

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Registrar Whois Meeting

Tuesday 16 October 2012 at 13:00 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.

Man: Recordings are connected.

Man: Sixteen October 2012. The time is 1:02 local continuing RrSG Whois.

Thanks and welcome back for those of you that are here in Toronto for lunch.
For those of you that are remote welcome back as well.

We're going to get going with an update on the Whois replacement protocol briefing from ICANN and IETF folks, (Steve) and (Murray).

I will turn things over to you and thank you for coming by today to make this update.

(Steve): Thank you. And thank you for giving us this opportunity. So with the IETF chartered a working group to work on a new protocol for Internet registration data.

So from the ICANN area there are a couple of policy working group's or not policy working groups but a couple of activities that are related on this issue.

So the most recent GNSO and ASAC Report internationalized registration data one of the recommendations is pointing out that the Whois protocol has now been internationalized.

And therefore it will have challenges in supporting internationalized registration data going forward and therefore calling the community to evaluate and assess a replacement protocol for Whois. So that's one stream of work.

The second stream of work is last year ASAC published Spec 51 Whois domain name terminology which one of the recommendations ASAC also asserts is for the community, the ICANN community to evaluate and assess a replacement protocol.

And there are similar streams of work indications in the Whois Review Team Report.

Man: Do you have slides for what you're talking about because you need to display them using that laptop?

(Steve): There will be.

Man: Oh okay. All right we just thought...

(Steve): Yes. So this is, you know, originally, you know, the IETF worked to - for the replacement protocol. So we thought we want to provide the community an update and briefings on these issues so that engage a dialogue sometimes the technical community and the policy community they need to engage dialogues on these early on. So this is one of those sessions where this could be possible.

So (Murray) who is IETF working group chair on this will give us a presentation and after that will be happy to answer questions.

I'm going to present on my computer if that's possible.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Murray Cuchiranni): Sure. Okay good afternoon. My name is Murray Cuchiranni. I'm one of the two co-chairs for the (Weirs) working group at the IETF. We are chartered to do the work that you're talking about here.

The need for new protocol as you might imagine comes from the fact that Whois which is from RFC 3912 has never been internationalized.

There's no way to make an internationalized query, a standard way to make an internationalized query or provide an internationalized answer, something that supports better than basic ASCII answers.

Among the other problems there is no data framework. Every service you ask, every Whois service you ask can give you a different answer. Data can come in different orders. Dates can be formatted, however the local site does it or in any manner really.

The same with phone numbers and other objects in the reply can be formatted or ordered in any way. And this might be fine for humans but it's not especially useful for systems that need to get access to this information in a more automated way.

Another important thing that's missing from Whois is that we do not have the ability to support the notion of differentiated access.

All clients look the same apart from the fact that their IP addresses are different. And I can't tell if two clients coming from the same IP address are the same user or one is a user, one is a program, one has privileges the other should never or anything of that nature.

It's therefore difficult to give what we call privileged access to information. And it doesn't mean that it's not a reference to PII. It means that this client is different from that client in some way. It could be rate limiting. It could be the type of data that are returned to the queries.

So we formed a working group inside the IETF and in response to increasing demand for solutions to these problems.

And among the things we're chartered to tackle are the standardization of a data framework. So if you're going to prevent - present date here's how you have to present it so that other - so clients all know how to handle the reply.

Deliver objects encapsulated in the framework over a restful service using http. And those are basically some buzzwords for do it cheap and easy with readily available software already.

We are keenly aware -- and this has come up many times in our work -- it's actually in the chartering process -- that we already took a run at doing this with the CRISP working group some years ago.

That went absolutely nowhere after it was I think one major provider adopted it or took a run at adopting it.

So they'll be - although the technology has for all intents and purposes failed us the requirements are largely the same. They haven't changed.

So we are paying very close attention to wanting to tackle the problem in a way that is - that manifests and appears rather than in a way that nobody can adopt or nobody will adopt.

And keep it simple yet support internationalized registration data is the key goal here.

We also want to this notion of the capability, not the requirement of differential service based on authentication of the client.

If I can tell that you are a specific kind of client, I want to give you a specific kind of information and perhaps give you more or less access to what I have.

