

**IRTP C WG team
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 18 September 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 18 September 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/irtp-c-20120918-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

James Bladel –RrSG co-chair
Hago Dafalla – NCUC
Barbara Knight – RySG
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP
Angie Graves – CBUC
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSG
Volker Greimann- RrSG
Roy Dykes – RySG
Bob Mountain - RrSG

Rob Golding – RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Michele Neylon – RrSG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Phl Corwin – CBUC
Zahid Jamil - CBUC
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair

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 18th of September, 2012. On the call today we have Hago Dafalla, Barbara Knight, Simonetta Batteiger, Bob Mountain, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel, Kevin Erdman, Volker Greimann and Paul Diaz.

We have apologies from Phil Corwin, Chris Chaplow, Michele Neylon and Zahid Jamil. From staff we have Marika Konings, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the IRTP-C PDP Working Group call for September 18, 2012 as we push on towards our self-imposed deadline of the Toronto meeting for our final report. And I think that we are getting closer and making progress on some of our open issues.

Per our standards rules of procedure here the first step is hopefully everyone had a chance to read - review the draft agenda that was sent around by Marika. And it appears in the right-hand column of the Adobe chat room. If there are any objections or additions to that agenda please indicate so now.

And if there are any updates or changes to statement of interest - if someone who has any of those please indicate so by raising your hand or interrupting me on the call. Don't see any of those either. Great.

So we'll start the agenda with item Number 3 which is the - we still have this open loose end here with consensus recommendation for Charter Question B. And this is regarding the expiration of FOAs.

And there is some language that bounced around last week and that was discussed by the working group on the call. And that caused us to go back and then revisit some of the changes. Some were accepted; some were added.

I think that there some - some of the text in the center there was added I believe by Bob. There was some changes by Simonetta. I believe Barbara Knight had some edits as well. And then the group accepted some of the changes and modified some of the changes and did not accept some of the other changes or, you know, whatever the case may be.

But anyway the result is what you see there on the screen with a marked-up version on the top highlighted in the different colors and then a clean version down at the bottom.

So what I would like to do at this point is ask Marika to read through this one last time and if there are no objections we will call this language adopted for our consensus recommendation for Charter Question B. And then we will move on to the list of open issues for Charter Question A.

So, Marika, if you could read through the clean version one last time and then we will - we'll just take a queue. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Okay. This is Marika. I will do. So the recommendation reads, "The working group concludes that FOAs, once obtained by a Registrar, should be valid for 60 days. Following this time period the Registrar must reauthorize via a new FOA the transfer request. Registrars should be permitted to allow registrants to opt-into an automatic renewal of FOAs if desired."

"In addition to the 60-day validity restriction FOAs should expire if there is a change of registrant or if the domain name expires or if the transfer is executed or if there is a dispute filed for the domain name. In order to preserve the integrity of the FOA there cannot be any opt-in or opt-out provisions for these reasons before expiration."

"As recommended and approved as a result of the IRTP Part B PDP losing Registrars under IRTP-B are now required to send an FOA to a prior registrant. The workgroup advises that losing Registrars have the option to send a modified version of this FOA to a prior registrant in the event that the transfer is automated where the FOA would be advisory in nature."

"Finally during the course of its deliberations on this topic the working group notes that the use of EPP Authorization Info - auth info codes - has become the de facto security mechanism in our industry and thereby replace some of the reason for the creation of the standard FOA."

"We recommend that future efforts in this area examine whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP Auth Info code should eliminate the need of..." And actually there is something cut off, "...of FOAs."

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Marika. I think that we'll go ahead and take a queue here if there's anyone that wants to comment on this language or we can begin the process of moving on from it.

I did want to point out that there is one bit here that is still sort of a loose end which is that we recommend that future efforts in this area examined the relationship between auth info codes and FOAs.

You know, Marika, I think, raised an important point, which is that we have other IRTP working groups coming up. And perhaps we should explicitly recommend that one of those future working groups examine this issue.

You know, I'm open to that idea. I think it's definitely more - it's less ambiguous; it's more clear. But on the hand it does kind of feel like it's punting an issue to a different group as opposed to, I guess, now where it's punting it just to some ambiguous, you know, future work.

So what are the group's thoughts, if any, on the last part of this sentence and any recommendations on that? I saw Marika's hand went up and then down so I guess I will start with Mikey first. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, James. Thanks. It's Mikey. I was on the group that chopped the IRTP into five. And I don't have, at the tip of my tongue, which of the next two would be the best. But I would tend to support the idea of taking a look at those and picking one that's more appropriate.

