

**IRTP C WG team  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 11 September 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 11 September 2012 at 1400 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120911-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#sep>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

James Bladel –RrSG co-chair  
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair  
Hago Dafalla – NCUC  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP  
Rob Golding – RrSG  
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG  
Angie Graves – CBUC  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Phil Corwin – CBUC  
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG  
Alain Berranger – NPOC  
Paul Diaz – RrSG  
Matt Serlin - RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings  
Glen de St Géry  
Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Volker Greimann- RrSG  
Roy Dykes – RySG

Bob Mountain - RrSG

Coordinator: Hello, this is the operator speaking. The recordings have been started. You may begin now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Andre).

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 11th of September, 2012.

On the call today we have Hago Dafalla, Kevin Erdman, Simonetta Batteiger, Mikey O'Connor, (Paul) (unintelligible), Paul Diaz, James Bladel, Matt Serlin, Philip Corwin, Angie Graves, and (unintelligible) and Avri Doria.

We have apologies from Bob Mountain, Volker Greimann, Michele Neylon, and Roy Dykes.

And from staff we have Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery, Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants that please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much, and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. And good morning, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the IRTPC working group call, September 11, 2012.

As per our usual procedures, if anyone has any updates to their Statements of Interest, please indicate by raising your hand in the Adobe (Room) or shouting out now. Okay, no takers on that.

And next, if you would, please if you have any updates or edits to our proposed agenda that was circulated on the mailing list yesterday and appears in the right-hand column of the Adobe screen, any changes or edits to that?

Okay, no takers. So we will consider that agenda adopted.

So we want to get through a number of things today. The first up is continue to work on these beautiful diagrams from Mikey and the sub-team that was working on that.

Mikey, can I turn this over to you with the understanding that we're really under a time crunch and we can maybe spend a max of 15 minutes on this diagram?

Mikey O'Connor: Ooh, I love that. That's exactly the number I was mentally telegraphing to you, so that'll work fine.

James Bladel: We're on the same frequency today.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Perfect alignment. I'll sort of shoot for 20 after the hour and go from there.

So I circulated these quite late last night to the list, I apologize, I've been juggling a lot of plates.

So I'm going to just highlight the changes to this and we'll see sort of where this takes us.

I've added a page. This first page is really the policy pieces. This is like the piece part that we can use to build the use cases. So I've separated use cases from policy chunks.

And so what there really are is there are changes to the IRTP. There are - in Chunk 1 there's a whole new gizmo which is the change registrant, and an associated safeguard to prevent registrar hopping. And then there's a chunk to speak to how the toggling on and off of that safeguard would work.

So those are the policy parts. And then I take those policy parts and put them together into five use cases.

So the first three are essentially identical to the policy pieces, but they should not be confused with the policy piece.

The three things that we really need to write are the policy parts. The use cases are just used to describe how those things would be used. And in this first pair of slides that's pretty subtle, but there you go. And in a minute we'll get to exploding each of the use cases.

Then the last of the use cases are the more complicated ones. There's the one where we change registrar and registrant at the same time and we leave the safeguard on. And then the last one is the one where we turn off the safeguard and then change registrar and registrant.

And I'll point out one puzzler that I'm still thinking about. And that is that the first time we talked about the removing of the safeguard, we said that both the old and the new registrant had to approve that. But with this notion of toggling the safeguard, that's not necessarily consistent throughout this. So in some cases I have the current registrant toggling, and in some cases I have old and new approving. So there's still a little consistency to iron out here.

Then we go into...

James Bladel: Sorry, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes sir?

James Bladel: I'm sorry to interrupt, but there's a question in the chat that I'm afraid if you don't go too much further you're going to leave some of us further and further behind.

What do you mean by toggling the safeguards? That's really...

Mikey O'Connor: Let me get to it. I promise it'll become clearer when I get you through it. That's part of the reason why we need these slides.

James Bladel: Okay, so it's coming up then?

Mikey O'Connor: It's coming up.

James Bladel: Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: They're all coming.

So let me take you through - so remember we had three simple cases. The formatting got a little hosed up in the translation into PDF. But this is the first case. And, you know, this is just good old IRTP. I want to move my domain from one registrar to another.

