Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Update Meeting

Wednesday 17 October 2012 at 08:30 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

James Bladel: ...this transfer working group to the community. And as we look around us we can see the community is in attendance. Fantastic. Today is October 17, 2012. It is 8:30 am Eastern Daylight Time in Toronto, Canada, ICANN 45. And I'm James Bladel, the Co Chair. My other Co Chair, Avri Doria, is not in attendance; she probably has a conflict and we have staff with us as well.

So perhaps what we'll do - we'll start off is go around the table, some of the working group members. And then we have attendees in the audience but we have plenty of space at the table near the microphones. I would encourage everyone to please join us at the table, please; otherwise we're going to suspect you're here for wifi only and that you're napping. Thanks.

So let me start - let's start down with Pam please, if you could introduce yourself and then we'll just - name and affiliation and then we'll move around the circuit there. It looks like we have no microphone on that side. Okay. Hi, Pam.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay.

Mike Murphy: Mike Murphy

James Bladel: Okay fantastic so that was, for the recording, Mike Murphy, from Com Laude, Pam Little from Contractual Compliance, ICANN staff. And I'm sorry, sir, if you could repeat...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Victor Oppenheimer also from Contractual Compliance, ICANN staff. And Now Mr. Cole.

Tim Cole: Tim Cole from the Registrar Relations Group at ICANN.

Simonetta Batteiger: Simonetta Batteiger, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor, ISP Constituency and now owner of cheaptakedowns.com.

Bob Mountain: I have to follow that of course. Bob Mountain, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Sarah Wyld: Sarah Wyld, Aplus.net.

James Bladel: And I'm James of course. And then Marika.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight; Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Benny Samuelsen: Benny Samuelsen, Nordreg, Registrar.

(Jan Leidenhausen):   (Jan Leidenhausen), (CSN) with Registrar.

James Bladel: Excellent, thank you. And then we have a few folks on the phone, correct? Is there anyone on the line? Julie, okay. Okay fantastic.

So we called this meeting and I believe we have two hours, is that correct?

Marika Konings: Hour and a half.

James Bladel: Hour and a half which still might be a little too long depending on the types of discussions we have. But this is the penultimate meeting of the IRTP-C working group as we conclude our efforts.

I can tell you that our work was well received over the weekend; that the report was submitted to the GNSO Council and will be on their agenda for today. So congratulations, everyone, for making that very ambitious deadline that we started off right coming out of Dakar and pushing for this to be our finish line and congrats; we made it.

And that's no small thanks to everyone's extra efforts, not just on the working group but the extra diagrams and the extra sub team and the various, you know, nights and weekends and everything like that that were invested in this effort to get us here on time so thank you for that.

We'll probably have Marika go through the slides, for those of you that were here over the weekend. Sorry, what? Me?

Marika Konings: Yeah.

James Bladel: Okay I'll go through the slides. I'm - this much caffeine is all I've had - so we'll go through the slides this morning and we'll certainly stop to address any

particular issues or questions and then we'll essentially open it up for the community to throw rocks at us after - and, yes, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, James. I mean, I have to interrupt you. I mean, the - this working group has actually managed to get its final report through in what is possibly record time, which is down to, you know, your dedication and your commitment and you should be proud of that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks. I'm going to 100% of the credit and give 95% of it to Marika. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Well I would normally do that too but.

James Bladel: Okay so let's dive into our first slide. And apologize for the repeats for those of you that have already seen this over the weekend. But - so the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy is an important component of the ICANN ecosystem. It allows registrants to vote with their feet; if they don't like their registrar or they amazed and bedazzled by the promotions of another registrar they can choose to move their registrations to that new registrar.

However it is also the top source of complaints both amongst ICANN and amongst registrars. It is - it can be a complicated process and the policy was in dire need of updating to take into account a number of developments in the ecosystem that weren't anticipated at the outset most notably the rise of domain name aftermarket.

This is IRTP-C, which, as the alphabet would imply, the third iteration of this series of working groups. And we have three primary goals the first was to understand - oh, Avri, we've got a spot right here for you.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: So for those remotely our Co Chair, Avri Doria, has joined us here in the room in Toronto. So IRTP-C was meant to address three key issues; the first is this important concept of change of control or change of registrant.

As we discovered at a previous IRTP working group the transfer was designed to allow a single registrant to move their names from one registrar to another. It did not anticipate the transfer of control of a domain name from one individual to another either through business acquisition or through a commercial transaction or even, in some cases, in the implementation of a UDRP decision.

The second question we were asked to address was the notion of a form of authorization and whether or not they should be time limited. FOAs, forms of authorization, are a component of the transfer process that captures the authorization of the transfer contact, which can be the registrant or the admin contact.

And as part of the natural evolution of the aftermarket some of these were being obtained in advance. But there was no guidance from the policy on whether or not these would ever expire. And I think we all thought that that was perhaps a problem that needed to be addressed.

And the third one was a little more of an operational question, which is that all registries - I'm sorry, all ICANN registrars have a unique identifier called their IANA ID number and that registries would also assign registrars a unique identifier.

And it was manageable in the era of 20 or so - a couple dozen TLDs but in the coming wave of hundreds or thousands of TLDs I think we anticipated that that was operationally going to be a problem to manage all those unique and proprietary identifiers. So we were looking at the question of whether or not registries should standardize on the use of IANA IDs.

Just brief timeline here; our initial report was published in June ahead of the Prague meeting. We had a public - a comment session that was - overlapped - I think it was before and after the Prague meeting and then spent the balance of the time coming out of Prague analyzing that feedback, the comments received in the public comment forum as well as received in person in Prague and factored those into our deliberations and our final report which was published last week.

Any questions or concerns? I know that the balance of the room is probably 60/40 in favor of folks who have this stuff tattooed on the inside of their eyeballs but I want to make sure I'm leaving ample opportunity for the folks who are seeing this perhaps for the first time to comment or ask questions. Okay.

So Charter Question A, this is the change of control, change of registrant policy. And this is where we spent, as you might imagine, the bulk of our time particularly in deliberations.

What the group determined I think very early on is that, one, there was no policy in this area; and, two, we probably needed some. I think those were the easiest questions to address. It got harder from there on as we discussed things such as how this policy would play out, what components were necessary in this function and whether or not, even, this could be considered a part of the IRTP or whether it needed its own standalone separate policy.

And here's what we came up with. So we have created this change of registrant consensus policy, which outlines the process for changing from one registrant entity to another.

We are going to propose to rename the IRTP - the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy - to just the Transfer Policy. And the Transfer Policy will have two parts; the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy and the Change of Registrar and Change of Registrant as two separate parts of the new policy. And this is

really just a nomenclature change; were not throwing out anything of the existing IRTP.

