ICANN Costa Rica Meeting
Status of implementation of IRTP Part B & PEDNR recommendations - TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 10th March 2012 at 15:00 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.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay. So we'll start again please. Operator, please start the recording.

Coordinator: And the recordings are started at this time.

Stephane Van Gelder: Great. So we'll start - we are still talking about registrar transfers. This is the status of the implementation of the recommendations that came out of the previous PDP - part of that PDP process, which is the IRTP Part B.

We have Brian Peck here with us to take us through this and Brian will also take us through the PEDNR recommendations because Mike Zupke was supposed to be doing it as unfortunately not being able to travel for person reasons. So we wish Mike well and we will hand the mic over to Brian. Thanks Brian.

Brian Peck: Thank you Stephane and good afternoon everyone. As Stephane mentioned, we'll start first with the status of the implementation for IRTP B. This was approved by the Board in August of last year. And happy or pleased to report that we're finished with the actual implementation. And now in terms of

having the registrars given a reasonable period of time to comply with the new requirements and obligations.

Basically just to quickly refresh your memories, under IRTP B, the GNSO approved two major revisions to the current existing policy. One was to establish an obligation for registrars to establish a transfer emergency action contact or TEAC, if you will.

And this basically allows for losing registrars to contact gaining registrars if there is a problem or an issue or concern with a pending transfer or transfer request. You know, won't be reading the screen for you here but basically this is to set up a system again where all registrars have this TEAC established and allows for a quick communication.

It basically requires for a human response to any sort of request for a concern or issue on a pending or a transfer request. And that initial response must be provided within four hours of receiving the request.

That doesn't mean that a solution has to be reached in four hours but at least initial response by someone that's qualified to handle or to resolve the issues that's being raised. Again, it's within four hours and to be worked on.

The other key revisions that were approved by the Board based on the GNSO recommendation were some modifications to the existing policy. One was that making it now a requirement for registrars of record to notify the registrar name holder or registrant of the transfer or request. Before it was at the discretion or it was voluntary. It is now a mandatory requirement.

There were also two modifications to the denial reasons for a request. One was for reason Number 6. It now requires that the objection must be provided with the express and informed consent of the authorized transfer contact on a option basis rather than begin again it was not required for that.

The other is the deletion of what was previously denial reason Number 7, which basically was when a domain name was already in lock status. The reason for being that is technically it's impossible to initiate a transfer hen it's already in lock status. Therefore there's no reason for denial and so for practical purposes that particular denial reason was deleted.

In terms of implementation, we have completed the actual revisions to the text, which requires two of those first modifications I just summarized. That has been cleared by legal. We recently posted the revised IRTP on the Web site.

It's provided here with the specific, you know, very, you know, disclaimer that this goes into effect as of June 1 but is up there at least for registrars to kind of see what these changes look like in terms of again the modifications to the denial reasons and the new TEAC requirements.

A formal notice was sent out to the registrars on February 29 also stating how to comply with the TEAC requirement. The effective date for the new revisions and obligations is the 1st of June.

It was determined that a reasonable period of time for registrars to comply with the new obligations of requirements would take about 120 days given especially the implementation of the TEAC requirement might be necessary to revise codes, change software and so forth like that.

And so the reasonable period of time which is required under the RAA was to be basically four months or the 1st of June, excuse me, three months or the 1st of June of this year.

In terms of the TEAC implementation, the necessary (tentacle) adjustments have been made in RADAR. A new contact field has been set up and it is now live and effective.

The registrars were notified with the notice that they are, you know, requested or urged to fill in that contact field if they have a different or separate transfer emergency contact name. Otherwise the default would be the current transfer contact or primary contact. The transfer contact was not present.

Once logged in RADAR registrars will have - or RADAR, excuse me, registrars on RADAR will have access to the contact information for all the registrars under view all registrar's button. This feature, as I mentioned, is live now but the actual use of the TEAC system and the response time requirement again are not effective or will not go into effect until June 1.

Then just basically how the TEAC will work. All the potential aspects to facilitate this system will be going live on the 1st of June and are already in place. And again, the message time and date stamped will - to facilitate the compliance will help keep records if necessary to resolving disputes that might result after the TEAC system is implemented and put into place.

Any questions on the implementation of IRTP Part B? Yes.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Now really a question but just, you know to inform the Council as well that of course there the two recommendations the Council has recently voted upon but they were still part as well of IRTP Part B.

And one of those is expected to be considered by the ICANN Board coming Friday. The one relating to the new provision to replace the Number 7 that was deleted on the how to lock and unlock domain names.

And for the other one the clarification of Whois status messages that are still in public comment period open and once that closes, you know, provide the known substantive issues being raised. And they will as well be sent to the Board and then will move as well into implementation.

Brian Peck: Thanks Marika. Anybody - any other questions? Okay. I think - oh, sorry.

Stephane Van Gelder: And so while Brian switches that over, we'll now move on to PEDNR. And once again look at the status of implementation of those recommendations. Thanks Brian.

Brian Peck: Thank you Stephane. As Stephane mentioned, coming here for Mike Zupke who is actually working on this on the staff level. But just to give you just a brief update. As you're well aware, the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board adopted 18 specific recommendations.

As a result of the GNSO recommendation as well a review team was formed consisting of members of the community to support the ICANN staff in the implementation of the recommendations.

That team ahs been formed. Recent activity is in reviewing the approved changes as by the GNSO Council and adopted by the Board. The ICANN staff team went through all the recommendations one to ensure the understanding of the intent and the identity and to identify potential areas for clarification.

Since that time the ICANN staff has submitted a list of issues and questions for clarification, which has been sent to the PEDNR review team for feedback. Basically the next steps is to - we're waiting for the feedback from the PEDNR Review Team on the issues requiring clarification.

The ICANN staff is looking forward to working constructively with the review team. Once they receive that feedback, the goal for the next trimester between now and (fall) will be to develop and propose an implementation plan which then again will be shared with the PEDNR Review Team for input and review. So that's basically where we're at with the PEDNR implementation status.

So any questions on that? Good. (I'm sorry).

Man: As someone who's been moderately involved in the process and am on the implementation group, I would say certainly I would value and I suspect others might value seeing interim work as we go along and not waiting for the full 18 recommendations to be dumped on us and worst case scenario tell you no, no, you thought you understood but you didn't.

And the earlier the better we can get that sanity check I think the more all of us will feel comfortable. Certainly I will and I would like to hope you will also.

Brian Peck: Thank you. That's a very useful suggestion. Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments?

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks Brian...

Brian Peck: Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: ...for coming in and giving us that update. So we've got a short break now, which is a bit longer than anticipated. But we will reconvene at - sorry, too many papers on my desk. I think it's 4:00. Yes. So we will reconvene at 4:00 with the Cross Community Working Group.

What we might want to do is - because the three remaining sessions are sessions that we could push forward if we wanted to by half an hour and that that way end earlier than we had planned. Is that something that everyone would be in agreement with? Great. So in that case we will reconvene at 3:30 and just move everything forward by half and hour please. Thank you very much.

END