ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
RrSG Session 2
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 1100 UTC

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

Also found on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Michele Neylon: The Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting. (Elise), please start recordings and all those other funky things. Okay thank you.

Over to you, (Darcy), I think. No. Maybe? Okay sorry. Mr. Zupke, you have the floor.

Mike Zupke: Thank you, Michele. This is Mike Zupke of staff. I'm really here to turn over the microphone to my colleague Fabien on the Registry Services team, who is heading up the implementation of the thick Whois policy recommendations. So I'll just step down and hand it over to Fabien.

Fabien Betremieux: Hello everyone. My name is Fabien Betremieux. I'm from the Registry Services team. So I think we're here to discuss the thick Whois policy implementation and in particular from the perspective of what can be - what

will be the impact on the registrars in - regarding input that we'd like to seek from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the registrars for us to refine - define and refine the implementation plan.

So maybe we can move to the next slide that will just provide with an overview of the background, and then I'll turn it over to (Theo) regarding the discussion on the input that we're seeking.

So as you may be aware, the thick Whois PDP started in 2012 and concluded in October 2013. We've - the policy recommendations that were produced, adopted by the board in February of 2014. In terms of outcome of the implementation, we've identified two outcomes: the transition from thin to thick of .com, .net. and .jobs, and the consistent labeling of display for all gTLDs per the specification three of the RAA2013.

In terms of the discussion of the transition from thin to thick, the IRT has suggested that we consider two parallel tracks. So we would seek in parallel and we've - each of those tracks would have a specific timeline. We would work on a track which would transition the new registrations, the registrations created after the policy effective date, and the other track would be the transition of existing registrations.

And I think the purpose behind those two tracks is the rationale for that proposal is that those two types of registration create, or would potentially create, specific challenges that would need to be managed appropriately. And so the reason we're here is really to seek your input on in particular the second track of existing registrations so that we can inform the definition of the implementation plan.

Can I turn it over to you, (Theo), with the next slide maybe?

(Theo):   Sure, Fabien. Thank you. So basically the IRT is facing a couple questions here on how to move forward and that's why we're here to ask the registrars

to provide their input on it. Because wherever we are going with this, there will be operational impacts some way or another. And the scope of the questions is pretty broad from the sense there is a lot of open questions here, and the IRT, the members in it, do not have the answers. So we need to come back to you guys and basically put out a question like guide us here and help us and see where we are going with this. So I think that's basically the question for this session here.

Fabien Betremieux: And so I think we shared with the group a scoping paper for a potential analysis of data that you registrars are currently holding in your records. The objective -- and this is in relation to the transition of existing registrations -- the objective of this analysis of data would be to identify the type of challenges that we would face when transitioning those registrations from thin to thick, and not only identify but also quantify those issues that we may face.

And the - and so that would serve to define the type of expectation requirements that we should put on the transition, the timeline and any types of supporting measures that would be needed to complete the transition. The nature of the analysis would be to look at the existing registration data and compare it to requirements from the registries and the requirements existing in the various contracts that would be applicable to the end state which was - which would be a thick .com, .net, and .jobs.

So in the scoping paper we've provided proposes systems requirement from the registries applicable to .com, .net, and .jobs. And the purpose of the analysis would be to look at how the current data that are on your records compare to those requirements and the types of problems that you would face as an affected party when transferring that data to the registry in the context of that transition to thick.

And in terms of participation, what we are hoping to have is 10 to 20 volunteers that would be willing to contribute to such analysis and look at their - a sample of their data and provide those types of findings that we're

looking for. And so maybe to the last - to the bottom of the slide here, we would discuss with the IRT some types of challenge without this being an exhaustive list. So we expect that there would be potential missing data or incomputable data format.

So for instance you'd have dates or phone numbers that would not be compatible with what the registry would expect. The data may - some data may be missing complete data, or there may also be issues with the - your ability to initially contact a registrant to get some data you would need for the transition.

So those are initial ideas of type of challenges that we may face, but again we're seeking your input and your own analysis to identifying and quantifying those type of issues. So I think we can open it up for questions.

Tom Barrett: So this is Tom Barrett from EnCirca. The - as registrars we're all required to do data escrow, even for the thin TLDs. We're all required to have a local Whois database with thin TLDs. And we've all gone through an audit by ICANN Compliance, who have probably confirmed that we're collecting the right data for the Whois, that we're collecting the right data for data escrow.

