

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 14 August 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 14 August 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-20120814-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#aug>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Mike O'Connor - ISPCP
James Bladel –RrSG co-chair
Hago Dafalla - NCUC
Angie Graves – CBUC
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Kevin Erdman – IPC
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Bob Mountain - RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Alain Berranger – NPOC
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG
Rob Golding – RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Géry
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Roy Dykes – RySG
Matt Serlin – RrSG
Barbara Knight – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG
Phil Corwin - CBUC

Marika Konings

Coordinator: We're going to start this. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Well, thank you very much then.

Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 14th of August, 2012. On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Michele Neylon, Paul Diaz, James Bladel, (unintelligible), Angie Graves, Alain Berranger, Chris Chaplow, Kevin Erdman, and Bob Mountain.

We have apologies from Matt Serlin, Simonetta Batteiger, Jonathan Tennenbaum, Roy Dykes, Barbara Knight, Avri Doria, and Markia Konings.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your 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 for August 14th, 2012.

First off, I would note that we have a significant number of apologies this week, but it looks like we also have a fairly healthy and representative turnout for the call. So is there anyone that believes that we have not achieved a sufficient quorum to proceed? Please indicate so now. We could discuss that.

Okay, good. I thought that was the case as well. It looks like we have probably the - a minimal skeleton crew, but enough to continue our work.

Next steps. We would ask everyone to review the agenda - the proposed agenda that appears in the right hand column of the (unintelligible) - of the Adobe Connect screen and was circulated to the mailing list by Berry on yesterday. Does anyone have any edits or comments to our proposed agenda?

Okay, the queue is clear so we'll consider that adopted.

And then finally, are there any updates, modifications, or declarations that anyone would like to make relative to their Statement of Interest?

Okay, thanks.

And now that our formalities are done we can move into Item Number 3, which is a continuation of our review. The public received to our initial report as well as feedback that we collected during the workshop session in Prague.

I don't know that I have scrolling ability. I don't know if that's just me or if it's everyone, but - oh, there it goes. Thank you Mr. Cobb.

And it looks like we left our discussion on Page 12 with Item Number 22. But before we dive in, I think that there were a couple of items that required follow-up. And perhaps Berry, maybe you could walk us through all our homework assignments from last week and where we left off and if anything remains before we charge forward this week?

Berry Cobb: Thanks James. This is Berry.

So on Comment Number 11, James, you had the action item to review the internal processes at GoDaddy with respect to an organizational name change at - of the registrant. And I think you had sent a response back to the list noting that when there's an organization field change that the entity is

considered the registrant, while the name fields are used to designate a contact within the organization.

In the event that there is a dispute or confusion between these two, the person -- pardon me -- the person claiming to represent the organization with appropriate documentation ID can overrule the individual listed in the name fields.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Berry. I think that that was one of the questions that was left to us is - from last week is how do we untangle those situations where the organization or the individual might be at odds? And I think this is one way to approach it.

I think Mr. Neylon responded with a different take on this issue. Michele, can I put you on the spot here and ask you to run through your response to that message? And then to see if there's any further discussion required on this topic.

Michele Neylon: Yes, sure.

What was I saying?

Oh, yes. I mean basically all we do - it's not that complicated. We just look at it in terms of the account as opposed to whatever data may or may not be in WHOIS. So if the account has been set up for an organization or a company, then we consider anything in the account, be that domain names or hosting, or any other services, to be associated with the company or organization as opposed to an individual.

So if there's any conflict, then we will take instruction from the organization. It's significantly easier when it's a limited company. It becomes a bit more complicated when you have - which I think in American terms, what you might refer to as a DBA - is it DBA? Trading as something? Because I'm not sure

how it works in the US, but in Ireland and the UK - I mean a DBA is just a trading name. It doesn't actually have any legal status.

So I as an individual could have a registered business names, which means I can accept payments as the business names, but it's basically me. It does - so it's just - it's going to be tied back to me as an individual. And that was pretty much it.

