

**ICANN Costa Rica Meeting  
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C (IRTPC) Update - TRANSCRIPTION  
Saturday 10th March 2012 at 14:30 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Man: Back when (unintelligible) pulled from one sign in sheet to another. This is (unintelligible) of the (unintelligible) sector and markets but also under other circumstances in areas such as mergers and acquisitions or in situations where for example (unintelligible) decision.

So we wanted to take a look at that including (unintelligible) other areas outside of GTODs (unintelligible) and wanted to look at what this means in terms of (unintelligible) portability versus (unintelligible) security. And ensuring that there's (unintelligible).

The second item is just whether or not the authorizations (unintelligible) for us are required to (unintelligible) process. Should have any sort of an assignment where they're now (unintelligible) policy and that seems to be universally permanent as they are prevalent.

And the (unintelligible) security concerns. Hoping that just once we get that clarified and the answer is more attention to being (unintelligible).

Man: I can't hear it. You have to call me...

Man: And finally...

((Crosstalk))

Man: It involves the Netbook communication between registries and registrars.  
(unintelligible) registrars, registries...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Universally, uniformly...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Just help with the (unintelligible) examples of (unintelligible) all of a sudden their (unintelligible) on record with the market base indefinitely. You know, and then the registrar's name (unintelligible) or perhaps decide to take it somewhere else or decide not to sell it or sell it through a private party -- something like that.

But the FOA is still kind of out there live. So unless we have some need of looking at what those should be expired, does an FOA, you know, outlive a renewal event?

For example these are things that we need to take a closer look at.

Man: But I mean has the cost - has there been an issue that's arisen out of it? Or it's just something we're looking into?

Has anyone complained saying yeah, I know I gave that authorization a year ago but I didn't really mean it for today.

Man: Yeah I'm not sure. And I can get back to you and looking as far as whether there's been some specific complaints.

I know that it was something that was brought up during the group that put all these things together. And I think that there is some difference of interpretation amongst registrars.

So I don't know if that constitutes a problem yet. But that's kind of what we're seeing right now.

I've seen Mikey, you know, laying up here and wants to jump in so.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. The big issue is that with those sort of infinite FOAs there's a pretty significant vulnerability for fraud.

And so one of the problems we're trying to address here is sort of the tradeoff between convenience in a marketplace setting and security for domain holders that have never even heard of a marketplace. But, you know, there's a whole part of the domain renewal life cycle in terms of the FOA that there's pretty big vulnerability there right now.

Man: So but just a question. The reason I'm asking a lot of questions is there's been a lot of IRTPs and there's still a lot more to go - to come.

And so I'm just trying to get - you say it's a vulnerability. Is it one -- it's a perceived vulnerability?

It's one that - or has anyone ever exposed this vulnerability? I mean like I'm just trying to figure out if there's a way that we at some point as a council can put all these IFTPs to rest.

Man: No I mean it's a good point Jess. And Mikey I mean I think the answer is we don't know.

And we - it's not come up. Now if you have a specific anecdote you can share real quickly. But - okay go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connell: Remembering that these questions aren't our questions. These are questions that were chartered at the beginning of the IRTP.

And, you know, I think that what we are facing here is a learning thing that says hmmm, knowing what we know now in terms of how to do a PDP we probably wouldn't do this this way. However this was chartered long ago and so we're not going to spend ages on this particular question.

But it is a significant question. And it came out of a concern from the original IRTP working group that said look this is a vulnerability.

Man: And if I may just add actually the working group created the sub-team that's now going to look at data gathering. And one of the issues they're looking at is indeed like, you know, have you encountered this problem?

And, you know, if so what happened? To indeed get an idea of is this a really big issue?

And if, you know, if the feedback would be this has never happened and has never been an issue the working group might conclude well, maybe there is no need indeed if there is no problem. So they are looking into that and considering that.

Man: Yeah. So no, I mean we are looking at whether or not this is a real or perceived - it's a good point Jeff. I don't mean to cut you off but...

Jeff Neuman: No.

Man: It is something that, you know, and perhaps there's no there there. So moving onto the next one and I hope this will answer your point Jeff...

Stephane van Gelder: Can I just - I see your hand up. Can I just ask that we give James time to finish his presentation and ask questions. Is that okay? Thank you.

Man: Yeah that's good. Thanks Stefan.

And then to your point Jeff that the IRTPs have been stacked up and there's a couple more on deck. We've adopted a very aggressive timeline.

So we want to wrap this thing up in nine months. It was kicked off in - shortly after Dakkar.

And we have a target at Toronto as our final recommendation. And you can see here some of the milestones that we've identified and things that we've already done.

We've got a detailed approach that we've developed to tackle each of the charter questions so we're not just swinging at the air or as working groups are wont to do going back over the same arguments over and over again. So we have established that.

We reached out to not only stakeholder groups and constituencies but also some specific folks within the CTNSO. And as Marik indicated we've created two subteams to tackle specific questions -- one is which is about the FOAs.

And another one is to look at what an ideal change of control process would look like. In Costa Rica we have two events scheduled.

The first is an open working group face to face meeting which will be Wednesday morning. This is our typical one hour weekly meeting with 30 minutes tacked on for open Q&A.

So we're encouraging everyone to please go back to your respective stakeholder groups and constituencies and let them know that this outreach is coming. And if they have specific questions or comments that we would love to hear about them.

Especially if they've been burned by having an indefinite FOA. We definitely want to hear from those folks.