The report goes into lengthy detail about how this is all going to work but there's the highlights up on the screen right now. Essentially both sides have to authorize the change. We allow for the possibility of the preapproval.

It says here not possible to have a change of registrant at the same time change of registrar. What we want to say here is that those are two separate transactions and while they may occur very close together with one another that they cannot be blended together into a single operation.

And then another controversial topic; following a change of registrant the domain name would be locked for 60 days. However there is an option to opt out of this lock at the outset so that when changing the registrant the registrar could secure the registrar's - the registrar could secure the registrant's permission not to apply this lock first. And secondly, as a result of IRTP-B the lock would be removed upon request.

Why is this a problem? Well, you know, as we discussed at length in this and other transfer groups is that the phenomenon of the thin registry means that a transfer in conjunction with a change of registrant means a domain name could show up a new registrar with brand new contacts and the new registrar has no idea whether or not those are valid or whether the domain name has been hijacked.

And this is a particular use case that mimics a signature of an abusive practice. So we're trying to put some safeguards in there to prevent against that. However being mindful that this new era of - in commercial domain name aftermarket requires that domain names be fluid and be portable from registrar to registrar and from registrant to registrant.

And so the balance that this working group sought to achieve was how to, you know, how to split that difference equitably and provide the benefits of the security without overburdening the - overburdening the domain name aftermarket.

Michele, it's time to get up. That's my alarm too. It gets you out of bed.

Okay so do we want to stop on each slide or do we want to go through - let's go through. We've only got a couple more slides. Let's go through the next couple recommendations and then we'll stop and we'll just have an open floor pillow fight, whatever.

So Charter Question B - I did say pillow fight.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: You brought your pillow, yes?

Michele Neylon: Well if you're going to have pillow fights you have to bring pillows for everybody in the audience; I believe that's only fair.

James Bladel: I have a pillow and you have to take it away from me. That's how it works.

Okay so Charter Question B discusses this length of time validity for FOAs - forms of authorization. And what we determined, as a working group, is that, yes, FOAs should be valid for a fixed or a finite period of time and to impose a degree of consistency with other time periods and grace periods in ICANN consensus policies and domain name life cycles we established that for 60 days.

Following the expiration of an FOA the registrar would have to obtain a new FOA so essentially go back to the registrant and reauthorize the transfer. If you're authorizing transfers in advance you have to periodically check in and

make sure that's still what the registrant intends. However we did allow for the possibility that this could happen automatically.

More importantly than the timeframe the working group determined that there are certain events that should expire any FOAs that were outstanding. So for example if a domain name expired or if the transfer was executed, I mean, I know we all like to think that we're the only registrar in the registrant's life but it's possible that they may have FOAs outstanding with - they may be cheating on us and they may have FOAs outstanding with multiple registrars.

And so if the - if one of them were to actually execute a transfer then the FOAs, of course, would no longer be valid. Again - and if there is any kind of a dispute associated with the domain name that would also be reason to require reauthorization of the FOA.

And a very excellent point, I think, first initiated - or introduced by the working group by Simonetta was this concept that FOAs were an original paper trail for domain names but they have been mostly replaced in the real world by EPP auth info codes, which are these keys or codes that can be used to transfer - execute a transfer that are stored at the registry and they're unique for each domain name - or supposed to be unique for each domain name.

And so what this working group has determined is that it is possible that auth info codes have eliminated the need for FOAs going forward and in that whoever holds the EPP auth info code can, you know, is by description or by definition authorized to transfer the domain name. So we've asked the future working group to take a look at that.

We'll save the questions for the end and then we'll go through them. We'll start with the chat how's that? Everybody always leaves the chat for the end. We'll start with the chat.

And our final question was the use of IANA IDs in place of proprietary IDs. And in typical ICANN fashion we gave everybody something that they wanted here. We, I think, have asked that new registries going forward use the IANA ID as a means of identifying the registrars. Existing registries who currently use proprietary IDs can continue to do so but we ask that they use the IANA ID along side of those proprietary identifiers.

And, you know, that's kind of it. Everybody who's currently in place gets to continue what they're doing and the new folks coming on board have to do what we say. And I think that that is kind of typical of a lot of policies that have been coming out over the last couple years. Okay, next.

A couple other just side note recommendations. We realize there's a lot of blanks remaining that need to be filled in with IRTP-C. So this group recommends the formation of a review team or an implementation review team that would work with staff to craft the language and preserve the intent of the working group recommendations in the actual policy.

This is going to be tricky. This is going to be a - yeah - there's a little switch inside of your iPhone. I don't know if Mr. Jobs introduced you to this function but can - you can actually...

Michele Neylon: From the grave - from beyond the grave?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: From 1997 or whenever thing first came out.

So anyway we've asked that this team be formed. It will probably comprise a subset of the working group team along with ICANN staff to help bring this - put some language around these recommendations while preserving their intent.

And the final thing is that I think we've kind of all hit a wall. I mean, here it is Wednesday where people start to hit a wall with ICANN meetings. But I think we've hit a wall in our careers with IRTP. And all of us looking around the table are smiling saying, you know, let's see if we can speed this up.

There are two scheduled IRTP working groups, IRTP-D and IRTP-E. We have recommended that all remaining IRTP issues - I think there are five - be folded into one IRTP working group; the next one, IRTP-D - as in D for Done and let's get this put to bed and let's get this IRTP series concluded. So those are two of our additional recommendations not directly tied to our charter.

Next steps (unintelligible) this afternoon and the Council will unanimously, I'm predicting, no they don't do anything unanimous, will approve our final report. And then the ICANN Board will do its thing and bless the report. And we'll move into the implementation phase.

Okay I think that's our last slide. Additional information, lots and lots of documents; we wouldn't be an ICANN working group if we weren't killing megabytes of digital forests to produce stacks of paper. I love your use of graphics, by the way.

If anybody hasn't seen Marika's PowerPoints she has a very dry sense of humor that comes across in her choice of graphics. And I think we all - it's not lost on us.

So let's start with the chat. Let's go with the folks who are in the virtual room first to make sure we can get their questions addressed and then we'll just kind of have more of an open free flowing discussion on the floor. And I'll probably ask for Avri's help with that as well just because she's better at moderating conversations like that.

So what's our first one, Marika? Who's our first customer?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We have a question from (Tao). "Assuming a transfer starts auth code is checked and valid and FOAs are sent but a registrant change takes place. What happens then?"

James Bladel: Well one thing that would happen, we believe, as part of the details of our change of registrant process, is that the auth info code would be reset. So when the transfer was attempted it would fail. Somebody help me if that's - if I'm misreading the question. But I think that that's one safeguard in this process, correct?

Now as far as the FOA that's trickier. And I think this goes back to Simonetta's main point is how does the FOA know when it's dead? And the answer is I think that it requires a bit of knowledge and a bit of information sharing that currently is not taking place.

