

**ICANN Prague Meeting
IRTP C Meeting- TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 27th June 2012 at 09:00 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.

Coordinator: The recording has started.

James Bladel: Well good morning, and thank you for attending. And have we already started the recording? And do we have any remote participants? Perhaps we could read off the names of the remote participants, and then we'll go around the room for introductions.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe we have Barbara Knight and Bob Mountain on the conference bridge.

James Bladel: Barbara and Bob welcome. And sorry that you couldn't join us here in Prague. So can we then go around the room? I'll just start. My name is James Bladel, and I am the Co-Chair of the IRTPC PDP working group. I didn't want to get that wrong. Which is as the C would imply, the third in a series of 27 or five IRTP PDP efforts to review and reform the transfer policy, which is an important component of ICANN's competitive marketplace and an important component of the secondary marketplace.

And just an overall key consensus policy that registrars who normally would not want to even be in the same room with one another, under which they are forced to cooperate and coordinate and - their technical systems.

So with that, maybe we can go around the room. Our staff helped, as always, is the amazing and unstoppable Marika Konings who does all of the heavy lifting in this working group and many, many others. We could start with.

Marika Konings: Yes, I'll just give the mic around because you don't have any (standing members). So it's Marika Konings from ICANN staff.

(McKailey Malam): (McKailey Malam), likewise.

Paul Diaz: Paul Diaz, PIR.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor, retired guy.

Simonetta Batteiger: Simonetta Batteiger (Garcido).

Christian Mueller: Christian Mueller from (Straddle) in Berlin.

(Mike Astrohos): (Mike Astrohos) from (Straddle).

(Nick Stanbock): (Nick Stanbock), (unintelligible).

(Gino Girch): (Gino Girch) (Real Time Register).

(Denny Norbrick): (Denny Norbrick).

Man: (Unintelligible)

(Alan Barney): I'm (Alan Barney) (unintelligible) Bureau of Registrations.

(Steve Dovan): (Steve Dovan), ICANN.

Stefan Wagner: Stefan Wagner, Internet (Express IUSA).

Matt Serlin: Hi it's Matt Serlin, MarkMonitor.

(Sara Patalis): (Sara Patalis), (Name Media).

James Bladel: Please come up front. You know, it's a small room and it's great because the air conditioning is running full blast. But it also means I have difficulty hearing.

Kelly Salter: Kelly Salter, (Registered).

James Bladel: I think that's everyone. Thanks.

Marika Konings: And I see that Roy Dykes has joined as well on Adobe Connect.

James Bladel: Okay so just as a matter of format, I think we wanted this to be a workshop. We wanted it to be an interaction. My Co-Chair Avri Doria may be joining us a little bit later. But she's currently in another session.

So what I'd like to do is very quickly go over the slides that were presented both to the registrars yesterday during their meeting with policy staff. And also the GNSO updates over the weekend.

But really get to the heart and soul of this session, which is a discussion of one of the empty spaces that still needs to be filled in with regard to this group's recommendations.

We have a number of placeholders or open questions where we've identified that the community feedback is necessary in order to help the working group complete its recommendations.

So with that, I'll just burn through these slides. If I go too fast, that's the idea. So here's the, you know, here's the welcomes. Here's the background. You having some trouble hearing?

Christian Mueller: Yes.

James Bladel: It's like being on the runway over here.

Christian Mueller: (Unintelligible) maybe.

James Bladel: We'll see what we can do Christian. Yes, we'll see what we can do. So this is, as we mentioned, this is the third of seven, or third of five IRTP efforts.

Myself and Avri Doria are Co-Chairs. We started late last year with a goal of wrapping up by the Toronto meeting, which is IRTP land. That's as fairly aggressive timetable. But we are pushing hard for that deadline. And I think we are going to make that deadline.

We just released our initial report with initial recommendations. And there are many, many gaps that still need to be addressed. And we're looking to this group, as well as those commenting on the public comment forums, to help us, as a working group, help us fill up those gaps.

So this is not interesting. There's the background. Here are the three charter questions that the working group is tasked to address. And very briefly they are change of control or change of registrant function. The second one would be the time limitations or lack thereof regarding FOAs, forms of authorization. And the third one would be the use of proprietary registry IDs versus standardized IANA IDs.

We've taken a number of different approaches to our work. We have I think initially had a very extensive training program for those in the working group that were not familiar with the transfer process.

We did a really interesting compare and contrast of various different registrars, various different transfer functions to figure out exactly how

intuitive the process was. And spoiler alert, it's not - it's very confusing. And it differs significantly between registrars.

We then have conducted a number of surveys to focus in on the specifics of one or more of these charter questions. For example the impact of time limiting FOAs. And what the standard practices amongst registrars would be.

And we gathered all of this information, all of knowledge, all of this accumulated wisdom and use that to prepare our initial report, which was released on June 4. And is currently open for comment.

So here are the recommendations, or more of a findings and recommendations. The first one being that there is no change of control function with ICANN. The transfer policy is often used to affect a change of control, particularly when the change of registrant occurs in conjunction with the change of registrar.

Having a policy here might address various security issues. And provide some certainty in a process that right now is very, very confusing. We looked to the ccTLD space for some guidance here, as a number of ccTLDs have mature processes around change of control.

And we are recommending that the ICANN gTLD world adopt some form of change of control. And that it would have some basic elements such as both sides of the transaction being required to authorize change.

So the - and we struggle with the terminology of course because it's ICANN, but the old registrant. It would be registrant for simplicity sake.

We looked at the use case where a change of control would take place simultaneously or in close conjunction with change of registrar. And the special considerations that would be necessary in those cases.

And we're, you know, trying to do all of this without creating unnecessary burdens or hindrances to innovation, to competition, to the health and vibrancy of the registrar primary market and the domain name after market.

And all of the really great and interesting and commercially exciting things that are happening in this space. So we don't want to interfere with any of that.

But we do now have some open issues, which is that if we have change of control, how do you define that? Is - if I were to change a registration from James to Jim, did I change the registrant? Did I clarify it if I take my middle initial out or if I correct a typo?

I mean it becomes a fuzzy logic problem. Obviously, you know, it's less when the entity is, you know, the same person but calling themselves by a different name. For example if a person were to get married and change their name.

Should the change of control function be its own separate policy? Or is it appropriate to include this in the transfer policy? This is a little abstract. And I don't think it's an exciting topic.

But I think some have raised the concern that this working group is chartered to revise, specifically revise the transfer policy. And here it is now creating something new. And is that okay?

And then we wanted also to take a look at, I think I skipped one here. We also wanted to take a look at the special case where a change of control occurs very closely with the change of registrant.

We're going to skip that. We're going - because the whole section of this meeting will be for questions. But Charter Question B is regarding forms of authorization.

And just as a quick update, an FOA is required by the gaining registrar. You have to obtain authorization from the registrant that the transfer should go through.

What we've learned is that in the policy that those are good once they're obtained, they're good forever. In reality, hi folks - in reality that just simply cannot be the case.

Domain names expire. Domain names change registrants. Domain names are brought and sold or taken away or suspended. Lots of things can happen that would make that authorization no longer valid.

And what we were looking at here is what sort of events, but specifically time. Even if none of those events were to occur, is there just an appropriate length of time to keep an FOA valid?

And what we found in the course of our work is that the (real) or potential impact of this are small. But we had also could not see any significant impacts to putting some reasonable time limits or expiries around this issue.

But we don't know how long. And that's one of the things we're asking. Is this is a 45-day time limit? Is that reasonable? What sort of events expiree or change of registrant would trigger the invalidation of authorization, etcetera? And could they be auto renewed, especially for the time limit?

So here's some of the open issues here. And I was joking with Marika earlier. It's always fun to say does anyone foresee any unforeseen, in fact there's an irony in that question a little bit.

But the last charter question is regarding the use of proprietary registry IDs. And for those who might be unfamiliar with this issue, registries want to, you know, want to keep their data systems as simple as possible.

And that may include both gTLDs and ccTLDs. So a number of registries will have a new registrar assigned - will assign them a registrar ID, you know, 1, 2, 3, A, B, C.

The problem, or the potential problem that exists is that we already have a database of identifiers for registrars. It's the IANA database where all registrars, when they obtain ICANN accreditation are assigned an ICANN IANA identifying number that is unique to them.

What we're seeing with this question here is does it make sense to require registries to use that standardized ID that already exists as opposed to imposing their own proprietary ID naming system.

And, you know, the findings here from the working group were that this is not a problem. But in a very near future with hundreds of potential gTLDs coming on to the scene, this will become an unmanageable issue going forward.