The policy part that we have to focus on is that in order for this very simple use case to work, the registrant information needs to match between the two. And that was the puzzler we worked on last week, which is well, how's that going to work in a thin registry?

And we've got some options on that, primarily arising from the (RAA) discussions where there's an emerging idea of uniform Whois, that if that emerges the way it looks like it's going to, would provide a mechanism for the gaining registrar to query the Whois data from the losing registrar in a consistent way, even in a thin Whois environment.

So I'm glossing over a pretty long conversation. I won't go into any more detail now, but we did have a pretty good call about that last week.

So as long as the registrant information doesn't change, IRTP remains the way it goes and this is just an additional requirement that would have to be added to IRTP.

There's a bunch of conversation that I went ahead and answered. I'm not going to go into a whole lot of detail on this either, just to point you to it that we indeed are going to have to change the way the current domain transfer process works if we do this, etc., etc.

The next case is unchanged. Basically this is the registrant is changing registrant, she does it the way we've described in this new policy where she changes it and then there's a lock that leaves the safeguard in place for 60 days.

The next one is the toggle safeguard. And this arose from a conversation that started on last week's call where we said, "Well people may want to be able to turn this on and off." So there are really two cases here and I've combined them into one up in that top paragraph.

(Susan) either wants to waive the safeguard in anticipation of a transaction, so she wants to turn it off. Or she wants to reinstate it maybe because something didn't pan out or whatever.

And the key there is that note at the bottom which says that in either case the authentication to do that would need to be very rigorous. And so we've got language that we're going to have to wrestle over in the policy in order to get that squared away.

Because I think without very strong authentication out-of-band, we don't actually accomplish anything because if somebody's hijacked the account, they can just toggle it off and steal the domain and so all of this pain that we've been through is for naught.

The next one is the one that is likely going to happen a lot, especially in cases where the registrant information can't be validated between registrars, which means that in today's case where we don't have a good way to transmit or validate Whois information between registrars and thin registries, this is really the default use case. And in this case they will change registrar and registrant at the same time and leave the safeguard in place.

And then the final one is the one where an investor wants to buy a domain and she wants to move it to a new registrar and have the flexibility to immediately move it along. And again, this is the toggle safeguard. But here it's waive the safeguard, and I wasn't sure whether I was looking at two things or one thing. So I left this inconsistency in here as something that I think we still need to iron out.

So that's it. That's my story with five minutes to spare.

Now let me circle back to the chat.

James Bladel: I'll go ahead and run the queue here, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay.

James Bladel: But I just wanted to say thanks for you and the sub-team, these are really impressive diagrams. I think they do introduce - I'm not sure if they introduce new information or just maybe put it in such a clear way that it raises some questions.

So we'll circle back. I know Simonetta has some things. I'm going to put myself in the queue because I had some questions. And then anyone else wants to jump in, go ahead. But I will start with Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Hey Mikey. I have a couple of clarification questions, I guess, and one little suggestion if we are going to use those slides as part of our report.

I think it would be good, if we do so, to use the - on the first one or two or three slides where you introduce the use cases, if it's made more clear on these slides that these individual items could scroll up even further.

I somehow didn't quite understand that, like 1 and 2 and 3 isn't like a process step of the same use case, but they're really like 3 or 4 or 5 different use cases. So if we could make maybe (write) Use Case 1, change registrar, Use Case 2, change registrant of all safeguards, blah, blah, blah and so on. So that was the first - that kind of just confused me.

And then I think the other thing that I still don't quite understand is what's exactly remaining with the safeguard. So maybe you could explain a little bit what your thoughts were there. Is this just - is the safeguard basically some kind of request in the account to do what, really? What were your thoughts there?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Simonetta. I think the first suggestion is terrific, and I will go through and make it really clear the difference. Some of this was sort of late-breaking editing last night.

In terms of the safeguard, it's really a certain number of day anti-(IRT) lock. So basically I think that the easiest way, at least that I've been thinking about it, is if we change registrant, the default would be that after the change of registrant there would be a 30 or 60-day lock that would prevent inter-registrar transfers from happening. And the thought here is to prevent registrar hopping.