So I guess I'm confused why you think there's going to be challenges of this sort unless we're not already following our RAA and did not - somehow wasn't caught during audit or - or perhaps you can discover this yourself by looking at the Iron Mountain data escrow and see if this type of problem exists.

Michele Neylon: Just hold on a second. I'm going to take a comment from remote first. Caitlin?

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you. This is Caitlin Tubergen speaking for Frank Michlich. The comment is, "I don't think it's a good idea to split the migration between old and new records. It would mean registrars need to implement checking for contact changes to see which group the domains belong to. It seems to be

simple to do a migration based on a per-registrar basis, which I believe is how it was done for .org."

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Any reaction? (Unintelligible) it was more towards Fabien.

Fabien Betremieux: So I don't mean to represent the IRT here. I'm just the staff supporting the work of the implementation here. So I'm not the only one that can certainly answer the question. And I am looking to my colleagues from the IRT here, (Frederick) and (Theo).

So the comment, I think that's - I'm not sure - I'm exactly - I'm not exactly sure of how deeply this was discussed with the IRT, the possibility to consider a registration on the registrar-per-registrar basis. But currently the proposal from the IRT, including several representatives of registrars, is to consider proceeding with two tracks existing in your registration.

So I think the commenter should certainly get closer to the work here and help us understand what would be the benefit of this approach compared to potential drawbacks of the current proposal push. (Frederick) or (Theo), do you want to add something?

(Frederick Guemo):   (Frederick Guemo), a member of the IRT. I think you're right, we're supposed to have the right data but as it's also a good possibility for us to remove the last thin registry and to be able to have old registries equal, and maybe that would allow us at some point to remove the data escrow obligation and the Whois obligations. That would be also a possibility.

But it will be a challenge because I mean the issue of data, you have to transfer that to the VeriSign registry. We discovered that some of the fields are not mandatory, some of the fields might have some different formats. And when will have to fill in their database and you know it never goes 100% right,

maybe it's just me, but. So there will be some challenge. And we would have to do it and we would have to do some testing and working together.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I saw a few hands earlier. I think Tom you may have had a hand up. Are you okay?

Tom Barrett: I have a few questions. So why can't they just look at the data escrow data and determine where the problems are?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. They don't have a right to. Essentially the data escrow is only - it only exists for a very specific purpose. So to answer you, to be blunt, if you went out of business then they could look at it but until you do they can't. I know that may seem a bit crazy but I think that's basically the way it's set up. And somebody can correct me. (Theo)?

(Theo): You are correct, Michele. And, Tom, the suggestion is really, really good there. And we looked at it and we saw there was not a solution there. But basically what you are - what we are seeking is to get answers to these questions, because we do not know how all the data is at a registrars.

I've been involved in several migrations from different registrars to our database, and the first thing we have to do when a registrar supplies us with data is we need to script it in the correct format according to the RAA2013 because there is some really old data there and to avoid any display issues, we need to script it. And that's just a practical issue there. And if you have a team of developers on your side, okay, that's brilliant, they can script it.

But if you are a registrar who has to rely on maybe external developers, you're going to have an issue there because VeriSign expects in a suitable format according to an RFC. So it has to be in the format. And that's just one of the practical challenges that we are facing here. Thanks.

(Frederick Guemo): And to add another point to that.

Michele Neylon: (Frederick) speaking for the record.

(Frederick Guemo):   (Frederick) speaking for the record. I also thought it was a good idea for VeriSign to use it at escrow. No work for us. But when I proposed that, some other registrars were not very keen on having VeriSign taking their data because of confidentiality reasons and so on. So it's - some registrars apparently don't feel at ease with giving the keys of that data to VeriSign.

Tom Barrett: And what will happen with thick Whois?

Michele Neylon: I have remote comments. Caitlin?

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you, Michele. The first remote comment is from (Rob Golding) of (Estudeim). "We will need exemption from Whois complaints during and for a significant period after the implementation. And this needs to be done on a TLD-by-TLD basis, jobs, then net, then com."

   The second comment from Frank Michlich. "The escrow data format can vary quite a bit from registrar to registrar, and why there are now under the 2013 RAA rules for Whois output format it really only applies to the field names, as far as I know, but not format and length of the fields."

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mr. Greimann?