So let's look at ways we can address this now before it becomes a headache. And so the recommendation I think is something along the lines of allowing existing - some carve outs for existing registries to continue to use proprietary IDs. But requiring all future registries and the existing ones to publish the IANA ID alongside of the new proprietary IDs that are used.

So that is where we are. The public comment period is open until the 4th of July. The responses are open until nearly the end of July, the 25th. We will review - the next steps are we are going to review the comments.

We will incorporate them into our work as a working group. We will use them to complete, flush out and finalize our recommendations. And we will present the final report with the finalized recommendations to the community and to the GNSO Council at or before the final meeting in Toronto in October of this year.

So okay, the clock said that took me 17 minutes, which is more time than I wanted to take on that presentation. Sorry. So let's now just kind of, I know we have microphones and everything. But we want to take a queue, sure, let's do that.

But let's just say do we want to organize the feedback or the conversation by the three charter questions? Or do we just want to have a free-flowing discussion about really any and all topics that were raised by this working group? What do you think Christian? I'm putting you on the spot. You make the call.

Christian Mueller: Yes I thought that I'd just say my opinion about the - all the points. And then duck under the table.

James Bladel: Okay. I'm sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes can I just reminder everyone to say their names before making their comments so people that are participating remotely and for the transcript, we know who is speaking.

Christian Mueller: As he just mentioned, my name is Christian.

James Bladel: Christian, what's your last name?

Christian Mueller: My last name is Christian Mueller.

James Bladel: I mean I think it's for the people on the phone.

Christian Mueller: Yes, Christian Mueller from (Straddle). Okay, where are we? First of all it was about time periods right? How long - let's start from the back. How long should the authorization should be valid?

We think that 30 days is actually what we want to have. If it's longer, than make it multiple of months. So don't do 45 days, 27.6 days or 62 days. But do it 30 or 60 days.

Otherwise customers get confused because they are simple minded. Their interest is not domain industry, but other stuff. And so they need an easy way to calculate how long it would be valid. And that's months or - and not fractions of months or something. Our - I would say 30 days.

Furthermore, what was the other question? Help me out with that. So what is an update right? Was that the question?

James Bladel: Oh yes, where's the threshold for change of registrant, yes.

Christian Mueller: Yes and we'd say name or address. But not phone number, email address or something like that. And name or address, many people argue that name changes alone should be sufficient while address, if you are moving, is not a good thing.

On the other hand, my name is Christian Mueller, which is obviously one of the very common German names. I used to live on a street where we had three Christian Mueller's on one street.

So to, you know, separate possible domain owners with street address, even the house number in this case was significant. The important - or the nice thing about that is I got a lot of postcards from different countries.

Hi Christian, we are now in South Africa. The weather's nice. And I'd go what? So name alone is not sufficient. You need the - your home address. But phone numbers, changes, updates should not be, you know, (a change of owner).

What else? Sort of a grace period after changes we say no. So if you change the owner wide limit, that would - why do we - we are not in favor of this kind of period is that people make mistakes. They change owner and mistype the new owner or the address of the new owner.

And then we have no way of correcting that for the next let's say 60 days or so. We see that this is, at least with mass customers, is a more often problem than, you know, misuse of changing the owner (rapidly). Is that customers misspell something, mistype something because they actually type in their names in our (storefront).

And, you know, they quite often do mistakes. And then they call our customer service and say yes, my address is this and that and not this and that. And can we correct that? And in the future we would have to say no for the next two months let's say, we can't do that. And, you know, that might be a problem.

James Bladel: I think, so I think that you may have misinterpreted.

Christian Mueller: Okay.

James Bladel: But this is good because we had not considered this. What we were asking specifically was if you change the registrants, how long before you can change registrars?

But you're saying how fast or how frequent can you change the control of the registrant. And I don't know that we really spend any time on that at all.

Christian Mueller: Okay I thought that was included in that thing.

James Bladel: It should have been.

Christian Mueller: Yes.

James Bladel: Well hang on Mikey. I'll start a queue here. But that's just an interesting...

Christian Mueller: So may I thought unthinkable?

James Bladel: So you want to be in the queue as well (McKailey)? Oh for Mikey, okay. Okay and then what was the third?

Christian Mueller: Let (unintelligible). What is the threshold?

James Bladel: Oh okay, yes that's the fourth actually.

Christian Mueller: And we don't have any opinion about that.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. That was good feedback. I have Mikey in the queue. And is there anyone else that would like to speak after Mikey? Take it away.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. I just wanted to respond to Christian's thing. And you started to do that. The distinction is between the 60 days is the length of time until you can change registrars, just like James said.

And actually the impression that I came away from our conversations with was that you could change the control mode as often as you wanted. You could change it every ten seconds if you want.

But, you know, the goal here is to keep the thing in a registrar so that if there's a conflict, both sides of the conflict are in the same registrar so the registrar can resolve it.

But in terms of number of times, I don't think - I have a terrible problem with as many times as needed.

James Bladel: Yes I think if it stayed within the registrar, there was really no concern about how often it changed. Did we want to give Christian the microphone again please? We have more than...

Christian Mueller: Yes Christian again. Yes, I understand now. I was actually a bit confused about that. Okay. I still think that that might be a problem if you can't change registrar, if you change the owner name. Because what - if people sell a domain, what they do is they change. And then they change.

But we can't force them to do it in a certain way. You know, like first go change the owner. And then - or the other way around, and that would, if people do it wrong, then they are stuck for let's say 60 days.

James Bladel: Yes Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey again. Our thought was that what we're trying to encourage is a sequence. First, change registrar because changing registrar is really the source of the security problem because it's that hopping across registrars that allows somebody to essentially escape the trail. So in any of these processes, first change registrar then change control so that the subsequent changes of control can be unwound by a registrar.

And then in terms of, I mean basically there are two classes of, well or many classes. But there are two big classes of registrant. There's the typical registrant for whom they have a very small number of names. They hardly ever change. It's their business, blah, blah, blah.

And then there is the domain investor types who have a lot - we need a lot of convenience. They need to be able to move their, you know, their nicknames around a lot.

And so one of the concepts that we're introducing is that the default position would be to take care of the very large number of sort of small registrants.

And so the default would be pretty secure, pretty slow, pretty cumbersome, pretty protective.

However, the idea that we're trying to introduce is that for the registrant who wants to be able to have their names really portable, they can waive that requirement.

They can say to their registrar no, I would like these names to be more portable. And we have to sort out how that happens yet. So that very restrictive process doesn't necessarily have to apply to a registrant who wants to move a lot of names around really quickly.

They want to be able to change registrars, blah, blah, blah. That's the key concept that we haven't completely flushed out yet.

James Bladel: Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: From (fatal) point of view, I tend to agree with Christian that we have both kinds of people trading in our marketplace. And actually a lot of people trading in our marketplace, especially buying in our marketplace that are first time buyers who would be hit with a more cumbersome process here as well.

And I know that the sellers have the right to waive things. But I would still think that whatever your talking about right now Mikey is going to make it more complicated than the status quo because currently there is no such thing as a lock mandatory after you change the name of the registrant on a registration.

And I just hope that whatever we're doing here will take into account what this does to the user. Because we all went through this exercise to see how complicated and confusing the process currently is.

So we - I think we owe it to people that whatever we come up with is easy to use. And a model that requires to work only one way around. So that you change the registrar first, and then you can make an update to the registrant. And it cannot be done the other way around is more limited than what you can currently do.

James Bladel: So before I go to Mikey, I wanted to kind of pick on some of the voices that are in the room because we have some very I think powerful and compelling voices on our calls every Tuesday.

But this is a unique opportunity to get some fresh, you know, I think Christian, you know, put some - shed some new light on some of these issues. And I think that's exactly the kind of thing we're going for.

So I could do something really crazy and ask for people to close their laptops because I always feel like we get a lot more engagement when that happens. So, you know, you go to these ICANN meetings and people are nervous about speaking, but yet everybody is not looking at them.

So any other thoughts, and we'll circle back Mikey. I mean but I think yes, I'm sorry, I met you yesterday in the (nominet) breakfast and I did not catch your name. So could you please, we can get a microphone back to this gentleman. And state your name and affiliation for the folks on the telephone.

(Alan Barney): Hello, yes it's (Alan Barney) from Registrar and (Pure Registrations). My comment about the introduction of the policy saying of the change of registrant or control and the change of registrar is that I think the aftermarket will tend to move rather from registrar to registrar transfer into registrar reseller transfer.

I think we're already seeing that with some of our registrants moving domains now and holding them with a large registrar. Because they feel that if they

need to move them to a new registrant, it's easier to do that. And avoid the registrant transfer process completely.

