

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 07 August 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 07 August 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-20120807-en.mp3>

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

(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
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RrSG
Rob Golding – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Géry
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Bob Mountain - RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG

Coordinator: Go ahead. We're now recording.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP-C call on the 7th of August of 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, Barbara Knight, Michele Neylon, Hago Dafalla, Simonetta Batteiger, Roy Dykes, Phil Corwin, Matt Serlin, Rob Golding and Angie Graves.

We have apologies from Paul Diaz, Bob Mountain, Avri Doria, Chris Chaplow and Jonathan Tenenbaum. From staff we have Glen de Saint Géry, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

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

James Bladel: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone, to another exciting addition of the IRTP-C working group for August 7, 2012. As per our standard operating procedure can anyone who has any updates to their statements of interest please indicate this by raising your hand now. No takers so thanks for that.

And also I would ask that anyone who has had a chance to review the proposed agenda, that was circulated by Berry to the mailing list and is posted on the right hand column of the Adobe chat room if you have any additions or comments or edits to that agenda please raise your hand now. Okay thanks.

We'll consider that agenda adopted and we'll move forward beginning with Item Number 3 which is a continuation of the review of public comments received to date both in the public comment forum and in the workshop in Prague.

As Berry noted, when sending the agenda, this is the first of three sessions that we've identified in our work plan to review these comments so we are - we have this session and two more. But - oh, Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, James. This is Berry. I just wanted to state that before we get started with - or picking up where we left off if we can kind of start at the beginning; we had a couple of action items from our previous session.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Berry. And that was actually one of my next questions here was if we could start off at - circling back to Page 1 and then just hit on the highlights and then any action items that we have. And then I believe - I don't have the ability to scroll - but I believe that we then later on picked up - it looks like somewhere in the neighborhood of Page 8 for the continuation of the review.

So can you start us off, Berry, on Page 1? What breadcrumbs or mile markers did we leave for ourselves to circle back to?

Berry Cobb: Okay. Thank you. This is Berry. The first one was based off of ALAC's comment that they had submitted in and the dialogue from the working group was basically to talk about creating a visual representation of the transfer processes.

I don't know if the entire group has seen - Mikey just sent out a first draft; that visual representation. And I have it uploaded and ready to go in the Adobe Connect room if we wish to review it now or we can save it for the very end just so that we can move through the comments. So it's really up to you how you want to move forward.

James Bladel: I think let's - I do want to thank Mikey for sending that. And I think Michele and someone else has commented on it as well. I think that if we can just keep pushing forward we'll come back to that. But let's keep that active on the list if it's not already circulated there.

Berry Cobb: Okay very good. The next action is on Page 5, Row Number 10. And this was the comment from the Registries Stakeholder Group. And basically the - there was an action out to Roy Dykes to try to get some clarification on the comment from the Registries Stakeholder Group. And basically the comment is, "The Registry group supports the third option which permits the registrant to opt out of the 60-day restriction on an IRTP after a change of registrant."

"It is the view of the Registries Stakeholder Group 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. And if memory serves - I see Roy is on the call so I'm going to probably put him on the spot here in a moment. But if memory serves there was a bit of confusion about whether or not the - both parties were known at that time. Or - I'm sorry, maybe I'm misstating that. But there was - it seemed like there was a hole in the knowledge in that recommendation.

Roy, did you have any thoughts or any updates from your group - your constituency?

Roy Dykes: This is Roy for the purposes of the recording. And I apologize for my voice. I feel better than I sound. The - I think the key words that are missing here from the comments are the words, "change of control." So all this says is that if there's a change of control of the name and both parties - both, you know, registrants in the change of control activity are agreeable that they both may opt out and have the 60-day restriction window go away. That's it.

Unless - I think I've captured that correctly unless Barbara - and I see her hand up now - has additional comments on it. But Barbara and I did talk about this offline to make sure that there was a way to present the view of the Registries Stakeholder Group. And I'll let Barbara talk now.

