

**IRTP C WG team
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 25 September 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 25 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/gnso-irtp-c-20120925-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
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Bob Mountain - RrSG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Phl Corwin – CBUC
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG
Michele Neylon – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Barbara Knight – RySG
Roy Dykes – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Angie Graves – CBUC
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG
Alain Berranger - NPOC
Paul Diaz – RrSG

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much, Tim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.

This is the IRTP C call on the 25th of September, 2012. On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel, Bob Mountain, Kevin Erdman, Hago Dafalla and Philip Corwin.

We have apologies from Simonetta Batteiger, Alain Berranger, Angie Graves, Barbara Knight, Roy Dykes, Paul Diaz, and Avri Doria. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Gery, Berry Cobb, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you everyone to IRTP C working group for the 25th of September. Getting very close to the end. Hopefully everyone has had the chance to review some of the posts to the mailing list when we're hashing out some final language that will constitute all of the recommendations.

But first, sorry, I skipped the preliminaries here. Does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, has everyone, oops, I'm sorry, Michele has an update. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'd like to declare myself a tree-hugger.

James Bladel: All right. Join the club.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm reluctant to take the bait on that one, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

James Bladel: Can you quickly bring us to tie it to our industry or the work at hand here?

Michele Neylon: James, considering the number of conference calls I've been in on over the last few months since this was introduced, and considering the complete lack of any updates from (unintelligible) anybody with respect to the rest of us apart from like, one person out of I don't know how many hundred.

You can consider my comment to be my reflection on the importance and the critical necessity of going through the motions of this on every single call.

James Bladel: Got you, okay. Well, message received. We can also call it comedy interlude, because I think that would be a good one today, so. Moving on, then, hopefully everyone has had a chance to review the draft agenda, which is, was sent to the mailing list by Marika yesterday and was also posted in the right-hand column of (Adobe)'s chat.

Does anyone have any concerns or comments about our agenda, or can we consider it adopted? Okay, thanks everyone.

So, just going back to where I hastily rushed in, we're getting very near the end. Item Number 7 in our agenda is to review the work of the next two meetings, and, you know, I think the next two meetings will definitely be - will involve some review and just a polish of our final report, including our recommendations.

So, with that in mind, we can move on to some of the language that was circulated on the list. And I apologize if this went out over the weekend, I had every intention of getting it out late last week, but we all are in the same boat, I think, when it comes to firefighting from one crisis to the next and I just could not get through it.

So let's take a look, then, at the consensus review for Charter Question A, and this is the recommendation for the exchange of registrant policy, and

whether or not this would be a combined policy, as in if it's just part of the (RTP), or whether this would be a separate policy -- its own stand-alone policy, or whether that there's some hybrid approach.

And hybrid approach I think would be that we take the existing (IRTP). We don't throw it out completely, but we create a set of parts to it. We call that the change-of-registrant part we add to the interregistrar existing language and then we rename the (IRTP) to be something else, like transfers.

I think that's the approach that it seems we were coming down towards in our last discussion because, while there are trade-offs, creating a separate policy you might lose a number of definitions and procedures by creating a stand-alone, but creating a wholly combined policy presents challenges as well.

So that was kind of the thinking behind developing this hybrid approach. So, we've got a queue here of Michele, but I just wanted to, before that, can we have Marika quickly read through the proposal items, Michele, and then we'll go to the queue. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's just a (unintelligible) as well, because basically this would replace the current language that's in the initial report that basically details those three approaches as we had in the initial report.

So basically the proposed language reads, "The working group discussed as part of its initial report whether a change of registrant policy as outlined above should become part of the existing (IRTP), or should be established as separate consensus policy, or a hybrid of both should be followed.

"The working group would like to express a preference for the creation of a hybrid policy whereby the (IRTP) would become a transfer policy, whereby one part or section details the policy for change of registrar, and another part or section details a policy for a change of registrants.

“However, if as part of the implementation process, there are strong arguments for why a different approach should be followed, the working group suggests that those arguments are reviewed by the (IRTP) prior to the Part C implementation review team.”

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Marika. And I’m going to the queue, and Michele, you’re up first.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. The trees have an opinion on this. Sorry, I'll stop, I'll behave. Seriously, I would agree with the idea of the hybrid because I think, you know, trying to break things out into multiple separate policies, while it might be suitable in some contexts, if anything, in this particular context, it would be a really, really, really bad idea.

So I’d be supportive of that. And based on the proposed language, I support that 100% and would like to find Mikey and the rest of you for doing such a wonderful job here. And also to apologize for my total lack of input over the last couple weeks since I’ve been otherwise occupied. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. I’ll go ahead and put myself in the queue and say I also agree with this approach. I think it is a cleaner way of, when you say hybrid approach, you really were talking about a cleaner way of combining them so that it makes sense without having things like interregistrar acting as an umbrella for a change of registrant policy.

So I’d also like to say thanks for my team, you know, the folks who helped draft this language. I think it’s good. I think it’s that we have sent this out to the list with the comments that silence is agreement, and so far, Marika can correct me, but since there’s nothing but silence, and explicit agreement.