And so I think what I'm hearing is that I need to clarify that from the language that's sitting on these slides to make that clearer. Does that clear it up for you if I describe it that way? Or does that still leave you confused?

Simonetta Batteiger: No, but if safeguard means lock, why don't we use that word? Because that word is known in the ICANN world and will make immediate sense to people, whereas safeguard is not really defined or known. So I think that more people reading the report will have the same question mark in their hat that I had, they just don't know what that safeguard means.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think I did that, because on some call somebody said, "Ooh, don't use the word lock." And so I was being a good scout.

But I agree that lock means more to me than safeguard. And so if that's a friendly amendment for the rest of the group, I would change this to do that to clarify what this means. Because I think it also helps with the implementation, because people know how to implement locks. They don't know what we're talking about when we implement safeguards, so...

Simonetta Batteiger: So is it then right, and correct me if I misunderstood this, that basically the idea that you're presenting here is that by default when a registrant changes there would be a lock, but that lock can be removed somehow with this toggle mechanism, whatever that is?

Mikey O'Connor: Correct. Precisely correct.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay. So really the toggle - the (post-change) - okay, there actually it says lock. So what that third use case means is basically a mechanism to remove the lock on Use Case 2 and/or others, or did I misunderstand that?

Mikey O'Connor: Well this is where I've confused you with the difference between Slide 1, which is Policy Components, and Slide 2, which is Use Cases. And so I clearly need to make this distinction clearer.

These two slides are identical. It's just that what I was trying to get at was the idea that in this first slide, from our vantage point as writers of policy, these are the three things that we need to write. But we need to write them in such a way that we can actually use them in at least five ways. This is the first three of the five ways, and this is the last.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay. Then maybe another suggestion would be to just make two more slides that kind of - like one initial slide that introduces the distinction. And then in between the Policy Components slide and the one where you start the use cases, just one that basically says Use Cases on it and then it kind of (flow)...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's a good idea.

Simonetta Batteiger: ...in a more structured way.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes, yes.

Simonetta Batteiger: But then on the use case - oh I get it, I see. So on the use cases you would have a independent Use Case number 3 from 2 or 1 or any one of the others that is describing a mechanism to remove that lock.

Mikey O'Connor: Correct, or reinstate it.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay, I see. Got it. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks a lot. Those were good. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi Mikey, thank you. And putting my registrar hat on here for a moment.

I think this is good. I think it's - I was a little confused as well at drawing the distinction between policy and, you know, the automation components.

But I have this concern about the - and I'm not really sure if this is coming from the group or if it's something that we, you know, kind of discussed in a larger venue. But this concept of being able to turn on and turn off the lock or toggle or safeguard, whatever we want to call it, but the ability to activate and deactivate that as needed.

So I had some thoughts here. One is that we can make that the default and we can certainly have a change of registrants (poke) out of it for after-market transactions. But being able to then come back later and turn it on seems like a very significant development and procedural effort for relatively little benefit, in my opinion, because that's - the folks that explicitly opt out and then later decide they want to opt in, we're basically saying that a domain investor has changed their mind and decided to willingly and voluntarily lock their domain name against transfers.

If there's a concern, excuse me, for hijacking, I mean, most registrars have a number of products that could - or services or free functions facilities to do this already. And then the ability to come back later and unlock it, if that's misapplied, is already established - or was already established with (IRTPB), which says something along the lines of, you know, upon the request of the registrant, the registrar had removed those kinds of safeguards within five calendar days.

So I feel like we're introducing complexity that doesn't, I mean, the payoff isn't there is kind of where I'm driving at.

You know, I feel like it - I get what it's saying and it makes the whole process have more integrity, but it seems like we already have some mechanisms in place to address with the turning on and the turning off of this safeguard and

building it in or baking it into this policy, it seems to really, really complicate this picture.

So that's my thoughts there. And I would submit that to the group that perhaps we just say that it's the default toggle or safeguard or lock and that you can opt out of it. But the ability to come back later and turn it on and off seems like a much bigger step.