I don't think that it's punting. I think it's really just putting that issue in the right place to discuss it because, as I recall, the next two IRTP working groups have different focuses. And I think it would be good to pick the right one and recommend it.

James Bladel: And if there is not a right one or a best fit should we just...

Mikey O'Connor: I'd pick one anyway.

James Bladel: ...tack it onto the last one or...

Mikey O'Connor: No, I'd pick one anyway. I have a feeling just off the top of my head that there will emerge a better one I just can't remember what's in those last two.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Mikey. Bob, would you mind if I went to Marika first?

Bob Mountain: I don't mind at all.

James Bladel: Maybe she can clear some of this up. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I initially, indeed, raised my hand on that specific point I also believe that it will really help the Council to be, you know, as specific as possible where you believe this work fits.

And on the question on what are the remaining PDPs, I'm not really sure where that fits exactly but, you know, to be fair there I think the issue that got added to this PDP on the change of registrant didn't necessarily maybe fit as well with the category that was assigned to this one so that might not be such a big issue.

But the ones - the issues that are lined up for the PDP D they focus on dispute policy enhancements. They're questions like whether reporting requirements for Registries and dispute providers should be developed, whether additional provisions should be included in the TDRP, whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for Registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants.

And then the PDP E is - only has one issue in it at the moment is the penalties for IRTP violations and it deals with the question whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional (unintelligible) penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy.

James Bladel: Okay so I'm not sure that it fits naturally or cleanly within either of those. And perhaps it can be tacked onto, you know, either or. The other concern, I think, would be that if we were to punt this to a later working group is that whatever policy would be adopted or changed as a result of this working group, let's say in early 2013, would then be modified again at some point in the future and I think at this pace we would say sometime in 2016.

So we would essentially be creating a three-year policy or a deferral of a policy if something were to come out of that so that's another thought as well. But thanks, Marika.

And I guess we didn't - next time we do something like this we should probably create a catch-all bucket at the end that picks up all the issues that shake loose during the course of these series of PDPs. That was a joke, by the way.

Bob, you're next.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks, James. This is Bob. I guess I support everything Marika and Mikey said. I would - I think by doing that it changes the modes or rather than being a punt it's probably a forward pass to a future group rather than just a, you know, random kick it ahead for whoever gets it so - but I think that's a good approach.

And I agree, I'm not sure which one it fits into but I think, you know, it seems like either one, you know, we have a keen group that would be willing to tackle it and work it to, you know, the appropriate conclusion.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Bob. I like that forward pass. That seems like it's a little more deliberate doesn't it. Mikey, you're up again.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I like forward pass. This is Mikey. You know, and I'm thinking - here's a radical thought; why don't we just combine the last two? I think by now - remember the context of this was that back in 2007, I think, when we were building this, these were extremely contentious issues that were perceived to be very difficult to figure out and so we decided to split it into chunks.

I think time has passed. I think this working group is a good example of how well the various interested parties can figure things out. And so my suggestion would be that we combine the last two, get them all done in the

next cycle and put this one in that and any other catch-all stuff and actually do treat it like a catch-all and finish off.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Because that way...

James Bladel: I'm in favor of that, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay.

James Bladel: But I think it's maybe a conversation we can have outside of this but I agree with that; we should be consolidating those few other things. They seem like they can do that. I think we borrowed from one in an effort to speed this up as well. But Marika's up next.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Once just, indeed, I don't know oppose that proposal because I think something that, for example, could happen if, you know, staff conducts the issue report and we find that indeed there are so much in those issues identified.

At that stage we could still suggest like well the Council may consider still splitting them up or, you know, doing it in a different way than having everything together. Because looking at the last issues on the policy violations I wonder if part of that has already been addressed with the new RAA where I think there's certain, you know, gradations of penalties in there when, you know, the contract or policies linked to the contract or violated.

So I'm just, you know, this is just on the top of my head. I'm not sure if I'm right there. But maybe that might be on issue where it's maybe less of an issue than, indeed, when this whole process started, you know, a couple of years ago. So from that perspective I think there might be benefit in

combining these and looking at the end of the issue report state to see what we really have at hand and decide the path forward from there.

James Bladel: Yeah, I agree. And like Mikey is saying in the chat here it's not really all of our intention to leave IRTP work to our children and grandchildren to complete.

Okay next up is Barbara.