And then right after that we're meeting with I believe -- I wouldn't say the entire CTNSO - is it - it is the CTNSO. Okay. I thought it was specific folks from the CCNSO but I think it's the CC - okay.

So those interested parties within the CCNSO -- some of which as we indicated have a mature change of control process. And we want to learn a little bit more about how that's implemented and what their experiences are with that.

Okay. So now we will go back to questions. And (unintelligible) I think you were patiently waiting there. So go ahead.

Man: Yeah thanks. Actually it's a question or a comment.

I think it would be helpful also to get an understanding and input from our - from the registrars, the stakeholder group on what are the, you know, the practice that they actually do is - for that point that Jeff raised.

Are - how many of the registrars actually keep this forever? Or maybe they expire -- they do put an expiration date on the FOAs.

How do they treat that? And did they encounter cases of people saying hey, I gave that and someone stole my domain a year ago or something.

I don't - we never had such a case. But maybe other did.

So it would be maybe good to just approach our stakeholder group.

Man: Yeah thanks. And that is exactly the nature of the data gathering sub-team that we've established. So there will be a survey probably coming your way in the future.

I would say please respond as well as the other registrars. I should mention that this is a registrar heavy working group.

And, you know, before I see the eyebrows raise I should mention that that's probably not unexpected. Transfers our coordination between registrars who are otherwise not inclined to play nicely with one another.

So it's natural I think that we would have a number of registrars participating in these IRTB working groups. So any other - Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah my question's not for you James it's more for the council I think. Or actually first a question to ICANN staff, to Enrique I guess.

Is there a way you can outline all of the - not just C but D, E or whatever we go up to -- all of the issues that still remain on transfers? And maybe to revisit as you said or as Mikey said I think, maybe this isn't the way we would have structured it had we done this from the beginning.

But we still have a number of transfer issues that remain. And I foresee even though nine months is really aggressive and a great, you know, if you could do that that's extremely aggressive for a working group.

But, you know, figure that okay, Part C takes a full year. Then D, E or whatever we go up to -- you're still talking about years' worth of work being done.

And that's not even accounting for any new issues that may have arisen in transfer - in the transfer world. So is there any way the council can get a - like a list of all the issues?

Maybe reorganize it or maybe figure out, you know, we really - we may not need to do this in D, E and F anymore.

Man: Yeah and (unintelligible) issues already exist and I can send that to the council without any problems. Because that was the list that was developed by an original transfer working group.

And I think the way they actually categorized it so, you know, you're saying it might go faster. But I think the way they categorized it was the easy issues first and the more difficult ones later.

So might mean that D and E are actually more complex issues. But at the same time I've already looked a little bit ahead.

You know, I have some questions as well on - because there's, you know, the trans - that review took place over such a long period of time that it's sometimes really hard to find what the actual issue was. There's this one sentence that's the issue.

But to me it's not clear at all what is meant. So on some of these I've been doing some digging and have been able to find out what was behind it.

But indeed it might be a good idea to revisit that list. And maybe indeed do a little, you know, survey or, you know, especially probably as registrars like, you know, are these issues still valid?

Or I know some issues have been resolved for example as well by using EPP -- have become less of an issue. So I'll send that list and I think it would be a good idea to maybe look at it.



And possibly ask as well if there are new issues that have arisen. Because for example the first one on the list here came from the previous discussions.

It wasn't one of the items that was on the...

Man: Right.

Man: Transfer list. But it was identified as, you know, an obstacle or a thing that should be considered. So I'll do that.

Man: Because how - when did this start again?

Man: This one or the whole thing?

Man: The whole thing.

Man: Well I think it started in 2005 I think already. And I think there were several iterations.

And I think the first of the group to, you know, gather issues, I think and staff it as well, memoed. And there was a group that actually went through, you know, prioritizing those.

And I think then it went to the council. And then they said okay, let's move forward.

I think there was a bit of a lapse at some point in that process because I think one of the chairs dropped out or was at least it took a very long time to actually get to the stage of this is the list.

Man: Right. So we're seven years in and probably another seven years left to go.

Man: No. And, you know, we're not completely oblivious to that. I mean we had done a lot of shifting things around and trying to pad more and front load this process a little bit, Jeff.

So I mean your concerns are shared exactly. I mean we borrow from later working groups and move those into earlier working groups.

And at least on one occasion.

Man: So I think (unintelligible) I apparently have the strongest liaison with this from the council. And I just wanted to sort of say that, you know, and it was a very interesting way that this working group really worked through the walk throughs we had -- the presentations that were there.

I learned a lot about the actual practical mechanism. And, you know, it was very transparent.

And it wasn't just by one or two presentations. It was several people and anybody could basically make that presentation, share their experiences.

So I found it was extremely useful. It brought a lot of issues and a lot of things were identified.

As you said well, you know, we hadn't identified earlier. Maybe we need to work on this.

And I think speaking to the point of it's registrar heavy I have not felt with whatever calls I've been on and seen what's happening that there's been a sort of an imbalance there at all. It's been very balanced.

And also the pace at which we're going is very sort of logical. And I think it's a fairly well paced progress that I've seen.

Just wanted to report that.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible). And we appreciate having you on the calls too by the way.

Anyone else? Any other questions?

Okay. So again if you have interest or if you believe there might be interest within your stakeholder group please alert those folks to the public outreach session that we're having on Wednesday. Thanks.

Man: James thanks for that. We will stay with IRTP for our next session.

But first of all let's, operator, close this session and move straight into the next one please.

END