James Bladel: Yes, I think that's a good point. And I'll just - I don't remember if I responded on the list, but I'll just verbally reply that we used to have something similar to that. My understanding from our team is that we used to have account level controls the way you described. We don't anymore, and I don't know why the change was made or what prompted that change, but it was in the significant past.

And I don't mean to pick on Paul Diaz here, but when - but he definitely has a wealth of experience here going back to his days at (Nord Solutions). And I remember they used to have the concept of handles - (unintelligible) handles to control contacts as well. So, I think that there's a lot of interesting ways to slice this one.

Chris Chaplow posts, "What does DBA stand for?" And I believe it's Doing Business As, and Simonetta responded (unintelligible). Thank you, and welcome to the call.

And yes, so I think Michele, perhaps where it gets complicated in the Blacknight approach, as you mentioned, is when the organization that is controlling the account is not a legal entity, but just another iteration or manifestation of the individual.

So go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Well the other thing, James, is we would deal with the loss of - how do I describe this? Not-for-profit, loose organizations, clubs, societies that wouldn't legally be incorporated as anything. So for example, the (Carlo Record Collectors) something or other, or I don't know. You know, the (Carlos Stamp Collectors Club) or something like that. They don't exist as legal entities.

James Bladel: Yes.

Michele Neylon: And what tends to happen there is that the person or officer, or whatever, that - within the organization that handles the bill would probably change from year to year. We also have the same kind of issue arise with schools. So you get - I'm trying to think of what's the international term this? A primary school. A lot of primary schools, the teacher who knows how to turn on a computer might have been the one who organized hosting and domain registration, so everything ends up possibly associated with them. But it's just - it's a little bit messy, but going just based on WHOIS would cause other complications.

Because you find sometimes that the domain details might be completely different because you've got say for example, a design and development company, then they're going to be registering their names hopefully in their client's names.

James Bladel: Yes. Okay, thank you.

So let's see if we can bring this in for a landing. On Comment Number 11 - I do appreciate, Michele, your take on that, and then definitely I believe substantiates the idea that there's not just one way to approach this issue that was raised in Comment Number 11 by the registries, that there are sometimes differences between organizations or individual's specific names.

I think what we are saying here is that whoever - you know, whether - in your case, whether it's the account level or (unintelligible) case, whether it's the

organization that demonstrates the necessary documentation a little closer to the field for the registrant?

Whoever is currently authorized under the registrar procedures to override or just establish itself as the entity that is the registrant would be the entity that would have to authorize or approve any sort of change of control. And I think that sort of brings us back to where we are with Comment Number 11.

Maybe just a clarification is required in our reports to satisfy the registry's question here.

Go ahead Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: That's what I was wondering. What does this actually mean for us that we - we're having difficulty to come to some kind of definition of definition of what a legal entity might be that may or may not have the right to say something that is different from what the registrant information (unintelligible) is.

Is that what it means were you to set that - that maybe we have to put some comments in the policy that says that based on each registrar's definition of who may or may not have additional rights to make a change, this is what we also want to allow. Is that what we want to put forward? Or, what does that mean?

James Bladel: My thinking was - thank you madam. My thinking was that we should always try to be as simple as possible, and I think that the RAA and various other documents are fairly clear that whatever organization or individual listed in the registrant field, you know, is the person or entity that's legally responsible. And, it's that entity that should approve this change of control.

Now registrars may have their own internal processes to verify who that person is or who's claiming to be that entity, or claiming to represent that entity, but I don't think that that needs to be built into this process. I think we

can safely piggyback on other definitions. But, I'm certainly open to folks who think that that may be in just - whitewashing that issue a little bit there.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: No. Just the only thing I would say is that you know ultimately let's call a spade a spade. You know, it doesn't matter what may or may not exist in a policy somewhere. If that policy is not - if that policy conflicts with your domestic law, your domestic law is going to win out.