And as much as possible we want to do this in a way that addresses the needs both of both names and number registries. We - ICANN has many notions of a constituency.

And with the IETF looking at this problem we really have two. We have the names which are the RIRs and we - sorry we have the numbers which are the RIRs and we have the names which is all the domain registries.

And we really want as much as possible to produce a single protocol here that deviates as little as possible for the two major constituencies.

So very briefly why did we go with Restful? It uses HTTP and there's ample code out there to produce HTTP clients and servers now so that makes perfect sense to do it that way.

Another important property is something that is restful is that it is stateless. Maintaining state is expensive so try not to.

The layering and cash ability I won't go into there although they I will say that they provide additional capabilities for enhanced services.

But perhaps one of the most interesting things here is that an object that you want to ask about is represented by URI as an example here for something at ARIN where you're asking about an object inside the ARIN database.

And this means that a browser can pull that up. A (Cro) client can pull that up. Anything that is able to query in HTTP URI can get this information and do something interesting with it. That makes it available to a large amount - a large client base right away.

And we actually already have running code. Five of the six RIRs have put up prototypes of this concept.

In fact ARIN put theirs up a while ago and has been encouraging use of it to the point where they now get more queries for this than they do for conventional Port 43 Whois.

So this kind of momentum is extremely encouraging that we're on the right track. CRISP never saw anything remotely like this as far as I can tell although I must admit that CRISP predates my work at the IETF all together.

So working group status we chartered in April of this year. There are five core documents we're working on. The basic protocol we're calling (ARDAP).

(ARDAP) over HTTP a very simple introduction to doing this kind of work using HTTP. You format the query like a URI as you saw in the previous slide.

The reply - replies will come, the current favorite is JSON. We thought about XML and moved instead in this direction.

An entire document about security considerations, encrypting the data if necessary, identifying clients differently from each other, to whom you show which kinds of data, that's an informational document for people to build a policy on and is not us declaring any kind of policy whatsoever.

And redirects, so if you right now if you ask ARIN about a network number that's owned by LACNIC then ARIN will do the redirect. And so this is simply a document that explains how to do that.

The last RFC in this list is scheduled to be done in terms of the working group at the end of December 2013. There are still the usual IETF approval procedures beyond that.

But we expect to have it wrapped up by then. And there's confidence in the working group that we can be done by then.

For those interested in monitoring or even participating which we would very much welcome the next meeting is in November. The first full week of November is the next IETF meeting. And I believe (Weirs) is meeting on Monday.

The URL you can see here you can see the working group charter, the various drafts we're working on and some I don't know adjacent ones that have been offered that the working group isn't actually tackling yet.

Contact information for the co-chairs or the area director if you're interested in and archives for and subscription access to the mailing list which is completely open.

And I think that's all I had. If there are questions for me or (Steve) I'd be happy to tackle them.

Man: Okay thanks guys. Questions? So this is something that folks are in the room I know some of them are familiar with it but I don't know if it's something that everyone is paying close attention to or not.

Man: Why are you looking at me?

Man: I always look at you. You're sitting right next to me. That's why. Yes okay, thanks guys. It's...

Man: (Do you) have a question?

Man: Oh yes so I wonder if you can speak to how this would if - effect thick versus thin Whois model how that plays into the Restful protocol and if the two are interconnected?

Because obviously the registrars have the data in the thin model but I'll, you know, we're kind of transitioning other than common net to more of a thick model so is that something that's being discussed as well?

Man: So the protocol will not affect either. You know, you can accommodate either thick or thin model.

So there is nothing in the protocol that, you know, we'll now be able to accommodate one of the other.

So but depending on which model to choose that's a policy question that - to be discussed and reach consensus.

Man: Right so that in the current environment this new Whois protocol if we still have thin Whois for common net would have somewhat of a significant impact on registrars since we're already providing the Whois output, you know, we would have to change systems and adapt to the new protocol once this is adopted, correct?

(Murray Cuchiranni): Yes.

Man: Okay, great thanks guys. We'll...

(Murray Cuchiranni): Just really quickly...

