

00:26:45 Julie Bisland - ICANN Org: Please review ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2016-06-28-en>

00:30:53 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): Thank you!

00:36:17 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): This is an interesting idea

00:37:43 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): That part doesn't quite sound right to me (about no new process for updating outdated email)

00:38:07 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): did you say the TAC will be sent to the current (losing) owner via email, and then given back to the Rr?

00:39:07 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): could you just write out for me the process as you described it please? I'm not sure if I lost track or disagree or both :)

00:39:49 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): but if that email doesnt work anymore, and that's why they want to update it, then what?

00:40:24 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): +1 Sarah- often email address updates are made because they cannot access the old email address

00:40:29 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): due to the diversity of models of business and structures that exist in the strata of optional layers between Registrar->Registrant, registries have typically stayed in their swim lane on CoR

00:40:39 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): Agree with Theo- this sounds like a very costly process to implement and operate

00:41:16 Jim Galvin (RySG): i'll repost my responses to Sarah:

00:41:23 Jim Galvin (RySG): yes Sarah on TAC to old email and brought back to Rr that sent it to the old email.

00:41:37 Jim Galvin (RySG): in that case Sarah, you fall back on whatever process you have now for changing the email address, presumably manual.

00:44:36 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): I think if we allow for fallback, then we just use what the fallback is. If it's OK for some cases, and it's being used now, then let's keep it rather than create new complicated/costly processes that IMHO will just confuse and frustrate registrants

00:45:10 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): I could get behind the idea of this being an added service that a Rr might want to offer - like, an extra layer of security that the RNH could choose to enable, a secondary lock against updates. but i'm not sure about this being the standard.

00:46:30 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): but what specifically about that change of control?

00:46:41 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): is it that the domain owner must be aware? is it that they must request it and then also confirm it separately?

00:46:55 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): we are discussing "Change of Registrant" in the scope of discussion about transfer

00:47:04 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): not "Change of Control"

00:51:39 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): +1 Theo

00:51:54 Jim Galvin (RySG): @owen, there will always be registrants who don't appreciate the importance of maintaining their accounts and their email addresses. If that's your largest customer base, then perhaps eliminating a CoR overall is the right answer.

00:53:03 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): Namecheap's position is that COR is not needed at all, so I cannot support expanding TAC and other solutions to COR.

00:53:04 Jim Galvin (RySG): @Sarah, I'm not suggesting any new policy or layer of security. In principle, I'm eliminating an existing system (CoR) and re-using Phase 1A for a specific change.

00:53:52 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): With GDPR and Temp Spec, the risk of hijacking due to exposed contact info in whois is basically none, so we do not believe that the scenario that necessitated COR still exist and it does not appear that COR has "solved the problem"

00:54:09 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): +1 Jothan

00:54:14 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): +1

00:54:27 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): ooh roger the philosopher!!

00:54:35 Jim Galvin (RySG): I'm having trouble seeing the "lot of squeeze". It's using what you're doing anyway in one particular use case.

00:54:51 Jim Galvin (RySG): I'm probably missing something. :-)

00:55:00 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): that is the space station issue I was saying

00:55:18 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): down here on earth it looks different

00:55:20 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): The one particular use case (inter-registrar transfer) is much different than the process to change an email address internally in a system

00:56:01 Emily Barabas - ICANN Org: here's the working document for today's discussion:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1eB3cowSoEp4ERoqQmlc3hc5dpV4g5NzP/edit#gid=1964761525>

00:56:07 Emily Barabas - ICANN Org: see tab 5

00:56:19 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): is this the 'change of control' wg?

00:56:43 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): "If there is a change of control" - that could mean moving the domain from one account to another in the Rr's or Reseller's system, do we want policy on that?

00:56:53 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): I think we should be careful (as Jothan is suggesting) of moving from change of RNH to change of control

00:57:04 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): "Change of 'Title'" perhaps

00:57:09 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): I think the vast majority of COR is for customer updates rather than actual handover from one registrant to another

00:57:31 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): +1 Roger

00:57:38 Jim Galvin (RySG): @Sarah - no. I would suggest defining "change of control" in a way consistent with the overall ICANN registration ecosystem, and that is if the contactability changes.

00:57:39 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): trying to use perhaps Real Estate or Vehicle as an analog

00:57:52 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): Change of "Title"

00:58:44 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): "Change of RnH Entity"?