That's a good from (Tao) but I think that this is part and parcel of that discussion of whether or not auth - or sorry, FOAs, are still valid or if they can be trumped in the real world by auth info code validity, which I think is what we've seen, you know, this environment move towards.

So any other - is that - any other thoughts on that? Should have had coffee. Should have - I would have popped for coffee. Bob buys his coffee sometimes. Thank you for the coffee yesterday. It helps get the conversation flowing. But - okay so I must have answered it because everyone seems to be nodding. Tim.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Cole: ...here, James. Could you go back to the first - the slide for the first recommendation please? I don't know if it - was it just one slide or was it two? Okay when - excuse me - when you're talking about it's not possible to have a change of registrant and registrar not simultaneously and so that's prevented.

And then - and the reason for that is to minimize the potential for hijacking, right? But then you said that - or then you say that the registrant can remove that - can volunteer to remove that requirement. So what is, in your mind and in terms of the implementation that - what is your thought about - how would you prevent someone who's hijacking a name then authorizing that not be prevented from moving?

James Bladel: So that's an excellent question. And what we're counting on to some extent is that the registrar - when the domain name is still with the original registrar that they know their customer or that they have - in the granting of that opt-out they have some knowledge of who they're dealing with whereas the gaining registrar may not have that knowledge.

So by saying that they are two separate transactions, two discrete transactions or that they occur in a certain sequence we're trying to preserve that confidence, that trust, that the original registrar has in the original registrant and then changing to the new registrant and then changing registrar.

If you blend those or interleave those steps into a single process there is a gap, there is a knowledge gap, an awareness gap, on the part of the new registrar on who exactly it is they're dealing with. I see Simonetta's going to bail me out here so go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Honestly I think you can't entirely prevent this. So there is going to be some cases where people are doing things that are not intended.

James Bladel: Right.

Simonetta Batteiger: The hope is that in part what we've been working on is IRTP Part B where we have increased some of the security measures around hijacking cases and created some suggestions for how that should be dealt with; that should

cover most of these cases. And the intent isn't really to break this out in a process that needs to have a wait time in between or anything. The intent really is that these steps can happen in a very fast succession.

The intent is just simply also that to recognize that these are two separate things to change a registrant and to change a registrar and they may happen very quickly with each other. And, yes, there could be a small security risk but that's there today and we hope that IRTP Part B will cover those items.

Tim Cole: Is it envisioned that one of those changes will be preferred in the process over the other in terms of the sequence?

Simonetta Batteiger: No, we left that open because we got some feedback in the Prague meeting that certain registrars and partners in the space have preference to do it one way and/or the other way so it doesn't really matter which way around you do this as long as you follow the ideas for how each one of these two steps are supposed to happen.

James Bladel: So Marika is going to shed some light here. But I will mention that in the report there's a lot more detail substantiating what I was saying, what Simonetta's answer as well. There's also some calls for something short of recommendations - we say best practices I know is a dirty word sometimes in ICANN.

But it is more of an acknowledgment that there is probably a sliding scale of good ways and better ways to pull this off. Mikey, for example, raised some points about out of band authentication if you're going to grant anything in advance.

They have some mechanism to check that that person is who you're dealing with that's not tied to their Whois record so that someone off the street couldn't say yes, I am Tim Cole of 123 Main St. Los Angeles, California

because everything that you're asking them to verify is already present in a public data source.

So that's one option. And we've laid out a couple of other things as well. So - but...

Tim Cole: You could possibly put some of those best practices into more of a safe harbor type clause that would sort of say, you know, you'll be assured of blah, blah, blah if you do the following.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Tim Cole: Isn't a requirement but it's a, you know, a...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: No I think that's a good idea and that's maybe something that the IRT should take up because this isn't complicated enough. I'm being silly. But, no, it is a good idea to set up a safe...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...implementation. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Indeed to follow on the report specifically says that if a registrar chooses to offer an option for registrants to opt out the process to remove this restriction must use a generally accepted method of authentication, indeed, make sure that is not just someone hijacks a name and just ticks the box I'm opting out and, you know, there goes a domain name.

And on the sequence, indeed, as Simonetta said, there's no requirement but I think the report says that there is a recommendation that if you want to do

both changes you are recommended to first do the change of registrar and then do the change of registrant, you know, to avoid locking or having to opt out or those kinds of situation.

That is something, as well, that I'm not sure whether that's a necessary part of the policy but it's something that probably registrars and their communication to registrants should tell them like if you want to make these changes please consider doing it in this order if you want to avoid, you know, being locked down or needing to opt out and get authentication and things like that.

James Bladel: And, you know, just as a reminder IRTP-B provides that if a registrant wants that lock removed that a registration must do that within five days. Now that also provides us a five-day window to take a closer look at the sequence of events leading up to that transfer request and that lock removal request and say does this look good?

Does this look like someone who may be was learning the process on the fly or does this look suspicious? And I think it gives some latitude for registrars to protect their customers.

I see Mikey. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm completely agreeing with everything that people have said. The one other thing I want to clarify is that we did spend a lot of time talking about the current business practice, which is changing both of these at the same time. And one of the things that we really amplify or want to highlight in the report is that this process can be made to look like a simultaneous change of registrar and registrant to the customer even though the transactions are separate.

So that it's - our goal is just to keep the flow as smooth and easy as possible. But detail under the process is under the covers in such a way that we can

still preserve the sorts of improvements that we're going for in the policy change.

Tim Cole: Just so everybody's clear the reason I'm asking all these questions is because we're going to have to figure this out and write it up so I'm trying to get a better feel for - and I know we'll be working together with the IRT.

But just one other question about the Part B recommendations just from the standpoint of implementing and informing registrars and so forth and educating them - because I know this one calls for some education as well - would you have any - would you be more inclined to combine the implementation of these various recommendations at one time or do you think they should be, you know, spread out? Just your thoughts on this.

James Bladel: So I think - Simonetta, did you have your hand up first or...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...separate topic so, Mikey, did you want to address this one? So, you know, I think - I think that we can launch these simultaneously because first of all let's look at Item C, that's a registry, registrar, you know, interaction I think that can happen behind the scenes most - in, you know, I think most folks on the street are not going to see a difference unless they're looking at Whois and see this new identifier pop up next to the registrar.

The second one is maybe going to take a little bit more work but it's really applicable to folks who are getting FOAs in advance, which is not everybody, you know, it's a smaller subset of the market. So I think we can put them all into one bucket.

I would say that that is probably a decision - this is just me shooting from the hip - a decision should be made by the implementation review team as they get further into this.

So Marika always gets to go first for the queue and then Mikey.