Volker Greimann: Yes thank you, Michele. Volker Greimann speaking his name for the record. I think the current planning that foresees a multi-stage transfer is not the ideal situation because that would mean that we would have to have two, at worse three, parallel systems running at the same time that provide Whois data or not. That would have to switch at certain points, look at their registration data and so on. So that's not ideal.

What we're looking for as a registrar would be a cutoff date at what time Whois provision would be switched from the registrar to the registry, and data protection and data transfer can happen before that. And then a delta could be sent that would just have the update data between the first transfer and the last transfer. And then that would be done.

The second point with the escrow data, I agree that the escrow data is not the ideal situation. First, the contract is set up in way that the escrow data cannot be used for that purpose. Second is that the escrow data contains actually more data than what is currently available in the Whois. For example we are also required to escrow underlying registrant data for these privacy services that we operate that would have to be - that is currently escrowed but would not be reflected of course in the data that would be sent to VeriSign or the .jobs registry when we make the transfer. So it really has to depend on the data that we can send to the registry.

And the third point that I would like to raise is that the registry maybe should not be too strict in what format to expect but rather allow all possible format as long as these formats are in some way conceivable to have the data in it. So the registry should at the transfer point at least not check that data is in the correct format but rather is data there or not.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm going to go to remote and then to (Theo).

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you, Michele. Remote comment from (Joyce Lynn). "I do not see why escrow data should have anything to do with the implementation."

Michele Neylon: (Theo)?

(Theo): This is (Theo) for the record. So just to piggyback on what Volker just said about that the requirements from the registry should be too strict, actually the situation currently is that the RFC is - has a couple of optional fields that actually caused some confusion amongst the registrars. Because we as

registrars, we have to comply with RAA2000 format - RAA2013 format output, and the RFC that VeriSign intends to use has several optional fields. And from what I've seen, but I'm not an expert there, is it looks pretty well in a sense like there's - it's not too strict. But like I said, I'm not an expert. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: (Ben), go ahead.

(Ben Anderson): Yes, (Ben Anderson). Would it be possible to socialize that data? Sorry, I've not really kept up with this. But it would be good for the group to see those additional fields. And my other point is moving forward from this, I'd like to see a potential staging area from the registry where registrars can test data submission first rather than having to do it all in one go and then deal with the problems afterwards.

Michele Neylon: And we have another comment from remote.

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you. A comment from (Kelly Salter). "Doesn't our data escrow also contain the underlying registrant data where we have provided our own privacy service?"

Michele Neylon: Does anybody have a comment on that, reaction, answer? Go ahead.

(Theo): Okay. This is (Theo) for the record. And these questions are exactly the type of questions that we are facing in the IRT and we do not have an answer, and that's why we should have a discussion about it. Because people on the IRT from several other stakeholder groups are pushing for timelines, and that is the question there what do we think is a reasonable timeline, sort of - so those are the questions that we are dealing with and we do not have the answers as an IRT. And I'm not sure we registrars have the answer here, and that could be a possible outcome that we do not know also and that might affect the timelines heavily I guess. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: I have (Graham) from (Dios), and then James. And then we're closing out this topic.

(Graham):   (Graham) from (Dios). My understanding is that the privacy and underlying data from privacy should be in escrow but obviously if we can't access actual data then that's a moot point.

Michele Neylon: (James), I'm giving you the last word.

(James):   Thanks. That's probably the least helpful. Because I had to step out -- this is (James) speaking -- and I had to step out and come back twice, so I apologize if this has already been beat to death. But generally speaking, I don't agree that we should involve the escrow at all in this process. That data's encrypted. We're supposed to turn that over in the event of de-accreditation or registrar business failure. It does contain additional data that's not necessary, so I just - I feel like we need to leave that off the table. This is just my, I think, my personal position.

    The second thing is for, you know, it's going to be an operational challenge for registrars with a large legacy domain, and I think that, you know, for us it makes the most sense if we tackle this update whenever it is - a domain name is transferred or a domain name is renewed. And then that gives us a timeline of ten years minimum to get this whole thing done. Okay? And we just - and that's the timeline.

    I mean if you're getting pressure from other groups say, "Look, you know, it's going to be a long tail problem. You're going to get a big chunk of it probably in the first year or two, and then it's going to trickle out for the next ten years." But it doesn't make any sense to update hundreds of millions of records when some are going to expire and some are going to be you know. Anyway that's my thoughts. And I apologize if this was all well covered ground by the IRT or even this conversation today.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. We're going to move on. No, we're moving on. Sorry, (Fred). If we can follow up with this on the members list. And I know that quite a few of you have an interest in this. It is a topic that is of interest to a lot of you.