So I see there's a queue building up behind me, so I'll go ahead and go to Simonetta.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me query the queue and just check and see, are you guys - Simonetta and Avri, are you interested in talking about this thing that James was talking about? Or should I respond to that before you talk?

Because if you're responding to James, by all means go ahead.

Avri Doria: I was going to question James.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Simonetta, you too? Or do you have another point? Simonetta, you may be...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) wants to talk about James' comment also.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay. So let's let Avri jump the queue and then we'll circle back to...

Avri Doria: Simonetta would jump in first since she's also talking about James' comment.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I'm sorry, I read it backwards. Go ahead, Simonetta

Simonetta Batteiger: I was just wondering if - and I heard what you said, James, and my reaction was the same thing. If we already introduced this as part of (IRTPB), my question was is it really that much more complicated? Or is it just the new

safeguard and toggle language that makes it sound a lot more complex than it really is?

Because if we're just speaking about locks that are there by default can be disabled and can be reset, I mean, a mechanism to lock a domain name or unlock the domain name is already in most registrars interfaced anyway. So I don't know if that is actually that complicated.

If we're starting to speak about safeguards and toggles and all kinds of other things, then it sounds a lot more complex than what the idea really is.

James Bladel: So Simonetta, maybe that's a question for Mikey as well. You're saying that existing locks functions would qualify under this new language and that we wouldn't have to go out and develop a completely new kind of lock?

Simonetta Batteiger: I wouldn't know why. If there is a lock that basically is set once a change in registrant is made or a change in registrar is made, but there is a mechanism for people to remove that lock somehow. And then they can just relock the name if they wish to not leave it locked anymore. That's something that most registrars support anyway, I think including GoDaddy.

James Bladel: Yes. If that's the case, then I'm okay with that and I think we should just explicitly say that to eliminate confusion. But I was concerned that we were building a distinctly separate lock.

Mikey O'Connor: And this is Mikey. I am interested in the idea of instead of building a new lock, using an existing lock.

I think the reason I mentally built a new lock is because this is a new policy, this change of registrant thing. So that's the only reason I did it.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. First I want to speak to the question that came up about why would you want to relock it. Basically if the person that was doing the domain name sales wanted it open so that they could turn it quickly, why would they - I was thinking that it was a person who had acquired it...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Avri Doria: ...would want to reset the lock. And I'm not sure that there's an automatic mechanism in that transfer that would relock it. So I think that if I bought a name from, you know, some domain salesperson and now I have it, I want to relock it.

So that was my notion, that the person acquiring it would be the one wanting to reset a lock normally.

There could also be reasons why, you know, the person doing domain sales would do it. I don't know how that business logic works.

In terms of the locks, I think if there is an existing lock and that it doesn't have any uses where having been set or unset by this set of policy processes would warp its effect, I think using the same lock is really great.

I think the only thing we need to make sure is someone that understands the complete function of the lock -- the existing lock or the existing defined lock -- to make sure that there's no case where - and naively I don't see it. But just looking at it from the software engineer perspective, that there is no use case where that other lock would be in a different state than this lock, you know, in a reasonable use case.

But otherwise I think using an existing lock is a good thing, so software-wise you just have to be careful that you're not overloading meetings and confusing yourself in the future. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, I get all that. And actually I get both sides of that.

I think in terms of your reinstate thing, Avri, typically what I would expect is that if you're doing the change registrant and registrar at the same time, that you would just - when the transfer to a new registrant took place, the default would be to throw that lock on. And so that would be Use Case 4.

And so one of the interesting things that came up on the call - the working group call - oh James, by the way, I'm paying attention to the clock here and note that I'm...

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...chewing your agenda all to shreds.

James Bladel: Yes, we need to move on to Hago. And then we probably need to put a (button)

Mikey O'Connor: Can (unintelligible).

James Bladel: ...on these charts because we still have a number of open questions. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: I think maybe this says that we need another one of those subgroup calls. So I'll go ahead and throw a question out on the list on that and we can - we made a hell of a lot of progress on the last subgroup call, so maybe we can do that again and iron out some of this stuff.

Hago, go ahead.

Hago Dafalla: We have two options, lock or unlock. I want to ask once you (hear) which of (them) (unintelligible), the lock or unlock and why you choose it, one of these lock or unlock, again?