James Bladel: Thanks, Roy. Barbara.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So, I mean, yeah, exactly what Roy said. I think there's some confusion because it was our understanding or it was our interpretation as the Registries Stakeholder Group that in this particular case the change of control happens before, obviously, a change of registrar happens.

So the registrar of record would have both the previous registrant information as well as the current registrant information. So we felt that they would have all of that information to be able to confirm with both the prior registrant as well as the current registrant that both would choose to waive the restrictions - the restriction.

And we felt it was important for the prior registrant to be able to offer their, you know, be required to provide their waiver as well because it would act as a red flag to them to the extent that, you know, somebody did change the registrant information then wanted to go ahead and transfer the domain name. And they weren't aware that the registrant information on that domain has changed.

You know, by being required to opt out of that it would basically raise a red flag to them that says hey something has happened to my domain name and why am I being asked to opt out of, you know, the restriction on transferring it for 60 days.

So we just thought it was a method by which to - I guess have an additional registrant protection in there to give them that additional heads up.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Barbara. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Sorry, I was on - lost my connection to Adobe Connect so I can't take my hand down. But my comment would be that this assumption that the previous

registrar always knows who the new registrant will be is just not - I don't think is realistic because in most transfer scenarios where there's been a sale and the new owner is with a different registrar than the previous - where the seller had the names registered at - there's not usually any way to know for the losing registrar who the new registrant will be.

So I don't know if that's - if that use case is even - does what happens in reality justice is my comment, I guess.

James Bladel: Thanks, Simonetta. I have myself in the queue but I wanted to take a swing at responding just because I started off on this issue thinking similarly to Simonetta. But I think I get it now which is that in the conjunction with obtaining approval for the change of control since that requires approval of both parties that there would be this other checkbox or whatever where the opt out would be offered at that time.

So it would only be - this opt out would only be gathered from both parties when the change of control was approved. At least that's my understanding. I may be misstating the Registries position on that but that was kind of where I thought this was going. It looks like Barbara is agreeing so it seems like I finally get it and I - it took me, I don't know, a couple of attempts on that.

I have a question and a suggestion. So one is I - and this is just speaking as a registrar who does have a practice in place like this. And we use terms - terminology like lock and restrictions and things like that. And I think that that is doing a disservice to some extent. And I realize this is just semantics and some of you might be rolling your eyes and saying I'm spinning this.

But I do believe that calling this some sort of a hijack protection is important especially when we talk about allowing people to opt out of this service. I think that, you know, I might - when we get to the point in the report where we're saying what we want to allow people to opt out of I think it's important that we both - the new registrant and particularly the old registrant realize that

they are opting out of a hijack protection mechanism. There's probably a less clumsy way to say that.

But I think that would convey the message that, you know, this is something that is done not to hassle people but to make sure that you, you know, are not being, you know, becoming a victim of a hijacking.

And I think most folks are proving a change of control will immediately recognize that this is legitimate and that this is something that they want to do and the little protections are not necessary to their situation and they will just gladly opt out of it.

But it might be just a - kind of a - it might give pause to those folks who might be affected by hijackers. So that was just my thought here. Not really any action item or anything that needs to be captured in this document but just more of a terminology discussion.

So I guess - I see that the queue is clear. I wanted to say thank you to Roy and Barbara for clarifying that statement. And I think that that makes sense.

Can we then take a look at the next one, Berry? Was that part of the same - no that's me. Okay so can you read through the part that I forgot to do?

Berry Cobb: Before we move on - so, you know, I think we've made the clarification with respect to Row 10. Is there any kind of recommended action that we should document now or is this something that the working group will circle back on in later deliberations?

James Bladel: I think that we need to decide whether or not to adopt this now that it makes sense. Before I think it wasn't making sense. But I think now that it's been clarified we just need to mark this as an open question of should both parties be allowed to opt out of the 60-day transfer restriction?

And I think that's - dovetails with the other question of should there be a 60-day transfer restriction? And then that follows onto that that they should be allowed to opt out of it. That - at least that's my takeaway. Anyone else - I see that the queue is empty but if anyone else has a different read on this please let me know.