Marika Konings: Just to clarify because I think Tim is also referring to the IRTP Part B recommendations that are still out standing so that's the one on the unlocking within five days of a request and the other one is the clarification of Whois status messages. Right? Because those are still - they're in the process of being implemented. Yes, Whois, yeah, clarification of the locking term.

James Bladel: Oh okay so sorry for missing that you were also talking about the loose threads from the previous iteration. And I would say that, again, it's probably something that the IRTP implementation team could take a look at. But it seems like it would make sense to move the unlock and put that with this because then you've got both sides of the coin going into - going live at the same time.

But Marika is waving her hand furiously over here telling - she's going to explain to me why I should just stop talking.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. My only concern is there because that actually specific recommendation was of Part B of another recommendation on the express consent. So my concern would be if - because I think this, you know, this still need for public comment - oh so it first needs to get approved by the GNSO Council. Might happen at this meeting, might get deferred another month.

Then it will just go out for public comments. Then it will need to go to the Board. And, you know, depending on when the Board has a chance to adopt it then it'll go to implementation. Then we need to have the implementation review team that might need to work through these things.

So my concern is that, you know, the other recommendations were already adopted quite some time ago. And I said the one on the locking/unlocking

was linked to another IRTP-B recommendation that already has been implemented.

And I think the (unintelligible) is not necessarily linked to what we're doing here. Personally my concern would be just leaving them on the shelf, we'd leave them on the shelf potentially for quite some time before we would get to those because I said I think this one will require as well an educational element. So that would, you know, I just want to put that on the table.

James Bladel: No I understand. And, you know, again this is probably something that we need to - you know, I don't know if it's within - I want to say the S word - I don't know if it's within the scope of this team to go back and say no IRTP-B, hold off on yours until, you know, I mean, if it's happening at a certain pace I think that we can say that it makes sense to bundle them together, you know, it's ripping the band-aid off all at once as opposed to pulling it slowly.

This is a number of changes. It's going to fundamentally, you know, reconstruct some elements of the transfer process. I know as registrars - I can't speak for the others - but making significant changes to your process and educating your customers and changing your help files and your systems and then going later - six months later and doing it again is probably not a situation that we would like to be in.

So (unintelligible) event delaying the outstanding parts of IRTP-B for another six months I don't think, you know, I think would actually be preferable then changing twice in a year. So that's just my thinking. But I certainly would open that question up to the group.

Tim Cole: Do you envision the IRTP being pretty much the same people for both of those?

James Bladel: It has been so far.

Tim Cole: Okay so that could also be a place where that might be made.

James Bladel: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I just want to highlight one tricky bit and that is that change of registrant
                 process that we're proposing works fine with registries. It does not work in
                 today's thin registry environment because thin Whois - I'm sorry, I'm using the
                 wrong terms - it's too early - thick Whois this works fine because the two
                 registrars can confirm the identity of the registrant through the thick Whois.

                 In thin Whois the two registrars don't have a secure way to communicate that
                 information. And so one of the small footnotes in the report is that for thin
                 Whois TLDs implementing the recommendations that we're making is going
                 to have to wait until something happens.

                 That something could be a recommendation out of the thick Whois PDP, if
                 that's launched, that all Whois is thick. It could be that something could fall
                 out of the RAA negotiations in terms of uniform Whois. It could be something
                 else. But there's a gap. Until that gap gets filled this recommendation
                 probably can't be implemented in thin Whois.

James Bladel: Can I jump in on that for just a moment?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, go ahead.

James Bladel: Because I think that while what you said is correct it's probably more accurate
                 to say that this works better in a thick environment but it can work in a thin.
                 Well I'm concerned that we've now done two things with that statement is that
                 we've predicated the recommendations of this report on a presumed outcome
                 of the thick Whois report or we've essentially said that in order to implement
                 this - that we're going to implement this dissimilarly in some registries and not
                 others. I'm concerned...

Mikey O'Connor: It's, you know, I'm not sure where it is in the report. I know it's in those little slides. But, you know, there is the acknowledgement that we've got this hole right now.

James Bladel: Yeah, go ahead, Marika's found the spot so maybe she can...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So what it currently says in the report on a Note H it says that, "It's not currently possible to validate that registrant information is identical during an inter registrar transfer in thin registries thus implementation of these policy changes in thin registry gTLDs is contingent on either, A, the implementation of a uniform Whois data access provisions being discussed in the current round of RAA negotiations, B, an outcome of a PDP process that mandates thick Whois across all registries or, C, some other mechanism which provides secure and reliable sharing of registrant data between registrars and thin registry TLDs."

Mikey O'Connor: Like she said.

James Bladel: Well I can tell you that the RAA negotiations are not going to save us here. There's nothing in the current, you know, on the docket that's going to. So I think that takes us down to...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Sorry?

Michele Neylon: There is standardized but it's just not thick Whois.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, standardized Whois would work.

James Bladel: And so maybe that's what we're driving towards here?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I mean, that was the - that's the one that bailed us out when we were doing the slides was to say ah, there is another path.

Michele Neylon: Just for transcript purposes it's Michele. The standardized Whois output is in the operational document, which is - sorry, it's the same document as the Whois SLA document I think isn't it? Matt might be able to confirm that we're looking at in the RAA thing.

The problem is that the - I think a lot of registrars are probably - kind of missed that one because there's this massive, huge, ginormous elephant that is, you know, running straight at us and other aspects of the RAA negotiations as the standardized Whois out put thing is kind of yeah, whatever.

It's only one bit of bit on one bit of a page. That would make certain things a lot of easier to track. It would also make a lot of the issues we currently have with transfers between registrars pretty much vanish because nobody would be able to shove all sorts of things like flash and bad codes and other spurious junk into their Whois output.

Speaking for me, on my registrar, I look forward to that day. I look forward to being able to report to Compliance that somebody is shoving spurious (unintelligible) into Whois output. That'll be so nice.

James Bladel: Because you are (supposed) to have html tags in the output.

Michele Neylon: No, you don't have to have html tags in the output. You can run output on Port 43 which is a clean text with no html and at Port 80 you put your html in. There are two separate things. There's no technical reason why html tags should appear in Port 43 Whois.

Tim Cole: IRTP Part B.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No a link is a URL, Tim, it's not - it is not html markup.

Tim Cole: Okay.

James Bladel: So now we're - I understand both of - what both of you are saying. We're kind of hair-splitting a little bit. So - but, I mean, the text in the link that you can copy and paste...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: It was really nicely done though.

James Bladel: It was.

Mikey O'Connor: Don't you think the hair-splitting? That was excellent hair-splitting.