And I fear that if you put this lock on, what it might do is encourage certain (unintelligible) move domains to keep them with a single registrar. And just move them between reseller level under the same registrar.

And it's always been, from our point of view, a bit of an issue as to how resellers operate in the larger market base. I think a lot of the end users see resellers at the same level as registrars. And it's not always clear.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. Yes, and I don't know that we've spent a lot of time discussing the role of resellers in this equation. And their role in a potential change of registrant function. So I think we've used that somewhat synonymously with the idea that whatever the registrar is doing, those will - those obligations will flow down to the reseller.

So any other thoughts here or I'm going to go back to Mikey. And he's got lots of them. He's struggling. Oh yes, (Michael).

(Michael): Yes thank you. It's (Michael) from (Straddle). Two points, the 60-day lock for transfers before - after, after updates or after only change. (Goldalee) tried something like that for a while. And it's (Mr. Christiansen).

There were some clients complaining because they didn't understand the rational behind it. There is a rational. And the rational makes sense. But still it was confusing for some clients.

And I think if we introduce this as a general mechanism, it would be confusing for our registrants for sure because they don't understand what they're doing. They just, you know, they got a domain. And anything beyond that is beyond their grasp. So I'd be very careful introducing this kind of.

Regarding the question introducing some kind of regulation on owner change, because right now it's just an update. You know, updates, we change the name. There's no regulation. You're it's just going the other way because until recently with (URED) in order to change the owner there was a strange mechanism where the owner had to confirm per mail that he, you know, that he approves of it. And now they're turning it off. And starting November it will be just a normal update because they have many problems with this kind of mechanism.

So we've made the experience that the current mechanism for GTLDs where there is no mechanism and owner changing and update works for us and for our registrants.

And the ccTLDs where there were any, you know, burdens on change in the owner are moving away from it because our clients or their registrants don't understand it, may - don't arrive whatever and they want to get away from it.

So we would say okay it can be regulated. There can be - should be a policy on that but it shouldn't require additional burdens on changing owners.

Man: So that's an excellent point. And I think that when we get into this very early on we recognized that any function that would be created around this space would have to be very lightweight.

And I think that was definitely the message heard loud and clear from the ccNSO in Costa Rica.

And in fact some - and I forget which one but more than one ccTLD mentioned that they had some troubles in this area or in their experience and that they were able to make this a more lightweight process. And that was very well received with registrars and registrant's.

And that - so I think the message from the ccNSO was done to what we did, okay? Here's what we did later that worked. And so I think that that message is also what yes, that's your message as well.

And if I could just respond quickly to the Go Daddy point, one of our contentions, our long contentions has been that when you go into our control panel and you change from (James) to (Jim) or from, you know, making a spelling or telephone number that's just a routine Whois update.

But if you change from (James) to (Michael) you have in effect reassigned the registration agreement that was signed between Go Daddy and the registrant.

And so that's a little more of a complicated, you know, situation. And I think we've had some, you know, we've had some issues and you are correct to point out that we've recently relaxed our positions on those.

But I think that what we were trying to communicate to the community was that those fields in the Whois were special, that changing those fields was a reassignment of a contract and we were trying to communicate that message with some degree of success, not always.

So yes go ahead.

(Alex): Yes I'm (Alex) (unintelligible). I totally agree with what (Michael) said. And I would like to add that in our client base we see that the more restrictions you have on processes like registrant changes the fewer the uptake of a ccTLD is.

So of course nobody could afford not to include.com when we introduce that. But if we see the long tail of small registries that are to come that might have a few registrations that have those kinds of processes they would definitely be an impediment for their success.

So we should also keep that in mind. The more complicated we do that the few people will take up that registry in their portfolio.

Man: Excellent. I have (Simonetta) and then (Christian).

(Simonetta): One of the things that we heard feedback was that there was a concern that some people said well if you can just update the registrant to someone else and then basically assign a name to someone who has no idea that they know the official order of something offensive should there at least be some kind of a notification requirement? Does there need to be an acceptance of this assignment of some sort?

Other thoughts in the room about this issue is this a non-issue, is this an exotic level thing that never happens, was it something that you have experience with, what do you have concerns around, just making it a notification to the previous and the new owner versus would you want to go that far to say the new owner has to actually accept this in some way shape or form or is this exactly the type of complication that you don't want?

Man: Yes thank you. That's an important point. And I think that we have at least one individual in the working group that has pointed out that this has happened to where, you know, if I have a name that is very offensive or perhaps infringes on a trademark I can assign it to someone else and make them and (Michele) I think I didn't want to name you but since you raised your hand.

(Michele) has pointed out that some folks have done this and he's - his company response to requests from individuals and he is not aware that names have been put in his name.

So I have (Christian) and then Mikey and then no Mikey? Okay no Mikey and then (Rob) and okay (Christian) please.

(Christian): I want to come back what you said about the former Go Daddy process. And I remembered that we recently got sued from two Chinese brothers who had almost the same name. So the last name was the same and the first name was different by two letters only.

So, you know, twin brothers. And they actually had a domain together and then they sort of, you know, got angry, mad about each other. And then they were fighting about a domain.

And we thought okay this must be the same guy. Somehow it's only misspelled it's an update or something, you know?

And suddenly we transferred the domain from one owner to the other and later on we got sued.

So what I want to say is there is no way to some sort of automatically or semi automatically distinguish between smaller misspells and owner changes.

So when you said if you change that from (Jim) to (James) then it's only an update you can do that. If you change it from (Jim) to (Mike) it's an owner change. That might work in the, you know, where you know the names and maybe even know the persons but it won't work.

So it - I only wanted to say don't think about things like this like think minor changes or updates.

So if anything changes it's a change. And that sheds a light on if you burden that, if you want to cover real owner change by a burden you always also cover minor updates by the same burden. So that's what I want to say.

Man: No that's an excellent point. And we've been speaking in terms of individuals here but as - and I'm going to pick on Matt here a little bit.

As our colleague Matt Serlin represents a corporate registrar is and has pointed out a number of scenarios for DBAs or acquisitions or mergers where name changes could be legal entities changing names as opposed to going from (Jim) to (James) or something like that.

When is that, you know, if a corporation moves from, hypothetically moves from Arizona to Delaware, you know, what does that - does that constitute a change of an entity even if the name is the same? And how do you go about updating if you go from Inc. to LLC?

So, you know, those are excellent points. And I think I just wanted to add in since Matt is very shy I just wanted to add that was an interesting consideration that he brought to the working group that I think was - we were missing initially.

So the next one I have (Rob). And before I go to (Rob) who's in the queue behind (Rob)? (Nick) okay so (Rob) go ahead.

(Rob): We've seen this from both sides in the last couple of weeks. I got rid of a few domains that I no longer wanted through (CEDO). It largely just worked.

I stuck them up there, somebody bid on them. The next thing that happened was it was changed between one registrar and another.

And then once they got their registrar they were told to change the details on it. So there was a definite change of registrar and then there was a separate change of the Whois details, what we're calling the change of control.

And that appears to be when I bought domains that appears to be the very defined steps that happened in aftermarket, yet the domain and then you change the details on the domain.

The other thing is we were and happy to be involved in acquisitions of some other smaller hosts and registrars.

And we've had exactly this issue. We've had to go through and get all sorts of things changed. We've had to update company's house, we've had to update telephone number records. We've had to get in touch with the electricity suppliers.

In a lot of these cases we're required to send, you know, proof that we've purchased it, letters on heavy paper -- all these things.

So it's not unusual if you need to change who the owner of something is to go through a formal process and to have this documented.

It's not onerous. So I completely support the if certain fields changes, the name changes or the company name changes who the registrar has as their potential customer or what the registrars (unintelligible) have and the customer has changed and therefore needs to agree to a different set of terms and conditions that apply now and update their details.

Man: Thank you (Rob), excellent points. Next in the queue I have (Nick), and (Volker) and then Matt and I'm sorry (Alan).

(Nick): So I just had two points, the first one going back to the hopping between registrars. It seems that the only thing you need to transfer between a registrar would be the access to email address on file and the authorization code.

So if you were able to change or access the account it seems like you would - they'll be able to hop registrars pretty easily without changing contacts.

Even if the name and the address changed as long as you could control the email address and you had the off code you could continue to hop registrars it seems like.

So a lot of our cases we'll see the account compromised in cases like this and then the domain will transfer.

And the second one was the opt out for the people who are interested domains. That one wasn't on a presentation so I was just wondering if that was an official thing of the working group or just something that was kind of discussed before...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think it was discussed well we've got a queue but maybe for a quick response Mikey or (Simonetta) can you address that? I think Mikey you raised it so if you could respond?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey again. Right towards the end of this we basically have a clash in the working group between two fundamental...