Yeah, Rob Golding I think points out that obviously hijackers are going to opt out. I think that's a good point, Rob. But at least, you know, one side of the transaction at least has an opportunity which is not perfect but, yes, we can assume that the bad guys are always going to opt out. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Well obviously I agree with what Rob's saying. And adding to that as well I have a general - what's the word I'm looking for - I generally don't like policies where there's too many opt outs. I mean, either the policy is binding on everyone or it doesn't exist.

Because then surely what we're driving for is uniformity of policy and - what's that other word people like to use? Oh what is it? Oh wait, wait, wait, coming to me. Oh yeah, predictability.

Either we agree that, you know, that there is a lock of some kind or we agree that there shouldn't be a lock of some kind. But this opt out thing I just see as being a massive can of worms which is going to come back and bite everybody in the rear end. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. I tend to agree. But let's mark that. I think what we're doing here with these comments - we're reviewing these things - we're getting clarification where we don't understand the comments but we're also leaving ourselves markers because we're identifying existing and new open questions that I think have to be a part of our future deliberations before we get to a final report. And I think that's - what you've just mentioned - is one of them.

Rob, go ahead.

Rob Golding: Yeah, I'm going to end up agreeing with Michele. I don't think there should be the option for people to opt out. I mean, as I've typed into the chat, the bad guys are going to opt out. And hopefully the good guys, if they've sold the domain, are going to opt out. So there's no point having an option where the default is going to be that people are going to opt out.

If we're going to implement a hold on transfers of a domain for however long, 60 days, after change of contacts to prevent hijacking then there should be a rule, not an option.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Rob. I think that's a good point. Simonetta, you're up next.

Simonetta Batteiger: I wanted to add to that and say that the reason we put this opt out scenario in there was to find a compromise between security and portability. And I think that if we're now looking at not doing this then we're going to have to have a much larger conversation again around locks that don't current exist.

James Bladel: Yeah, thank you, Simonetta. And I wanted to point out to everybody that - it's probably not - well I don't want to say appropriate because with ICANN everything's appropriate. But it's probably not the best use of our time to start this deliberation process here when we have so many other comments to go through.

I think we have a good approach which is to indicate that this is an issue that needs further discussion and that we're going to have those discussions before we get to a final report but not necessary to maybe get into those deliberations at this time when we still have so many unreviewed comments.

So if we could push forward here, you know, I can give everyone the commitment that we're not going to finalize any decisions on this without a

healthy and probably lengthy discussion. So with that can we, Berry, can we move to Number 11 and the homework that I forgot to do?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So basically there were two actions here, again, what James just mentioned about trying to understand internal process with Go Daddy that the working group can leverage. And then the second one I think was also to Roy to get clarification from the Registries Stakeholder Group comment as well.

James Bladel: Okay. And I will own up to the fact that I did not get that information and I will do that here today - this week - to the mailing list by this time tomorrow. But I think that what we're looking at, once again, is that we're talking about disputes between individuals listed versus organizations and when an individual - the individual listed as the registrant is James Bladel and then the organization is James Co.

You know, how do we reconcile that if someone from James Co. comes up and says, hey, you know, James left the company and we need to reassign this. Or, you know, how does it work when James leaves James Co. and says he wants to take the domain name with him and take the organization off that? I think that, you know, and where is that threshold? Where is that tipping point where this becomes a change of control?

And I think that there's a lot of fuzzy logic involved. We have some procedures. I will go back and borrow - or at least report back on those to the mailing list and get that back to this group for consideration.

And then the next item was the discussion a little bit about the - it looks like we're still talking about opting out of 60-day restriction on the inter registrar transfers. Roy, your name is attached to this one. Do you remember why?

Roy Dykes: I think you summarized it already. It's - and I think that's correct; the notion of hey if James has left the company and somebody else - and John for lack of

a different name - is now the owner and there's a transfer why should there need to be a 60-day wait period for John to execute that activity?