Okay, next item up, and we can flip a coin and see which one of you wants to lead on this, it's the change of registrant which as part of the IRTP C implementation. And for those of you who are not au fait with all of the wonderful acronyms in the ICANN space, IRTP is basically domain transfers. If you go to icann.org/transfers it will redirect to the current policy. IRTP is Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy.

So way back in the dawns of time when Jeff Neuman didn't have a beard and also some other things were different, ICANN had a transfer policy and there has been a series of four PDPs to review that policy. And quite a few people in this room have been involved in various parts of it. So IRTP C was the third of the PDPs on this. So I will hand over to Mike and Caitlin and they can toss a coin as to who wants to speak. Over to you guys.

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you. This is Caitlin Tubergen for the transcript, and thank you, Michele, for that introduction. I know this is everyone's favorite topic. I think we can skip this slide, as Michele has already gone over this. I just did want to note that these changes do go into effect as of August 1 of this year.

So if you take a look at the new policy, you'll notice that it's divided into two sections. The first section is what is - was then the inter-registrar transfer policy. There's been a change to that policy and that deals with the FOAs, or the form of authorization. The FOA now expires under four circumstances, which are listed on the slide.

The first is after a period of 60 days, though the registrar does have the option to allow the registered name holder to auto-renew the FOA. The second is if the domain name expires before the inter-registrar transfer is completed. Third, if there's been a change of registrant that's been completed

prior to the inter-registrar transfer. And lastly, after the inter-registrar transfer is completed, the FOA would expire. So what that means is if the FOA does expire under any of these circumstances, the registrar would need to reauthorize that transfer via a new FOA.

Michele Neylon: Just actually pausing for one second. Is there anybody here who doesn't know what an FOA is or are we all comfortable with that? I assume you all are. Sorry, I'm very conscious of acronyms and people getting confused. Sorry, back to you Caitlin.

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you, Michele. Again, Caitlin Tubergen for the transcript.

For the second part of the policy, the change of registrant is the most significant change to the policy. And so I thought I'd start by going over a couple of definitions in that policy. So a change of registrant is defined as a material change to the prior registrant name, prior registrant organization, prior registrant e-mail address, or the administrative contact e-mail address if there is no prior registrant e-mail address.

And the prior registrant is simply defined as the registered name holder when the change of registrant is initiated. The new registrant is the entity or person to whom the prior registrant is transferring the - or proposes to transfer the name to. And in some situations, that may be the same entity. Material change is defined as a non-typographical change. And there's a couple more example in the actual text of the policy.

Tom Barrett: Caitlin, are you taking questions?

Caitlin Tubergen: I can take a question.

Tom Barrett: So if you go back a slide -- this is Tom Barrett from EnCirca -- I want to make sure I understand bullet four here.

Michele Neylon: Tom, can you speak a bit more closely into the mic?

Tom Barrett: Yes. So I'd like to understand the scenario that you describe in bullet four. When does that happen?

Caitlin Tubergen: So when we were working on this with the implementation review team, one of the registrars in the group noted that for some older domain names there might not be a registered name holder e-mail address but there may be an admin contact e-mail address. So that would be a situation where there's a blank field for registrant e-mail, but there is an e-mail in the admin contact. I don't know how common of a scenario is but - how common that scenario is, but someone did raise that point so that's why we added that language.

Michele Neylon: (Vlad)?

(Vlad):   (Vlad) (unintelligible) for the transcript. I'm trying to link these definitions to the FOA. Because in the FOA you mentioned that if the registrant changes then the FOA expires. So can I apply these definitions over here to the FOA definitions directly? So you're saying that if the organization changes while there's a transfer and an FOA out, then I have to cancel that transfer, is that correct?

Caitlin Tubergen: So the FOA would expire when the change of registrant is completed. So what we're going to go over in a few minutes is there's a whole process that happens when a change or registrant is requested. But once the new registrant is in the Whois, that would mean that the FOA would need to be - or would expire.

(Vlad):   Thank you.

Caitlin Tubergen: You're welcome.

Tom Barrett: So Tom Barrett again from EnCirca. So prior registrar, that second bullet, is that referring to - what field is considered the prior registrant? Is that the name organization or e-mail address?