I mean you know, ICANN is not some super-national, legislative body that can supersede Irish or European law. So if I am bound under Irish law to do something for a client under Irish law, you cannot turn around to me and say, "Well, because somebody who didn't really understand the scope of what this policy would - the implications of this policy would have, then you know this is what we're going to have." I mean, that's ridiculous. That's just never going to fly.

I mean, I think...

James Bladel: I don't think anybody is saying that though, Michele. I think that that's - I don't...

Michele Neylon: I just think (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: (Unintelligible) going down that path at all.

Michele Neylon: Well maybe not, but that's just something I just felt like sharing.

James Bladel: Okay. I mean, fair enough. I just - I don't think we're headed in that direction. I think the registries have raised a concern here. And, I think we're trying to

address it in such a way that doesn't, as Simonetta said, doesn't create a whole bunch of complexities in policy.

And then that would, I think, start to head down the path that you're worried about here where we've got all these asterisks and if/then statements relative to jurisdictions. And I don't think that we're saying that. We're saying that the registrant is still responsible and that the registrant is the party that has to authorize a change of control. But I want to make sure that we are addressing the registry's concerns here.

So I've got a queue going here, so I'll go Kevin and then Chris. So Kevin, go ahead.

Kevin Erdman: Yes, this is Kevin Erdman.

I just - make a counter-comment to Michele's comment, which is ICANN as a non-government organization is free to set forth regulations that conflict with national laws. In fact, you know, in many cases where there are different trends and national laws, you don't really have a choice, you know, at that - you know, a system-wide rule is bound to violate somebody's national law somewhere, or something like that.

And - but more to the point, which is what are the - all the registries worried about? Well, I think what it makes most sense is to create a policy that is number one, the - you know, relatively fair and easy to implement because we don't want to create policies in the registration system that unduly tax all the participants with lots of excessive complications.

Number two, I don't think you should ignore national law. But you know for example, you know, Michele is all caught up in European law, as he should be since he's subject to it. But there's a whole bunch of registries all over the world that are subject to different national laws and have different concerns.

And you know, I think what the main purpose of our group is to develop a policy that, you know, helps the registration system altogether. You know, not one that, you know, picks fights with national laws or anything like that.

But I think it is also permissible that there is a situation where - you know for example, if we as an organization say, "Well, this is the way for domain registrations that we're going to identify parties that are able to act on behalf of a registration that's a non-human entity, these are the things that we need to have happen." We're free to do that.

You know, I think it would be better if you make a procedure that isn't obviously going to conflict with a whole bunch of national laws. But on the other hand, you may not be able to make a procedure that is totally compliant with all the national laws that all the registries are going to have to comply with.

So you know, that said, I think we should be mindful of those national laws. But you know, I don't think that US law, or European law, or Bolivian law should be the, you know, primary motivator in our conversation.

So I'll get done ranting, but that's my thought on it.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Kevin. And, I tend to agree on a number of points. Chris, you're up next.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you. Chris Chaplow speaking.

Just reading the first part of that Comment 11, it doesn't seem to be correct. That's my first impression on reading it, and let me explain why. It says in cases where the domain name is registered to an organization or a company instead of an individual, the registrant may no longer be employed by the organization.

So my first reaction to that would be, well, if the domain was registered correctly in the first place, then the individual would've completed the registrant - would've completed the organization field and put the organization in, whether it be a legal entity or whether it be a DBA.

So I just quickly looked up two domains - two WHOIS's actually that somebody rang me about this morning. Both in .com. One of them, looking at the WHOIS, actually domain - it gives an organization field where he's incorrectly put his name in rather than the organization.

And another domain which they have with a different registrar, there's no organization field at all in the WHOIS. It's registrant first name, last name, and then street and post code.

So am I missing something here? Are we in a situation where you don't always get the opportunity to put in an organization when you make a domain registration? Because that's sort of an additional problem isn't it?