Man: Clash is a strong word.

Mikey O'Connor: I think it's a clash. Feels like a clash. Anyway I we have...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You know, as a fashion guy I can't comment on it given my stylish dressing.

We have lively discussions between two points of view. And the past two compromise/consensus that's emerging which isn't done yet is this notion that maybe we can figure out a default state for the vast majority of slow-moving

registrant and a non-default state for registrant' who either do high volume or do high frequency, you know, essentially trading.

We are a long, long way from actually figuring that out. And one of the fundamental difficulties is if you captured an account by compromising its credentials then you can flip that protection switch off then we don't have - then we haven't really accomplished anything.

So that's part of the reason why this is such an important meeting to hear what you all have to say because we haven't figured this one out yet.

But I will tell you that, you know, I think I may be the only registrant represented in the room. And I'm very uncomfortable with the idea of just only paying attention to ease of use.

I understand that ease of use is important. I understand that the margins are thin sometimes and that anything that gets in the way of uptake is a problem.

But the same time for most registrant's security is much more important for them than uptake and ease of use.

So I hear but I'm not necessarily persuaded that ease of use is the primary driver here. And so what we're trying to do is figure out a way to get the best of both worlds.

Man: Okay next I have - oh was at the end of your comment (Nick)? It seemed like you had a two-part comment but...

(Nick): Yes I just wanted to get back to so in the event that the account is compromised and we're going to name the address constitutes the change of control so you would have the ability to change the email address and in some accounts depending on your business model, the authorization code would be there.

So I'm just confused as to how that would prevent any form of registrar hopping? It seems like you could still do it.

Man: Well I don't know that we would be able to prevent. I don't know that we're looking at prevention to be honest and I'll just kind of respond.

What we're looking for is when something goes wrong how do you work it backwards?

And the answer is that if it's changed registrars and the - as part of that then it becomes very, very difficult you've got this gap where the credentials change and the registrar changed and it just - it becomes this stopping point.

You know, it's like trying to trace a family tree through, you know, through some sort of a gap, you know, or missing ancestor. You know, you just don't know what happened prior to something there.

So I don't know that it's preventing anything necessarily. It is just trying to enforce some sort of an unbroken chain of on documentation without any gaps.

But certainly these are things that would encourage you to please write those up. Because another thought that just occurred to me while you were speaking was if you're going to steal a domain name why mess around with the registrant? You can do all the transfers from the admin contact.

Nobody's watching that one, go steal that. So there's another loophole you could drive a battleship through.

Okay so the next one we have in the queue are (Volker), Matt, (Alan), (Simonetta), and (Christian).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I - so remove okay so then let's start with (Volker).

It's funny I'm switching Germans here so give me a moment to go through the German on my left.

(Volker): One thing that we also should bear in mind and I'm not sure if missed it because I came late but there should be an exception process for certain circumstances.

For example the standard process of transferring a domain name after a UDRP is changing the owner name and then I think it transferred out.

It would be counterintuitive to leave the owner of the data as it is and then let the winner of the UDRP transfer because in most cases the old owner doesn't want the domain transfer even if he loses the UDRP.

Man: Well this is an excellent point. We did only briefly touch on the concept that a UDRP references the transfer policy as one of their remedies of a UDRP that has been won or lost.

So whatever we do here is going to have ramifications into that and I think that's something we need to think about as well.

Next up is Mr. Serlin. Good morning sunshine.

Matt Serlin: Yes good morning. So a couple things, first any time you accuse me of being quiet it's just forcing me to speak up.

I would like to just give a shout out to (James) for doing a really great job in getting so many people here today.

You know, I think when we were in Costa Rica it was literally a handful of folks just on the working group and no one beside that.

And so I think this, just seeing this packed room on the one hand is great. On the other hand is going to, you know, give us a lot more to think about I think.

Man: Well and (Simonetta) put it in the (CEDO) newsletter as well...

Matt Serlin: Yes okay great.

Man: ...so I can't take full credit for that.

Matt Serlin: You know, as I'm listening to a lot of the comments I think really? I think the thing I want to caution us about is, you know, just to kind of echo what Mikey said.

I agree with him that we need to sort of balance this notion of security and ease of use.

And I would just caution us not to get too far down into rabbit holes that we can't pull ourselves out of.

You know, and we all have different perspectives and I think those are good. But what we're trying to do and what our goal should be is to create a recommendations that will work across the board and don't, you know, specifically target, you know, any one business model or one, you know, and so and I think (James) has been doing a really good job of trying to balance all these different perspectives.

I think it's good that we get them all because anything - any policy that we recommend I think should be done with those considerations at least with the understanding of what it would do across the board.

And so that's just kind of my comment for us, but I think it's great to see this level of participation.

And Mikey we're all registrant's. I mean we all have domain names registered. So I mean I see your point but and I think you're exactly right this balance of, you know, security and ease of use.

You know, when we talk about a change to, you know, hundreds of thousands of, you know, I don't know how many - it would be interesting to know, you know, how many transfer transactions are there in a year in the GTLD namespace? We're talking millions right?

So anything we do is going to have a profound impact not just on registrars but on the registrant as well. I'll shut up now. Thanks.

Man: Well thanks Matt. That's those are good points. And I - and count me in the camp as well as someone who wants to balance, you know. And I know that I mean we're not - we understand that the aftermarket, the secondary market is important. It's very, you know, it's very innovative. It's very exciting commercially.

And I know I don't think anybody wants to unnecessarily burden that - the individuals in that market or the transactions that go on there.

I think the hope at least me maybe naively would be that if we do this right that this process will enhance the aftermarket because it will improve the overall integrity of the entire industry and, you know, and kind of raise up the standards all across the board.

Now maybe that's - I already have you in the queue (Simonetta) did you want to respond to that specifically because I have (Alan) next?

(Simonetta): No it's (okay).

Man: Okay but you're after (Alan). So I have (Alan), (Simonetta), (Michael) and then you know what? Just for fun I'm going to put a placeholder in here because this change of control is so exciting. It gets everybody going.

What we'll do is then just in the interest of time we'll go and we'll talk about some of the other issues because there were, you know, some other issues as well. And then if we have time later we'll circle back.

But unfortunately what we found in this working group is if you start off with issue A that you don't ever get to issue B or C because it's just too much fun.

So (Alan) next and then (Volker) I'll put you at the end there.

(Alan Barney): Okay. First point I'd like to make is many years ago I have seen the case that (Michele) referred of a name being transferred into a different owner's name without their knowledge and then that one going to UDRP.

So these things do happen. And really it comes down to the registrar to be monitoring these things.

But what I really want to ask is just to go back to what (Rob) said about this is a - just a process for - or we should change in the aftermarket.

But you say you bought a domain, okay or you say - that's got to be - all right. You sold a domain okay. Okay let's take the (sold). You sold a domain okay?

Right, so the domain is still yours but you've agreed to transfer it to somebody else, all right?

It's transferred from registrar A to registrar B which I believe is the standard (CEDO) way of doing it, okay?

So you've entered then into a contract with registrar B. Okay did you have a login? You know, did you have operation of control at while you're domain was with registrar B?

Although, you know, what the process is it goes to registrar B yes, but it's on the new owner's account, right?

Man: For...

(Alan Barney): For a fresh (and a) second for that new owner logs in and changes the address or updates it. It could be any of the fields, all right?

Okay but for that...

((Crosstalk))

(Alan Barney): ...I'm just a little concerned what's happening contractually here across that transfer because the purpose of this is to transfer the domain from one person to another.

But in practice its control from one person to another, yes? So when it flips registrars it's still in your name as the owner but it's under full operation of control of the new party.

Man: Yes.

(Alan Barney): Yes and it's their job then to update the fields and reflect the change of ownership.

Man: Yes.

(Alan Barney): Yes. But of course while it's there it's your name, you haven't got control of it with that registrar even though presumably you should have a contract with that registrar.

And I just find that part of the aftermarket a little bit weak shall we say in terms of procedures.

Man: Yes I mean I - there were more than one domain. Several of them were with the registrar that the new registrar wanted to use so they were just pushed from one account to another.

And a couple of them were with somewhat esoteric registrars. And they required to be actually moved.

To - for the move of those I believe I did actually have or end up with an account in my name at the new registrar because it was effectively still at that point my domain.

For the ones where I could just push them over that was trivial. It's move them to their account. They can update the details.

At the registrar level we accept updates from people. We accept them going in going in and changing the names because they have administrative control for getting admin context.