So I think that this is probably - my co-chair is not here, but I think we’re ready to declare that we have consensus on this language. So I will say that

we can move on on this, and look at agenda Item Number 4, which is similar to reviewing final language for our (charter) question A recommendation.

We'll just wait for the (Adobe Rogue) to catch up to our conversation here. And it's coming up now. So this is the - this is the guts of how our recommendations, number 1, for Charter Question A.

And Marika, maybe, can you walk us through the beginning, and then the highlighted part, I think, is because that's new or that's something that's yet to be discussed.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So basically the first part of the recommendation 1 is the same language we looked at before, but we go into the parts that I highlighted in yellow, some of those have changes based on our discussion last week, especially the first part, where I think Mikey proposed some new language based on the comments that people made.

So that is slightly different from what was reviewed last week, while I believe that the other part highlighted in yellow are more to mark the fact that those are significant changes from the initial report based on the discussions that we've had. And I think there's maybe language that was suggested by Mikey.

James Bladel: Okay, so can you, can we go read through the first part and then the first bullet? And I see that see that we've got one hand that's not from Bob, but we'll maybe take a queue as we go.

Marika Konings: Okay, so this is Marika. So the first bullet is basically outlining the proposed change of registrant process for detail these that currently reads, "Both the prior registrant and the new registrant need to authorize the change of registrant.

"Such authorization could also be provided by the prior registrant in the form of a preapproval or by a proxy. However, such preapprovals must be highly

secured and constructed in a way that prevents an unauthorized person from requesting the actions based exclusively on accounting credentials that may have been compromised.

“For example, registrars may want to consider out of band authentication based on information that cannot be learned from within the account, or publicly available resources such as Whois.

“The working group recommends that (IRTP) privacy implementation review team to address questions on this and other recommendations and assist registrars and staff to implement this recommendation in accordance with the intention of the working group.”

Do you want me to go point by point, or?

James Bladel: No, thank you, we'll stop there. I think we have a queue and Bob is first. We'll see if he wants to weigh in on this first bullet point and then we can move on to the second one. And I went ahead and put myself at the end of the queue because I have a question/comment. So go ahead, Bob.

Bob Mountain: Okay, yes, thanks, James and Marika. This is Bob for the recording. I guess I'm a little confused. I thought that last week when we added the section which was referring on the sentence, referring to the (IRTP) implementation team, that meant we were going to lighten up on our, sort of, recommendations in the specifics around the implementation.

So I guess my concern is that we're - in the second sentence, the “However, such preapprovals must be highly secured,” I think we all agree that's true. But then we go on and we sort of specify some implementation details or approaches and constructed in a way that prevents unauthorized persons from requesting the actions based exclusively on account credentials that may end in compromise.

So I thought that the reason for inserting the implementation team was so that we would not necessarily dictate the approach or the details on the implementation, but would defer that to a follow-on group that would, you know, really focus on the optimal approach. So I guess that's my comment. I'll stop there.

James Bladel: Thanks, Bob. Can I respond with two hats on simultaneously without confusing the transfers. I want to respond as the person who put the language out and then I want to respond to support what you're saying.

The first response is, I sent that out because I felt like it was weird, that the first mention of an implantation review team is coming buried in this bullet point. I thought that was an important concept that belongs somewhere else earlier in the document.

So that's probably why I think when Marika sent around some apps earlier, that I see that went out. But I agree with you. I think that sentence that starts with "However," is very prescriptive. And in some respects, and I see Mikey's hand up, so maybe he can weigh in as well.

I'm concerned, now I'm speaking to the registrar, I'm concerned that it sort of says, you know, we can stop high-jacking if registrars will stop doing things that are insecure. You know, well, I think that that's noble, and everyone agrees with that.

I think the trick is, you know, how to do that, and how to keep it flexible and making sure we don't enshrine that into something, you know, like policies. So one of the things I was thinking about is that we replace, or look at replacing or condensing that whole section to something along the lines of, "However, as a best practice, registrars should have - registrars offering preapproval must blah blah blah blah blah blah blah blah."

And saying something, you know, very straightforward. When we start saying things like, you know, requesting action based exclusively on account credentials that may have been compromised, I mean, we said, for example, this was not your registrar's account, but your credit card account.

Well, if someone had stolen your entire identity, then they have all of you. So I just, I feel a little concerned that we're essentially throwing, you know, we're, I mean, we're being overly prescriptive here. We're kind of telling registrars what they can and can't do and the registrars very quickly will find themselves in the situation where they - the policies conjoined, or restricting them from taking action against, or from building a secure system.

So, that's just my thoughts, and I see Mikey's hand is up. So I'm going to drop my hand and let Mikey weigh in. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, James, it's Mikey. I just want to replay the bidding on this one. Remember that this is compromised language. The original language, which would have said, "both prior registrants and the new registrants needs to authorize the change of registrant." Period.