James Bladel: I thought it was. The difference between a URL that you can copy and paste into a browser versus a link that you click on; it's - yeah. Okay so let's peal back here then a minute. I do remember now, Michele, thank you, that there is a whole separate document in the proposed RAA that is an annex about mostly - it's mostly an SLA for Whois services and the registrar thing so - just a minute here, I'm trying to manage the queue. We've got - one second here.

So - but I don't know - what I'm saying is I don't know that the status of that is such that we can just count on that coming out of these negotiations to trigger the adoption of these. But Volker is much more of an expert on the RAA than I am so go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just as one caveat here on that this will only help us once the new RAA is universally adopted. We are still working on getting that done. Not sure how that will look like. But until the time that there's universal adoption of

that specification on the Whois we will still have that problem because some registrars might not be forced to be held to that specification.

James Bladel: Thank you, Volker. An excellent that could be adopted over the course of, you know, a number of months. I think, Simonetta, did you want in the queue?

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I just want to point out that there was this third part of the statement that Marika read out there and that we did discuss at the time that this might be a challenge and that maybe there needs to be some other way brought up or suggested as part of the implementation preview process of how to - maybe this could be done even if it's not in the RAA or it's not in one of these other nice ways that could fix the situation.

So we don't know necessarily how that would work and exactly how that would look like. But you definitely wanted to say that, yes, this needs to be one of those things that you need to pay attention to and maybe we need to come up with like a practical solution to the first part of the implementation.

James Bladel: Mikey. Mikey, the gentlemen from Wisconsin withdraws. Tim, did you - you looked like you wanted to jump in there. Okay so this is just...

Tim Cole: I've said more than enough.

James Bladel: Sorry?

Tim Cole: I've said more than enough.

James Bladel: So - now you're starting to get maybe a - I do appreciate it because we can - you can see a little bit of the flavor of some of the issues we've had to wrestle with both conceptually and just from a practical standpoint this - yes, it would be great if I knew this registrant and this registrant and practically how do I get that - the information that I need in it from a trusted source at the exact

moment that I need that information so it's a - it can be - there are a number of chicken and egg type scenarios I think when you deal with transfers.

So next what about - huh?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm trolling for comments. Well what about - oh I have Pam, oh this is good.

Pam Little: I have a question, Tim. For domain names that are registered to a legal entity, a company, what do you registrars usually do or set as a requirement to say a change of control? Do you say no? Maybe there's no change in the register name holder field but I think Whois output where under the company name as the registrant or registered name holder there's another name by a person's name.

So if someone or a domain name wants to change that person's name under the registered name holder company what do you do? Do you consider that a change of control or change of...

((Crosstalk))

Pam Little: ...change of control or change of registrant (regime)?

James Bladel: That's a good question and something we discussed fairly extensively. I'm going to go to Volker here with a response.

Volker Greimann: I suspect, as there is no clear policy on that, that every registrar treats this his own way. But most common treatment is that the owner is the legal entity and that the name that's there is the contact person at that entity but is not the owner.

So the registrar is that to determine if somebody contacting him from a company is authorized but that's the registrar's prerogative to make that decision.

Pam Little: Sure, thanks Volker. Just briefly from compliance where it could be a dispute between two owners of that company and how do you then determine whether one - the complainant has the authority representing that entity?

James Bladel: So a couple points here; one is that is - I see a lot of nodding heads when Volker said that we treat the legal entity as the registered name holder and the other person as a point of contact.

However we have encountered the exact scenario, in fact that is a very common scenario where hey, you know, I fired this guy, the IT guy but he took - he's still listed as the point of contact so I want to change all those things or I left my partner and I want control of the company domain name not him or her.

We have - and registrar processes I think will differ somewhat. But we have various documentation thresholds that we establish that need to be provided in order to demonstrate that you are in control of a legal entity or the authorized representative of a business.

In the event it is a true dispute, for example, outside of business what if it's a divorce? You know, certain things that we don't want to get involved in as a registrar we'll say essentially that this looks like a dispute; we're leaving the registered name holder as-is and we need you to come back to us with a UDRP decision or a court decision.

The other scenario that we discussed fairly extensively, which I think falls along similar lines, is when someone fills in the organization field aspirationally. So I could go into my account and I would register, you know, this great domain name and then I would put, you know, as the registrant I'd

put James and then the last name Bladel and the organization is James's Cool Website Incorporated.

What a lot of registrants may not realize that they've done is that they have now established that an organization has control of that domain name. That organization may not exist; it may be a daydream that they have for a business someday. But it does complicate that particular issue if they want to then come later and remove that organization name and just to make it an individual domain name it creates a number of issues.

So I've got a queue. I want to make sure we're addressing Pam's questions first before we change the topic so I've got Mikey, Michele and Volker.

Mikey O'Connor: Pam, I may have misinterpreted your question so if I missed it's not a big deal. But basically, at least the way that I've always thought about the change of registrant policy, is that it's pretty easy to trigger. In other words if there's a - and there's a section in the report called something like a minor change, which we discuss the distinctions there.

And at least in my mind the thought is pretty much everything triggers the change of registrant even the change of name, say, you know, I get married and I change my name because the repercussions are relatively mild. The one thing that happens is the name gets locked for 60 days.

And for most registrants that's not a big deal because the name is - they're not planning to change registrars anyway. And so it simply stays in the same place, which then gives the registrars the time to trigger their internal processes no matter how they vary.

And then for the registrant that is doing a minor change at the same time that they're changing registrars they can invoke that waiver process that we've got. So the thought from a policy standpoint is that the change of registrant would trigger at a very low threshold but be waivable rather than trying to get

into defining in policy what things trigger because then we get into a really complicated discussion.

Is it name, is it email, is it, you know, we go into the weeds almost immediately. And so we've set a fairly broad path as to what triggers that change but then lets registrants remove it.

James Bladel: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele, Blacknight. Pam, just to your question I think the way we thought - the way we would view it is that you either have domains and hosting for you as a private individual or for an organization. So if there's an organization there could be changes of contacts, people leaving companies, stuff being changed around. So we deal with that, I mean, we look at Whois as just being an end product, a side product, something coming out at the far end.

Because ultimately we're not being paid by a Whois record, we're being paid by a company. So if there's something in the organization field for their - it ends up in Whois in our control panel we're going to have, you know, the business name, the entity, the organization.

Now as others have mentioned it does get a bit messy at times because common things we've seen is, say, schools or clubs, associations, they're very loose in how these things are managed so often we see things where it's not just anybody is trying to do anything nasty or even it's just that literally it was set up by John.

John has now gone off to Australia to experience life and play with kangaroos. He's unreachable and everything on our end is in his name. I mean, it may have the organization but it's not a proper legal entity. So maybe it's a bit like James's example of people just putting in some kind of random thing.

I mean, it has interesting implications for us in our implementation of Whois. So for example if you were to come to us and register a DotCal domain name we would automatically opt you out of Whois because there's no organizational (themes).