But the.uk there was a much more formal process. I had to tell nominate. They have to go to nominate. They have to put in new their details. They had to put in a new tag. They drove the process after effectively I said it could happen.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay I think the key thing that needs clarified here is that status when the domain is with a registrar okay, the Whois or the record of record indicates it belongs to one party but control belongs to another. And that in the aftermarket is the point when the sale or transfer takes place, yes?

Well I'm not sure who has control and to where it's going to. Is it done on good faith? Is it done unto the registrar's terms and conditions or what?

And I think that is a cause of concern for us as a registrar if we see that going on within our registrar for example, you know?

It is concerning because domain but, you know, it's showing it's belonging to person A. It's under the control of person B and it can be transferred to person C forward in the Whois...

Man: You have that now because you have...

Man: Absolutely. And the purpose of this review is to change this, okay? And I wonder, you know, if everybody is fully aware of what's going on there because I'm struggling to understand it in many cases.

Man: Okay thanks. Next up is (Simonetta).

(Simonetta): So to add to this it can work the other way around just as well. And a lot of transactions actually happen exactly the other way around.

You update the owner first and then you make the transfer because currently with the current transfer policy whoever is at the gaining registrar needs to confirm the FOA.

And that happens with the Whois details that are currently in the Whois record so if you do it the other way around you change the registrant first and then you move the name.

That is another way to do a transfer and that's done one way or the other way and not just one way all the time. We do both, whichever way seems to be operationally easier to get the task done. And yes it's gray and it's not defined and this is exactly why we need something.

So I'm also a little concerned when I hear the story of oh it's simple, we'll make the process to always require registrar change first and then registrant change because exactly of what you were just saying that moment in time while the old owner is still the registrant.

However with the registrar that they don't even want to do business with what is that state? It's kind of gray.

And I'd love to find a solution for this. But really when someone is trading a name and they want to move the name to a new registrar both at the same time the policy needs to somehow do this justice.

And it current - even the current draft that we have on the table isn't quite there yet. So we'd love to have input of how this could be achieved and what your thoughts are.

And whatever this outcome is I'd love to see something that doesn't conflict with how names are currently moved.

And again this is not just for the professional domain or the majority of the trades happening in our marketplace are actually trades that go to end users.

And what DLS has been built (name) media or what we have been built or what (fabulous) has been built for the fast transfer network where domain

names are moving from seller to the new owner directly by someone going to the new registrar searching on that Web site and the whole process starts from there with no one at (CEDO) is even still involved in this.

There is - it's all happening in this gray zone of how we're trying to like tweak the policy and make it work as good as we can with the existing transfer policy.

But the existing transfer policy doesn't have this concept of there is a change of owner at the same time with a change of registrar.

And I hope that we can find a way to make this work because that's really what end users who are looking for one of those names are - that's what they need.

And it's not that the sellers wants to enter contractual relationships with registrars where their buyer happens to be and it's not that these buyers want to have any kind of hurdles in getting their names moved. We want to just pay and have the names.

Man: Can I just ask if (CEDO) or any other of the large aftermarket, but (have any) statistics as to which way round is more common, you know, registrant transfer and then trade or trade then registrant transfer?

(Simonetta): I don't have a statistic. But I definitely know we do with both.

Man: But you're feeling and that's 60/40, 50/50, 10/90?

(Simonetta): You know what I'd have to ask the transfer team. I know that the automatic transfer process changes the registrant first and then moves the name.

Man: I think...

(Simonetta): I - but I also know that from the example that you just gave and whenever a manual trade happens the transfer team does all kinds of stuff.

Sometimes they do pushes if it's within the same registrant. Sometimes they move the name into a (CEDO) holding account along the way.

Sometimes they have a customer who is a repeat buyer who gives them access to everything and they do everything on behalf of the customer. There's all kinds of ways to get this achieved. So there's no one thing that is currently done.

Man: Yes exactly right. I mean to understand the impact of this new policy on the aftermarket I mean we need to know more about the aftermarket.

The aftermarket is coming saying well this is, you know, this could be really bad for our business. It could prevent instant trades and domains moving.

But it might be insignificant if it's all happening the other way around.

So I think, you know, it would be nice to hear more from people who are actually are doing it or have - or seeing the mass volume of domain - domainers trading domains and presenting whether not this is an issue.

I mean I get a feeling from what's being said and what I've read that it is felt that some sort of lock for 60 days or whatever is going to impact the aftermarket, is that right?

(Simonetta): Yes it would definitely impact the aftermarket. And from my point of view I...

Man: But by what 10% of the aftermarket or 80%? Well if you're going to present - prevent the registrar transfer after registrant transfer how many of your transactions go through that - using that mechanism?

(Simonetta): A significant chunk.

Man: We have in the queue now (Michael), (Volker) but I wanted to check and see do we have any - sorry. I wanted to check and see if we have any hands raised in the Adobe Room? No.

Okay it's the bridge all right. There's no audio Room. That's been happening a lot this meeting actually so (unintelligible) get that.

So next up is (Michael), can we pass that microphone up forward to the first row?

Thank you.

Do you go by (Mike) or (Michael) I've been calling you (Michael).

It's a comment name.

I don't want to trigger any sort of a lock by calling you Mike yes right instead of (Michael).

(Michael): (Unintelligible) domains are safe.

I just wanted to add a kind of perspective on this, you know, security versus ease of use discussion, you know.

I consider ourselves on a regulation level ease of use, you know, advocates because we don't want to be regulated regarding the processes because we our tech people deal with lots of ccTLDs and then the GTLDs and everyone has a different process.

And each such burden is a burden for us because, you know, we have to go around those registry policies.

And it's - we are, you know, we're just the end users so we don't care domainers, we don't care about secondary markets.

And still we want to know everything to be as easy as possible because it means for us always a tech burden.

On an operational level for us we are very security conscious and we actually every registrar change that is done by us is validated manually on paper.

We don't have a control panel where the owner can change the owner details. Everything is done by paper.

So if you want to be, you know, if you want to secure your domains there's always ways to do that and they are ICANN compliant. There is no problem about that.

But to introduce technical mechanisms that we need to implement for all GTLDs additional to what we do with (ethnic), and nominate, and VNIC, and ethnic and all of them we'd rather avoid that.

So if you leave, you know, the regulatory - the regulation thing open and let us take care of the security and all registrars to do that in their own way they can be more caution.

They could have, you know, put the Go Daddy 60 days log, they can have other mechanisms confirmed with per mail but let them do it themselves and - or give them some options on how to do it.

But we'd rather, you know, avoid restrictions that will just complicate the technical (costs) because we are already dealing with lots of technical requirements from other ccTLDs and it's a headache.

Man: Agreed. And then by the way we'll say it's unfair to bring ethnic into a change of registrants conversation right now because I know that you mean .ES.

(Michael): Yes, yes, yes.

Man: And so...

(Michael): Right.

Man: ...red ES yes, so just because it's very, very complex and I know that...

(Michael): Yes.

Man: ...we've been having a number of issues with that so...

(Michael): But that's, you know, that's part of the pain.

Man: Yes.

I'm trying to make a joke that that is I mean you could show up at their office with your passport and your grandma...

(Michael): Yes.

Man: ...vouching for your identity and they still wouldn't change...

(Michael): Yes.

Man: ...the registrant.

(Michael): Maybe I'm too sensitive a joke for you but would it's- you know, the ethnic thing is really...

Man: Yes, no I making light of a very painful...

(Michael): Yes.

Man: ...painful situation.

(Michael): Thank you, thank you.

Man: So next is (Volker) and then we would try to move onto some of the other...

(Volker): Yes my comments...

Man: Okay very good.

(Volker): ...my comment would be along the same lines as (Michael)'s. I was listening to the conversation especially about the different transfer processes in place today.

And I was thinking that we may be doing ourselves and our customers a disservice by implementing one strict procedure that has to be followed.

Why not make mandatory for registrars to offer one or more optional ways of locking a domain name against transfers after element changes like Go Daddy has been doing it and other registers are doing it by introducing manual processes or different ways of protecting their customers in a way that the registrar must give their registrant an option to lock a domain name but the registrant if he does not choose to go for the - that option the domain can be transferred quickly.

So essentially something to that is very easily -- that can be very easily be opted into by the registrant's but very difficult, the opt out process or the removing it would be very difficult at the end, might achieve the same goals

that we are trying to achieve here and give more freedom to registrars and registrants to move their domains if they want to.

Man: Thank you (Volker). And to summarize from between (Michael) and (Volker) what I'm hearing is if you look at for example the existing transfer policy gives registrars the option of refusing a transfer if - in certain situations.