And the compromise is this notion of a preapproval, which I don't like. I have never made any bones about that, but, in the spirit of compromise, I've said, okay, if you want to do a preapproval, that's fine with me, but we have to erect some pretty big fences around that before I'm going to be comfortable.

So I'm not keen at all on the idea of leaving, you know, building a security hole, and then reducing the protection to best practices. I think you get a choice. You either take the security hole that we're creating out, or you leave the protections in. But building a security hole and then unprotecting it is something I'm going to squawk long and hard about. Sorry to be such a trout.

James Bladel: No, Mikey, that's understood. And I think we're all - we're closer than we think. And because I'm not- I want to preserve the compromise as well. And I think

Bob does as well, but I think it's really that second part the really, I think we're all agreed that we need - that this has to be a tight process and we have to be respectful of security.

I think it's the prescription nature of saying once I solicit security looks like, is where I struggle with. So one approach -- I'll let Bob go here -- but I'll put myself in the queue, because I think I may have a fit that you - that I think you might like, Mikey, but I don't want to presume. So Bob, go ahead.

Bob Mountain: Yes, James, yes, you know, feel free to keep going. I can jump in after you're done.

James Bladel: Okay, I didn't want to overstep here. So I think that we can possibly leave that first sentence intact, Mikey, but be highly secured and constructed in a way that prevents an unauthorized from requesting action piece on account credentials.

We can say, "Registrar on account credentials that may have been compromised." I think that limits it to the things that we can actually control. And I think registrars feel a little more warm and fuzzy about that.

And then the next sentence can be where we give an example, I think that we can say, for example, as in best practice registrars could consider, or we can say as a non-limiting example, or as a, you know, as a demonstration or a demonstrating example.

What I just didn't want, and Mikey, and I think a lot of the other registrars piped in as well, is for that example to become the policy requirement or policy obligation. Does that make sense?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me just - I'm assuming you want a reply.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm fine as long as we don't think it was the first sentence, the one that starts, "However," you know. It's tinkering with the four example sentences to soften it is fine with me.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: What I was hearing was that. And I'm even fine narrowing the account credentials to registrar account credentials, if that helps, but...

James Bladel: We might even be able to shoehorn the public Whois back up in here as well, like registrar account credentials or public status such as Whois.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's fine. What I really, really, really - I mean, I am extremely uncomfortable creating security holes and then leaving them unguarded on purpose. That's my concern.

James Bladel: And I think a very valid concern, and I think that as that the registrar's concern is that they want to make sure that if they have an obligation, it's something that they actually control.

So, you know, I think, I mean having that breakdown so the first sentence is basically unaltered except to state registrar account credentials or public data such as Whois, the "for examples" and everything that follows there just probably needs to be clarified that that's where we're helping registrars to get there as opposed to saying this is how you have to do it, because there could be other ways.

Registrars could have like a safe deposit box, which is key-carded, or something crazy like that. Actually, it sounds like something (Mark Monitor) would do. Go ahead, Bob, you're up next.

Bob Mountain: Yes, thanks, James, this is Bob. Yes, I guess, first of all, I'm not quite sure what Mikey means when he refers to himself as a trout, but I'll leave that for later. The - I think Mikey and I worked on this language together, so I've got no problem with the language.

I guess just my concern was in, you know, in kind of putting something that was a hard recommendation on the implementation that might limit the implementation team. They might come up with something that's more secure, but not be able to do that because we're sort of restricting their approach.

So that was my only concern. I totally agree with Mike, though, that, you know, the - we can't have a security hole, and, you know, the whole idea is that I think we're all in agreement that we want to make sure that any sort of fast track approach is not going to be, you know, sort of open season for high-jacking.

So I'm totally on board with Mike. I just want to make sure that the ability of the implementation team is not restricted in one way or the other. So, that's my only point.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Bob and put the fish reference in the chat there so we'll see if Mikey agrees with me. He's in Minnesota, so he probably has a better handle on that.

So I think we're getting pretty close to some compromise on the compromise. I think that we want to - I think we are all violently agreeing with each other and there's room where, hey, I think registrars are particularly cautious about anything that would tie their hands and their ability to address or design a secure system.

And I think, you know, Mikey has some good points here. We can't knowingly create a loophole and then just walk away from it and call it work done. So Marika, you're up next.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just in relation to the reference to the implementation of review teams, my idea would be that if somewhere in the report, the appropriate page, we would create like an overarching recommendation, which I think we've also done in some of the other (PDP) working groups, where we basically say, like, for the implementation of all these recommendations, the working group, we recommend creation of an implementation review team that, you know, will consist of members of this working group and the other standout language.

And the second part could basically refer to that, basically saying that the working group recommends that the (IRTP) (unintelligible) as referred to before, or after, wherever it fits in the document so that it flows easier and making clear that that group is in need there to work with staff to implement recommendations in accordance with the attention of the working group.

James Bladel: Okay folks, we have done - I think we've poked this whole point full of holes and I think we've arrived at something we can all live with. Marika, did you capture that language change that we were discussing about concerning some qualifiers in account credentials and then making sure that the, you know, and I almost leave it to the lawyers, on the call so we can say that the examples are not obligations, something that clarifies that.