00:58:52 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): Jim - so I think in that case we're talking about change of ownership, rather than control

00:58:59 Theo Geurts (RrSG): We still fax everyone

00:59:00 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): I get what you're trying to suggest Jim

00:59:08 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): tell me you're joking Theo

00:59:10 Jim Galvin (RySG): on the other hand, if you don't believe that any change of registration data represents "change of control" or "transfer", then just eliminate the CoR. I'm focused on trying to honor the "first principle" I think is represented by CoR.

00:59:11 Steinar Grøtterød (At-Large): Fax? :-)

01:00:02 Theo Geurts (RrSG): no we are not using fax :)

01:00:03 Jim Galvin (RySG): @Sarah, no, I'm focused on contactability as the first principle that the transfer policy is addressing.

01:02:02 Jim Galvin (RySG): This is not about ownership or account or RNH or registrant. This is about first principles in the ICANN Registration ecosystem. Transafer applies whenever registrar of record changes or contactability for the domain name changes.

01:03:18 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): there IS already

01:03:20 Jim Galvin (RySG): ICANN ecosystem does not have a concept of "owner". That's my point. ICANN ecosystem has a concept of contactability.

01:03:21 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): the whois verification policy

01:03:29 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): But I do not think there should be policy

01:03:37 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): so there's something already in place for change of contact information , outside of this transfer policy discussion

01:03:51 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): We want to encourage registrants to keep their info up to date, and CoR can punish them for doing so

01:03:55 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): Jim I think there is a concept of owner, the domain registrant is the owner ??

01:04:03 Jim Galvin (RySG): So, more directly, let's not focus on why CoR exists or what it was trying to do. Let's eliminate it, identify first principles, and focus on meeting those objectives.

01:04:03 Mike Rodenbaugh (IPC): who doesn't like 'ownership' when referring to domains?!

01:04:24 Owen Smigelski (Namecheap) (RrSG): Sounds good Jim

01:04:34 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): To Jim's last comment - yes! let's consider what we're trying to do and then figure out how.

01:04:46 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): registries don't like 'ownership' because they actually 'own' all of them. perhaps we should be referring to this as 'change of rentpayer'

01:04:58 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): change of tenant?

01:05:01 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): We already have a policy for when contactability for the domain changes - the whois verification policy

01:05:06 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): we don't need a transfer policy for it also, IMO

01:05:25 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): I still think this is high squeeze, low juice territory

01:05:36 Steinar Grøtterød (At-Large): Privately (not necessary At-Large view) - the registrar is contractual obliged to keep the registrant data updated. There should be no need for a policy covering when the registrar is contractual obliged to "secure" a change of registrant data. It is all in the area of responsibility of the registrar.

01:06:39 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): agreed steinar - I suspect a lot of the ground we're covering here to make sure we're adhering to the important principles Jim's raising is defined outside of this group's definitions (or purview)

01:07:27 Mike Rodenbaugh (IPC): @Jothan: that is debatable; most people, and courts, think registries are service providers and registrants are property owners

01:08:07 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): I'm hearing cost...

01:08:25 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): Are the registries will to pay for this?

01:08:30 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): what process do you have in mind that we would fall back to specifically

01:08:32 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): willing

01:08:48 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): right now, if the RNH and cannot approve the COR via email, they instead do it via SMS

01:08:54 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): is that still an option in your suggestion?

01:09:01 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): would we send the TAC via SMS?

01:09:52 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): @mike #wisdom - yeah there are a diversity of perspective truths on "ownership" that vary from role, district, etc. Really, for practical intent, transfer integrity is what we're all attempting to evolve.

01:10:17 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah, yes, using SMS if email doesn't work, or use whatever if neither work. presumably registrars already have a process for dealing with this. do you want an industry standard for this? I'm thinking there is no need to be prescriptive. it should be local policy.

01:11:03 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): I mean, I want the standard to be that there are notificaitons sent out following material changes but no approval necessary, so

01:11:03 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): I am dealing with a number of registrant validation service disruptions with a registry that has a very stringent and poorly executed model for this exact topic at the moment.

01:11:15 Jim Galvin (RySG): @theo, what I'm proposing is the "standard process" for us in "standard cases". exceptions are exceptions and should be handled accordingly. so, the policy needs to be careful about what is prescribing when.

01:11:42 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah, yes, just as it is defined Phase 1A, no approval but notifications.

01:12:02 Theo Geurts (RrSG): Jim we tried that 6 years ago and it is a mine field.... I gave up, we were killing a different business model each week :)

01:12:17 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): But Jim, the TAC provision to initiate the update is (basically) an approval , is not just a notification

01:12:29 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah, part of the discussion last week, and here again, is what is a "material change". i'm saying the default is change of contactability, with the option to add anything you want.