So, I mean, I think these last two fall on the same sort of bucket, right. And that's under the umbrella of do we have this 60 - do we have this opt out or not, right.

To Michele's point, and others, this is - it's another opt out but it's actually a different opt out because the circumstances are slightly different. So you start to get, you know, you start to have this basket of opt outs. And I think it's more philosophical relative to what does the team want to go, where does the group want to go? What do we think is in the best interest of the community?

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Roy. And I will, once again, just go back and make sure I get a pretty healthy and comprehensive explanation from our team, put that to the list. And then I would hope other registrars would also be forthcoming in sharing their procedures and how they treat the differences between individuals and organizations especially - or particularly when they are in dispute.

Barbara was next in the queue. Go ahead, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So just to kind of I guess expand on what Roy was saying, I mean, this really does relate to that original opt out requirement so I don't really view it as an additional opt out. But it's, you know, in the case where the domain name is registered to a company or an entity and, again, the person who may be listed as the registrant or the admin contact who would be, you know, to do the opt out is no longer there.

So it's basically making certain that we've covered that particular scenario where it may not necessarily be just an individual domain name holder. It could very well be an entity. But, you know, as we know people do change jobs or change organizations.

So it's basically just having a mechanism in there to be able to have a workaround so that people aren't stuck with, you know, something for - I mean, I don't think 60 days is actually that long of a period of time but, you know, that they're not stuck having to keep their name there in the event that there has been a change of personnel at a company. So it's just, you know, kind of taking into consideration that scenario.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Barbara. So it sounds like all of the burden of this is on my lap at this point. And I fully accept that. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, I put myself on mute by accident. I mean, in terms of differences from our perspective, I mean, I think I mentioned this previously. From our perspective it's very, very simple. Either the services you have with us are for a private individual or they're for a legal entity, be that a company or business or some other kind of organization.

That doesn't mean that we don't have disputes. But that's how we view it. I mean, whether the account on our end is set up as one or the other will define how we deal with any issues surrounding the domain name or any other service that they may have with us. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Michele. Berry, can we just note here that I have a homework assignment to get something to the list here in short order? And then hopefully we won't have to circle back to this next week because that will, you know, kind of kick off a discussion on this on the mailing list and then we can identify this as one of our continued open questions.

Berry Cobb: Got it.

James Bladel: But I think it lives in my lap right now and I need to get this addressed.

Berry Cobb: Very good.

James Bladel: Okay. What was the next item that was scheduled for action?

Berry Cobb: I believe that takes care of any actions that we had identified last week. I will draw attention to Row 13 that I think is where we ended our call last week. And there was discussion about it but we didn't walk away with any particular recommended action. And then basically Row 14 is where we need to pick up from.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Berry. Can you walk us through Comment Number 14?

Berry Cobb: Sure. Okay this is from the ALAC. And as - if you recall from the last session their response to the public comment forum was three or four paragraphs. And I believe this was Paragraph Number 2 that was extracted that it looked like that it belonged to this section of the public comment tool.

The ALAC similarly supports all efforts to formally define the process by which the registrant of record can be changed with implicit safeguards to inhibit hijackings.

The ALAC does not have strong views as to whether this needs to be a separate consensus policy or not but the overall results and benefits to registrants should not be diminished by this decision.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Berry. I don't know that there is any specific take away or action from us on that comment.

It looks like they are supporting a lot of what the working group is saying as a whole is that we want this to be a formal process that has effective but not burdensome safeguards. And I think we're so open to the idea of whether this is a separate policy or not.

Okay well any thoughts on that before we move on to item 15? Okay Berry.
Hello?

Berry Cobb: Sorry I was on mute.

James Bladel: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Row 15 is from the public workshop in Prague. The commenter was not specifically identified.

The more restrictions you have on a process like change of registrant the fewer the uptake of ccTLD registries is in practice.

The working group may also want to consider what the effect may be on the gTLD market space.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Berry. And I vaguely recall this line of discussion while we were at Prague.