Caitlin Tubergen: Correct. So a change of registrant is defined only as a change to those three or four fields depending on the situation. Any one of them, yes. So if I were to - if a domain name was registered to Caitlin Tubergen and I proposed to change that to Mike Zupke and that's the only thing I'm changing, that would be a change of registrant per this policy. Similarly if I were to just change my e-mail address, that would also be a change of registrant.

Tom Barrett: One follow-up question...

Michele Neylon: No, I'm giving it (Jeff) and I'll come back to you.

Tom Barrett: Sorry.

(Jeff):   Thanks. Also a question on number four, I just want to make sure again I got this right. So if there is a change to the administrative contact e-mail address, that does not count as a change of registrants, is that correct?

Caitlin Tubergen: That is mostly correct.

(Jeff):   Okay, because I don't know, I think I would - I don't want to speak for everyone but I know a lot of systems that when we do the transfer it goes on the administrative contact e-mail address is the one that is, so that could be a giant loophole. So I just wanted to make sure and I don't know, I'm assuming that most people use that method so I wanted to make sure that the administrative contact change if there - well, I'll let you continue because you said it was partially correct. So I'll you go through on that later. Thanks. I just wanted to bring that up.

Caitlin Tubergen: So generally speaking, if an admin contact e-mail changes, that would not be a change of registrant. It would only be a change of registrant if the admin contact e-mail changed and there was no e-mail address in the registered name holder e-mail field. Does that make sense?

Michele Neylon: I think so. I'll go to (Jeff) - sorry, go to Tom in one second. Just so you're aware, the transfer policy for transfer domains, the hierarchy is registrant then administrative contact. So the registrant is the one that is meant to authorize the transfer. If the registrant does not authorize the transfer, it's blocked. If they don't respond, the administrative contact can authorize it. Tom, over to you.

Tom Barrett: Okay. And I think I have it reversed to what he just said, but that's a different topic.

Michele Neylon: No it's not. What I said is correct.

Tom Barrett: Okay. So, Tom Barrett again from EnCirca. I want to talk about typographical corrections. Is it - can we rely on the registered name holder to assert that what they're changing is a typographical correction or is there some other third party judge of that?

Caitlin Tubergen: Thanks for the question, Tom. This is Caitlin Tubergen for the transcript. That language was used to give registrars some flexibility into what would be an actual change. There are some examples in the implementation notes of what a typographical change might be. So there was some talk about registrars using some sort of algorithm to determine that, although others cautioned against that for reasons of international registrants and it's unclear what might be a typographical change.

I don't know that anyone mentioned that there would be some sort of button or some sort of option for the registrant to assert that it is a - only a

typographical change but that could certainly be something the registrar uses to show the registrant noted that this is just a typographical change.

I also wanted to note that there was a question in remote from (Joyce Lynn) which was, "Is e-mail change a material change?"

Man: Why.

Caitlin Tubergen: Oh. Why is e-mail change a material change? Thank you for that question, (Joyce). The GNSO delivered this final report with recommendations and it was clear that in the recommendation what a change of registrant would be, and it was these three fields, and so that's why that's included in that definition.

Michele Neylon: I note this might be another comment from remote, Caitlin.

Caitlin Tubergen: John Berryhill, sorry. Question: "The summary of public comment on the IRT draft said the implementation review team will be reviewing these comments and decide on a proposed course of action in the coming weeks. The ensuing discussion of the IRT mailing lists contains a minor update but no substantive discussion of the public comments" -- excuse me -- "or desirable, undesirable changes in view the comments. In what way have the public comments been taken into account and what was put forward as the final draft?"

Thank you for that comment/question, John. And I do want to say that the implementation review team did review all of the comments. I do distinctly remember the comments from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and I'm not sure if you recall the first iteration of the policy. (Theo) probably recalls, James might recall as well, or other members of the implementation review team.

But the first iteration of the policy that did go out for public comment in terms of the process that the change of registrant would take had a very prescribed

way of doing that with a change of pin to the prior registrant, the registrar, the new registrant. And registrars did ask for something that allowed them more flexibility. In particular they asked if they could just do this via some sort of secure mechanism that that they could have a more flexible business practice and choose how to implement that. And so we did take note of that and the policy was updated to account for those types of comments.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Any - oh go ahead, (Heath).