It does not require them to do so. And I think what I'm hearing is that, you know, it's options for registrars. They don't have to engage in certain scenarios but it is available to them.

And if they choose to add additional security for their customers then they are not going to come and ICANN's not going to come and smack them on the wrist for violating the policy.

Okay so right now we have Marika in the queue. And I believe it is because someone has raised their hand online?

Marika Konings: No actually I have a comment myself if I may?

Man: Marika please join the conversation.

Marika Konings: All right.

Man: And then we're going to try to move onto Charter Question...

Marika Konings: Right.

Man: ...B and C.

Marika Konings: But in relation to the discussion on 60 day lock and the flexibility I'm wondering as well if the working group will need to consider the recently adopted recommendation that it hasn't been implemented yet but this

provision that will enter to the IRTP on locking and unlocking of domain names which basically requires the unlocking of a domain name if a request is received within five days.

So I don't know if that's a, you know, kind of compromise raising the standard, you know, 60 day lock is applied. But at the same time there is a requirement if a specific request is received that it needs to be unlocked so that might be something to discuss how those two link together.

Man: That's an excellent point. And from the perspective of the registrar who does have a locking practice that new - that requirement to remove that lock what we're finding is that hijackers are not likely to call customer service and present themselves for identification to have that lock removed. So it is in effect a nice security mechanism that can also easily be opted out of.

And so what I'd like to do now and again is it - okay go ahead (Volker). The last word is coming from (Volker).

(Volker): Just a comment to what you just said that we just recently had a hijacking case where somebody compromised an account, compromised an email address but the old owner also had access to the email address.

And we tried to figure out who was the legitimate owner. And we got three different copies, three different passports with the same name. And they all contacted us threatened with lawsuits.

We were unable to figure out who is the owner of that domain name because it turns out that the initial registration was also done under a false name.

So in the end we just locked the account down and the domain name remains un-transferred.

Just as a contrary position to which you just said...

Man: Yes.

(Volker): ...there can be cases when they contact you directly. And they're very, very how do you say it sometimes they're...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Volker): ...they are very shameless.

Man: Oh yes, yes. So the bad guys I think we understand are very, very they're smart, they move quickly. They are bold, shameless. They have no fear.

And that's why I think the options for registrars to I think going back your point (Michael) to innovate in and around security and be flexible to the changing security environment is important.

So really great exchange here and these are the kind of things that I think exactly what the working group is looking for out of this session.

However we have other issues besides change of control. It's just that when we start talking about the change of control issue it sort of becomes the, you know, it dominates the conversation.

So the next issue I wanted to just put on to the table for discussion is this concept of a time limited or event limited authorization.

And once again when you transfer a domain name I as a registrar, Marika wants to transfer her domain name and why would she? But if she wanted to transfer her domain name I have to get her authorization.

And what we're saying here is that there is no formal expiration for that. I think we've seen a number of business practices rise where authorizations

are being - a change but then the transfer is not happening immediately due to maybe it's being listed in a - on a catalog of domain names for sale or, you know, something like that.

So it is something that is being obtained but not yet executed. So what is an appropriate time frame for that?

And, you know, I think (Christian) weighed in on this fairly early that he said , you know, it should be a multiple of months that 60 day time period keeps coming up every time you look at ICANN policy.

So I think we attach that number to it, not saying it's the right number or the wrong number just that it's a conveniently consistent number.

The - this then prompted a discussion of how, you know, a person might want to unburden themselves of constantly renewing their authorization if they chose to. Could they auto renew their authorization? I think the answer is that we're definitely interested in that.

However that certainly wouldn't apply to the event driven expirations of authorization. So if a domain name expires obviously the FOA is no longer valid.

If a domain name were to transfer change registrants from Registrant A to Registrant B than Registrant A has no persistent authorization to transfer that name anymore. It becomes the disposable responsibility of the new registrant.

So all of these things I think come into discussion. And we're putting this out to the group does anyone have any feelings not only on the problem or the potential for problems but also the, you know, the proposals that we put up on the, you know, on this recommendation or, you know, tell us something new we haven't considered. what have we forgotten?

So I'll start a queue with (Nick). Did you have your hand up (Volker)? No. So I'll start a queue with (Nick) and will see where the conversation takes us on this topic? (Michele) after that. Go ahead way down at the end here.

(Nick): Just as far as the expired I may be way off base on this but it was my understanding that GTLDs that have recently expired are still eligible for transfer.

So like within a certain timeframe immediately after expiration they would be eligible for transfer at this point. So would this seek to change that or is that a...

Man: No. No this is just would you if you retained an authorization...

(Nick): Right.

Man: ...and then the domain name expired would you have to reauthorize that transfer...

(Nick): Okay.

Man: ...to get it? And I think that they transfer process does require you to renew or reactivate that, you know, you can you can transfer in the auto renew grace period...

(Nick): Sure.

Man: Right. But this is a separate issue...

(Nick): All right.

Man: ...which is that the authorization that the registrar, the transfer registrar obtained prior to the expiration is it still good?

(Nick): Okay.

Man: And I think the answer is you want to be careful because there are a number of aftermarket products that are based on options that are occurring during that auto renew grace period.

Is that still the original registrant who gave that authorization still the registrant? How would the new registrant - registrar know that if they weren't forced to reauthorize the domain name?

So it gets a little weird but...

(Michele): The other thing to bear in mind - (Michele) speaking. BPP keys will expire a lot of the time. I mean some of the registries now mandating the BPP key be only valid for a certain number of days.

So why would you have an FOA that is valid at the moment potentially forever you have an BPP key that's only valid for X number of days?

Now even for the registries where they don't expire them automatically I know quite a few registrars do expire them just for security sake and also just to preserve some level of sanity.

Other registrars will automatically put a domain on lock after a certain number of days because like, you know, you're opening a transfer window et cetera, et cetera.

The problem is let's just say for example that I have a domain with name.com because maybe sometimes you do special offers which are actually more - it

would be cheaper for me to register all my domains through you then go directly through VeriSign.

So I want to move - I move those domains around over there but maybe I picked up an FOA along the way, you know, it's still lingering. It's still there. It's still valid.

This is the things that we're concerned about. Now personally I really couldn't give a damn how long the FOA is valid.

But the fact that it's open ended I see as being an issue. Personally I couldn't give a damn. If at the end of this comes out and says the FOA is valid for 30 days, it's valid 45 days, it's valid 60 days, it's valid for 90 days fine.

. Personally, couldn't give a damn. But it's like I don't like this open-ended, forever and ever type thing. I just see that as being a potential issue.

And I don't know if it's been exploited yet or not, but it just seems to be that rather - you know, weird. Thanks.

Man: You know, we certainly see the time so much, so the event means like that's a much better way to at least start the discussion. I'm not sure that the time thing has been exploited.

Man: Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: I know that we have a bit of confusion in the work group that's all around FOA's versus auth codes, because auth codes often times do expire and expire much quicker. And then there's FOA thing which really could just be a piece of paper or an email or some kind of audit trail thing that you're required to file and be asked to present if and when there's ever a conflict around a transfer.

And so, I'm not quite clear still how if we in the work group are 100% clear on the difference and when those FOA's are required, and why, and where we filing them, and why this - and in what way it's different from auth codes? Because, I know that they are two totally different things, but what you just said around EPP codes, why is an FOA linked to an EPP code for example?

Man: Yes. I always thought of it as - and I don't know if this is helpful or not. I always thought of it as with my car, the EPP code is the key that starts the engine and opens the doors, and the FOA is the registration that I signed that I keep in the glove compartment or something. But you know, that's just how I try to keep it straight. I don't know if that's always applicable or if that analog probably falls down fairly quickly.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well, I actually like that analogy because that registration piece of paper kind of stays with the car for the lifetime of the car. But on it, you make no entries for whoever the new owner is. So I think that if the first owner of the car is the first person who gets to say, "I give my consent to this name moving around at whatever point in time, either now because I currently have a buyer for this name, or I want to just move it to another registrar and not even change the owner of the name," then that person obviously has the right to do so.

And, you could even argue that with their new registrar, their FOA should still valid because it's the same entity who still should have the ability to authorize transfers for the same name. But if you are thinking of it as the - the FOA as a one-time authorization of a one-time change of registrar, then it's a different thing. And I think we're just not clear on what that thing actually is.

And where it comes from currently is that in the existing transfer policy there is this requirement that the gaining registrar has to somehow provide this piece of documentation that they got consent from the person who asked for this transfer that yes, indeed, they would like to authorize this transfer, which makes sense as long as the same entity moves from Registrar A, to B, to C.

But, it falls flat on its face when you are trying to move a name and at the same time change the owner of the name.