My take away was that this is a high level description of our opportunities and concerns with consulting the ccNSO and surveying the ccTLD landscape to find out what's practices are out there, which ones work, and which ones don't work, and which ones would be compatible with the gTLDs and which ones would make a mess of things.

I don't know that there's anything - there specific take away in this comment except perhaps to reiterate the caution to this working group that just because something works in ccTLD does not mean it is immediately applicable to the gTLD space particularly when you get into things like new registries.

So that would be my just general reaction to this comment, any others? The queue is clear. Berry if you could take us to Number 16?

Berry Cobb: Okay Number 16 was also from the workshop in Prague. It's difficult to distinguish between correcting spelling mistakes or ownership changes ergo changing from James to Jim might be the same person but it could also it could be also someone completely different.

James Bladel: Thanks Berry. I also remember this one as well probably because I think I used myself as an example in the workshop.

This is another one of those fuzzy logic problems that we discussed. I think we also mentioned the case the situation where someone -- typically a woman but doesn't have to be I guess in Western cultures -- would get married and want to change their name but not necessarily indicate to their registrar that the registrant has changed to a new person.

There are individuals who change their names. There are individuals who correct typos or misspellings of their names. And at what point does that tip over into a change of registrant?

I don't know that there is an exact answer here. I think that what we have done as a practice and I'll just throw this onto the table is that we've offered individuals who believe that we've made the wrong call in this to let us know that hey, you know, I am - that's, you know, I went from James but I am also (Jim) and then they can indicate that, you know, in an email.

And usually we will back down from any sort of anti-hijacking safeguards that we've enacted as a result of that if we feel that it is in fact was not a change of control it was just a correction or a name change for the same individual or entity. But that's something that we should bear in mind when detecting a change of control.

Next or I'm sorry any other comments on this? I see some things going by in the chat but no one's raising their hand in the queue. Just oh there we go Simonetta go ahead please.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think that the only thing that I remember from the Prague thing about this comment was also that I believe it was also said that something of about the frequency of these type of updates.

And I'm wondering if we could actually somehow find out maybe from GoDaddy, or from Blacknight, or from one of the other registrars in this chat, you know, in this workgroup how frequently these type updates actually happen?

If it turns out that this is a very frequent activity than we should really think about what kind of confirmations that - other things we would require people to go through with when they make simple changes like this because I believe what the person said in the room and I don't remember who it was was that this was a very frequent occurrence of a change in registrant record. And that they don't wish to complicate those for the user.

James Bladel: Thanks Simonetta. And I put myself in the queue just to respond real quickly. I will definitely go back and get some indication of how common this occurrence is and how we usually deal with it.

I will point out that this is just another one of those you can call it fuzzy logic you can call it a judgment call.

One of my challenges is, you know, if you can't express something in logic or in code I think that makes it very difficult to express it in a policy.

So, you know, it's it becomes problematic to say here is the line between an update or a correction to a name versus here's, you know, anything on the other side of that line suddenly becomes a change of control.

I don't know that that line is always well defined particularly in cases where we're talking about different languages (unintelligible) different entity types, et cetera.

So but I will definitely go back - yes it's less of a line and more of a very wide gray area so but I will go back and get some idea of our process on this and share what I can. And I see Michele is in the queue behind me. So go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Well I basically decide what most of our processes are so I can probably answer most questions on what we do or don't do.

When I'm - our way of dealing with things is to do everything within line with Irish law. I mean being perfectly honest and I think other I know Rob will probably agree with me since we tend to agree we tend to agree on some of these things.

Ultimately we are going to be bound by Irish law first, European law second, and any ICANN policy third. I mean it's - that's the reality.

So I mean we would deal with whether a change of contact is just for building and nothing else, or a change of contact or a move around is for whatever, I mean we will follow the same pretty much the same processes whether their just doing so for a hosting account, or for a domain name, or whatever.

And of course yes there are going to be areas where there's going to be issues but that's reality. And there's no way for you to possibly imagine every possible crazy scenario that can happen.

I mean we've had people drop dead, we've had people get divorced, we've had groups of people decide to do things together and then they have a massive falling out and they don't want to talk to each other.