Barbara Knight: This is Barbara. So I think actually it probably makes a lot of sense to consolidate them as well. My initial thought was that if we did not consolidate them I would probably vote for it to be in PDP D just because that one relates mostly to the transfer dispute portion of the policy.

And, you know, I think that for the most part the FOA really is used in conjunction with that more so than anything else. I mean, obviously it is used to get I guess a request for validation, if you will, from the registrant that they actually want a transfer to happen.

But typically that's asked for as part of a filing if a transfer dispute does arise. So I could go either way. I would agree that, you know, to the extent that we could get this wrapped up sooner rather than later and since there is that only, you know, one item in the last PDP I would be all for consolidating them.

James Bladel: Okay. All right thanks, everyone. So it sounds like there's fairly strong support for specifically targeting this to a figure iteration of a PDP and then somewhere appropriately in the report, and I guess this is where we're kind of looking for Marika to guide us on where we could make a recommendation that the last two iterations of the IRTP - the D and E - be consolidated into a single final working group.

And that that - those poor slob, which, let's be honest it's going to be us, right, but those poor folks will have no ability to execute any forward passes. If they shake out any new issues in the course of their work they're going to

have to deal with them before they can go forward because they're the caboose on the IRTP train.

So that's kind of where I think everybody's going here. We'll just kind of target that. And then I guess as far as the recommendation about consolidation I would look to Marika to help us figure out where that needs to go.

But with the substance now of Charter Question B and the FOAs I think we've worked on this language fairly extensively. I don't necessarily hear that there are any material objections to anything left in the message. So can we now declare that we have resolved this message and ask Marika to include this clean language in our final report?

I see some green checkmarks popping up. Excellent. We'll just (unintelligible) - I don't know quite how to do that. There we go, oh lots of checkmarks. Fantastic. And we can certainly say that there were abundant opportunities to weigh in on these.

And I think that the dummy language that I put out there the first time around improved with each iteration so I definitely want to extend thanks to Bob and Simonetta and to Barbara for helping to clean that up and then Marika, of course, for making it all make sense in the end.

Okay so now that the low-hanging fruit is done we can move on to our open issues for Charter Question A and the change of registrant procedure. I'm open to ideas, folks, on how we can attack this list in the most expeditious manner.

Just looking at the calendar, you know, we have today, next week and I think maybe one or two more calls. And I think we indicated on our work plan that we wanted at least - we wanted at least one if not two weeks to read through the final report as a group.

So, you know, just want to make sure that we don't - we don't spend a week per open question when we get to Charter Question A. So, you know, I'm open to ideas on how we can address these in the most - in a way that makes the most sense and makes the best use of our time.

Marika, do we have the list of the open questions? I know we have the final draft report we can - here we go. So, everyone, it looks like you have scroll control. You see we have nine questions there for - okay, I think I'm a little lost here. Just a moment here.

Marika, can you help me understand? Are these the list of the nine - the first nine are attached to Charter Question A and then the last one was the one we just resolved with auth info and Charter Question B?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Indeed, the first nine that are listed there are all linked to Charter Question A but I think if you look at the final report we might have to put, you know, the two together to make sure that each of these have been addressed.

But I think looking at, you know, some of the proposals that Mikey has already made and that are incorporated in the report - and I've also highlighted some sections that I think link together with these questions. I think that should give us a good idea on where we still need to, you know, define what the working group's position is and where, indeed, we already have concrete proposals on the table to consider.

James Bladel: Okay, okay thanks. So as the person who was sort of holding the pen on this final report where do you feel you need the most immediate - where do you feel is a good starting point?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think probably starting at the language that Mikey proposed I think would be a good start because I think that basically describes the overall process. And I think having a, you know, agreement or clarification on

where working group members stand I think will help define some of other open questions which are sort of linked but, you know, can be addressed separately.

For example, like, you know, what constitutes a change of registrant? Which changes are, you know, affected? I think that's an open issue we have in there.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay so you think the best place to start then is by going to the draft final report and then going through them chronologically as they appear?

Marika Konings: Yes, that would be my suggestion.

James Bladel: Okay, okay well let's do it that way then just so that we're following that - the trail of bread crumbs there.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. I think then at the end of that we should probably - should just look back at the open items just to make sure that indeed they were all addressed as part of, you know, our final review of the report.

James Bladel: Okay. And do we have the ability to zoom in here? I apologize, I'm working from a hotel room so I can't really...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I've taken control now because just to make sure that everyone - if everyone just goes to - I'll release it now so everyone can zoom in and make it - but it's basically I think Page 21 where we'll start off focusing on the language that has been provided by Mikey.