Man: Sure.

(Murray Cuchiranni): ...on there. There - the focus of the working group is to enable any of the technical solutions you're talking about either thick or thin and any kind of policy that you want to deploy.

We're trying very hard to stay out of those decisions and just let you guys sort that piece out. So if we've missed something like that that's exactly the kind of feedback that we're interested in hearing.

Can - if you feel like the protocol's too heavyweight for thin or the, you know, if we've done something wrong in that regard please do let us know before it gets too far.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yes no I think staying out of the thin versus thick Whois discussion is a good move. Kudos.

(Murray Cuchiranni): We want to stay out of it as much as possible.

Man: Great. Well again thanks for coming by and giving the update, appreciate it.

Now I think we have the policy staff although I'm looking - no there's Marika.

It's really dark in this room for those of you that aren't physically here so and I guess I'm getting older so the two combined.

Mood lighting yes it's great. We're preparing for music night although I notice that (Adam) your boom mic is gone. What happened?

(Adam): I don't know what happened. Something about they check, you know, where I lived and I'm actually in the suburbs so I'm not a huge Torontoite.

Man: Nice.

(Adam): Sorry Torontonians.

Man: Torontonians okay. Hi Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes you ready for me?

Man: Are ready to go? Yes your...

Marika Konings: I'm ready to go. Hi everyone. For those of you that don't know me my name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director with ICANN supporting the GNSO and some of the policy development activities there.

So I'll just be taking you through some of the activities that are going on in the GNSO. And I just I think selected three of those.

But if you have questions on any of the other initiatives that are going on I'm happy to try and answer those.

And are my slides here (Tim)? No but here?

Okay if you want to put Adobe up here that's fine as well.

Yes I think it's this one, just loading. Maybe just in the meantime to mention that I think some of the initiatives I'll be talking about, several of you are participating in that.

So, you know, please feel free to speak up if you feel I'm missing some points or not saying the right things.

So first of all is the inter-registrar transfer policy Part C. And I think you already heard from compliance this morning that this still is, you know, a major area of where we get a lot of complaints.

So this is an area where the GNSO has already been working on a while on this issue. The policy itself was adopted in 2004 and ever since then they identified a list of issues that needed further clarification or improvement.

And as a result of that they split those up in a number of PDPs, basically labeled from A to E. And we're currently dealing with Part C of that.

So the Part C working group was asked to look at three specific issues so the first looking at a change of control or a change of registrant function.

A second question related to whether there should be a time limit on forms of authorization.

And third of all should registries be required to use IANA IDs for registrars rather than using the proprietary IDs?

So I think the last time in Prague I think I spoke to you about the initial report that was published which had a number of preliminary recommendations in there but also a number of questions that the working group was looking for input on.

And as a result of that we've got quite a couple of a number of comments. Also as a result of the workshop we held there and several of you participated in that and I think it was really helpful the feedback we received there.

And so based on that the working group went back and looked at all the comments received and, you know, continued its deliberations on some of the open items they had identified.

And they managed to come to agreement on the recommendations and they published their final report just prior to this meeting and submitted that to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

So what are the recommendations in the report? Actually the headings cut off slightly here in the bar. But I see there's - so I'm going to do the first question on whether there should be a change of control or a change of registrant function?

I think maybe, you know, to give a little bit of context there I think, you know, the working group actually tried themselves to enact a change of registrant and did a little case study and think - realized that actually it was really, really difficult and worked different based on, you know, which registrar you would use.

And these were really, you know, experienced people not, you know, the average registrants for whom it might be even more complicated.

And in addition to that they actually went to meet with the ccNSO and came to the conclusion that actually on all ccTLD operators have a change of registrant process or a different term for that.

I think some use the term trade or but actually realizing that this is a very common process in the ccTLD context.

So I think on the basis of that and also looking at the issues, the lacking of a process it's currently creating with the IRTP being used in certain instances as demonstrating change, demonstrating control of a name and actually changing domain names.

They thought it would be a good idea to actually recommend the creation of a specific policy that would outline the rules for changing registrants.

So their idea is that basically the IRTF would convert into an overarching transfer policy with one leg being the rules for changing registrars and the other part being the rules for changing your registrants.