Mikey O'Connor: Hago, your connection is just fuzzy enough that I didn't quite hear you. If you could speak just a little bit slower, that would help me a lot.

Hago Dafalla: Okay, okay. You have two options, lock or unlock. If you choose lock or unlock and you (got) to know that this procedure and why, why you choose lock and why you choose unlock, the (difference) between this. (Thanks).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. So what I hear you saying is that we really do need to describe the lock and - what I did in this is I made one use case and I combined...

Hago Dafalla: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...the two. What you're saying is we really need two use cases here, one to lock it and one to unlock it, correct?

Hago Dafalla: Yes, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: I agree. I was cheating and you caught me and I apologize. I think that's - I agree with that, that we do really need two use cases there. Thanks. James, back to you.

James Bladel: Thanks. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just had the last clarifying question but, you know, maybe that's something that can be clarified in further discussions on this because I think on the first case, you mentioned that this would result in further changes to the actual change of registrar process. And it wasn't clear to me whether you're talking about whether this means actual changes to IRTF or you're just talking about implementation of the change of registrar.

It might be something that needs to be clarified so it can actually be incorporated accurately in the report. I'm just thinking ahead of writing the



report, to put the right language in there, so if you have an answer now, feel free. Otherwise, you can clarify at (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I have a tentative answer which I think, you know, is just Mikey shooting from the hip here. But my tentative answer is that, yes, the IRTP needs to change in order to accommodate this because I think, then, it's the note that's on the bottom, that in the IRTP, we need to acknowledge that the registrant information cannot change during the IRTP.

And so I think that that's a change to the policy on the IRTP side. That's part of the reason why these use cases are pretty important and why we need to make the distinction - let me use this slide - between a complex use case where we are doing two policy chunks at the same time and a simple use case where we're only using one piece of the policy.

But in order to make sure that that use case is truly pure, we need to acknowledge in the policy that registrant information cannot change as a result of IRTP.

Hago Dafalla: Well, it looks like we still have a number of gaps that need to be filled here but I think this group has come a long way and I think that we - hello?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I think that's Hago. Hago, you may need to mute. Simonetta is - let me just briefly address Simonetta's comment in the chat.

James Bladel: Very briefly please, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, this was the subject of the whole call last week and I think it's critically important that Simonetta's absolutely correct, that today in the Dot Com thin Whois environment, it's extremely difficult for registrars to validate Whois information because there's not mechanism to do it. And so there're really two options - one is - well, there're three. One is to force people always into use case four.

Another is to acknowledge the coming uniform Whois requirements that may arrive in the new RAA. And the third is to acknowledge the possibility that the thick Whois PDP may address this. But Simonetta is absolutely correct, that today this doesn't work and thus the default, if we were to implement this today, would be that registrars for transfers in dot com would have to use use case four or five in order to accomplish this and essentially treat the registrant information as unknown. So there you go. Quick summary.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Mikey. And thanks everyone who's working on this. We've had some good questions, a healthy discussion, and we'll - so the follow up is Mikey, you're going to circulate another doodle to reconvene that group to address some of these loose threads and circle back next week. Is that correct?

Mikey O'Connor: Correct.

James Bladel: And we can take, you know, 90% of that discussion to the mailing list. I think that would be great because I'm concerned a little bit that our number of Tuesdays between now and Toronto is dwindling. And we still have a lot left to do, so.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and, you know, I caution people that, you know, we're still at sort of the conceptual design level here and after we get this hammered out, we have to write policy. So I am a little concerned that we are not going to make Toronto with this. Sorry.

James Bladel: And maybe we can discuss on the list as well. I - my thought when we initiated this project, is it was sort of visual aids for what we were already discussing in the narrative. And it seems like now the diagram is driving the narrative instead of the other way around or maybe I'm missing something, but I think we need to - if we could just move to the next item in our agenda, we'll definitely circle back on this next week and make sure that we have this

up just because I do think it raises some important questions and sometimes the diagram shapes out those conversations the way the text just doesn't have the ability to do.