There are some other changes before this in a document but they're more administratively I need to, you know, update the number of working group meetings everyone has attended and the executive summary will need to be

updated following final authorization of the rest of the report. But this is like the first hardware - the real substantive changes and a review needs to take place by the working group.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. Okay so it looks like, in scrolling through here, there's a number of terminology changes. And then we get to recommendation for Charter Question A, Recommendation 1. That the working group recommends...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Can I just maybe add one thing because one thing I did do is move around a little bit the order of, you know, where the recommendation starts and the proposed process because in the initial report we actually had it the other way around. We first spoke about the proposed process and about the notes and then we actually had the recommendation.

But my suggestion is to actually turn it around and start off with the recommendation to really make clear that the proposed change - proposed change of registrant process and the notes that are attached to that that those are all an integral part of the recommendation itself to make really sure that it's seen like that and not that those are just notes or deliberations of the working group but that's all, you know, part of the recommendation itself.

James Bladel: I agree. And knowing how many ICANN audiences typically consume these reports I think they skip to the recommendations anyway. So I think that makes sense. I don't know that anyone would object to that.

Okay so can we then begin with Recommendation 1?

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. Maybe it's worth asking Mikey to take you through the changes because I think he has basically suggested this language based on the work that was done on the flow chart and the discussions I think we had on the previous meetings.

James Bladel: Okay. But where do Mikey's changes begin? On Page 21...

Marika Konings: Oh basically - yes, exactly at the top of Page 21; those are I think already changes that Mikey made. I mean, I think all of these here on the page are Mikey's proposed edits.

James Bladel: Okay. All right if - they still had your name attached to them but...

Marika Konings: Yes because Mikey made them in a redline version so indeed they all showed as mine but they're actually really Mikey.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: Mikey can speak up if he sees something that isn't his. But it was impossible to do that differently unfortunately.

James Bladel: Well these also look like just more like stylistic changes or, you know, I'm looking for where the material changes begin.

Marika Konings: I think just looking at the proposed change of registrant process; I think that's where it really...

James Bladel: There we go, okay. So does everyone see where we are; about halfway...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...through Page 21 on the screen there. So, Mikey, would you like to walk us through your changes and the rationale here beginning at that point?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, this is Mikey. And I also have a new version of the pictures that kind of sort of aligns with this. It certainly attempts to so if you want to switch to pictures at some point let me know, I've got those handy as well.

The first few things that I did if you roll down to the part that says - actually why don't you - I'm going to take control back, James, and just see if I can make this big enough so that people can read it because that way I can make sure that you're looking at the right page. If I zoom it that big can you read it okay?

James Bladel: I can read the main text but the markup starts to disappear but we're good for now I think.

Mikey O'Connor: I think, you know, most of the - the markup stuff is mostly just stylistic. It's the red text that I think is the main thing.

James Bladel: Okay so take us through one where you feel like it's, you know, there's been a fundamental change. I think first of all when we're seeing change of registrant process. What we were calling this previously?

Mikey O'Connor: I can look back and tell you that.

Marika Konings: Change of control.

James Bladel: Change of control, correct.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

James Bladel: Okay. So I think everyone - at some point everyone on this working group was - we discussed that and I think we had very strong support for the idea that this is much clearer and easier to understand for consumers of this recommendation.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. So then the next one is having concluded that there are - actually that is Marika's change; the original language was that there could be benefits so she's amplifying that. And then the next one - the workgroup recommends the following. And in the original language that said, "...the workgroup proceeded by developing," so again, you know, this is where language is just getting amplified just a bit.

The first substantive change from our prior draft really occurs at the phrase that I tacked onto the first bullet where I said - I'm sort of amplifying the notion that if somebody wants to preapprove that they need to - those preapprovals need to be secured pretty aggressively.

And so this is new language that I've created. It may need some tweaking but the notion here is that, you know, one of the issues that certainly the aftermarket community has is having a way to set this up in advance so that essentially their whole business model survives.

And so this is saying that's fine but if you do it you need to take extraordinary care that a hijacker can't come in to an account, glean information from that account and preapprove the transfer. So that's the language that's trying to get at that. And we've talked about that a bit in the pictures.

The next one...

James Bladel: Can we pause there for just a moment?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's fine.