Marika Konings: Yes, that doesn't, but what I had it written down was now, and I think you used that wording as like a non-limiting example registrars may want to consider, something along those lines.

James Bladel: Okay, that works. And I think we've got the attorneys in, you know, in ICANN states, that they can tell us where we're walking into a minefield with that language. But, okay, great, let's move on to - and thanks for, you know, keeping us honest, everybody.

We do have some fragile compromises and we don't want to slow those up. But I think if we can preserve those in such a way that tightens up a language, well, we should take those opportunities as well. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Just real quick, the other change to the language is to narrow the first sentence to say exclusively on registrant account credentials, for publicly available information such as Whois, that's the other half for this.

James Bladel: I think Marika got that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to clarify, was it - I at first though it was registrar, but is it registrar?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry, yes, registrar.

Marika Konings: Yes, okay, I got that.

James Bladel: That's right, okay. Excellent, okay, Marika, can you take us to the second bullet point, please?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I don't think any changes were made to this part, but it's just a highlight that this is an update from the initial report. The second bullet point reads, "A change of registrant cannot take place simultaneously with a change of registrar, although they can be made - can be made to appear that way to registrants in a registrar user interface.

"If both changes need to be made, it is advised that the change of registrar (IRTP) be completed prior to initiating the change of registrant in order to avoid the proposed 60-day inter-registrar transfer law as seen below."

James Bladel: Okay, so I'll take a few on that and I'll put myself at the end, which right now is just me. You know, I guess I don't have any - I'll just pipe in here as registrar, I guess I don't have any real issues with this.

My concerns are very nitpicky a little bit here, but they say something about - sometimes I think when we're doing this, we tend to think of the retail registrar, such as GoDaddy or, you know Michele's firm Blacknight, or some of those other Web-based retail registrars, which is fine and probably is an indication of how successful we have defined that category.

However, there are other types of registrars that don't have user interfaces and aren't on the Web and operate, you know, more like a law firm or another business service that are not necessarily online like registrars.

I'm worried that the language as it's written is specific to the more common and familiar model of online registrars, but I'm not super upset about that being an assumption, but it is based into that recommendation. The other thing is that, what are we recommending here?

We're saying it is advised, but when, you know, this becomes policy then compliance. Are compliance going to come after my folks and businesses like us and, you know, I don't want to have long and drawn out arguments or discussions about what the word advise means.

So I guess what I'm saying is that if we were recommending this or we are requiring this or we are saying as an option or anything. I'm not trying to mess up a compromise here, I'm saying that we need some clarity. I think it's ambiguous and I think (registrars) may say, "I think advise means you tell me what you think you want to happen and then I'm going to do what I want." And ICANN compliance may think, "No, when it says advise it means this is exactly how you have to do it."

And I think that the intention of the working group needs to be captured in that verb. So I'll drop my hand now and let everybody throw rocks at me. (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I just stuck my hand up to respond. So, I'm going to just throw out, let me throw out some ideas on how to fix that. I think both of those points are good ones. My suggestion on the first point would be to strike - to end the sentence at the word registrants. And strike the end of registrar as user interface. That way, if you don't have a user interface, you can still make it look the same to registrants.

To replay the bidding on this, this arose from a discussion where the point was being made, "we want to make this easier for registrants, not harder." And we got into a discussion about the ability to do both things at the same time. And this is me being a geek saying, "No, you can't technically do both things at the same time. But you can make it look that way to your customer, if you want."

So this isn't really policy, this is really kind of addressing - except for the first part. That says, "These things can't happen at this exact same time." So I'd be fine just saying, "The change of registrant cannot take place simultaneously with a change of registrar, although they can be made to appear that way to registrants." Period. To avoid the issue that you're raising there, James.

And then, in terms of the advise word. I'd be fine backing that down to a word that doesn't trigger the policy flag. You know, we can say it's suggested, or a good idea, yeah, recommended, anything. Because I don't think, I actually would not want to see this sequence get into policy. I think that is a problem and so that's just bad word choice when I wrote the sentence.

So backing it down to recommended or even any other word that fits in there is fine.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey, I think those are excellent, and friendly, and improving edits. Michele is up next, go ahead Michele. Please don't talk about trees.

Michele Neylon: I'll try not to talk about trees. Can I talk about paper, no okay?

James Bladel: The subject is (unintelligible) today, not trees.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I would be very, very cautious as well about anything which is overly prescriptive. Because assuming that all registrars operators are using the same methodology is downright stupid.

Assuming that - what we should be looking at more is achieving a goal. As opposed to designating how that goal is achieved. So I mean the kind of thing that should be covered is that, you know, the registrar will have retained proof of X, Y, and Zed of having got the permission. Or having got whatever it is. As opposed to saying, "Registrar must do this." Even if registrar doesn't even use a Web site. So I think that's important.

Of course I have no confidence in ICANN compliance at the moment, so anything which involves compliance leaves me wondering.