So thanks everybody. I do appreciate that. And my desire to keep us moving is in no way to the discount to the importance of the work. It's just recognition that other things are also weighing down on us here. So next up is the agenda item Number 4 where we tackled our open issues.

We only had one option issue for charter Question B, and very naively, I thought that it was low hanging fruit. We dove into it last week and it turns out that that was quite a lengthy discussion. I put a straw man out onto the list and I know that there have been a number of edits to that from (Bob), Simonetta and I believe (Barbara), as well as some other folks weighing in that they supported it as-is or with one or more of these changes.

So perhaps, Marika, I see your hand is up. You can bring us up to speed on where we are with this consensus call on this text. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to clarify what is up on the screen. What I did is take the latest language that was out on the mailing list and basically disincorporate, if I'm right, Simonetta's suggest adage which I think are the ones that are highlight and, you know, the strikethroughs. It includes the suggestion that was made by (Bob), which is in the green language in the top part and I also incorporated the suggestion that was made by (Barbara) on the mailing list just before this call.

So at the top, you see the marked up language but what I did below is just clean that up so it might be easier for people just to look at the clean version off that. And I think the clean version of that and I think this is the latest based on the comments but if I've missed anything, please let me know and happy to update it further.

James Bladel: Thank you Marika. I really appreciate you consolidating those, particularly for someone like me who ran from one call to this one without catching the last two or three posts on mailing list, so I definitely appreciate that this is the most current mark up at the top and then the clean one at the bottom.

Simonetta, I see your hand is up. I was wondering if we could walk through this first or did you have something preliminary that needed to - we need to address before we do that? Simonetta?

Woman: She says go ahead in the chat.

James Bladel: Oh okay. I see. Okay, so we'll hold your place in the queue once we get the walkthrough. So let's start with the - we'll just go through the markup I think. So the working group concludes that the forms of authorization, FOAs, want them changed by a - and we strike (gaining) because we note that it's actually more involved than just gaining. That was two narrow - by a registrar should be valid for 60 days.

Following this time period, the or a - a registrar - and maybe that's a question - must reauthorize via a new FOA, any transfer request. Registrars should be permitted to allow registrants to opt into an automatic renewal for FOAs if desired. And I think that addresses the part of (Bob)'s question.

In addition to the 60 days validity restriction, FOAs should expire if there is a change of registrant or if the domain name expires or if a transfer is executed or if there is a dispute filed for the domain name. So we essentially roll out the events that would trigger an expiry.

In order to preserve the integrity of the FOA, there cannot be any opt in or opt out provisions for these reasons for expiration, so essentially saying these are not within the registrant control. If they happen, the FOA is killed, you know, end of discussion.

Here's a green text that (Bob) has added, correctly pointing out correctly pointing out we forgot that IRTPB requires moving registrars to send FOAs as well. So here is the part that covers that. Moving registrants under IRTPB now - I think he meant registrars there Marika. Just a thought.

But moving registrars under IRTPB are now required to send an FOA to a losing registrant. I don't think losing registrant is defined. I think we want to say previous registrant. The working group advises that losing registrars have the option to send a modified version of this FOA to a losing registrant in the event that the transfer is automated where the FOA would be advisory in nature.

So maybe we need to circle back on that because I think I have some questions there so we'll get that when we come to the queue. Finally, and this is not part of a policy recommendation. This is just more of an observation here that during the course of the deliberations on this topic, the working group notes the use of EPP authorization info keys has become the de facto security mechanism in our industry and thereby replace some of the regions for the creation of the standard FOA.

We recommend that future efforts in this area examine whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP auth info codes should eliminate or would or could eliminate the need of FOAs. I just wanted to note there that in the previous sentence we say auth info keys and then later we say auth info codes. We should probably standardize on one or the other. I prefer code and I think it's - that one's on me because I won't - there's no markup on those two words so that one falls on me.

Okay, so let's take a queue on this language but I think the goal is if we're going to say we don't support the language, we definitely have to offer up an alternative because we have strong compelling desire to arrive on something and bring this one in for a landing if we can today.