We're currently dealing with an issue where a company has three directors and one director is obviously having a dispute with the other two.

I mean there's no way you could possibly write policy for all that. All you can do is decide on a sane policy something which is compliant with local law and apply it as best you can. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Michele. And appreciate you - your statements illustrates many of the challenging positions that registrars often find themselves in is one of our common statements in situations like that is that we will not adjudicate or resolve those types of disputes.

We will establish a registrant based on the documentation that we have. You know, I think that with the understanding that there is some weight given to the status quo and that there are other processes such as UDRPs and court actions that are available to registrants who believe that we're not addressing those appropriately.

But I don't know that that - I'm hoping that that is a minor consideration and this goes I think back to Simonetta's point that the more common occurrence is these relatively benign name changes or updates that do not affect change of controls that fall short of that threshold.

And so I'm hoping that we're able to at least put some structure around those or at least define the boundaries of that gray area.

And then understand the registrars have some discretion inside of their based on the jurisdiction, and their local laws, and, you know, their current practices.

Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I think this will be especially the point that this comment is trying to make that it is impossible to define those in terms of policy of what is like a small benign little change versus a true change of registrant especially when you get into non-Latin scripts, or you get into address information, and other things that you can't even just because they don't follow a standard pattern that you might be familiar with in the United States or in Europe or where it's like names that you cannot distinguish as a Western person between this and that as James and (Jim) versus James and (money par) in some kind of other script.

And I think that was the point that the person was trying to make is that you can't distinguish those therefore think about whatever you do it will also cover these type situations and don't make it to complicated.

James Bladel: Yes good points. And, you know, if I could respond to that pretty quickly I know you probably don't want us to linger on this for too much longer.

But, you know, I think that what we are talking about here and we're really just discussing three fields in the Whois.

We're talking about the registrant first name, registrant last name, and organization name. I don't think anyone is maintaining that address changes, or email updates, or fax number changes or whatever constitute anything approaching a change of control.

So we're really just identifying that there are a few sensitive fields. And yes I agree that, you know, it's not clear in other scripts and other languages what is just a routine update versus a wholesale change.

And wanted to mention one other item but then we should probably - I see Michele has his hand up.

But so let's, you know, let's go to Michele on this one but I think we'll probably need to bring this one in for a landing. Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Sorry James. I know we've kind of touched on this before but I think for the purposes of showing the world that we're not totally insane let's recognize something which is kind of key when it comes to managing controlling online services in general be they domain names, hosting or any service you buy online.

The email address is not a simple field. I mean it would be great if it was but let's face it isn't.

If I want to gain access to any a lot of online services the email address is going to be the lever.

Most communications surrounded domain names are going to be via email with most registrars -- I know there are a couple of exceptions like (Matt)'s registrar for example -- but we can't - we have to be conscious of the fact that an email address isn't just a simple change. I mean it's not something that's going to kind of trigger a massive audit or anything like that.

But just being overly dismissive of the importance of the email address is in association with the domain name or the account and all that I think is something quite dangerous. And we should be very wary of doing that.

James Bladel: Understood Michele and certainly wasn't trying to be dismissive. But I think that, you know, we need to - we're going to need to draw a boundary somewhere.

And, you know, I don't know if that's if email falls which side of the line that falls into.

And, you know, let's keep in mind from my perspective let's keep in mind that if we're discussing the absence of any kind of transfer restrictions or the ability to opt out then what is the real impact to someone let's say who does this change?

If I see a domain name that says (Jim). And I change it to James. And they send me some approval form. And I click the box and suddenly I'm both the new registrant and the old registrant.

Has it really inconvenienced me all that much that the registrar made a mistake and thinks I'm two separate people?

I don't know, you know, it's in practical terms it's not really that big of a deal. And I can maybe appreciate that they were trying to be careful.

The other side of this is that we need to be careful that we're not straying into what I call the identity problem.

And I think that Michele this is what you're touching on is that there is currently no universal international language and jurisdiction neutral way of establishing and verifying identity on the Internet.