James Bladel: Understood, thanks. Marika you are up.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) can maybe make a suggestion on the last sentence. Because I think maybe changing advise to recommended, from my perspective maybe makes it stronger. Because all of these things have recommendations, which, you know, our consensus policy recommendations.

I'm wondering if just adding it to the end of the sentence, changing advised to maybe suggested, but then just adding at the end of the sentence saying, "But this is not a requirement." To really make clear that that is really not a requirement, it is just a suggestion.

James Bladel: I'm okay with that. You're saying that the word recommended is actually going in the wrong direction?

Marika Konings: That maybe, I said that maybe through my perspective as a non-native English speaker. From me, really recommending means all of the other things are really recommendations too. (Unintelligible) ICANN board, which (uses) recommendations for consensus policy. So in that sense, a recommendation is here but can be misconstrued as meaning recommended as a requirement.

James Bladel: I see that. So instead of recommendations to council for policy, we would say like, "Recommendation is recommended for registrars." But I agree with you, then it starts to get very tortured. So let's say, suggested I think was one of the words that Bob used. I think that it doesn't have a whole lot of (literature). And Mikey is plus oneing that in the chat as well. Is everyone okay with suggested?

And again, the thing we're trying to get away from here is ICANN thinks they've got an iron clad - and I'm not thinking on our policy friends. I'm thinking of the clients here where they think they've got some iron clad language and the registrar disagrees because it's ambiguous. So I see some folks putting checkmarks in, so I think we'll go with suggested there Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, another (unintelligible) adding at the end of the sentence really to make it crystal clear and just saying but this is not a requirement, so it's really clear that, you know, this is just a suggestion and not a requirement.

James Bladel: Oh, we could say it is suggested, - comma - but not required, - comma- that the change of registrar. I think it fits better right there.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: Okay. And you could've fooled me that you're not a native English speaker. You do better than I do. Okay - especially you write it better than I do. So can we then move on to the next bullet point? And I'm sorry, is the top of Page 2 part of that last bullet or is that a new section? I don't know if that's a formatting change or...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So basically it's not - you know, there were three bullet points that outline the main requirements and then the - Page 2 still belongs to the same section but it talks more - it's more general discussion.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: It's not a...

James Bladel: Okay, so I don't see any changes or highlights in that final bullet so we're saying essentially that the working group noted that any such process should not create an unfair advantage or disadvantage for any of the segments active in the (domain name) industry and noted that it should neither prevent innovation or (tend) differentiation amongst registrars.

Do we say neither prevent innovation, the (unintelligible). I'm having a little bit of trouble with just the styling of that word here. I would just say should not prevent innovation and differentiation amongst registrars. I think when we say neither then you're expecting a nor instead of an and, so should not prevent.

And then the next paragraph has some changes so Marika, can you walk us through that?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So basically the next paragraph, I think is just basically summing up the conclusions from the previous bullet points and then I'll read it out but just know that we'll need to make a couple of changes based on the changes we've agreed upon in the bullet points. So the working group also discussed extensively whether there should be any restrictions in place that

would be prevent the change of registrar immediately following a change of registrant (unintelligible) the initial report.

And recommends that a domain name cannot be transferred to another registrar for 60 days to protect registrants against possible harm arising from domain name hijacking. However, the option to opt out of this restriction would (span) a notice to all registrants of the associated basis is provided in order to meet the needs of registrants who are concerned about the negative effect on movability of domain name registrations.

If a registrar chooses to offer an option for registrants to opt out, the process to remove this restriction must be highly secured and constructed in a way that prevents an unauthorized person from requesting the action based exclusively on account credentials that may have been compromised.

So I'm assuming, especially this last part, would be updated to reflect the new language we agreed upon in the first bullet point.

James Bladel: Yes, I think that's correct. And I see Bob wants to jump in on this so - and there goes the hand. Were you - Bob, were you just pointing out that we mirrored some of that language that we changed above.

Bob Mountain: Yes, exactly. Marika, with her final comments addressed by issue.

James Bladel: Okay, and Mikey, any concerns about changing this, and that's what we agreed on in the first bullet point?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. No, that's fine. And I was going to say the same thing.

James Bladel: Okay. Excellent. All right, I think we'll get there Marika. As long as we line them up, I think everybody's good with that. Moving on.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And so that's fine. And so looking at the stats, I think everything here is the same apart from the highlighted part in stat zero. They see the highlight that the intra-registrar counter policy is revised so as not to permit changes to registrant information at the same time as the intra registrar transfer.

And, again, the registrar must validate this prior to completing this transfer. So basically just to reflect what, you know, what the two changes cannot be taken - take place simultaneously that that is something that needs to be spelled out in the intra registrar transfer policy.

James Bladel: Okay, so let me see - let's walk this through very carefully here if I could. I know we've discussed these pretty extensively and I don't want to blow up any fragile agreements here but I think we just need to tread very carefully. The intra registrar transfer policy is revised so it's not some of the changes registrar information at the same time as registrar transfer.