And, I think this is where this was starting to get confusing and where we're having discussions in the work group and we're not always on the same page.

Man: Okay, thanks Simonetta.

I'm going to go with (Michael), and then could we get some - you know, we had some lively discussion on the first point. I know this second point is not quite as, you know, interesting, but it is important. And any other folks weigh in after (Michael). We'll see...

(Michael): We support the time limit because it sounds like a standard security mechanism for any authorization to do something online.

And regarding this requirement for the FOA, what was the objective of that requirement be? The objective was that the (unintelligible). I mean, that was what I always thought is at the time of the transfer to make sure that the person owning the domain wants the transfer to proceed. If I have some kind of document from ten years ago, it's not what I need. What I need is now.

I mean, that's why it makes sense to have a (unintelligible).

James Bladel: No, that's a good point.

I think that - and I know we had at least one or two lawyers over here on the left. But you know, it is a question is if a document that is signed or something, is not time limited, is it - you know, there's a validity requirement I think. Things have to be limited you know in their timeframe.

I've always thought of an FOA as not necessarily you have to obtain authorization in order for the transfer to proceed, but if anything ever goes wrong you should - you must be able to demonstrate that you obtained it at the time and you must - and that you have retained it properly.

So I think that this - it's more of an after-the-fact thing than walking into a room with an FOA saying, "You know what? I'm free to transfer wherever I want." It's more of a - you know, if that transfer blows up later, you must be able to demonstrate that you took all the proper steps, and it's just more of your checklist.

So no, I think these are good points. Do we have a - we have Bob Mountain at the end of the queue, which is right now. So we'll have Bob, (Alan), and then (Rob). Okay, so go ahead Bob, and sorry you couldn't join us this time.

Bob Mountain: Yes, I'm sorry as well. Thanks (James). This is Bob Mountain from NameMedia. Can everyone hear me okay?

(John): Five by five.

Bob Mountain: Okay, great. Thanks (John).

Yes, I guess - you know, I know we've been around this quite a few times on the work group, but just to make sure that, you know, our perspective is - you know, just kind of on the table in the room.

The idea that a - you know, the form of authorization needs to be now - you know, is fine unless you know, in the - and we use a lot of real estate analogies, but if I'm selling something and I want to put something on for sale, in this case it's a domain, you know and I do want to sell that domain. I want to make it available for sale. And that domain might take years to sell, right. Domains - domain portfolio owners live with sales velocities of low single-digit percentages. That's pretty typical.

So it would normally take me many years to sell a domain. You know if you look at a real estate analogy, if I'm selling a building, I put it up for sale. I don't want to have to go the Town Hall every 30 days just to say, "Yes. For sure. I do want to confirm that that building is still for sale."

You know, the same case in a domain. If I want to list a domain for sale, I don't want to go back and confirm every 30 or 60 days that, "Yes, I still want to sell it," because I have potentially thousands and thousands of these domains you know that I want to you know make available for sale in a convenient way. You know, in a systematic way that's not going to require me to, you know, invest a massive amount of overhead you know for something like this.

So just - you know, I know like within the work group we've had this discussion, I just wanted to make sure for all the new people who are here that they understand, you know, one perspective as far as this goes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Bob.

And I think - you know, I think that that is - that perspective is important and is certainly not lost in this discussion. That we don't want to create something that is too short, or too burdensome, or too - you know, too obstructing to those types of activities, which is one of the reasons why I think we started looking more at the event-driven expiree than the time limiting expiree; although, I think they're both still important considerations.

I have next (Alan), and then (Rob). And then, I'm going to put out a final call for discussions on this topic before we move into the last topic, because we are starting to run up against our time limitations as well.

So (Alan), take it away.

(Alan Barney): From our perspective, a time limit is a good idea wd when we see the FOA's as an instruction for a specific action, not as an ongoing mandate.

And just one comment that (unintelligible) just said about kind of going to the Town Hall every 30 days. I mean, I don't think you have to to offer your domain for sale. What we're talking about here is when someone comes back and says, "Hey, I want to buy (this) domain name," you know, do you want to sell it to them?

I mean surely you know, it's - from a procedural point-of-view, you're either giving the control to somebody else to sell your domain name, in which case they should be holding it in escrow or something like that. Or, remains with the current owner. That's it.

James Bladel: Well, thanks (Alan).

(Ron)?

(Ron): I've always thought that the current FOA policy was (largely) because Network Solutions owned a company that sold fax machines. But what (unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible) get that in the record please. That was awesome.

(Ron): Well, (unintelligible). What real place does the paperwork have when you can't (unintelligible) getting the details and all those other things. Are they not realistically the real form of authorization of a transfer now?

And the other comment is that a couple of times I've heard the phrase change of registrar at the same time as change of registrant, and it's a bit of misnomer because you can't - you're not allowed to. If you change registrar, you have to take the existing contact. You have to take the existing WHOIS

details. You're mandated to archive that information for audit trail purposes in case ICANN comes back to you.

So, you can't actually change them both at the same time. You have to do one, then you have to do the other. So it's not even if a registrar (implements) the policy where allow you set new contacts after the domain is transferred into your account with them, that's their policy and they still have to do it as two separate actions.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks (Rob).

Next up is Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. For those of you who are in the room, it's lovely to have you here. And we've been in - you know, we're on IRTPC and we'll probably be at this for another five years.

Man: Don't say that.

Mikey O'Connor: (James) is doing really good by the way in moving us along, because this one is moving at lightning speed. It's only taken us 14 years to (get) through this one.

James Bladel: But it's like building a cathedral. You lay the foundation. You hope your grandchildren are going to finish it off.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Get all the arches done.

The sort of overarching observation I want to make about all this is that we've got a bunch of policy. (Unintelligible) is a really great example of policy where if you read the policy and then you look at the business practices that have gone up around the policy, they're just not in synch. You know, the current state of play in the marketplace compared to, you know, this sort of quaint

language that was written at least ten years ago - this needs to get reconciled.

And so it's really helpful to have - and Michele's now going to make me smile while I speak with his frickin camera. You know, it's really helpful to have this texture - this conversation because these are policies that are pretty antique and do need to be updated.

But the intent of these policies is pretty clear. It's just antique in its language. And so it's - I also just wanted to say thanks for this texture.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey.

I think that you know, we are trying to move this through as quickly as possible while not short changing some of these issues. They are important.

It is possible that at some point, when our grandchildren are doing this, that we may want to throw out the IRTP all together in light of where the marketplace has grown up, what (unintelligible) have arisen that people are comfortable with. Maybe - and by that time, everyone will have a Smartphone, you know, fused to their brain. And so, it makes more sense to authorize the phone to transfer the domain names instead of the person.

Who knows? You know, just weird things could come about that would invalidate more and more and make it seem further and further from the reality that was envisioned when this policy was written.

Unfortunately, or fortunately we're not there yet, but I think we're getting closer. And I think, you know, it's good to refresh these things and close that gap.

So are there any other thoughts or comments on this FOA issue before we move into the really exciting and very controversial topic here of IANA ID's?

So okay, so let's - I'll just kind of tee this up here and hopefully the rest of the group weighs in.

As a registrar, we - you know, we receive transfer requests. We pull the data from WHOIS and it says it's coming from Registrar XYZ 123, and it would be really nice sometimes if we knew who or which that was. You know, maybe we're doing a market share analysis. Maybe we are concerned that there's something fishy about this transfer. It could be a hijack. You know, it's a piece of data that we would like to have.

And so, we were pointing out that registries often use proprietary ID's to identify their registrars when there's this nice lookup table that anybody can go to -- I could probably put it on the screen here given five minutes -- that shows every registrar has an ICANN assigned IANA ID.

Registries in our session on the weekend, Mr. Jeff Neuman, pointed out that that won't always work because a registry operates - when they operate ccTLD's out of the same back-end systems as gTLD's, they may have registrars that are accredited for the ccTLD that are not ICANN accredited and don't have an IANA ID.

And so therefore, that's where the proprietary system arose was in a way to kind of level that from - so we have just kind of you know two peeking at the elephant from different directions and declaring it to be different things, you know, and we're trying to remedy that with this group.

One thought would be, and I think we've identified that we would use both, particularly in the incumbent registries. You know, you print the proprietary ID and then you print the IANA ID if they (unintelligible) qualifier.

Another one - I mean, I'm just throwing ideas out here. But you know, another one would be if an ID had two parts. You know, the first part was the IANA

part and then a dash and then whatever the registry wanted to tack on there to keep its own records straight. You know, that would be another possibility.