James Bladel: Thanks Chris. I don't know if I have an immediate answer for that. I think that we could probably take a look at the structure of WHOIS for all of the different gTLDs to see what the different fields are and which ones are required and which ones are optional. I think the only one I know of that is optional is tax number.

But you know - can I maybe just take off my hat here and jump in on this one a little bit here.

I almost - I think I want to reemphasize or reiterate something that Chris said at the beginning, which is that the case of (domaining) this registrar to an organization or a company instead of an individual registrant who may no longer be employed.

I think what we're saying here is that in that case, the registrant - the individual is not the registrant. The individual was a representative of the registrant. The individual was a contact at the registrant. I think in both the model that I described for GoDaddy and the model that Michele described for Blacknight. These - this situation has occurred and we have a system or procedures to account for it.

I don't believe therefore that this comment from the registry is necessarily new territory, nor do I believe it's necessarily following within the scope of what we're attempting to resolve here with the change of control. I think that the change of control like the transfer and like other functions of the domain name can simply say that registrant is ultimately responsible.

And while that sometimes may not be clear which individual or legal entity is the (represent) or acting on behalf of the registrant, I think that registrars have developed procedures that are compliant with their local laws to establish those identities or to document those relationships.

So I really don't - I'm concerned that we're going well into the weeds here a little bit and trying to solve a problem that no one asked us to solve. So I'll put my hand down here because that's kind of the end of my rant.

But, I believe that the registry's premise that a name could be registered to an organization, but then the individual leaves - you know, the name is still registered to that organization. Whoever the new contact is needs to establish that. But, I think that that is - that registrars have procedures that they've built that work fairly well in that regard.

So I'll go to Michele and then we'll try to button this up here into a response so we can get into the new comments, because we're already now half way through our allotted time.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Just in relation to what Chris was talking about, I'm not sure whether - I've seen, Chris, where you're talking about when you as an individual or as a representative of a company go to a registrar's interface, be that a Web interface or whatever, it's at that point being offered the option to specify an organization. Is that what you're referring to? Or, are you referring to what I think it was James was talking about, which is the fields that are available in WHOIS?

Because there's (unintelligible) are available in WHOIS. As far as I know, pretty much all of the gTLDs that I've been able to test whilst James and others were talking do have an organization field in there. If it's in relation to fields that are available to somebody when they go to register a domain name, I suspect that's going to be down to the registrars or their reseller, or agent, or whatever the hell you want to call them; whatever they've made available on their Web site. Thanks.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, Michele, Chris here.

I'm assuming that if the registration is done correctly in the first place, then they all get - the person on behalf of the organization filled in the organization name or the DBA into that field, and it wouldn't be a major problem if that person - if the person change the organization. It can be dealt with. And that's our response to the comment as a working group.

That's based on the assumption that on registration you have the opportunity to put in the organization name, which I've taken for granted. And if you just do a WHOIS lookup on (unintelligible) - sorry, (unintelligible) .com, I notice there isn't. But as Simonetta's pointed out, it may be something to do with the translation. I don't know why it isn't in an organization in the WHOIS.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks gentlemen. Simonetta, go ahead. You may be on mute.

Simonetta Batteiger: Sorry. I was on mute. Yes.

I'm just wondering if really it doesn't matter for us that much how someone would put for an organization in a WHOIS record for example, or how all of this was done for our - in relation to this Comment 11, I think what the intent of the registry stakeholder group was, was to say think about that maybe it's not just the registrant who's currently in the WHOIS who is allowed to authorize some kind of a change on the transfer.

But, think about this also that it might be necessary that the organization that is in the record, let's say it was successfully put there because the registrar who created this record does support an organization field. Then maybe it is an either/or and all we need to do in our policy is say something like, "The registrant or the - a qualified," or whatever - representative of an organization, but we leave it up to the registrar to figure out who that can be according to their local policies, are the ones that can make approval to removal of or letting the domain name be transferred.