(Unintelligible). Yes, Mikey, you're putting something pretty extensive in the chat. Is that the note that supports the steps?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Yes, we had a pretty long discussion about what this is getting at is this little note that I pasted into the chat and it's in the draft that I circulated but it didn't make it into this particular - it's a couple of paragraphs further down in the document, so I just stuffed it into the chat.

Remember that to replay the bidding on this one, if we have a thick registry, it's fairly straightforward for a registrar to validate whether the registrant is changing or not because they can go look in the thick registry. But in the case of a thin registry, that's not possible.

And so we had a pretty long discussion about that and basically came to the conclusion that implementing the validation part of all this, which is the highlighted part that's on your screen, has to wait until some mechanism to

do that is in place and then I, you know, recorded various choices as to how that might happen.

So I think that it may be important to sort of draw that note closer to this highlighted stuff or something but, you know, the notes are fairly important - a fairly important addition to this series of steps. And if we don't clump them together we wind up, when you just read that highlighted part by itself, it raises all those issues over again. So that's why I pasted that in there.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey and I tend to agree. I had a few thoughts here, the first one is maybe we can reference that and note the reason, move it to a footnote or an endnote or something like that but I agree, get it closer to this language. The second point I wanted to put out was just though here about thick registry in that you're correct, that they do retain that contact data but they don't retain a history.

So if a registrar goes and checks Whois on a thick registry on a particular domain name, they don't know if that's the contact information change, if that's the original data or that's, you know, only a couple of milliseconds old. I think that's maybe a challenge as well.

So I think that we could go forward with this. I'm concerned that we might be putting a lot onto the laps of the implementation review team which I pity those poor fools but let's be honest, it's probably going to be some of the folks that are on this call right now that are on that team.

So, you know, I think anything we can do to make their job a little bit easier would probably be beneficial. I'm going to drop my hand now and go to Marika and then Mikey.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Yes, the notes will follow this section immediately but it was just, you know, broken down to facilitate the discussions here but an idea would be then to basically number the different notes and then after this point

to say see also notes, you know, whatever the number's going to be so that the link is clear between those two points.

James Bladel: Thank you Marika. Mikey, you're up.

Mikey O'Connor: I like Marika's idea a lot. I think that the key thing, the key concept that needs to get retained in this is this notion that there has to be a mechanism - well, it's at the - that there has to be validation that the registrant is or is not changing. You know, that's the key.

And then, you know, we are going to have to punt a lot of this to the implementation team partly because the clock is ticking on other efforts. I mean, there's the one that Volker described, which is the business with uniform Whois that's going on in the RAA discussions but there's also then the thick Whois PDP which is also just coming out of a drafting team right now.

And so I think that a lot of the details probably have to wait but the key policy point is this notion that the validation has to take place so that the registrar says, oops, you're changing registrant. Wait a minute. We have to do that process too because remember the crux of all this is doing them both at the same time.

And that's what we're trying to prevent. So we may need to work this language a bit to get that squared away and that's why I posted that note in there as there may be some language in there that clarifies that.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey. And I think Marika's idea numbering those and getting those referenced here, is like we can say see Note 1 or whatever, is important. Okay, well, it doesn't look like there were any further changes to that language.

So we have about 15 minutes left in our call. Is everyone okay with that one? We can move on to agenda item Number 5 which is the notes. And this is something that Mikey was referencing early which was, you know, we've got all these little sidebar notes. And I think the first question that I would put out to the group is, is everybody okay with this format of having notes at the end of this discussion?

I guess the tradeoff being that we keep all the notes in one place and we can reference them, but on the other hand, you know, if they're big into the language of the recommendations and the documents a little bit better, maybe it clears up some confusion that folks might have while they're reading the documents so any strong feelings one way or the other? Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry to be so dominant on this call but this is all stuff that I wrote so I can shed some light on this. These notes immediately follow the stuff that we just looked at. It's not like they're at the end of the report. And the reason I broke them out like that was mostly because in the previous document, we were laying out a little process in a series of steps - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

And the notes came out of the conversation that arrived at those steps and it seemed easier to pull them out of the thing because otherwise you have a step and then you have a bunch of notes and then you have another step and it seemed hard to read.

So in terms of formatting, there's no editorial pride there at all. If there's a better way to do this, that preserves it, that's fine. We may find that some of these notes are not needed anymore. You know, this was during the pretty extensive compromise discussion to figure out all this stuff out and it may be that some of these are irrelevant. So anyway, lots of editing room. That's the main message here.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey. I think that the notes are fine. My concern is the readability. So maybe if we just keep them - if we just, you know, ensure that

they are as close to possible as the language that they are affecting, that that's what I was getting and that will be (a concern). Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm hoping that after this call when we have, you know, hopefully less sign off on most of these changes to actually integrate this all into the draft kind of report so people have a complete report to review with all the language and then people can also make recommendations indeed if they feel that there's a need to reorganize some of this stuff.