And that it's possible that some of the discussions and some of the comments that we will encounter in the work of this working group might stray into those waters.

And we should just recognize that that solution currently doesn't or that area currently doesn't have a solution.

So, you know, we, you know, we need to make sure that whatever we're doing or whatever we're recommending is at least cognizant of that black hole.

So any other thoughts on this comment Number 16? And as I said I will include that in my report to the working group as I go back and get some practices from our team and I hope that other registrars would respond to that thread.

Okay the queue is clear at this point. Let's move on to comment Number 17 Berry which starts to look a lot like comment 16 but I'll let you walk through it.

Berry Cobb: Yes indeed. This is also from the workshop in Prague how are corporate changes affected by this policy ergo changes from Inc. to LLC or changes as a result of merger or acquisition?

In terms of the working group response I was really just going to refer this back to row Number 11 which was from a registry stakeholder group comment and then how any actions that may come out of that would occur on row 11.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Berry. And I see it as, you know, attached to Row 11. I see it as attached to row the one immediately preceding this as well it's kind of a corporate or a legal entity equivalent of correcting a name or, you know, changing the legal designation without actually changing an entity.

And then of course we can also say the mergers and acquisitions are the corporate equivalent of marriages, et cetera.

So I think, you know, kind of it all kind of blends together whether we're talking about natural persons or legal persons so any further thoughts on this one? Anyone see any special case for comment 17 that we should be aware of?

Okay let's move on to, Number 18 which I think reopens our discussion of fields. Berry if you would walk us through that please?

Berry Cobb: Yes this is from the Prague workshop as well. When you change house or telephone number you also need to provide proof of ownership so it's not unreasonable to ask for a similar confirmation in the context of a change of registrant.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Berry. I'm not really clear on this comment. We may need to go back to the transcript and tease out some more context.

But when their saying when you change house or telephone number in the Whois data or in the real world we need to provide proof of ownership?

I don't know can anyone shed any light here? Michele do you remember this one?

Michele Neylon: I'm not 100% sure what this specifically refers to. But I think the point is it comes back to something we have discussed at some point I'm sure we had a discussion about it.

It was down to I think it's, you know, the keyword is authorization. Again if I wanted to update mneylon.com to put in your postal address change at the moment there's nothing to stop me from doing that.

And actually at a presentation that we were both at an Arizona we had ICE talking about how some people will actually register trademark infringing domain names using pretty much all the contact details of the trade - of the brand holder they're infringing except maybe for the email address.

I think that might be what they're referring to. I honestly don't know. But I - that's what I'd suspect is they're talking about.

James Bladel: Yes. And I think maybe this I might have to punt over to Berry to help us provide some context here.

I think that, you know, if this comment is essentially just saying that, you know, it's not unreasonable to ask someone to confirm or approve a change of registrant data I think we can say yes thank you we agree and thank you for your support.

But if they're saying something different if they're saying something along the lines of that registrants have to approve changes to other fields that may fall short of the threshold of a change of control then I think that's a different topic altogether.

So I think we need some more context on this. And Berry can you maybe put a marker here for next week to give us an idea of what was said before and after this comment so that we can bookend it with some background?

Berry Cobb: Will do.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Okay so let's move on then to comment Number 19.

Berry Cobb: This is also from Prague. If a domain name registration account is compromised the hijacker can easily opt out of any restrictions that the working group may put into place.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And I think that this is part of what we were discussing with the opt out with the registry comment.

And I believe Mr. Golding also mentioned this as well is that hijackers are always going to opt out of any type of protection mechanisms.

Okay any other thoughts on that? We can move on to comment Number 20.
Berry?

Berry Cobb: Twenty is also from Prague. The working group may need to consider an exception process for certain circumstances such as for example UDRP

where the standard process of transferring a domain name after a UDRP is changing the owner name and then it is transferred out.

James Bladel: And this is a good comment I think that we're - where we were discussing the impact of establishing a change of control with any kind of protections against hijacking.