James Bladel: Okay so what specifically are we saying here that if you're going to preauthorize a change of control, a change of registrant, sorry, that if you're going to get the - all that authorization in advance that that advanced authorization has to come through some other channel; it can't be through

just a checkbox in a control panel or something like that, it has to be through, what, some kind of two factor..

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: I'm not really clear what we're - exactly what we're saying.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's what the last clause of that sentence is trying to get at is trying to say, for example, out of band authentication based on information that cannot be learned from within the account. I put, "For example," in there...

James Bladel: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...because I'm not sure that we want to specify technology within a policy.

James Bladel: Yeah. I just want to get some clarity on this because I'm not sure I agree or disagree because I'm not sure I fully have wrapped my head around it so I'm just kind of playing devil's advocate if it sounds like I'm pushing back it's just in an effort to make sure that this is fully fleshed out.

So, for example, when we say based on information that can be learned from within the account...

Mikey O'Connor: Cannot be...

James Bladel: You cannot, yeah, so for - I guess what I'm getting at here is - and I see that Bob's in the queue so maybe he can probably articulate this a little bit better than I can if he's thinking the same question. But something along the lines of when you say from within the account, you know, I think you might also mean

from within - with information that could be gleaned from within Whois definitely, that's a public system.

You know, I mean, I can go into an account at - I'm thinking about the one-stop shop, the one-stop providers that have multiple business and product and service offerings under one log in, under kind of a single sign on. And I'm concerned that this might, you know, significantly impact those because a lot of this information is contained within that account.

If your account profile contains your method of payment and your telephone number, for example, then having an out of (band) authentication that uses text messages is not allowed by this language because you can get that telephone number from the account or you can change that telephone number in the account. Am I understanding that correctly?

Man: Well, the intent here is that - and again, you know, this is the grand compromise, so if it's possible to do this then...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...I'm fine to yank it but this is my attempt to reach out and bridge the gap between my position which is no, you can't preapprove these at all, to some mechanism that preserves the aftermarket's ability to do these things in an automated way. And so I'm happy to change this language to make it correct, but you know, in terms of pushing back, hey, you're pushing against a guy that doesn't care.

James Bladel: Oh no. Well, I guess I would think that the aftermarket folks would be more restric- well, you know what? I'm speculating now. Let's go to Bob. Bob, can you help untangle this for me please?

Bob Mountain: Yes, yes. No, thanks. This is Bob. Yes, I think, you know - and Mikey had talked about this before - and I think the out of (bin), I think the operative

phrase for example out of (bin) authentication. So we're not dictating how it work but I think for posing a, you know, one potential approach. You know, I think the, you know, maybe the word that we didn't insert here or the phrase we didn't insert here was a, you know, something along the lines of highly secure which gives the, you know, which essentially implies that, you know, this must take, you know, the utmost care in providing security yet not necessarily dictating what it would be.

So that's, you know, that was kind of my thinking. I think, you know, where Mikey and I were coming in together on this. I guess the, you know, the one question I might have is, you know, what does happen next following this? If we make a fairly, you know, some suggestions in the wording here that describes the intent, is the actual implementation then dictated as a follow on? Is that the next phase of IRTP or is that a separate group that then goes and digs in and figures out how it's going to be implemented? Because I actually wasn't clear on that. That was one of the questions I had.

James Bladel: Well, to address that question, one of the things that we'll have to discuss a little bit later on is whether or not this group should call for or recommend that there be an implementation team which is typically a subset of the working group working together with staff to actually develop the implementation of the recommendations that come out of the working group.

And we did that previously I think for some other working groups like (Fednar), et cetera. I'm just concerned on this particular issue, Bob, that the language might paint, not just aftermarket providers but all registrars in a - paint them in too small of a corner, that if you also, let's say, have hosting and aftermarket and SSL.

And let's say if you were a multiservice provider like the company that I work for, there could be a lot of information in the account profile that could - would all be off limits for any kind of secure (out of band) two factor authentication.

So I'm not really sure what's left. And I think it would say that certain providers would not be able to obtain any kind of preauthorization because they would be punished for having all that information account accessible. I don't know that that's the intent.

I'm just saying that that's been my impression of the language. But let's jump to Marika first and then Bob, is that new hand or?

Bob Mountain: Yes, I (put my hand) up but please, Marika, go ahead.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks. This is Marika. Yes, just to respond to Bob's question on implementation, usually you need - once recommendations are adopted by the GNSO council and then adopted by the board, they get passed to ICANN staff for implementation.