But as Mikey said, I think in the notes immediately follow at different steps and it's all written in such a way that they're all together, part of the recommendation as, you know, one big chunk, as such. So - and the idea would be as well to take it like that when, you know, we're going to the council or it gets into (war) papers and things, that's all seen as an intrinsic part of the same recommendation.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks for clarifying, Marika. Okay, so with that, let's get through these notes here. The first one here is the note, the change of registrant is defined as being a material change. I think we've got a plural and a singular there - either material changes or a material change - to any of the following - primary contact message.

Hang on one second here folks, because I think that we have another here, right. Okay, so name - I think we need to say registrant name or a - because I don't think we want - we mean technical or admin contact. Is that correct? So it would say registrant name, organization and primary contact method. Should we change the ordering to that? Does anybody have any concerns about that? Okay.

Hopefully that's a simple fix, Marika. So in the case of minor updates or corrections, at the registrar's discretion, may wave this requirement. I don't know if - I think what we can say, you know, we can actually make this a little bit clearer and say something like the regi- the distinction between material

change and what constitutes the material change versus a minor update or correction is left to the discretion of the registrar. I think we can say something like that. Mikey, do you have a question?

Mikey O'Connor: I was just wondering if we could replay the bidding on that particular one because remember if you say any change, that's fairly easy for computers to understand. Oh, his name is different. It's not a string match. So therefore, I know what to do. If you throw - is this the fuzzy logic thing? Because if it is, I'm a little edgy about that.

James Bladel: Well, Mikey, if I could weigh in, I sent a, kind of, an internal process that we use internally where we do tend to be a little bit - what we're trying to get at here is there're certainly a number of reasons why this could change and it wouldn't be a material change - changing James to (Jim) or vice versa, or if someone were to get married or divorced and change their last name or if an organization when from Inc. to LLC.

And we're essentially saying that the registrar can use its judgment in determining what is a material change, what is it? I agree that, you know, we're editing (op ex) up here and that the language may not be screened but I think that it's really important that we leave that somewhat open to the interpretation of the registrar because they're going to know they're market, what is a material change and what is just an update or a correction. Could we go to Marika first and then Mike after that? Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think this is also in response to one of the comments that was made during the workshop where we had where someone said, "Well, what if someone changes their registrant details then realized that they've made a spelling mistake? How can we make sure that there's a mechanism in place that the registrar can make corrections that don't automatically trigger going through the whole process again?"

So I think that was one of the other elements that went into allowing some discretion on distinguishing between material change and minor update on the correction.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Marika. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Just remember to ask the question, well, what's the harm of making somebody go through this process? Basically the only thing that happens to them is that their domain locks up for 60 days. So I'm a little - I'm remembering back to the domain tasting experience where the reason why we had domain tasting is because we put a process in place that gave people a way to fix mistakes for a week.

And, of course, a whole industry evolved out of that. So I'm - it's certainly not a show stopper for me. And I certainly wouldn't blow up consensus on the report over this one, but at the same time, it does seem to me that we are putting a gigantic security loophole into a process that we are trying to use to make things more secure for registrants. And I don't see any great harm arising.

If somebody changes from James to (Jim) or if they change their corporation name or they get married, the terrible thing that happens to them is they can't transfer to a new registrar for 60 days and there's a way for them to waive that if they want.

But to do it the other way, the way we're proposing now, if I can figure out a registrar's fuzzy logic, I can gain the registrar's system and steal domain names. That makes me nervous.

James Bladel: If I can jump in there real quick, another scenario on this, Mikey, would be that someone has decided to change their domain - their registrar. They're fed up with their registrar and they want to transfer. But in the process of requesting the auth info code, they notice that their email address is

(outdated). It's from a previous employer. They don't work there anymore. They can't get that email.

So the first thing that they want to do is change the email address so they can get the auth info code but, wait, now they've lost their domain name. So I think there are other scenarios that we need to make sure the registrars have the ability to, you know, exercising judgment based on the situation and based on what they're able to document as far as the registrant's identity.

Mikey O'Connor: Bob, if you don't mind, I'd like to respond directly to that one. That is exactly the use case that I'm trying to prevent because that's exactly the use case. Oh, my email address has changed. It's now Mikey@pirates.bay and then I've got the domain.

So the worst thing that happens is I'm fed up with my current registrar, I change my email address and then I wait 60 days to leave that registrar, or something. But I hate the idea of leaving giant gaps in what is otherwise a very crisp policy that says if any of these things change, you've got to go through this process and either wait 60 days or you get approval to waive it. End of story.

James Bladel: I'll go to Bob. I think we're getting further apart on this one here. Go ahead Bob.

Bob Mountain: Yes, I'm probably not going to help. I guess the - this is Bob. The, you know, the thing I'm thinking is, and it's something I did myself, was you know, adding middle initial. You know, which is a relatively small change and I just did it just to differentiate myself from my cousin who's got the same name and the same birth date.

So would, you know, are there discreet, you know, examples of a use case where Mikey would not object to, you know, where we could define those sufficiently where they wouldn't be part of the security gap but instead would

be, you know, minor enough where they would kind of flick it below the bar, so to speak?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You know, the trouble with that for me is that then we really are getting into implementing this thing for registrars and saying, well, these are the kinds of changes that are okay and these are the kinds that are not. And I can't imagine that we would be able to come up with all those cases, so I'm pretty stout on this one that - and as I say, it's not a show stopper for me.