Okay, so let me - I'm going to jump to Marika just in case she has some clarifying language or a question and then we'll start the queue with Simonetta. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just more on the last part of the recommendations, just a question whether the working group envisions that this should be part of the next IRTP and if so, or if not so, I think it will be helpful to clarify that so that the council is clear on what the working group means with future efforts.

James Bladel: That's a good point and I was thinking about that as well when we were writing it. It begs the question of when are we going to address this, if not now. And I think that we could discuss whether it should be part of future PDPs, like IRTPD or whether it should essentially just be left kind of open ended. We'll leave that one to the group. We're going to go Simonetta then Mikey then myself, so Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I wanted to respond to (Barbara)'s last comment on the mailing list which was this introduction of the should be permitted to allow registrants in the second sentence. The reason I had - because I was originally there when James sent out this initial draft and I removed it because I was thinking of the user of the policy who, if there're a fairly educated domain or, for example, they might be knowledgeable enough to identify registrars that support a process like this versus some other folks might not be that knowledgeable and I would actually think that this option to pre-opt into FOA should be something that any registrar should offer and not just the ones who would like to.

That's why my recommendation would be to not make it that optional but to really say that registrars should allow registrants to opt into an automatic renewal of FOAs if desired. But, I mean, obviously I'd like to hear what the rest of the group thinks about.

James Bladel: So - and just so I'm clear, the intention was that some registrars might want the 60 day time period to automatically renew and you're saying that instead of saying that it should be an option, you're saying it should be a requirement. Is that a correct statement?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes, because it would leave the users confused because with some registrars, something works and with others, it doesn't. And it's completely transparent which ones are the ones that support this and which ones aren't. And I mean, the transfer policy and the transfer process, as we evolved in very initial attempts at getting a named moved are still all over the place and still so complex anyway that creating extra complexity, because some people do something and other registrars don't do the same thing, I don't think we're going the users a favor if we go that route.

James Bladel: So just so I'm clear, we're creating a new rule and then we're requiring registrars to provide the ability to waive that rule? I'm just hammering this out in my head because I think there's a true table buried in this statement somewhere but I need to think about that one. I'm not entirely sure what - let's put a note there, Simonetta, and let's move to Mikey and then let's circle back to that and maybe others would like to weigh in on that as well. I'll go ahead and take the bottom part of the queue. Go ahead Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. This is Mikey. I'm going to comment on that same sentence and it may be that my comments will even further cloud the truth table or not. We'll see. Remember that this sentence was essentially a concession that was made to the aftermarket community.

When we originally set this up, we were working on how long should they be valid, no, they should not be valid forever. They should expire. And we came up with that list of reasons why they expire and this length of time. The concern from the aftermarket community is that in many cases, their business model depends on being able to leave that authorization in place for quite a

long time, much longer than 60 days, so that then when a domain is transferred, it can happen very quickly.

And so we added the language that said that registrars should be able to get registrants, give registrants the option to opt out. I'm - my concern here is that what we're essentially doing is removing a safeguard. I mean, the reason for the FOA expiring is another anti-hijacking safeguard. And so my comment was going to be, and still is, that if we could include language similar to the language that's evolving in the first part of the call that says this, the authentication for this needs to be out of ban. It needs to be much stronger than simply authenticating within an account, I'm comfortable.

If somebody can hijack somebody's account and then turn off the FOA limit, safeguard that we've just built, then I'm getting edgy about that. And at the same time, I'm a little edgy about requiring every registrar to offer that option if they don't want to because, again, if I were a registrar that wanted to make sure that these domains were secure and didn't run away, I don't think that I would be comfortable as a registrar being required to offer that option to my customers. So there's a rant.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. And I put myself in the queue on a separate topic but I wanted to weigh in on this. I agree. I think by adding this or requiring all registrars to offer an opt out or - not opt out but an automatic extension, and essentially the same thing is to say FOAs never expire.

So it's kind of like we've come completely full circle on the initial recommendation which is that FOA should expire in 60 days. And then we're saying but really they don't expire. And I just - I have some concerns about that. I feel like we have now undone our initial statement.