So here are just a few points. But if you're really interested in the details of that policy because they put quite a lot of work in outlining the different steps and also providing a lot of information on the different case studies are different scenarios you would have in this situation I'd really like to refer you to the report which is very short, very briefly.

Basically there will be a requirement for both the prior and the new registrant to authorize the change.

There is a possibility or it's foreseen there that it's possible to allow for preapproval, something that aftermarket participants were very keen about.

Basically it's not possible to have a change of registrant at the same time as a change of registrar. And just to clarify it means that it cannot be done simultaneously.

It doesn't mean that you cannot do it one second after each other or in a very short timeframe but it's just it will not be possible to call mingle the two in one procedure.

And also there is a recommendation that following a change of registrants the domain name is locked for 60 days for security purposes. But there is the possibility to and for the registrant to ask for an opt out of that lock.

So I'm looking - oh yes go ahead.

Man: I've got a question on that locking period. Would a change of registrant that's been completed also prevent a change of registrar afterwards?

Like would a domain that just - where the registrant has been changed be locked from a transfer, a registrar transfer?

Marika Konings: Yes. I think the idea is that you cannot transfer registrars immediately after change of registrant. I think the whole idea is to avoid, you know, situations where there's hijacking.

So the default would be a 60 day lock but there's the option to lock to opt out of that.

And I think also we - you'll see that there's one of the recommendations that's still in the positive implementation for IRTTP Part B that provides for the unlocking of a domain name upon the request of a registrant within five business days.

So the default would be the 60 day lock but there are mechanisms to unlock and still engage in the transfer but it's mainly for security purposes I think that the lock was - it has been recommended.

Man: Okay. Just to expand on that and (John) I think whatever you're reading must be exciting because I'm surprised you're not all over this.

So could you walk through how this would work in the sale of a domain name where the buyer is going to use a different registrar than the seller which by the way is, you know, the - which is something that happens thousands and thousands of times every day, you know, relative to the very rare hijacking the doesn't get rectified in the normal system?

Marika Konings: Right and in that case -- and I'm looking around if there are any aftermarket participants in the working group -- I think in that case it would ask for the opt out.

If they do want to consciously immediately transfer a domain name after the change of registrants to a another registrar so in that case they request the opt out so they can make that change.

(John) have you looked at that? Like have you seen whether you - that that opt out is the, you know, make the secondary market people happy?

(John): I haven't looked at it in detail. My understanding is it would but I - no one's gotten excited about it yet.

Man: Yes hold on guys. First can you make sure that you say your names because the remote folks don't know who's speaking. And then yes James you had a point? Go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes so there's - and as you might imagine this was a topic that was discussed fairly extensively. And we worked very closely with our representatives from SATO and from (Name) Media because I think that they wanted to preserve the fluidity of what you're talking about for the transactions.

And so what we came up with was as this compromise -- and I admit it's complicated -- but is the idea that you can at the time of sale get your registrant to opt out of this lock.

If they don't and they forget and they - and it triggered the lock you have to remove it.

You know, because of IRTPB says once you're asked to remove a lock you remove a lock.

So you've got the front end opt out. You've got the back end requirement to remove. And then the, you know, what we're trying to avoid here particularly

in think registries - sorry this is James Bladel. I just completely missed (Matt)'s instructions.

Man: (Good idea).

James Bladel: What we're trying to avoid - and we did all kind of look at this particular scenario. So it is hijacking (Elliott) but it is something else which is that it thin registries when a domain name shows up at the doorstep of a new registrar with a new contact there is really no way of knowing, you know, where it came from and who those people are.

So and this gets even more complicated in the new RAA but let's just set that aside.

So this is kind of what we came up with as a bridge is this you can opt out at the beginning, you can remove it at the end but, you know, if it's - but if it's left in as a component transaction there is this lock.

Man: And is that opt out - you know, one of the problems with the 60 day lock is if the language - well I don't think the language was ambiguous but it was interpreted as ambiguous by some.

And, you know, is the - that opt out very prescriptive? In other words, you know, is there no wiggle room on the part of the registrar around that opt out?