But, you know, I will then write the blog post that says, well, we did pretty good but we left a gaping hole for anybody who's concerned about SSR. There's the hole, because all they have to do is figure out how the registrar's doing that fuzzy logic and drive a bus through it.

James Bladel: Can I put myself in the queue here and then I'll go to (Chris). I'm going to weigh in now from the prospective of a registrar that is notorious for, say, being zealous about locking domain names against possible hijacks. Let's just leave it at that.

I also represent a registrar that has had a couple of incidents where, you know, the - number of folks that have decided that because of something we've done publicly or because of objections to some of our commercials or whatever that there's been this hey, everybody, let's transfer our domain names.

And I can tell you that this is sort of a show stopper for me, Mikey. As someone who is very concerned about security - domain name security - and is a registrar that has a team - a 24/7 team to handle these types of issues, the concern here is that we have to have the discretion to be able to make those kinds of judgment calls because when someone is angry at you, angry enough to leave your business and they can't do it, they've triggered a (lock) -

remember we're not all - our customers, the best majority of them are not familiar with these processes, so what they see is GoDaddy won't give me the auth info codes to transfer.

They are holding my name hostage and this is the blog post and the tweets and the Facebook, and this is the message that gets out when, in fact, the counter is hey, we're just following ICANN policy or we think you might be a hijacker, or hey, you know, we're concerned that our systems have misidentified your contact information or whatever, I mean, that stuff is just lost in this, you know, (loud) thing.

And I think, you know, we're all veterans of this industry. We've all probably seen those types of incidents where - so I'm not concerned necessarily - I think Bob maybe has some concerns about name portability from an aftermarket perspective and I think that also deserves some consideration but really my concern here is that if we go around locking every name that falls into this without the ability for the registrar or the registrant to remove it and take it back to (ROT BB), that is a real problem.

And I don't think that's going to go over well either, Mikey. I appreciate the security concern but now we're talking about like the TSA where, because a few bad apples and now everybody's got to take their shoes off and I think it can backfire. We can overshoot when we're aiming for security. So I'll just put my hand down and go to (Chris) and then Mikey. Go ahead (Chris).

(Chris): Yes, hi there. I must admit I do tend to agree with Mikey and (unintelligible) even though actually today I've got a case from, you know, we have done a Web design of a school and hosting with us. And the domain is registered in a (senar) account through one of the registrars and they want to move away from us, which we don't particularly like, but we authorize - we're not the domain to the authorization code on behalf of the client going to the admin contact.

And, of course, the client's come back and said, "Oh, sorry, the admin contact (said) master left the school a little while ago. It's not up to date.:" So we're going to have to organize for the email and the contacts to be changed and, yes, they're shouting at us and saying it's got to be done quickly and it might - they might have to wait 60 days but so be it. So that's just - throw that one in even though I've got a specific case at this time. It's a perfectly bona fide case but we're going to have to change the contact details before the transfer is made. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: It's Mikey.

James Bladel: Thanks (Chris). Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I think that if we continue down this track, basically what we've just undone is the whole change of registrant policy because I can see now way - I mean, I think that James, you're too quick to dismiss the fact that everybody will have to cope with this, not just GoDaddy. Every registrant will have to cope with this.

And eventually it will just get baked in. Oh, I make a minor change or a major change to any of those three fields, it's not GoDaddy's fault. It's just the way these things are done. That's part of what policy's all about. And my concern in the other direction is that we are gutting the policy essentially for PR purposes and that doesn't work for me. So, sorry to drag all this out at the very end of the call, but there you go.

James Bladel: We're over our time. Maybe, Mikey, you and I can take this offline. I can assure you, this is not our thing. This is building language for exceptions when the rule is in the millions and the exceptions are in the dozens and I'm concerned that we're lop siding this based on some high profile sets. Anyway, we need to - we're a few minutes over.

Okay, well, we got to item - we're on item Number 5. We had through item Number 6. We have two calls remaining. We need to start to get some things prepped so that we can get this into, you know, we can make the document cutoff by Toronto and that we allow sufficient time for a read through. Mikey, I still have a queue here. We're already over the time. Can we just - Marika, do you just have something that you need to add?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just a proposal on the how to indeed conduct that review. My suggestion would be that I update the final report based on the agreement that we reached on the different issues that were still open, highlighting this specific part where I hope we all have further discussion on the (unintelligible) or some compromise between those that raised the concerns about the current language and then encourage everyone on those parts that we are hopefully in agreement on, that people provide any kind of substantive issues prior to the next meeting on Tuesday so we can still try to work towards the deadline in having the report before Toronto.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Marika. And that's what we're driving here for folks. So let's adjourn for there and we will pick this up again on the list and through Toronto. It's always harder the closer you get towards the end. I think that's one of the precepts of project management. So thanks everyone and see you next week and see you on the list.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

Woman: Thank you very much (team). You may now stop the recording.

END