Maybe, it's as simple as just giving that choice and then leaving it up to the registrars to figure out how they establish who the correct person within an organization is that can make a request to change the registrant to a new employee or something like that.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Simonetta. I think that that's a good direction to head in. And if we wanted to saw this off, we would say something like, you know, where we say registrants, maybe a definition early on in our document. So something to the effect of registrants or their authorized representative. And, just kind of leave it to - leave it at that with registrars, as they are currently doing today, developing their own protocols, I guess, or procedures to establish that someone is or is not an authorized representative.

Okay. The queue is cleared. Do we have any other parting thoughts on this one before we move on to Item - to the next item of homework?

Seeing the queue is clear - go ahead Berry. What's the next one?

Berry Cobb: So just real quick for the recommended action. Basically, it's just to clarify within the report that the authorized party, albeit a person or an organization, is the only legal entity that can implement a change of control, i.e. registrant or authorized representative.

James Bladel: I think that is good. I mean, we'll probably want to - when we're in the editing phase of our report, we may want to massage that language, but I think it captures the sentiment for now.

Berry Cobb: Okay, very good.

The next homework assignment is row - Comment Number 16, and this is in respect to a distinguishing between correcting spelling mistakes or ownership changes, ergo, changing from James to Jim. It might be the same person, but it could also be someone completely different.

In your - James, in your homework assignment, you had mentioned regarding the treatment of minor updates, we try to make our logic as intelligent as possible. It can be tricked by routine changes, such as changing James to Jim or incorporated to Inc. As a fallback measure, we always remove any (lots) that were triggered by changes of this sort.

James Bladel: Right. So that was my homework assignment here, to address this question that was raised in the public workshop. And I think our many years of experience in this area has demonstrated that there is no right or wrong place to dial up or dial down the sensitivity of those changes. We have built some basic functionality into our logic that will detect routine updates, but those can always be fooled by false positives.

So when those occur, then we usually insert a human being into that process and I guess there're judgments on whether or not that change was substantive or whether it was just a correction or a typo, for example, or a change or a name.

It does get a little more interesting when someone changes a name due to marriage, divorce or other sort of legal name change because we want to confirm that that new person is also the previous person because otherwise that could be a security vulnerability but I think that's clearly fairly straightforward and I think we just (use) that for identification or something like that, that demonstrates that someone is legally known by two names or was in the past.

So I think that's, you know, the (essay) there. I don't know that there is a perfect solution to this. I think we put in place a relatively workable solution. And I think this is another one of those areas where registrars would have their own discretion to develop their own internal procedures to conform to their customer, their markets that they're serving as well as their local laws.

So we'll take a quick queue on this one here. Any thoughts or updates on this sensitivity of name changes? Okay. Berry, (what's next)?

Berry Cobb: James, so for the recommended action I'm going to list as non (unintelligible) for this?

James Bladel: I think - yes, I think that that's correct. I don't think that there's anything that we can put into policy language that would address this concern, and just recognize it as a phenomenon. Of course, unless someone else has any other thoughts but we can take those through the list.

Man: Okay great. Our next comment is Row 18 and the only action that I got out of this that the working group would address it again on today's call. This is when you change house or telephone number, you also need to provide proof

of ownership so it is not unreasonable to ask for a similar confirmation in the context, the change of registrant.

The only thing - I think we only - we briefly touched on this and the key word out of it was authorization to conduct that change. And I've only had that we would just re-review it. If need be, I can go back to the MP3 and try to get - flush out more details on that one.

Man: Yes, I mean, any additional context you can provide I think would be helpful. I'm just concerned about this a little bit now, rereading it with the benefit of some time between this and last week's call, but this is starting to sound a lot like some of the proposals for re-verification of WHOIS data so that when someone goes into WHOIS and says, "Oh, you know, I've got a new cell phone. I'm going to put in my new cell phone number."

