes registrants. You know, that's kind of like the person who used to own your house still has a key to your garage or something really strange like that. I think that we need to make sure that registries and registrars have a common treatment of that.

And I am by no means a security guru but it certainly seems like there are some best practices that could be developed around the use and management of those passwords. So I'll go over then to Michele. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. A couple things. First off several of the ccTLDs have introduced various levels of kind of authentication-based change of control, for lack of a better way of describing it - which isn't a bad thing.

The only thing though - I think there's a little bit of an elephant in the room when it comes to this - is that at the present the largest volume of domains - the largest volume of transactions around domains, the largest volume of issues around domains, the largest volume of transfers, changes, updates, sales, both in the primary, secondary, tertiary and whatever other market may come along - are all going to be around Com and Net and both Com and Net are thin.

So the problem there is that while if we were to come out with some nice new policy that mandated the use of various things around changes to domain names. Then the only people who would be able to see whether or not this is being done are the registrars ourselves because it's an internal thing to our own systems. The registry and no other third parties would really have any visibility on it.

And we all know how ICANN compliance has done such a stellar job of enforcing the current contract with registrars in certain parts of the global since they sent so many staff over there to enforce the contract. And they never, ever, ever send a complaint to the wrong registrar. And they never send Whois reports on a Friday afternoon in bulk. Thanks.

James Bladel: I think those are a number of other issues. So before I go to Simonetta I just wanted to point out here that I am not convinced that - I could be convinced but I'm not currently convinced that there are differences between the thick and thin models with how registries and registrars would treat the auth info code.

I agree with you, Michele, that it would be very, very difficult to see if a registrar was doing what they were required to do and it would make enforcement very, very problematic. But I don't know that would necessarily warrant differing recommendations. But I'm trying to keep an open mind on that one.

But go ahead, Simonetta, maybe you can help unconfused me.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm actually - I wanted to make the same comment that I am not sure if it matters if a registry is thick or a thin but you would use the

auth info code as kind of the authorization password to make a change. Because the only time the registry would want to even know about this is if the registrar changes which is one of these events where you would have to provide the auth info code.

So the fact that you have it and that you are providing it in that instance or you want to make that transfer between two registrars happen is all you need. And at the same time if it's a change of owner within a registrar and someone provides the auth info code to that registrar and then that registrar makes that change and sets a new auth info code then again all that matters to the thin registry is that the correct auth info code for something is being provided if it's even given to the registry for that purpose.

But I think it would have to be at least updated because the moment you change to a new owner you would want to set a new auth info code with the registry. But it doesn't matter at that point if it's thick or thin in my mind.

James Bladel: Oh, I was speaking in mute. Okay thanks, Simonetta. Mikey, you'll be our last speaker on here, 90-second shot clock please.

Mikey O'Connor: Just a real quick point and that is this interacts with the conversation we had about the length of time that an auth info code is valid. And where we wound up was a pretty short interval. And if we're treating this as a password, which is a completely different interpretation of what auth info code is then what's in the policy today so we've got some work to do there.

A password persists and it's treated much differently from a security standpoint than a token which is created for a short interval to enable a transaction and then expires. So I think we're wading into some pretty deep water with this one. And except for that I'll just leave with Elmer Fudd's - be very, very careful.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Mikey. And I agree with you there's ways that we can - there's a number of ways that we can make this work. But maybe there's some simple ways that we can make it better given that currently it's registrar practices appear to be kind of all over the map.

With that, folks, we'll call it a day. I appreciate everyone who made the effort to join the call and to contribute here. So can I ask Berry to - in the next say 48 hours distribute an updated comment review tool? I think Roy and I and maybe a couple of others have some takeaway homework assignments.

And then if we could, you know, continue to think about these issues, certainly read ahead, you know, we'll begin with Number 14 which is another comment from the ALAC when we resume our discussion next week. And that would put us just under halfway through the public comment review process.

So hopefully we can finish this up in the next couple of sessions, get ahead on our work plan, dive into some of these areas that we've identified that require more discussion and more documentation and then just keep thing moving towards an October delivery.

So thanks, everyone, for joining. And we'll see you next week. And thanks, Berry.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

Roy Dykes: Thanks, James. Bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Ricardo). (Ricardo).

Coordinator: Hello, yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Will you please stop the recordings?

Coordinator: Yes, no problem.

Glen de Saint Géry: Many thanks. Have a good day.

Coordinator: You too. Bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Bye.

END