(Heath Dixon):   (Heath Dixon) for the record. How does this work with customers that are under a privacy service? You know, when you turn that off to change the name, how does that affect the FOA and - under the new policy?

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you for that question, (Heath). Again this is Caitlin Tubergen for the record. So I haven't gotten to the slides yet but there is a whole process that needs to occur whenever there's what's considered a change of registrant. So if the registrant name field were to change because of the removal of the privacy or proxy service, that would be considered a change of registrant.

However, there is a definition in the policy for a designated agent, and so the prior registrant and new registrant can authorize or explicitly allow a designated agent to authorize or approve a change of registrant on its behalf. So in that circumstance there might be a privacy or proxy agent that would be the prior registrant's designated agent for purposes of approving a change of registrant.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Just bear in mind there is a, what are we calling it, a roundtable, yes, there is a roundtable on Thursday I believe. What time is that, Caitlin?

Caitlin Tubergen: That's correct. Again this is Caitlin for the transcript. There is going to be a registrar-led roundtable discussion on all things transfer policy updates related. And that will be from 8 am to 9:15 in the (Rosari) room. Some

registrars have graciously volunteered to help go through the steps of the change of registrant and talk about practical implementation ideas for these. So it would be great if everyone could attend, and I'm happy to answer more questions at that session.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Caitlin. And also as well bear in mind we are currently with our colleagues in the Registry Stakeholder Group and with ICANN staff on drafting the agenda for the GDD Summit in Amsterdam in May. And one of the suggestions that we've received and have given is that we are, you know, focused around implementation of policies, operationalizing policies. So I suspect that this one might be one that will end up on the agenda.

So, Caitlin, back to you again.

Mike Zupke: So Michele, this is Mike Zupke. I just also wanted to point out that we've heard from a number of registrars that they won't be here Thursday to participate but the session will be recorded and I believe also transcribed. So, you know, if you miss it it's unfortunate but you will still be able to sort of take part in another way.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. And as the former chair of the registrars, I won't be there either.

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you. Again this is Caitlin Tubergen for the transcript. This slide details the process that's prescribed in the policy of what the registrar needs to do when there is a change of registrant of there is a change to the name organization or e-mail address.

So the first is to confirm that the name is eligible for a change of registrant. The policy does enumerate certain circumstances where a name would be ineligible. So for example, if there's a UDRP complaint or a court order where the name should be locked, the customer cannot have - do a change of registrant.

Second, the registrar needs to confirm the secure mechanism that the new registrant has explicitly consented to the change of registrant. There are a couple of examples of secure mechanism in the implementation notes to the policy; however, that's not an exhaustive list. So the registrars do have flexibility to determine what a secure mechanism is or how they're going to implement that.

Next, the registrar needs to inform the prior registrant or designated agent, as the case may be, that if its final goal is to perform an inter-registrar transfer or to move the name to a different registrar and change the registrant that it's advised to complete the inter-registrar transfer first to avoid triggering a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock. And that 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock happens after a change of registrant is performed.

Next, the registrar needs to confirm via a secure mechanism that the prior registrant or designated agent has explicitly consented to the change of registrant. Once the registrar receives the explicit consent from both the prior and new registrant, it needs to process the change of registrant within one business day.

And next, the registrar needs to send the notification to the prior and new registrant. And there's some notification requirements in C.1.1.6. And lastly it needs to - the registrar needs to lock the name for 60 days if applicable. So registrars can allow registrants to opt out of that 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock prior to the change of registrant request.

If the registrant does not opt out of the 60-day lock, then the name needs to be locked from inter-registrar transfer for 60 days. And the working group's goal of the name locking was just in case a domain name was, or an account was, compromised that the name stays at the registrar to prevent some sort of domain name hijacking.

Are there any questions on any of those steps?

Tom Barrett: Hi. Tom Barrett from EnCirca. So yes I believe that there'll be a lot of customers who are simply trying to update their Whois information that fall into this process. So given that the prior registrant and the new registrant are essentially the same person, I would say that changing their organizational name but not their not e-mail address, can you explain in that scenario how the - how they would explicitly consent to the change?

Do they have to - can there be one consent where they say I'm both the old and the new, or do you want them to have to consent twice? "Hey I'm old, I consent to this. Hey I'm the new, I consent to this." What sort of process do you want, you know, routine Whois updates to follow?