But we've seen in recent years that there're sometimes questions that ICANN staff may have because, you know, some of the policy language might be ambiguous or there might be things as part of the implementation where staff realizes that maybe certain things cannot be done as certain recommendations imply they should be done.

So what is part of the new - the revised GNSO PDP is what (James) is referring to is the creation of implementation review teams which, you know, normally will consist of a subset of members from the original working group that developed the recommendations; so that staff has, like, a counterpart to which it can feature in questions and then have a review as well of the implementation plan before it's published to the broader community to really make sure that the implementation follows, you know, the intent of the actual recommendations themselves and (unintelligible) I think we're currently testing that sort of (way) as well with the post-exploration recommendations.

And I would strongly encourage you as well to make that one of your recommendations as well as, you know, maybe one (or more) and (administrative) recommendations in this report to the council that such an implementation review team is created so that you can work with staff to make sure that the implementation follows the recommendations as intended.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Marika and I think I agree we should consider that one of our recommendation - Recommendation 0. But, Bob, go ahead. Can you maybe bring us back to this particular topic?

Bob Mountain: Yes, this is Bob. So, yes, I totally support that. I think that if the, you know, a subset of this team gets to continue with this, I think the, you know, the chances of an outcome that we'd all be happy with would be much higher. I would also say, (James), to your point, if you're uncomfortable with this wording and you feel as if that, you know, that takes the intent further than it should and potentially constraints, you know, the implementations and, you know, might put us into a suboptimal position there, then I'm okay.

I don't know about Mikey, but I'm okay with revising the wording and making it somewhat more general as long as, you know, the intent is maintained that, you know, the idea is that this will be a, you know, a highly secure approach that would, you know, protect both sides, see both the aftermarket and the, you know, the non-aftermarkets.

James Bladel: Yes, maybe that's the right approach, Bob, is to say, you know, that we require or recommend, you know, emphasize security - security, you know, (unintelligible) best to (breed) the practices, et cetera, but when we get specific about what information can and can't be used, I think that starts to paint the providers into a very narrow corner and I think that's perhaps too restricted. Go ahead, Simonetta, you're next.

Simonetta Batteiger: Maybe one way forward could also be to give an example and then to say that the implementation team that gets to actually work on this should think

about items such as this so people get a choice because I'm thinking that it's not that hard to put something on paper, as for example, you predefine some security questions and the responses to these are (unintelligible) account and stuff like that.

And I'm sure there's like three or four or five different things that people can think of that could be done and then just give these as an example of the type of things that we would consider to be more secure than something that you can just visibly look up in the account.

James Bladel: Right, okay. Okay, so I guess it goes back to Mikey and Marika. Where do you think we should go from here? Do you think the language recommendations there will be sufficient?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I've been editing a draft as we talked and with your permission, I'll share my screen rather than - well, no. The trouble is that then I'm out of synch with Marika's. Let me and Marika push this back and forth. I've been taking notes in a draft.

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And - so maybe I'll just read it real quick just to give you a sense of what I've done. However, such preapprovals must be highly secured. That's new - and constructed in a way that prevents an unauthorized person from requesting the action based exclusively on account credentials that may have been compromised.

For example, out of band authentication based on information (that can't be learned), blah, blah, blah. The details of - and then a new sentence - the details of how this is achieved will be addressed by an implementation review team to ensure that this is implemented in a way that is technically achievable yet addresses the intent of this policy. So that's the start.

James Bladel: Yes, I think we need to - I think that's a good start. And I think if you can send that to the list, we can - we may want to take a closer look at that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I was a little surprised at how quiet the list was when I sent this out the first time, so I think it's important...

James Bladel: I bet you they didn't see it. I bet you I didn't.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, well, maybe this time around, huh?

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, because this is first draft. I was really expecting to see a bunch of comments and then a second draft before we got to this meeting but, you know, anyway I think it's pretty malleable language. I have no objections to the direction that this is going.

James Bladel: Yes, and I think that's - it seems like we're all violently agreeing with each other in principle. It's just we want to make sure that the language doesn't create any (unintended) consequences. And I (believe) that's where I'm coming from. It sounds like that's where everybody else wants to go too. Everyone wants to see a secure process without tying too many hands unnecessarily, so.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: Okay, Mikey, can you take us to the next paragraph and your changes there?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, the next one is a change of registrant cannot take place simultaneously with the change of registrar. That's from the old draft. And I added a clause that said, "Although they can be made to appear that way, to registrants in a registrar's user interface," and this isn't really policy. This is just sort of

clarifying something that, you know, the geek in me says you can't simultaneously update a database two fields at a time.