They enter that into their WHOIS field, that someone that the registrar is on the hook to confirm that number somehow and that it really kind of sorts to bog down the process of making any even routine updates or changes to WHOIS because they suddenly now have to go through multiple layers of approval and confirmation.

So I, you know, I guess I would like some more context there. I think that we certainly don't want to leave the back door in some sort of a verification scheme in the context of a transfer policy but if I'm reading that wrong, can someone please smack me on that one?

That's it for homework assignments. We'll start back where we left off which is Row 22. This is also from the Prague workshop. The working group may want to consider how the posed policy aligns with the recently adopted change to the IRTP which has not been implemented yet which will require that a domain name registration is unlocked within five business days following the request of a registrant.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Berry and I think that, as a refresher, what this is saying is anything that triggers any sort of a transfer lock or any transfer lock that is recommended in all works must also be removable per the work of IRTPB. So I think that - any thoughts, concerns or - I think that's a reasonable expectation but if anyone was coming at this with a different perspective, we'll take a queue on that.

It looks like the queue is clear. I think that's a relatively non-controversial point that anything that is proposed in this policy is more subject to other policies. Can we move to Number 23?

Man: Great. Okay, we've closed out recommendation one. This is - these comments were with respect to recommendation two where the working group recommends that the IRTP be revised to insert the following section 2.1.4. Once obtained, an FOA is valid for 45 or 60 calendar days or until the domain name expires or until there's a change of registrant, whichever occurs first.

The first comment is from (Michael Shohat). We support such limit and actually have one in place already. Time limits should be multiplication of whole months - 30, 60, 90 days, et cetera, which are easier for registrants to remember as opposed to fractions of months, i.e., 45 days.

Man: Okay, so unpacking this comment seems to say that, one, the commenter believes that this should be time limited and, two, is proposing some - to address one of our questions of how long should the time limit be, we can get some guidance on that.

I don't see anything in this comment that discusses whether there are more event driven limitations of an FOA such as, you know, expiration or change of registrant. So I'll just assume that he's not weighing on that issue. Any thoughts or comments on item Number 23? Okay, so we'll move on to Number 24.

Berry Cobb: Okay, Comment 24 is by the registry stakeholder group. They support a shorter period, such as 30 calendar days, or until the domain name expires or there is a change of registrant, whichever occurs first for an FOA to be valid based on the intent that the existing FOA is to be initiated and maintained by the gaining registrar to document the authorization of the registrant or administrative contact for a transfer to the gaining registrar.

Any issues that may delay the successful completion of a transfer authorized by the FOA, such as the unlocking of a domain name or obtaining an (auth) info code should be able to resolved within a 30 day - 30 calendar day period.

Man: Okay, thank you Berry. I'll take a queue on this one and then I'll put myself in the queue because I have a question. It looks like I'm the only one. Okay. So I think we're on to something here when we say that, you know, an FOA, if one is obtained in advance, for example, let's presume that I have an FOA in my pocket for - that was authorized by a registrant of a domain name that's banished by Michele's company.

And let's assume, then, that there is a change of registrants. How do I know that that has happened as someone who's maybe holding on to an outstanding FOA? Certainly the registrar of record cannot be expected to send out notification because those may not have already - so do you see where I'm - I don't know if I'm making any sense here but I think I found a perhaps a gap in knowledge or awareness where we're saying, "Yes, this FOA should expire but we're not giving anyone any visibility to when those events are occurring."

So any thoughts in the group on that? Should we just maybe put a marker here and say, "We need further discussions on this." Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: EPPs and other things can expire. I don't see why FOAs can't expire. I mean, the - as the gaining registrar, I have no way of knowing anything about

whether or not the domain name has changed hands or not. So, I mean, I personally as a registrar, we'll be a hell of a lot happier if an FOA was only valid for X number of days and if, once that number of days hits the thing, I have to get a new FOA from the person who wants to transfer the domain name to us.