James Bladel: That's the intent. There is no final language yet because this is going to -- and (Brink) is going to cover -- this's there is a follow-up team.

We recognize the importance that not just punting these issues over to staff and letting them fill in those blanks, especially blanks like that.

So the members of the working group and I'm sure that our aftermarket reaps will be among them will help craft that language. And I think that's the intent that we would try to preserve yes.

We want it both ways that's why it's complicated.

Man: Yes thanks James. Marika do you mind if Michele's got additional comments on (unintelligible)? Yes Michele?

Michele Neylon: Now just speaking to (Elliott)'s point which I think is, you know, it's important. And (Elliott) when this goes through the implementation phase and, you know, it's down to wording that carefully it would be great to have the input from people like yourself.

Because, you know, the last thing we want is something coming out of our end this going to be impossible to put into action in the real world.

Mike Zupke: So could I - yes Mike Zupke, ICANN staff. So Tim Cole and I will be, you know, probably kind of leading the charge here on implementation when it comes to that.

And, you know, one of the things that we've been talking about is, you know, how do registrars expect to see this work? In particular, you know, can you go back a slide Marika?

You know, I mean how should this process work? And, you know, our concern is that, you know, we're not registrars.

We don't, you know, we don't know how you've set up your systems. And so we really do want to get input from you on that.

And, you know, I don't know how many people are going to volunteer for the IRT but I feel like, you know, this is definitely a place where you want to be

involved in giving your inputs that we don't, you know, create a system that you can't or don't want to use.

Man: Thanks Mike. Good discussion Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes I - definitely and really, you know, been helpful to receive that input and very grateful as well to the working group members to help, you know, defend the recommendations that the working group has come up with.

And I think as many have said it's, you know, this is compromised language. And I think, you know, as part of the implementation that we will see as well that there probably will be a need as well to build into that, you know, education and outreach to registrars to really explain the whole, you know, new structure. And, you know, that will definitely be an effort that will require some time and dedication.

So I'm looking at the next recommendation the charter Question B relating to the FOAs. So the recommendation there from the working group is that the FOA should not be valid for longer than 60 days.

So basically following and expiration the registrar must reauthorize the transfer request by getting a new FOA.

There is again here a possibility for automatic renewal again I think as a concession to the aftermarket to allow for, you know, situations where a domain name is on sale. And it's, you know, you don't want to constantly have to ask a registrant for a new FOA.

So in addition the recommendation also specified that the FOA also automatically expires if there is a change of registrant or if the domain name expires or if the transfer is executed or if there is a dispute filed for the domain names. In those cases there is an automatic expiration.

And there is a recommendation that the next IRTP PDP should actually look at the question of, you know, whether EPP auth info codes actually have eliminated a need - the need for FOAs and whether these are still necessary.

So I think this is an issue you might see coming up in the next PDP.

And so as I said before, you know, this report has now been submitted to the GNSO council for its consideration. They have it on the agenda for their session on Wednesday.

There - I don't know at this stage whether there will already be a vote on it or whether there will be a request for deferral if some groups might need more time to actually review the recommendations.

We also have a workshop scheduled tomorrow to provide the community an update on what is in this report from 8:30 to 10:00. So if you have more questions or want to, you know, here this again you're welcome to come then.

Following the GNSO council assuming that they adopt the recommendations and just for the record the recommendations in the report did have the unanimous consensus of the working group members so there was no opposition. Everyone agreed with recommendations.

And they would then go out for public comments before the board would consider those. And once the board has adopted them then they move into implementation.

And as some people have already referred to there's also a recommendation by the working group to form an implementation review team consisting of working group members that would work with staff on the implementation of these recommendations.

And based on that work they would be doing there would also be proposed implementation plan that then eventually is also put out for public comment. So the broader community can also provide input on that.

And I think that's it for IRTP. See as more topics - if there are no questions on this one then...

Man: Yes no thanks Marika. I think there's a question online but I also just want to give a shout out to you for the graphics in the slide deck -- very good use of stock photos. Kudos.

(Voelker)'s got a question online and then I don't know if there is additional questions in the room or not. (Voelker)?