If you come along and put - and register a domain with your organization we'd automatically opt you in and the same with several of the ccTLDs. In terms of these kind of conflicts it comes down to whether there's an organization there and if it's a legal entity.

But if there's a conflict between say two company directors - and I believe my staff are dealing with about five of those disputes at the moment - our attitude would be if we get a report from Compliance about it being a Whois issue our reply to you would be a very polite - well actually it's not a Whois issue; this is a legal dispute between two third parties. Our reply to the two third parties is go sort it out yourselves.

And, you know, if you want to get court orders or anything else fine but sending spurious threats to us saying we must do X or we must do Y we're just going to ignore it. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks, Michele. And I can tell you that that's very common with us as well is we'll say something - I think we have a canned little bit of text which says, you know, that here are the remedies available to you, UDRP, courts, etcetera, etcetera, here are the ones, you know, implied, here are the ones that are not; one, we're not going to solve your argument for you; two, we really don't appreciate you asking ICANN Compliance to solve your argument for you and, you know, this is a genuine dispute.

I have Volker next. Did you have more to add to this, Volker? From Michele? Yeah. Okay thanks.

So this is - this is a complex issue. I don't know that we have a good answer. There are a number of places in the report, I think, where we indicate that some amount of discretion is required on the part of the registrar because they know who they're dealing with. As Michele points out they may have more information aside from what's in Whois.

And they may have something specific in a particular country. For example, Michele, I'm just picking on him a little bit here - but Michele may have - that the same company or organization may also have a ccTLD registration in a country that requires a business ID - license or an EIN or equivalent or a VAT ID or something like that. So the individual that can produce that documentation might also be able to untangle the mess that's occurring in the G-space.

So registrars have built I think their own internal procedures that suits them and suits their customers and suits their local laws. And probably then is, to me, a good indication that we as a policy working group shouldn't wade into those and try and create a one-size fits all process.

Pam Little: Thank you very much for your responses. Are there other questions in the queue?

James Bladel: The queue is yours.

Pam Little: Oh sorry. Then one follow up question is what if the entity is dissolved? What do you do with the Whois and the domain name?

James Bladel: Yeah, Michele and Volker. Do we want to let the lawyer guy take the first swing at this piñata? Okay, Volker, you're up since you took all of his brilliant insights last time.

Michele Neylon: James, this is one of the things that Volker and I try to do is just to confuse you so you have the German saying what the Irish guy is going to say and the Irish guy saying what the German's going to say; it's this kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: Don't give away the plan, Michele.

Michele Neylon: ...multicultural thing.

Mikey O'Connor: How many of you does it take to change a light bulb though?

Michele Neylon: We could possibly answer that.

Volker Greimann: Light bulbs are now illegal in Europe.

James Bladel: Okay so - on that note.

Volker Greimann: If the domain name - no the organization is dissolved we do not do anything. We - when we get a complaint or get notice of that then we ask the owner or the contact person to update the Whois to comply with Whois accuracy policy or quality policies.

But for ourselves we do not go out and check if domain names - if organizations suddenly cease to exist, if their contact persons change; that's not our job. We are likely we're not the policy to aid law enforcement, to do the job of law enforcement, we're also not judges that arbitrate third-party conflicts or police to Whois in a way that we would make spot checks like that.

James Bladel: So I'll expand on that a little bit because I think it's similar is that we would disposition a domain name in accordance with however, you know, the disposition of another business assets would be. So if a court said such and

such a company is in bankruptcy and we ask you to, you know, transfer the domain name to this individual we would do that.

Similarly I think is when it's registered to an individual and that individual dies. We have had situations where we've requested the executor of an estate to provide documentation similar to the dispositioning of a business's assets to the assets of an estate to reassign that.

I wanted to make a point about Whois accuracy - I got you, Mikey - about Whois accuracy. You know, we've seen this before I think where we'll see like a Acme Incorporated as the registrant and then right next to it the contact would be IT manager or domain name administrator. And a lot of, I think, other elements of ICANN - and perhaps it's the position of ICANN Compliance is that is an invalid Whois record and needs to be corrected.

But I think that in the particular case of there being an organization name we feel that that is a much cleaner Whois record than someone that actually puts an individual name subordinate to the organization because it addresses these issues that if the company goes bankrupt or they fire their IT manager and hire a new one or if the IT manager wins the lottery and goes to Australia to play with kangaroos that you don't have these immediate setting up of a Whois record for dispute.

So when we see those if we can verify that we can get someone at the organization with that that we would consider that a valid Whois because it addresses a lot of these problems so editorializing here.

But I have Mikey and Michele.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey for the transcript. I think the main point that I want to make is that - and the question you just raised, Pam, is not one that we considered except to say that if anything in those fields changes the change of registrant part of the transfer policy would kick in.

But in terms of all this dispute resolution and stuff like that the whole goal of that change of registrant policy is to contain the name within one registrar so that if there are disputing policies there aren't two registrars involved in resolving the dispute there's only one because it's going to be there for 60 days.

But we don't say anything about the job or the role or the responsibilities of the registrar when it comes to that; we simply slow the domain down so that they can do whatever they feel is appropriate.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mikey. I have Michele, Matt and Volker.

Michele Neylon: Yes think that just echoing what Mikey was saying. I mean this is not something, we weren't concerned with Whois accuracy more to do with the change (big) thing.

So the idea being if there's a change is this change legitimate or is this because some scumbag is trying to capture something?

I mean that was really how we viewed this because, you know, that's - we did not even delve into those kinds of weird kind of connotations.

I mean speaking to the points that James raised I mean from our perspective we would encourage our clients to provide generic contacts for business organizational domains because it's much less likely to cause us issues.

And let's say for example take icann.org and I would hope -- I haven't checked the Whois record -- but I would hope that the admin see and the registrant isn't set to Rob Beckstrom rob.beckstrom@icann.org because then that would actually be inaccurate Whois because he's no longer there.

I'd be much happier seeing something like, you know, Internet Corporation assigned names and numbers as the organization and I don't know, IT manager as contact person and then some kind of generic, you know, host master as icann.org or domain administrator@icann.org.

And I'm sure MarkMonitor would do something similar. I don't know. I mean I can let them speak to that themselves.

And but I mean the key thing with all this was to slow things down so that you don't have domains being kind of jumping around the place really, really quickly, making it very, very hard for everybody to find out what the hell had happened.

James Bladel: They did do a domain administrator for icann.org and congratulations on updating your new address too.

I was going to file a Whois complaint knowing that you're not in Marina del Rey anymore but you're ahead of me on that one.

So next…

Man: Yes but you could reach us through the other address so, you know…

Question I would have, would you have proper verification?

(Matt):   O boy.

James Bladel: That, no, no.