You have to - these things - I'm a Cobalt programmer. You have to do these things one at a time. And in policy, they have to happen one at a time but they can be - I think the concern from the aftermarket community was that this was going to be required two use - you know, two user processes. And so I just wanted to highlight the fact that this could still be made to appear as one thing even though they aren't, either technically or in policy.

And then the other part that I enhanced on this is just a suggestion that when registrars are building these capabilities, they probably want to do the IRTF first and then do the change of registrant because we've got this default lock that's going to show up. And if you reverse the order, you're going to hit the lock. So this is mostly just guidance. This is almost implementation guidance that could, in fact, go into an implementation document rather than a policy document. But it was mostly addressing concerns that have been raised and clarifying the thing.

James Bladel: Okay, any thoughts on that? Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm - maybe I missed something at some point because I know that I did miss a couple workgroup calls, but did we discuss this item? Because I thought that was one of our open items that we weren't clear whether or not, and in which order we want to recommend this should be done.

James Bladel: We've had a lot of conversation about that and it's fine with me to retrace those steps although I might want to switch to the pictures to do it. The main thing is in this sentence. What I'm trying to get across is that there is an order if there's a lock, because otherwise if you change registrant first then you trigger the lock. And then you have to wait 60 days or 30 or whatever we decide. So, yes, there has been quite a bit of discussion about this. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I know that there's been quite a bit of discussion about this. I am just wondering if we ever actually came to an agreement or some kind of consensus on the question because I just recall that we have discussed this in circles and up and down but we haven't - at least as far as I know - reached agreement on this item.

And I do remember specifically from the comments in - I think it was Costa Rica or Prague - one of those meetings where it's been voiced as a concern. I believe from (Michelle Shohad) or someone else. It was in the (comment) tool as well, that we shouldn't prescribe an order in which this should be done and I don't disagree, Mikey, with that.

Maybe we have to say something like it's two steps but I wasn't sure if we had said that it has to always been one way around or the other and I also don't know if we had agreement on the 60 day (lawsuit) either.

James Bladel: My understanding, Simonetta, from reading this, is not that we're prescribing an order but we're essentially saying that one order will - one order has a security vulnerability and will trigger a lock and the other order does not, so we're recommending that the other order - it's not a requirement but it's a recommendation in order to avoid a lock, you would use this sequence. Is that - am I responding correctly Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's why it says it's advised.

James Bladel: Advised, okay. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I thought that in essence basically means that there's really only one way left to, in fact, to efficiently get a transfer done because nobody wants to have a process that takes two months to complete.

James Bladel: Well, it wouldn't mean that there's only one way. It's that the other way, you would essentially be accepting the vulnerability and the 60 day restriction which we've already indicated in the previous working group has the ability to be removed anyway within five days so I - you know, I don't know that - it's not really requiring that it happen in a certain order. It's more just saying that there is a preferred order and that there's this other sequence that introduces these other vulnerabilities. But, you know, I don't know. I felt like we talked about this extensively but maybe I'm missing something.

Mikey O'Connor: this is Mikey. Let me just add that there're really two ways to do this in a different sequence. One different sequence way to do this is to wave the lock prior to initiating the transfers. We get down into that in a bit, in which case you can do them in either order you want because there's no lock.

But if the default condition applies, which is that there is a lock when you change registrants, then it's a good idea to do the IRT first then do the change of registrant.

James Bladel: Okay. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering, just in real practical terms, if this is something that maybe James and Michelle and other registrars on the mailing list can weigh in. But I'm thinking about how a transfer is currently done in a case where you want to change the registrar and the registrant.

Effectively, what's happening is that somebody gives someone else an auth code and that person goes to their registrar and says, "Please start the transfer for the domain name xyz.com. Here's the auth code for it." And then that new registrar just (spends) an ETP command into the registry that probably does both at the same time that a new registrant and also asks for the transfer and - or maybe they actually to send to commands anyway but this is something that maybe the registrars of the group could shed some light on.

And then with that in mind, tell us whether or not they see issues with this wording. I mean, really from a purely technical point of view, maybe James and Michelle and other registrars in the group can put their thoughts forward and ask internally how this is actually done.