(Voelker): Yes there's a question or more like a statement from (Bob Connelly) regarding what James is saying it's often necessary to update the email contacts of the admin contract - contact prior to a transfer.

If it's not updated the FOA will not reach the admin contact. Locking the domain name for this reason is a real problem.

Man: Yes thanks. And again just as I don't know if it was James or Michele said several of us were active in the IRTP Part C.

And when we get to that implementation team would definitely encourage additional folks to participate because obviously this is pretty big policy change. It'll have a significant impact on us from an operational standpoint.

Any other IRTP stuff? If not Marika we can move onto the next. Oh sorry James go ahead before you take a bite of your apple.

James Bladel: Yes I do it right in the microphone. Just - so there is going to be - you mentioned IRTPD in the consolidation? Okay sorry. So there's another IRTP blast, actually there was two.

We recommended to the council that they be combined into one IRTPD D as in done with IRTP working groups.

So, you know, we'd encourage register participation on that upcoming working group. And we'll probably see a call for volunteers between now in Beijing.

Marika Konings: Yes and this is Marika on that point. Indeed the adoption of the recommendations in addition to that there's the initiation - our request for an issue report on the last, hopefully last PDP on this topic at least.

And I think in addition to the question on, you know, whether EPP (authentic) codes have overtaken the need for FOAs I think a lot of the other questions relate to the transfer dispute resolution policy and questions surrounding that.

And I think one other question relating to whether there should be penalties in case of violations of the IRTP. So I think that's a package for the last one.

And then as James said, you know, produce an issue report and then following that the PDP would get an initiated and a working group is formed.

So if you're interested in that topic there's another opportunity to participate in the working group.

So the next one I wanted to briefly mention is the Thick Whois policy development process that's currently ongoing. You already had a bit of discussion on Whois just before this and it might be worth mentioning.

And I think you're all familiar with, you know, the difference between the thick and thin. But I think here as part discussions we actually had an IRTP.

And I think it was just mentioned before as well that there would be real advantages in having thick Whois from certain perspectives.

But there's also other elements that will need to be considered, you know, in determining whether there should be requirements for requiring thick Whois for all gTLDs.

So on the basis of that the GNSO council initiated a policy development process on this topic. And the next step in that process was to form a drafting team that would develop the charter for the working group.

And that drafting team has been working, you know, pretty hard to get that charter ready for Toronto. And it's also on the agenda for the GNSO council to consider at its meeting on Wednesday.

So basically the - as the charter is currently framed basically the objective of the working group would be to provide the GNSO council with a policy of recommendation regarding the use of thick Whois by all registries both existing and future.

And the charter also outlines the different topics the working group would need to consider in order to be able to make that determination.

So there - they'll be asked to look at the response consistency, stability issues, accessibility, what impacts would there be on data and privacy protection, potential cost implications, synchronization and migration, authoritativeness, competition and registry services, existing Whois applications, data escrow and also a registrar port 43 Whois requirements.

So basically the working group would be asked to look at each of these elements and basically weigh, you know, the pros and cons of requiring thick Whois and based on hopefully the overall evaluation come to a recommendation on whether or not to require a thick Whois.

In addition the charter also outlines that, you know, should the working group come to consensus on requiring thick Whois they should also look at another number of issues or at least provide guidance to the council as well as part of implementation on issues such as cost, guidance on how to conduct the actual transition and consider whether there should be any special provisions or exceptions.

And the charter also specifies that the working group should look at some of the other initiatives that are going on as they may relate to thick Whois such as, you know, registry, registrar separation discussions, you know, RA negotiations and Whois studies and 2004 transition of .org from thin to thick.

The work has been done on internationalization as you heard before although I think they pointed out that model would accommodate for either way and as well the recommendations of the Whois review team.

So I said the council is expected to consider adoption of the charter at this meeting. Again there might be a deferral which would mean it would go to the next council meeting.

But as soon as the charter is adopted a call for volunteers will go out to form the working group. And just like to encourage all if you have an interest in this topic to, you know, please join and participate in the working group.

So is there any questions on this topic?

Man: Anyone? Going on.