(Matt):   Don't take the bait. Don't take it. Yes this is (Matt). I'll just pin up on what Michele said. Yes, you know, we're, you know, as a registrar that represents only corporations we encourage people to use generic information like that.

You know, so you'll see probably 9% of our Whois records are domain administrator@facebook.com or whatever it is.

And so, you know, we agree with James very clearly feel that's a valid Whois record.

And before I sneak out the door I just wanted to make a couple comments, you know, as a member of the well (unintelligible) the working group and the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group I just I want to commend the compliance folks for participating in this.

You know, I - we have heard for the last several years that transfer issue's, you know, the number one compliance complaint.

So I think it's really important and I was actually commenting I think to (Tim) the other day about this before we got here how important it is I think for compliance to really understand what the recommendations are in the report and to provide feedback on them because ultimately you'll have to enforce them.

And so, you know, I've encouraged further dialogue on this and further comment. And I think it's great because, you know, the goal of the group is to create policies.

And we need, you know, feedback in terms of this - (those) policies are going to be enforceable downstream once they go into effect. So I think this was great and commend you guys for it. (James)?

James Bladel: Thanks (Matt). I agree completely and hopefully we can expect your feedback as well from the implementation team when they issue their - issue their whatever language, drafts, drafts policy -- whatever it is coming out of that report. So we would look for compliance.

We - the goal is not to make your life harder. That's the goal. Exactly, so we want to make sure that…

Mikey O'Connor: Hysterical laughter from compliance…

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: …for the transcript.

James Bladel: Evil laughter, evil laughter. No it was not evil. And so the goal is and but recognizing that, you know, we probably can't also solve all disputes.

And, you know, there's still going to be these gray areas. There's still going to be need for discretion on the part of registrars. And we still have to all work together.

And meanwhile there's a whole bunch of people who aren't in this room that are going to make our life difficult.

So (Voelker) is next and then Mikey.

(Voelker): Yes I just wanted to restate one small point that no matter what is the data in the Whois this data can be changed easily, quickly by anyone having access to the account of the registrant.

Therefore registrant can change on minutes' notice. That's okay. We do not check that unless we get a complaint.

What we wanted to do is make sure that once the data is changed the domain cannot be immediately transferred. That's the goal of the entire process here that we are doing.

And therefore the enforcement side, the compliance enforcement side should focus not on changes but rather on each policy or is the process being followed?

Does the registrar follow the process and can he document that the process has been followed in case there's a complaint?

I think that's what you should be looking out for. And that's easily enforceable as well.

James Bladel: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes this is Mikey for the transcriber. I'm going to follow right on behind (Voelker) and say that at the very end of the report there are about seven or eight use cases that are described that we intended - we used those for our own discussion but we think they're also pretty good for education.

They're also a pretty good way to understand all the different scenarios that might take place. And it's also an easier way to sort of frame use case specific questions. Because, you know, we may have missed something and so just wanted to draw your attention to the - it's last whatever it is, five or six pages of this gigantic report, it's the last appendix.

And it may be a very useful document both for you and for (Tim) when it comes to rolling this out and explaining it to all the registrars.

Woman: Thank you very much for that. I certainly will take a good look at the report. And I must admit I haven't done so. I've been relying on just some emails and bullet points high level. But I will take a good look at it.

And if I have any feedback I will be happy to provide that through Marika. Is that okay? Does that work? Okay.

James Bladel: I've reached the bottom of the queue. Do Michele - oh I shouldn't have said that. Michele?

Michele Neylon: No just one thought. I mean if particularly in relation to transfers - I can turn this thing on, the mic.

Particularly in relation to transfers I mean other policy things I mean it's not so much of a compliance heavy kind of topic.

I think, you know, the - it would be very helpful to guess, you know, regular interaction with compliance and both in terms of any implementation left over from IRTBB, the stuff coming out of this.

But also in what (James) has been referring to as the last and final IRTP she refers to an IRTP as in (done). I would like to think of it as death to IRTP but that's just me.

It would be helpful if there was some way and for ICANN compliance staff to if you're going to monitor or participate in that on a more active basis.

I mean even if that's just a case of you providing, adding a group email to the list so you get all the discussions and all the documents so you can immediately instead of relying on ICANN policy staff who may not be as familiar with the operational limitations and challenges that you face that you can actually, you know, participate actively - oh hold on a second guys, what in the hell are you talking about here?

You know, that's a lot of the idea about how the hell am I going to enforce that or, you know, statistically this is really a non-issue or, you know, I don't know. It's just you're going to see the actual complaints.

During IRTPB we got some - quite a lot of information about some of the complaints that you were getting related to some of the (tranfers) we were dealing with during that PDP.

And I wanted to be (sure) off the top of my head I'm sure (James) knows because (James) knows all these things and if he doesn't Marika definitely does, what the outstanding issues are in the last PDP in this series of anything which it might help us in terms of actual data would be helpful.

And, you know, an ongoing interaction is probably better than these, you know, once at every public meeting type thing when I'm just, you know, ongoing is always better. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele.

Woman: May give a response to…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Do you have something else (unintelligible)?

Woman: … Yes I've been trying to keep up with the mailing list. It's a great idea and I totally agree with it.

We internally also discussed how that whole policy development process and policy implementation policy enforcement should be all looped together.

And then after we have some time on enforcing a particular policy we should be able to feed back to the Policy Development Team again saying how effective the policy or a new policy or the change policy has been.

That's what I've been doing with the new changes recently with respect of (T Act) right? That's one sort of very new area.

And we'll do the same with other changes or new policy. I think that's really important. So rather than just kind of having new policy for the sake of new policy I think the review is very important.

And our involvement I certainly would - as we now have more resource in the team hopefully we could be, you know, be more involved as well in the process. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks. I knew that Marika wants to jump in on that.

Marika Konings: No this is Marika. And just to follow-up on what Michele was saying on the next IRTP and give my colleagues a heads up on what's been in the pipeline because the next one will mainly follow-on, focus on issues relating to dispute resolution.

So is it a TDRP and as well this one question on the universal adoption implementation of an EPP (auth info) codes whether that has eliminated a need for FOAs.

And as well for the record we do have regular meetings because I know, you know, they all have other jobs as well to do than to follow policies.

And we do try to with the different teams we meet on a regular basis to give them updates on, you know, what is being discussed.

So as Michele said, you know, we might focus on certain issues that are maybe not necessarily what their focal points are but we, you know, we are trying and improving I hope.

James Bladel: Thanks Marika. And can I just be a wet blanket on this conversation here a little bit which is this - I think it's important as you have said that we not - we

work closely and get - and solicit feedback from compliance. That's what (we think) so we make fact based decisions as we develop policy.