I mean, let's face it, if somebody was transferring a domain between - once transfer a domain from Registrar A to Registrar B, they really want to do it as quickly as possible. so there's not - I don't see any reason why the FOA should last longer than maximum 30 days. Thanks.

Man: Yes, thanks. And I tend to think that that's correct. I just wanted to point out I think a shortcoming of the issue of event driven expiry because, you know, I don't know that the person holding - or the person or entity holding the FOA would be aware of that.

I think Simonetta pointed out in the chat correctly that this is where the (osco) comes in. The (osco) can be reset and then the person holding the FOA would find out in very short order that their authorization is no longer valid because their (osco) doesn't work. But I see a queue for Simonetta and Bob so maybe we can shed some additional light on this question. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I wanted to make two points on this. Currently FOA, there're not rules around some expiring with any kind of (data) and I understand some registrars have rules in place. But maybe the short lived and others have rules in place that make them live forever basically.

Also I think one other comment that came out in the Prague meeting was a little bit about history of FOAs and how originally they were put there as a means to authorize a transfer which is really what we're trying to make a new policy for right now and at that point in time, no one thought about FOAs as

something that couldn't be useful in relation to a registrant change at the same time as transfer.

So I'm not sure we're trying to fit a square peg in a round hole or (unintelligible) in English. I don't know if this FOA thing is really helping us here as an idea and we might have to take a look at this (osco) piece really as the technical thing that can actually be used for this purpose that you can reset it when something changes in the registrant, for example, and the (moving) registrar or the registrar of record who knows that now something has changed in the registrar's record can go to the registry and set (osco) to something else which really then enables the gaining registrar to understand, yes, this transfer is authorized because (osco) is working or no, the transfer is not authorized because they're trying to use an (osco) that is no longer valid because whoever the previous registrar was, made a change to this piece and that's on file at the registry that shows the other side.

And yes, this transfer can proceed or can't proceed. And really, I think we need to think about this distinction and the functionality of an (osco) versus what an FOA was originally designed to do and whether or not this is something that we can still use and need in relationship to a transfer where an owner change happens at the same time.

Man: Okay thank you Simonetta. And I think that - I tend to agree with a number of your points. I think my only hesitation is do we know that (osco often compose) or implemented universally across all gTLDs and if not, then is that what we're saying. But let's go next to Bob. Bob, thanks for joining.

Bob Mountain: Yes, I'm in sort of a loud spot so hopefully there's not too much background noise. I guess the - my only comment on 24 would be that not be taken (unintelligible) and we look, you know, make sure we somehow refer to our notes, you know, the subsequent point of recommendation number three that, you know, any sort of time limitation also, you know, take into consideration the idea of a modified FOA that we discussed which would not necessarily be

time limited or subject to the time limits that we're talking about in Line 24 here. That's all.

Man: Okay, thanks Bob. So let's go next to Michele.

Michele Neylon: A couple of things. EPP codes are a standard part of the EPP spec so they're used by any domain extension both with gTLD or with ccTLD that is using EPP. Rotation expiry syntax and other aspects of EPP keys or codes or whatever the hell you want to call them, is something that's handled on a per registry basis.

So, for example, some of the ccTLDs use EPP but you can use the same code for pretty much any domain which is - kind of defeats the entire object of the exercise but just as a silly example. And coming back to the question here, I thought that we agreed that the change of registrant had to happen either before or after a change of domain of the registrar.

In other words, you couldn't have the change of registrant and the change of registrar happening at the same time because I thought we'd understood that this was causing a lot of the headaches and the complications. Or did I miss something? Thanks.

Man: I don't know that we made a hard and fast decision but I think that we identified that that was a special case that introduced a number of issues and that we were discussing the context of a transfer - well, we were saying (lock) but we were saying some sort of protection in that use case that were not necessary or useful in other use cases.

