

ICANN Dakar Meeting
Inter-registrar Transfer Policy B implementation- TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 22d October 2011 at 15:00 local

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

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Stephane Van Gelder: Ok, good so we'll start the IRTP Part B implementation session. Marika is going to give us an update on that. It's a 30 minute session we will then move into a 30 minute break and reconvene at 4 pm for our PDP presentation; that Jeff is going to give us I believe. So Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you very much. And I actually won't be doing it all by myself because (Tim Cole), sitting on the other end of the table, will help me as well. So the object of this update is to give you an overview of the different IRTP related activities that are currently ongoing. Starting at the top, I don't think we need to cover the background probably because I think most of you know where this all comes from.

I think Chuck has already referred to it as well. It's one of those reviews that started basically at the implementation or the adoption of the policy with a commitment to review the policy and see if there are any elements that needed improvement or clarification. And as a result of that we have basically five PDPs, two of which have now almost completed and three still to go. So first looking at the IRTP Part B adopted recommendations. The Working Group completed its work in May 2011 and the Council adopted those

recommendations in June of this year. And those recommendations are also consider by the board of this year and adopted in August of this year. And here's where I'll actually hand it over to Tim, where he will talk a little about the status of implementation.

Maybe just as quick reminder these were the four main recommendations were adopted. The first one is requirement for registrars to provide a transfer for emergency action contact. Which registrars basically to respond within a 4 hour timeframe in case of emergency. A modification of Section 3 of the existing policy to require that the registrar of record notifies the registrar name holder when a request for a transfer has been received.

Modifying reason for denial six to clarify the language that is currently there and deleting it. Denial number seven which was found not to, in its current wording. Basically it, you aren't able to use that language. So Tim...

Tim Ruiz: Thank you Marika. Good afternoon everyone. Basically the implementation primarily, we don't not actually do much with language other than find the way to translate the intent of the resolution into the new language or realized language in the transfer policy.

(Brian Pack) who is transitioning from my team to the policy team, has been working on the language and has drawn up all of the appropriate modifications to the policy to implement the changes and the reasons and that is currently under legal review.

But probably most interest is the TAC system, this was a recommendation that came from the folks on the team to was to use our existing registrar system, the registrar contact system with ICANN called RADAR.

And we have a consultant working that's drafting up changes or implementing changes in that system to allow for the addition of the TAC as a contact field. But even perhaps more interesting is that we will also than have a

mechanism within that system to initiate a request to the TAC at other registrar.

So in other words, one registrar will be able to walk to the RADAR, be able to pull up the TAC for another registrar. And by filling out a fairly simple form we'll then send that form, that form will then be translated into an email to the TAC at the other registrar. And a time stamp will be maintained at the point of when the initial communication was sent out.

Because there is a fairly rigid 4 hour response time built into this policy and so in order to maintain one common source of when the clock started for the 4 hours we'll be maintaining that information within the RADAR system at ICANN.

And so that, once we have that system fully functional and the language fully vetted by legal we will then be sending out an announcement to all registrars. Giving them the implementation time table and the implementation date for this and giving them a infinite period of time to find out who their TAC is and to begin the revised transfer policy and the TAC portion of that.

We've had a little bit of a delay on the programming side, because of some personnel issues within our own internal personnel, but I expect that to be finished within a few weeks. And we should be able to go live with that very shortly, and then we will announce to all the registrars that it is available and they should start using it as of a certain date. Any questions on any of that?

Marika Konings: No questions, we move forward waiting on the --- two recommendations from the IRTP Part B Working Group that requested stock proposals. One related to clarifying that of who is status messages relating to registrar lock status that was recommendation number eight.

And a request for provide language for a new provision to lock and unlock a domain names, which was recommendation number nine. And the second

part you heard my talking before about one, I think we deleted one of the reasons for denial and replacement for that some new language needed to be added to clarify how names can be locked and unlocked.

So basically we're already circulated a second draft of those proposes to the Working Group and even though the recommendation it's requested the staff to submit those proposals to the Council. We think it's important to get the input from the Working Group on those and I think the objective once we get the feedback and hopefully address some of the issues raised by the Working Group.

We'll also put these out for public comments because the thing is before it comes to the Council it's probably important to ensure that there has been an opportunity for community input and provide that feedback at the same time as the proposal. So we're working on that and there are a couple of issues that still need to be worked out, some questions have been raised.

I don't think there's an interest now to go into the detail of that. But happy to talk offline to people who that are interested to know. But hopefully we'll be able to soon go out for public comment with the proposal and then come back to the GNSO Council for consideration.