But I think there is also this concept of separation, I think appropriate separation between compliance and enforcement of a policy and the development of the policy in some respects.

So I think we want to make sure that we don't go too far in one direction. I think there is an extreme. And I think that what you've described so far is hey I'm - just your shaking your head. I'm allowed to think this, you know…

Michele Neylon: Of course you're allowed to think whatever you like (James). Just because you think it doesn't make it right.

James Bladel: No that's true. And I'm editorializing here that there are two separate functions of ICANN, policy development and policy enforcement.

And I think that it improves the quality of both functions if they're not co-mingled. I think that there are roles for compliance especially data and especially making sure that what we give them is enforceable.

But I don't know that we would want to go too much further down the road of having them actively involved in policy development. I'll just throw that (meat) on the table and see where we go with it so…

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that was a good one.

James Bladel: … Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I was actually going to move us on to another deep and difficult topic which we've been struggling with as a workgroup which is the name for the next and final IRTP working group, IRTP strikes back, IRTP the last generation.

You know, so I would love to watch you guys battle but I really want to move us on to this more difficult discussion if that's possible?

James Bladel: So Michele you were next in the queue or…

Michele Neylon: Yes I'm pretty much up in the queue. So (James) I think I understand where you're coming from. I mean maybe in some ways we probably agree but we're just not doing a particularly good job of communicating with each other.

I mean after all you are an American so and I'm Irish so, you know, the (unintelligible) challenges for us possibly influenced by cultural differences. I'm not too sure.

I understand that what you're saying about that policy and implementation that there has to be a certain degree of separation.

I would be quite strongly opposed to moving the two so far apart because sure we could come up with an absolutely wonderful policy that would never be implementable.

And we could spend eight weeks to 18 months of our collective lives as a group working out the finer details of something which requires us all to travel at the speed of light.

And since we can't travel at the speed of light we will never be able to implement it and never be able to enforce it. And that does not help any of us.

Now hands up registrars in the room who have never had an issue with transfers? And for the transcript I'll say there's nobody.

So, you know, look there are (unintelligible) transfers. And these issues - if we can fix them this would be a good thing. Getting (into them) from compliance from my perspective is not a bad thing.

James Bladel: And I think I did state for the record that input data and making sure that the policy enforceable is a good thing.

And just to - I think like everything in ICANN there are no black and white decisions. Everything is, you know, we discussed different shades of gray.

But I noticed that whenever we trot out our examples or our rhetoric it's always well it could be black or it could be white so we're always seem to be parsing gray.

And I think here we're in another gray area where of course we don't want them to exist in a vacuum or a silo and I think that that was part of the message from the new CEO on Monday.

But we also don't want to let the tail wag the dog so Mikey's up next.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm merely requesting closure - cloture on this issue. Enough already guys.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) tabling it doesn't (unintelligible) deserve that.

James Bladel: Well that's the funny thing because in the English language tabling has different…

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I don't want to use that word.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: …for that reason.

James Bladel: (Pam) did you have - I saw you raised your hand okay. So is this a new topic or are you going to hit me again?

Michele Neylon: No just moving off to what Mikey would like to would like to move on to which is, you know, how we're going to name the next working group iteration.

James Bladel: Exactly. But…

Michele Neylon: So, you know…

James Bladel: …there, can we just check the queue and make sure that - yes let's make sure that we've actually hit the bottom of the queue as far as substantial questions on A because we have two other issues that much like the working group are just the forgotten stepchildren of this charter and just don't get the same level of showcase attention that change of registrant does.

Any concerns about our treatment or recommendations regarding the FOA or any strong opinions about whether registries should call their registers by their given names and not their nicknames, the INID versus the proprietary ID?

Any - I see heads nodding so I think that these must not be particularly contentious topics. So okay so what's your next topic sir?

Michele Neylon: Well with the next - when will the next working group start? I mean when will a charter be generated, handed over?

And just before Marika answers all that for those registrars and other community people who are in the room who weren't involved in this particular IRTP just because I know (James) will say us like get in there him, you know, we always welcome new members in these working groups.

And I think that the caffeine's really kicking in now. You know, join in. It's great fun to spend quality time with Mikey, and (James), and Simonetta, and (Voelker), and (Bob), and all these other people once a week.

James Bladel: I think Marika can address the timeline issue for IRTP the final frontier, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, that'll make it really easy. So this is Marika.

So basically together with the motion on the adoption of these recommendations which may be considered or vote upon on this meeting and if not this meeting probably the next there's also the request for the issue report which is the first step in the PDP process.

So would it be required - would the motion be adopted for this meeting? I think we then have up to 45 days to produce the issue report which would go out for public comment.

And then you have the 2121 public comment period. Then staff produces a final report which it submits to the council. Then it's up to the council to initiate the PDP.

Normally it would also form a drafting team to develop a charter. But what we've actually done for the previous PD - the IRTP is because, you know, the questions (are both here) cuts.

There's, you know, in the charter there's not much that needs to be done since the last time around. I made a proposal. I just prepared a draft charter and told the council you may want to consider just adopting this one.

Of course it's your choice if you want to form a drafting team to, you know, do the same thing. But they were fine with that so I'm hoping that that approach would work here as well.

So after that then it would - then we would form the working group. So yes probably the beginning of next year would be my estimation if - although I would still have a look at the questions.

And again I'm already looking around the room if any of you have information on those specific charter questions that might be helpful to put in in the issue report. I'd probably look again to registries as well that may have no statistics on.

I think some of them already shared statistics with us in some of the previous session on how the TDRP is being used so we need to look at that but as soon as possible.

James Bladel: So thanks Marika. So with that I would point out that we are at the end of our queue. And I would like to propose that this working group consider that it was scheduled for an hour rather than an hour and a half. Or I'm sorry no we did use we did use the entire time. Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes we've got seven minutes. We could work on a theme song.

James Bladel: I was going to - there's only one person qualified to do the theme song here Mikey and that's you. So I would say to folks I would propose that we give the seven minutes back.

More importantly I would propose that we give you your Tuesday mornings or afternoons back.

Man: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Wait a minute.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: When's the IRTP going to be?

James Bladel: Exactly at least until the implementation team gets up and rolling. But, you know, for a number of weeks here I would propose that, you know, if you wanted to learn a new language or, you know, take lessons on how to ride a unicycle or whatever you'd like to do during that time…

Mikey O'Connor: Learn brain surgery from Marika.

James Bladel: Brain surgery so but thank you very much to everyone on the working group. I know we just spend a lot of time petting everybody on the back but, you know, this is maybe the last time that we're all in the same place so thank you very much for that.

And when we come back we will have - probably be the same group, let's be honest. But we will have a different name, different chairs, different charter, different - Marika will still be here of course because how could we function? And we'll go from there. So thanks everyone. It's been great work.

END