So I think that we kind of flagged that sequence as being problematic and needing some additional work but I don't know that we've put anything into ink yet. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Michele, I think the point that you were just making on whether or not we are in agreement on this point is at the heart of what we really need to really discuss as a workgroup when it comes to this process because I don't think we are completely clear on the best way to approach this.

We started the ideal process flow with this idea that, yes, we're going to do it as a sequence. We're going to, for example, always do the registrant change first and then move the name or and then we got feedback but now it might be better to allow the other way around as well because in a lot of cases we are already doing this so it's not just coming from the aftermarket which, of course, I would make that statement, too, but it came also from the workshop in Prague where people were saying keep it flexible.

It could also be the case that someone would want to move the name first and then change the registrant over. And there still is this great (face) that we haven't put forward in our initial (pull over). It actually does happen both at the same time and we're just not yet clear on this put it is one of these things that we, as a workgroup, need to really understand and put forward as a proposal so that it will work for all the (unintelligible) but it will work for someone that is interacting as part of an aftermarket scenario or any other use case of when a name moves from one registrar to another and you would want to make this registrant update at the same time.

And I'm thinking about the (use) cases and other things that can happen. So I don't think we are clear on this, is my response to that question, and this is part of the trouble we're having with a lot of these thing with who knows which FOA to accept and what to set forward as the authorization mechanism and all these things are just not clear on that.

Man: Okay thank you Simonetta and thanks everyone. I wanted to put myself in the queue here just more as a place marker to saw off discussions because we have a couple of things to chat about before we close the call and we only have about five minutes remaining.

So real quickly here, it looks like we've spent the balance of today's call hitting our homework assignment and follow up from last week and that's fine. But we still have it looks like somewhere on the order of eight - three, four, five, six, seven, eight comments remaining to go through. We have one more session allocated for review of public comments, review discussion of feedback received and that is next week on the 21st.

After that, we then need to revisit our work plan but it looks like we then move into further discussion on those points as we work to refine our initial report into a finished product that we can then review, edit and publish in advance of the ICANN Toronto meeting.

There's, of course, a complication. There always is - which is that I will probably be unavailable for next week's call. I know that a number of other folks will be unavailable for next week's call as well. And I have reached out to our co-chair Avri who is tentatively unavailable as well although we're trying to kind of work that out right now.

So there is a distinct possibility that we may not be able to - and I see some other folks in the chat room saying that they're going to be out as well. So there's a distinct possibility that our last public comment review session will have to be postponed to August 28th which we'll have to take a look and see how that impacts our overall work plan.

So just kind of a heads up on that. I don't know that we have any homework or follow up for this particular call so next time we will drive right in with item Number 25 which begins to discuss recommendation Number 3. Thank you - oh, Berry, I'm sorry. When will Marika be returning?

Berry Cobb: If - I don't think she'll be available if we have our meeting next week but the week after that, she will return. I believe she gets back on the 24th. So the 28th is when the working group can expect to see her.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay, good news. But, you know, if we had to continue on with you for the remainder of this working group, I don't think anyone would complain about that either. So - but we want to hear all about her vacation as well. So let's close for there today.

Let's note, as a working group, the strong likelihood - I would say better than 50% that we do not have a meeting next week and that our next meeting is on the 28th. But I'll work with Berry and Avri to resolve that here in the next 24 to 48 hours to see what the availability will be and maybe we can even send out a doodle poll because, you know, if there's no one there, there's probably no one who will be willing to step in as a temporary chair and lead the discussion.

So with that said, I would say thanks everyone for your patients (unintelligible). I think that the public comment and public feedback - workshop feedback is an important component of the ICANN process and our model is dependent on it and I really appreciate all of the considerate thought and scrutiny that a lot of these comments are receiving and the healthy discussion that they're causing.

So thanks everyone and we'll look for any announcement on next week's meeting to appear on the mailing list.

Man: Thank James.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: Thank you (so much) and I'll stop the recordings.

END