Though you might recalled you recently initiated the PDP on IRTP Part C and approved the Charter. A call for volunteered has been launched we already have quite a few people signing to that Working Groups. But if anyone else is interested, you know please let Glen know and she can add you to the mailing list.

You can also the call for volunteers that's on the wiki and the first meeting of this Working Group to scheduled the 8th of November at 1500 UGC were I think basically we're continuing on the old schedule of IRTP Working Groups.

Just as a quick reminder this new group will look at a change of control function and discuss whether there needs to be a definition either within the IRTP or separately on what change of control means.

And we'll look at whether there should be provision on time limiting forms of authorization and we'll also look at whether it should be a requirement to use IANA IDs rather proprietary IDs for registrars. You're going to go on, or there's a question?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes I just had a question about the Council lesion. Tim Ruiz, I believe said he would carry on doing it until the end of his term, is that correct?

Marika Konings: I think that he said that he would be willing to but at the same time it wouldn't make much sense as his term ends here so...

Stephane Van Gelder: So we still need...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: So this is a call for a Council lesion to this group and you know and knowing that Tim Ruiz, whose terms ends on Wednesday will then no longer be able to fulfill that position. Thank You. If there are any volunteers please contact me, or the leadership team, or just send to the list.

Marika Konings: So I think this is the last issue in this update. On the 'thick' WHOIS Issue Report, as you also you might recall that is also one of the recommendations that came out of the IRTP Part B Working Group. It was a recommendation to request an Issue Report on the requirement of 'thick' WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs that Working Group basically consider 'thick' WHOIS a really good idea in the content of the IRTP but it think conscious that there might be other facts, positive or negative of mandating such as or making a recommendation of such a requirement.

So their recommendation was to first actually have a Issue Report and really consider this issue further detail. And we're in the process of preparing an Issue Report or I suggest it would be like we've done the UDRP Issue Report as the IRP Part C Issue Report to actually follow the new PDP model and put that out for preliminary version for public comments and following who would than produce a final report for the Council's consideration. If you're interested to hear more about this, there is a workshop later this week on Thursday. And I said if your participating Part C Working Group is looking for volunteer and hear some additional reading materials.

Man: On the 'thick' WHOIS are we, I can't remember -- we just approved the new notion of moving but we haven't approved charter or anything else or...

Marika Konings: No you just have, you request an Issue Report.

Man: Oh an Issue Report, ok.

Marika Konings: So once that's done you'll get to consider whether or not to initiate a PDP.

Stephane Van G: Thank you very much Marika, Any comments or questions? Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is series of PDPs is doesn't get a lot of attention generally. But I think it's worth noting that there's a group of people that have participated in now this is their three PDP and actually there was one even before this, before we got to the A through E that had participated over several years on this review process and that certainly need to appreciate in terms of their willingness to continue, because makes it a lot easier to have people that are knowledgeable and have been through the other PDPs.

So Council may want to consider expressing appreciation at some form at least verbally or in writing to this people who are continuing to progress this that isn't as highly visual as many of the other PDP but still very important.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Chuck, we actually did say a big grand of thank yous in the Singapore open meeting. (Unintelligible) has been very involved in this I know and others. And you are right there's been a lot of work, so if the Council wants to actually write to the group and thank them that may be something that we need to do but we have made vocal thanks I think. And we are continual grateful that the work of this is being done by this very talented group of people. Anymore comments, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes if I can indeed echo what Chuck has been saying, because I mean without that group of dedicated volunteers we wouldn't be IRTP Part C yet. And I know that there is a dedication and desire as well of the group that has been involved in the previous PDP to try as well to speed this up and to deliver to a report as soon as possible. And (Mikey) said he wants a t-shirt.

Stephane Van Gelder: And of course there's still we're on Part C, and there's Part D and E. So there's still a lot of work to done as well. It's by no means over. So you know, we want to encourage the people working on this as much as we can (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks Stephane, and thanks Chuck. I think what with IRTP, IRTPC kicking off part of the initial stage will be too be bring people up to speed on the entire issues. Because I think there's been quite a few new volunteers joining in the group which is great. It's nice to see people get involved.

And it is unfortunate that it isn't considered to be a highly interesting or sexy topic, but it's pretty fundamental. I think ICANN compliance will be able to confirm that for you, because most of the compliments that they have are in relation to transfers. So while it may not be exciting it's still pretty important. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Ok, thanks. Any further comments?

In that case can I first of all thank Marika and Time for helping us get up to speed on that and then I suggest we take our break now.

We will reconvene at -- get the time right at 4 o'clock for a session PDP the policy development process and Mary Wong will be leading that session. So we will reconvene at 4:00 in this room please. Thank you very much

END