I think that another - another avenue would be that whatever mechanism recommendation or new policy comes out of this working group that it is immediately referred to the UDRP as one of the means by which registrars can implement the decisions coming out of the UDRP panel.

I think that it's worth considering that if there is any sort of restrictions that it would be have an override mechanism by UDRP.

I don't think that that's necessarily controversial. But I think that the question is, you know, can we get other registrars to use the change of control mechanism coming from this working group instead of or in place of or in addition to what UDRP decisions are currently being, you know, used to implement.

So any thoughts on this one folks? I know we're starting to run up against the last few minutes of our call but I think that I don't think that's a controversial at all.

Okay comment Number 21.

Berry Cobb: Yes this is Berry. We basically have two comments and we'll close out for the most part the recommendation one section.

So hopefully we can get and I think or Michele has his hand raised?

James Bladel: Michele is this for Number 20 or Number 21?

Michele Neylon: It's for Number 20 I agree for Number 21 I have issues with this is as I would have with a lot of any things making certain things mandatory for registrars.

James Bladel: Okay can we have Berry read through that first and then we'll just - you'll start us off of that discussion?

Michele Neylon: Sure.

James Bladel: Okay Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: This is from Prague. Why not make mandatory for registrars to offer one or more optional ways of locking a domain name against transfers after element changes like GoDaddy has been doing it and other registries are doing it by introducing manual processes or different ways of protecting their customers in a way that the registrar must give their registrant an option to lock a domain name.

But the registrant if he does not choose to go for the - that the option domain can be transferred quickly.

James Bladel: I'm going to guess this was a copy paste of from the transcript because it does read a little rough and I don't really understand how someone can make for - make optional ways mandatory.

Anyway Michele go ahead help us here?

Michele Neylon: I'll try. It is one - as Mikey put in the chat it's one heck of a sentence.

Okay first off I think part of what this person is asking about is that registrars should offer more protections to registrant's.

And my answer to that would be surely that's what this working group is discussing and we thank them for their input.

But making it mandatory and also making it optional is rather confusing -- because as you said I don't see how you can make something mandatory and optional at the same time -- that doesn't work for me.

I'm actually going to step away from this now because actually as I read that comment it's so - the sentence is so convoluted I'm running to the hills screaming asking for commas.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele and I'm actually putting myself in the queue. But I'm going to take my hand down to and say that I the more I read it the less certain I think I'm understanding the intention. So go ahead Simonetta it's all yours.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I'm not sure if that was the intent of the comment but it could be read such that if you turn it - if you turn this locking idea around and you say it's not default that everything is locked but the default is that everything is open but you give registrants a choice to lock things down more securely.

And I'm thinking about what some of the corporate registrars are already offering to their customers where you can buy extra protection.

And then that basically means that you can't just unlock the name and the user interface you have to call and on the phone provide some extra password or something else to unlock the name that.

If you do it this way around you will have the opportunity to give a registrant the choice to make their name or secure while leaving it open for everyone else to move names around without locking restrictions and things like that.

So that's an idea. And I think it's not - I think it's actually a neat idea and we should explore this as well.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Simonetta. And I can point out that, you know, our registrar offers a number of services that do this and they were fairly popular.

However there's not a 100% uptake and therefore there's always going to be those vulnerabilities.

Also IRTPB the previous instance of this series of working groups has a new recommendations slash restrictions on the locks that registrars can implement and how they ask to remove them upon the request of the registrant and things like that.

So I think it's could be debatable whether or not those new policy requirements will have an impact on those security products.

Unfortunately it looks like we are one comment shy from closing off this section but we have run out of time.

I note that Simonetta is noting she has to drop off at the top of the hour. I do as well. And I think I'm probably not alone in that.

So let's put a marker here. And I think we have a couple of people -- well let's be honest it's me -- that have some homework to do and owe some responses back to the working group. So I will get started on that right away.

And I thank everyone for their time. And we will see you next week.

Man: Thanks James.

Woman: Thank you James.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

Woman: (Unintelligible) thank you.

END