So my feeling is that, you know, or at least initially I thought that, for example, I think it's along the lines of where you were going with this Mikey, is that the primary market, you know, say 80/20, the primary market would not have



perpetual FOAs. They would expire in 60 days and then the - there was this carve out to support an acknowledgement and a recognition that that was problematic for the aftermarket so that for that group, there was this special facility.

Now it seems like we kind of want to put that on its head and say, no, 100% of folks will behave according to the carve out or the exception. And yes, so I guess I'm kind of coming down on the same area that Mikey ranted on, which was that I'm not real - I think we've built something in and then we've chipped away at it to the point where I can't see it anymore.

So I mean, I understand Simonetta's point, is that this is a confusing process. I think that the message needs to be that FOA is expired. And the upsell, or the exception from those folks who choose it, would be to communicate through their customers and their registrants that we have a service, we have a facility to extend the validity of your FOAs but not that being more of the exception than the rule.

So, the other thing I had here, and just - and maybe it's just, you know, it's really just language crafting in some point here, which is I think that there was a - I was concerned or at least confused a little bit why some folks changed the to any in front of transfer in a couple of places.

I was specifically writing this to - with the understanding that the FOA was attached to a specific transfer, not any transfer, and that if another transfer were to initiate, let's say, I have a domain name and there's a transfer initiated that (Rod Golding)'s registrar, that that would have an FOA but if there was a separate transfer initiated, that - and Matt Serlin's registrar, for example, that that would have a separate distinct FOA associated with it.

And I'm concerned by saying any transfer or something like that, maybe I've got this backwards. Maybe we do need it to say any, but I was thinking that there was a one-to-one relationship between FOAs and transfer requests.

And that by changing the to any, we were blurring that one-to-one relationship. So that was my thought and concern on that regard.

So I see that we are running out of time but I think we wanted to get to a point where we can at least put some light, reach out to the list, for folks to consider. So any thoughts on this here? I noticed that we're coming up against the top of the hour.

Man: James, the chat's pretty much running your way.

James Bladel: I completely lost - I'm lost on the chat here. So let's see, what are we saying here? Okay, so Matt and (Barbara), okay. Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I can make a recommendation, is to put out a clean set of language, you know, with the things you mentioned and then just over the week and then at the next meeting, try and call it and determine. I think at this point, you know, there's certainly near consensus on it and not having contributed much to it other than an agree check at one point.

But I think I would say that, you know, write down the language. Make sure that this is the language that there is, you know, at least near consensus and check if there is anyone that, you know, feels that they say something against it and go on from there. But I think you are right.

James Bladel: Avri, do you think there's a benefit to, you know, even if it's somewhat arbitrary to putting a deadline into that, like by the end of this week, we're going to, you know, you and I together, we'll make some sort of determination on whether we're at consensus or not and then - because I think that...

Avri Doria: I think (unintelligible) can make a recommendation for where we're at a consensus certainly at the deadline, certainly any time. And then we can always be forced to revise it.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay, that looks good. Okay, well folks, I noticed we are at the end and unfortunately I do have another call to jump onto. Such is the life of every ICANN critter and I'm sure everyone here can relate. You know, I thank Mikey and the subteam for their diagrams and everyone who has weighed in on the list. And I know I sound a little bit like a broken record here but we have a number of open issues relative to charter question A that need to be addressed and we're probably going to need to make sure that we emphasize those deliberations on the mailing list because the time on our calls is becoming increasingly dear.

So if we could, please watch the list and please contribute there. That would be fantastic. And I think, Marika, you get the last word before we sign off for this week.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And just to clarify, because I've been trying to keep note on the change that people suggested. Would you like me to send out an updated version based on the discussion we have now or would you like me to send it to you or?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes, Marika, maybe you and Avri and I can work offline and try to come up with a new set of language that reflects the changes today.

Marika Konings: Okay, I can just send you what I took note of and then you can see if that makes sense.

James Bladel: That works great. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks everyone and appreciate all of your work on these issues. I think we are getting closer and, you know, I think someone once wisely said

that the work gets harder as you get closer to the end and I think that that is definitely the case in ICANN PDPs. So thanks everyone. We'll see you next week, same time.

Woman: Okay thanks. Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: (Thanks everyone) and I'll stop the recording. Thank you very much.

END