Caitlin Tubergen: Thank you for the question, Tom. Again this is Caitlin Tubergen for the transcript. So the goal is that you've confirmed with the new registrant and the prior registrant that they've explicitly consented to this change. So there may be a situation where you can confirm that the entity is the same exact entity and that you've - that that entity has explicitly consented to the change with one communication.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Jeff, you're up.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So the question I have on reading through this is on section three on the 60-day lock period. So first I'll have one small complaint and that is that right now a lot of registrars are not enforcing the 60-day lock on transfer registrant, and that's, you know. So I've seen that. That has not been enforced and people aren't agreeing to it.

So knowing that sort of - in that environment, how would ICANN enforce a 60-day lock if the change of registrant and the secure mechanism happens within the registrar ecosystem? How would ICANN know about it and enforce that 60-day lock unless it was we're on the honor system, which is something unfortunately I can't say works too well? Thank you.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele for the record. Caitlin, can you address that? But I'm also very conscious of time. We're running out.

Caitlin Tubergen: Yes. Thank you, Michele. This is Caitlin again for the transcript. Thank you for the question, Jeff. The first thing I wanted to note is that this inter-registrar transfer lock following a change of registrant isn't effective until August 1. So - but August 1 going forward it would be effective.

And I think that the way that ICANN would become aware of this is through its normal complaint channels. So if for example someone says, "You know, my name was hijacked, it was changed. I didn't consent to this. I didn't opt out of any sort of lock. Now it's at a different registrar." Then ICANN would be aware that the registrar was not locking the name per the transfer policy.

Jeff Eckhaus: Sorry. So I know -- just a follow up because this is important. Does that mean that ICANN would then if somebody did not and the transfer was not authorized ICANN would enforce a transfer undo process? Because that doesn't seem to be a process right now. And would they then work with the registries? And is that in their contracts to enforce an undo of a transfer? Thank you.

Mike Zupke: Jeff, this is Mike Zupke to respond, and I'm sort of channeling our compliance team. And in general, the remedy, you know, if there's a breach of the agreement or a breach of one of the policy requirements sort of varies depending on what happens. So the compliance team would say what's your remediation plan for this.

The remediation plan might be well, you know, work to get the domain name transferred back or it might be we'll work with the new registrar to ensure that the registrant gets control of the domain name again. But that's sort of handled as it arises. So there's not necessarily something in this policy

explicitly that says we'll require you to undo it or we'll require registries to take a particular action.

Man: No, I'm not in the queue.

Michele Neylon: Okay. We need to kind of bring this into land.

Jeff Eckhaus: Can we just flag this for the workshop on Thursday?

Michele Neylon: Yes that's what I was going to say. But guys and ladies and everything else, it's great that people are actively engaged on this topic. If you can make it along to the session on Thursday morning, that's being designed to allow you to get into the nitty-gritty, into those fine details, to ask those awkward questions and to hopefully get some responses.

Now I personally suspect that no matter how much gets done on Thursday morning it won't be enough and that we may need to look at, you know, conducting other, I don't know, virtual workshops or something. Because it's not a simple change, it's complicated, it's complex. We're aware of that. Mike and Caitlin and their team is aware of it.

I hope that Compliance is aware of this, it's on their radar. Is it on Compliance's radar? Okay, for the transcript both Mike and Caitlin did nod their heads. But since neither of them are wearing bells, that didn't get into the recording.

Okay so going back to our agenda, thank you guys, very helpful. Our agenda now is we have a break for a few minutes. Lunch is being served in here. Is that correct, (Darcy)? So lunch is being served in here. The lunch is being provided for members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group as in you pay to be a member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, which helps to pay for the lunch.

So therefore, members of the stakeholder group get priority on the lunch. There will probably be stuff left over. I'm not sure how this is set up today. Is it - oh it's a closed session. Oh beg your pardon, yes. So let's make that clear. If you are not a member of the stakeholder group, at this juncture I'm going to politely but firmly ask you to leave the room. And then I will then unleash people to move you physically from the room.

This is a closed - we're moving into a closed session which is for Registrar Stakeholder Group members only. If you are a registrar and you are not a member of the stakeholder group, please come and speak to (Darcy) immediately or we will kick you out.

For recordings and all that, you might want to pause them for now as we're going to take a break while they set up for lunch. So this is working lunch, people. Thank you.

END