Marika Konings: To the next. So another policy development process that's currently ongoing and I think it was already touched upon this morning as well is relation to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

So basically this comes out from an issue report that was requested on the - an overall review of the UDRP.

But the council decided that to leave that for a later stage but instead just focus on this very specific issue of the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

I think as well as you know currently there is no, you know, requirement to lock domain names in-between the filing of a complaint and commencement.

The UDRP just refers to, you know, status quo. And there's no definition of what status quo means which has resulted in different interpretations and also confusion I think among registrars but also complainants and UDRP providers.

So the working group is basically asked to respond to a host of questions which I think basically come down to, you know, when and how to lock.

So they're basically looking at because I think there is general agreement that status quo doesn't mean that it needs to be locked down and no changes can be made.

But the question is really, you know, when should that happen? At what stage is that at? You know, commencement? Is it at the stage of verification?

Should there be a new stat built in at which locking is requested, and what time frame? You know, once the information is received by the registrar how quickly does a lock need to be applied?

And I think one of the more challenging questions is going to be what is actually locked? What changes are permitted?

And I think there the key question is there as well in relation to privacy and proxy should the real registrant be revealed?

Should any changes be allowed or should, you know, at the time of locking that's what is there that how it will stay. So those are some of the questions that the working group is asked to look at.

So as a starting point the working group was asked to actually gather information and get input from the different parties on, you know, really trying to understand what the issues are and what current practices are.

So they conducted a survey amongst registrars and as well as UDRP providers. And we actually got a really good response from the registrar community -- and I want to thank you all for that that -- on the base of which they developed a little summary that gave a bit of insight on the current practices.

And I think it did paint the picture that indeed there's no consistency. You know, some lock upon notification, some lock upon verification. So I think it provided the working group with some useful insights on what is currently going on.

In addition they also opened a public common forum and they reached out to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as the different supporting organizations and advisory committees to ask them for input that might help inform their deliberations.

So they've now actually started looking at the comments received and then going through them and trying to, you know, slowly come to agreement or

initial recommendations on these different questions that they've been tasked with.

So that's the work that is ongoing. And I think they've set themselves as a goal to publish their initial report by December.

So if you're interested in this topic the working group is having a meeting later this week on Thursday from 9:00 to 10:30. I think the intention is to make it really interactive.

We've tasked a number of working group members to (defense) and propositions with the idea of trying as well to get feedback from SNDs whether, you know, either propositions are, you know, supported or what the challenges might be which we then hope will inform the working group with, you know, directions to take on these issues.

Because the (guests) we've seen as well and the results of the survey and as well putting together the program for the workshop it looks like they are, you know, a limited number of answers that the working group will be looking at, you know, when do you lock and how do you lock?

So it's the number of options and trying to come to a consensus on what the appropriate way would be to dealing with those.

And I think that's all I had for today. I don't know if there any questions or...

Man:

Great. Thanks Marika. I know that Michele is actually chairing the locking of domains to UDRP and (John), (Voelker) and (Luke) I think some others are involved as well so I encourage you guys to attend that session tomorrow as well as the IRTP - oh sorry Thursday as well as the IRTP one.

Any additional questions for Marika on the three areas that she covered today or anything else?

Excellent. Thanks Marika. You've left us all speechless yes. Well done.
That's actually tough for this group.

Marika Konings: Thanks for having me and this, you know, we're always ready and available if there are questions or if people want to get involved but feel a bit overwhelmed with all the information that we might provide here, you know, feel free to reach out to us and we'll do our best to help you catch up.

Man: Great thanks. So were about 15 minutes I think ahead of time. Our board, meeting with the board starts in their room in about 30 minutes. So we'll get an extra 15 minutes to either walk really leisurely down to their room or just take a 15 minute break.

We're in the Metro East which is across the way on this level or downstairs?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Straight across the sky bridge? Oh yes, yes, yes where the REA session was yesterday.

So we start that at 2:00 just...

Man: (Unintelligible) next to the exhibition area.

Man: Yes right next to the exhibition area. So we'll do that starting in just about 30 minutes. So we'll see everyone over in the board meeting room in 30.
Thanks.

END