((Crosstalk))\

Bob Mountain: (Unintelligible). Sorry about interrupting you. I can't get into the Adobe room to raise my hand. It's Bob Mountain. You can't change the context on the domain until after the transfer completes. It's physically not possible. You don't own the context. So you can't do it as one action and you can't do it before the transfer happens. You can only do it after the transfer happens and as far as I understand, in current ICANN policy, is we must retrieve the current Whois details for audit purposes as well so you know who the existing details were at the point of transfer.

James Bladel: That's correct. And within registries, you can't change the (contacts) because there are none.

Bob Mountain: Exactly.

James Bladel: Okay, so I think Simonetta's advice is well founded. Let's take a closer look at this operationally what the - what is actually possible and what's desired. I think that the general idea that we're trying to get across here is that change of registrar and change of registrant are two separate functions that should not and could not occur simultaneously, although they can be - they can occur within close conjunction of one another to the extent that from a registrant perspective they may appear to occur simultaneously but there are security concerns if they're not done according to a certain sequence and that we need to think about the protections there.

So let's take a look at that as Simonetta mentioned, so maybe point that specifically at the registrars the registries. I guess we shouldn't - when we're talking about how they're going to handle it in sequence of EPT transactions, we should include the registries as well. And we've only got eight minutes left. Mikey, what's next?

Mikey O'Connor: I think we've probably - well, I didn't think any of these were going to be hard but I think we've hit the - oh, onto this next page at the - here is where we were talking about the 60 day lock. We had beaten that up a fair amount in the first draft but there you go.

And this language that I tacked on is the same as the language above so I think it falls to the same discussion. Let's tune up the opt out security stuff the same way we did on the other one. So I'm going to skip that and just push pretty quick here.

The step zero changes is essentially, again, the sequencing thing. I don't think we want to debate it on this call. I think once again this one might be one to send to the registrars and registries. Let's see, then there's the step on where, you know, there's changes here to let either side initiate, so either the prior or the gaining registrant sends credentials to the other registrant. This is another one probably for registrars especially to take a look at because I kind of made that one on my own in order to allow flexibility for either side of the transaction to initiate it.

James Bladel: Which (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: This is all change of registrant. It's not - this is not, you know, this is not IRTP. This is the new thing. And there - this is one that we may want to include in the hard look from the smart people conversation because I may have made up something that doesn't make sense.

So I'll just highlight it for you and you know that it's purely a Mikey fabrication and may be wrong. Then - I'm trying to push through really quick. I think the remaining - oh, one of the conversations we had was about what to do in the case of thin registries.

All this works a lot more easily in a thick registry. What about thin? And so I added a note and let me just highlight this. It's not currently possible to validate the registrant information - that the registrant information is identical during an inter registrar transfer in thin registries.

And remember, what we're saying in all of this, is that registrant information cannot change during an inter registrar transfer. That's the reason we're splitting these things. Thus, implementation of these policy changes in thin registries is contingent on either the implementation of a uniform Whois data excess provisions, which are being discussed in RAA or an outcome of a PDP that mandates thick Whois across all registries or something else.

And so again, this is something that smart people should take a look at because, you know, this is at the core of the policy that we're proposing here. And I...

James Bladel: I think that makes sense.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I think that's - yes, I think then we're into other stuff. So sorry that we soaked up the last half hour but I think this shows the need for people to really hit this hard on the list between the meetings because we covered a lot of ground that, in my mind, had already been covered here. Sorry about that.

James Bladel: Well, thanks Mikey. And that is good advice. And Marika just reminded me that I think we only have three meetings remaining until we're all going to be heading up North there to Canada. So we've got just a minute left here.

But I wanted to close off and say that - well, thanks to Mikey for this draft language and for tracking the drafts for the previous charter questions. We are going to have to somehow boil these down on the list and, Marika, I think that while the draft report makes a nice container for all of these changes, I think that we will occasionally have to just kind of extract the draft language out into a - the body of the emails so that it's a little bit - so that we can break them down into different email threads based on whichever language section we're talking about.

So we can maybe address that offline. Next meeting will be same time, same place. Please look for a (date) on the list. And we'll continue to push through the open questions with regard to charter Question A. I will also work with Marika to - I think there are a couple of - I've been burned by this before but there are a couple of relatively non-controversial questions that are still open so I'll start some email threads on those along with some dummy language that we can poke at.

And then maybe we can parallelize this process a little bit so that some of these questions are occurring simultaneously with the work towards the final language happening simultaneously on a number of questions and a number of fronts. So thanks everyone. Hope to see you next week and please watch the list.

Woman: Thanks everyone.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James.

Man: Bye.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

END