But anyway, you know this is more of a data modeling question or a schema development type of an issue. But what we're trying to say in the policy is that when these hundreds or dozens, or thousands, or however many of these new registries actually hit the streets, this is going to be - this small bit of confusion is going to you know probably require investment in databases just to keep it all straight.

So we've asked the registries to weigh in on this. We have one in the room.

Oh, yes. I'm looking at you.

You know, so we would definitely like to hear your thoughts, Chuck. We've specifically reached out through our registry representatives on this working group which (Barbara Knight) from VeriSign, Paul Diaz - sorry, I still haven't - think of you as a registry. Paul Diaz for (PIR) is also here. And Roy Dykes from NuStar, and other folks. Just particularly if there are any (unintelligible) registries that would like to weigh in on this. Although I think when you say country code and IANA ID's it makes for some (unintelligible) not much sense very quickly. So...

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Oh, excellent. Excellent.

So with that, let's kick off a queue here, and (unintelligible) - okay. And let's start with Mr. Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (James). I think (Barbara)'s done a good job of weighing in this already, but for the sake of this group here I will communicate that we're fine with the compromise. We were okay with just doing IANA ID's, but we

understand that some of our other registry partners have used the proprietary ID for their - for certain uses. And as long as the IANA ID is also included, we think that's fine.

James Bladel: Okay.

And I think that we see that Roy and then we'll go with Paul.

I'm sorry. Go with Paul first. Paul, go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thanks (James). Paul Diaz from .org. Just to echo what Chuck said and - or to (unintelligible) - support everything Chuck said. I just wanted to elaborate on a point he made earlier.

Another way to look at the - hopefully the near-term future where we'll have many, many more TLD's in the room. These proprietary ID's are very important for back-end providers because they need ways to distinguish your registrar, for example (James) (unintelligible) registration services, across those TLD's.

There needs to be something unique that their back-end systems have a way to identify so that they're - we're looking at a work effort that is associated with the particular TLD that they're applying the back-end service for.

So the compromise is very important. Yes we understand and there's a desire to make it simpler. Be able to automate more the transfer process; therefore, use the IANA ID is fine. But the compromise is important. Do not get rid of the proprietary because those back-end systems are only going to become more important in the future.

Another way to look at it - yes, it could be even more complex if you only had proprietary - people trying to figure out. That's understood. But really, push

hard for the compromise where you could use both if they exist, and that's an important qualifier based on what Jeff had said over the weekend, et cetera.

Then again, if the cc - what does that have to do with ICANN, right? We're talking about gTLD policy. So, I'm not sure exactly what that point was. But if it exists, why not? It should be in the WHOIS output.

James Bladel: Agreed. Thanks Paul.

Roy? And (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Roy Dykes: Yes, the only comment I wanted to make was the reason that the registries that use proprietary ID's, it came back pretty strongly relative to using only IANA ID's is because not only did they use them for the identification, but there are other back-end systems within themselves that - like in the case of NuStar; this interfaces with other systems like billing, et cetera, that use that proprietary ID. So it'll have a ripple effect to only use IANA ID's.

The other thing is on the wording that was modified more recently to talk to - that talks to displaying the IANA ID in the WHOIS, this already complies with that. I checked with our technical folks here, and so that's another plus that, you know, there's not a lot of code modification that would need to be done on that end.

So I think the way the language stands now is good. I've expressed that also to the team, and so it's a really good experience to go through and just kind of research this and understand what the implications are of what was being presented.

So I'm really pretty happy with the outcome here. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Roy. Sorry that you couldn't be with us today, but we appreciate you dialing in at O'dark-30, or whatever time it is there in the - you on the East Coast.

Mikey, you're up next.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Again, this is just one - I - for those of you who are sort of new - you know, listening to all this for the first time, I think one of the things that I wanted to emphasize is how well this group compromises. I mean basically, the conversation has been pretty civilized on all these topics the whole time.

It's not a group of people butting heads and not moving. We're listening to each other. We're trying to find ways to get things done. This is a perfect example of what we're trying to do where you're hearing sort of everybody say, "Yes, this works fine for me." You know, I think that the goal - what you're seeing is that on this topic we feel like we've kind of gotten to the end. We sort of feel like we've got this one figured out.

The first two, we haven't quite got it figured out yet, but I'm pretty confident that we will. And so, I was thinking I might be the last one in the queue, and so I just wanted to sort of wrap this up by saying what a great and collegial this is. It's very well led by a fellow Midwesterner, even though he is from Iowa, which we won't go there. You know, a certain football team...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Got a thing about talking.

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible).

But other than that, it's gone pretty well. And you know, the hope would be that by the time we get to Toronto we'll be at an equally well thought out

consensus solution to the very complicated problems that we - puzzle that we've been working.

James Bladel: I think we have a gentleman in the back that - and could you make sure that you state your name. And I think I know who you are, but I'd like to hear you say it first.

Gavin Brown: Yes, this is Gavin Brown from CentralNic. Hi.

On the subject of proprietary ID's, we use proprietary ID's because our registry system pre-dates IANA ID's, and so that we had to sort of (unintelligible) system.

One of the things that - what surprised me was EPP never defined registrars as an object to be queried. So it always occurred to me that it made sense to have a - because obviously in a registry database, registrars are first class objects, so they exist and can be queried through (unintelligible) for example. But, there's no way to query for them through EPP.

And, it occurred to me that registrar would find (unintelligible) command on a registrar ID to find out contact information, a Web site, and so on. And obviously, that object could have you know IANA ID as part of the information that you provide.

I think including the IANA ID into those records is completely obvious and (unintelligible) can do it in (unintelligible) so I'd be done by the end of this meeting.

So I think these are very simple, practical things to be done to solve that issue on the registry side of things.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

And our last commenter, and if I could remind you please to...

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Chris Chaplow from the BC. Sensible comments I've just heard just now.

And as far as I know from everything I've heard today and on Saturday, Sunday, whenever it was, nothing said that actually rips apart our statement or recommendation for the proprietary ID. We're going to have to kind of check the transcripts on that, but I think it's still intact.

And just following on from Mikey, because these two charter questions are quite close now, then maybe the working group moving forward, we should move forward in the order 3, 2, 1 rather than 1, 2, 3. Leaving us time that - be flexible (unintelligible) to the end or rather to spend more or less time on Number 1 as needed. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you. I think that's a good point. And sorry for not recognizing you Chris. As soon as you started speaking I immediately heard your voice, because we know some of these folks from years on telephone calls. But then when we see them face-to-face we don't have (unintelligible).

So we have a question in the - or we have Marika herself, and then I'm going to kind of bring it in for a landing here and send everybody back on their way.

So Marika, please.

Marika Konings: No, I just wanted to make a last reminder that you know, we take note of all the comments made here, but it would be really helpful as well if you can submit them as part of the public comment forum that's open. The link is on the ICANN homepage. As (James) said, you know, the first part is open until the 4th of July, and then there's a reply period that runs until the 25th of July. So if you can think about anything you want to contribute further, please submit them in the public comment forum.

And, thanks for all your...

James Bladel: Marika is being very diplomatic. I'll say it a different way.

We're going to take all of the things that we think we've heard here today back to our working group. There's a very, very real possibility that after, you know, the flights home and all this stuff, and the holidays that we're going to get some of it wrong.

So make sure we don't get it wrong or be imprecise by submitting what you've said here today or your company's positions to the public comment period just as a backup kind of documentation trail to support these ideas and make sure that we get them accurately captured into the working group's effort, and that they formulate the final report and the final recommendations.

So with that, I will start to wind this up here a couple of minutes early so that the next group can set up. Thank you very much for participating in this. I think that this is precisely what we set out to accomplish here in Prague, which was you know Mikey and Simonetta, and Michele, and I can - and Bob, and Roy, and (Barbara), we can sit around and stare at each other. We can watch (Matt) yawn and - which I think he does on the phone sometimes as well.

But you know, it's the same group and it's the same voices, and after awhile you can almost predict what people are going to say as soon as you see their hand go up. What we like to get is some fresh thoughts and fresh voices onto these things.

And I would say let's not make this the end. If you find this stuff riveting, fascinating, or worse, if you say that, you know, your business can't go on unless some of these problems are resolved or something like that, then there's still time to join this working group. There are more working groups on

transfers coming down the pipeline after this one. You know, the thinking is that perhaps they will occur in roughly the same timeframe.

So, there's plenty of opportunities to throw your hat in the ring and become one of the - what do you want to call it? The coffee circle that discusses these topics every Tuesday at 9:00 am Central.

So with that, thank you very much. Don't forget the comment periods and really appreciate your feedback. Have a great afternoon.

Man: Thanks (James).

END