01:12:33 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): and I do think that in case of inter-Rr xfer, we do need a TAC , but I dont think so for COR

01:12:41 Theo Geurts (RrSG): It was like playing with mikado sticks every week in the IRT

01:14:21 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah, TAC provision is an authorization, not an approval. i don't mean this to be a semantic debate. from a technical point of view the distinction is relevant.

01:14:36 Theo Geurts (RrSG): Correct Steinar, and GDPR applies and as such we MUST provide an adequate level of protection to registrants

01:15:46 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): Jim - ok, I can see that as a meaningful difference! I still dont think we should require the TAC provision for COR :)

01:16:00 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): In that context, authorization would be also obtained by logging into the account where the domain can be managed

01:16:26 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah, if you don't think you need a TAC intra-registrar, then that tells me you don't need CoR. I'm just observing that it is consistent with the overall registration ecosystem for the change of contactability to be transfer, whether inter- or intra-registrar.

01:16:38 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): I am in agreement that I think we dont need COR :)

01:16:54 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): Jim, you're right here on the principle. the materiality part in the registrars' "Last Mile" of coordination with the registrant through optional layers makes that really challenging already. Once this group makes its policy related to Inter-Registrar, the registrars with resellers and customers will have a lot more work to educate, update, dev/support etc so the headwinds and resistance being presented here have to do with minimizing disruption to status quo and resourcing where there is lower value other than academic

01:17:30 Sarah Wyld (RrSG): Roger - I still dont think change of CONTROL is the same as change of REGISTRANT

01:19:47 Jim Galvin (RySG): @sarah - I agree CONTROL is not REGISTRANT. that's why I'm setting that aside, stepping back, and considering first principles as to the purpose of transfer.

01:20:41 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): "Change of RnH" ?

01:21:40 Jim Galvin (RySG): So, we can stick to inter-registrar transfer, and abandon everything else, or we can understand that transfer is about control of the domain name. that's my logic. certainly you can disagree with my starting assumption of transfer being equivalent to the issue of change of control.

01:22:15 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): I have an idea to present when I am up next Jim

01:24:28 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): rather than an assignment for registrars on this I have an idea on an assignment for registries on this...

01:25:00 Jim Galvin (RySG): @jothan - hit me!

01:25:25 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): easier to say once I get the floor

01:29:11 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): The registries don't want to be involved

01:29:22 Rick Wilhelm (RySG)(PIR): The registry doesn't know a bunch of this stuff

01:29:31 Theo Geurts (RrSG): How does that work when those registries move to thin? Plus Verisign is already thin and has no such info

01:29:42 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): +1 Theo

01:30:16 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): higher level - some kind of x actions in y period of time, tracked at registry

01:31:00 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): +1 Owen!

01:31:43 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): +1 on Owen's mention - this has not served its intention or created more benefit than cost

01:33:58 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): I agree with Owen

01:36:11 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): Please leave the registries out of this process

01:36:41 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): on what I was suggesting as an Ry Attribute of a domain name was that once we determine our 'end to end' timing period at the conclusion of phase 2, we will have some idea of when the rollback timer runs out or locking periods. It would be helpful to have some counter that keeps track of events within that period of time since transfer, that would include change of RnH contact info.

01:37:20 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): If we're presenting ideas with odd juice / squeeze in Ry/Rr implementation realms

01:37:34 Rick Wilhelm (RySG)(PIR): +1 KT

01:37:45 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): seems like staying in our lanes is wise, as Keiron states

01:38:18 Berry Cobb - ICANN Org: Inter-Registrant Transfer, not CoR. ;-)

01:38:33 Berry Cobb - ICANN Org: Standing up another swear jar.

01:38:48 Emily Barabas - ICANN Org: <https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/initial-report-on-the-transfer-policy-review-21-06-2022/submissions?page=1&sort-direction=newest>

01:38:58 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): actually, Berry would it not be CoRnH?

01:39:03 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): or Corn-H

01:39:14 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): we need a clever mnemonic here, that's perfect

01:41:59 Jothan Frakes (RrSG Alt.): was the removed comment the SEO spam one, or was it 'spicy'?

01:43:03 Berry Cobb - ICANN Org: All good.

01:44:12 Keiron Tobin - GoDaddy LLC (RrSG): Thanks all, have a nice rest! And enjoy the summer!