

**IRTP C  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 29 November 2011 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 29 November 2011 at 1500 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/gns0/gns0-irtp-c-20111129-en.mp3>

On page : <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#nov>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Attendees:**

Avri Doria - co-chair  
James Bladel –co-chair  
Mike O'Connor – CBUC  
Rob Villeneuve – Registrar SG  
Jonathan Tenenbaum – Registrar SG  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Barbara Steele – RySG  
Philip Corwin - CBUC  
Bob Mountain – Registrar SG  
Michele Neylon – Registrar SG Chair  
Simonetta Batteiger – Registrar SG  
Erick Iriarte Ahon – NCUC  
Volker Greimann - Registrar SG  
Rob Golding – Registrar SG

**ICANN Staff:**

Marika Könings  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apologies:**

Paul Diaz – Ry SG  
Jacob Williams – Individual

Coordinator: You may begin.

James Bladel: Thank you (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 29th of November 2011.

On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Kevin Erdman, (Rob Lastelle), James Bladel, Mike O'Connor, (Walter Grimans), Philip Corwin and Simonetta Batteiger.

From staff we have Marika Konings and myself (Maxi Peraguine). And we have apologies from Jacob Williams and Paul Diaz.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you (Natalie) and welcome, good morning, good afternoon everyone and welcome to the IRTPC training call, I'm sorry, Working Group call for November 29.

I think if you see over here our agenda on the right-hand side of the Adobe Chat Room. The first item of business is of course to ask everyone to ensure that they have submitted a current Statement of Interest.

And if you have no Statement of Interest or if it's submitted in the old format please get that remedied as soon as possible.

And I think Marika I believe that Glenn sent out some reminders for folks who had not done this last week. So we should - everyone should know whether or not they have a Statement of Interest active in the new system.

So let's just go ahead and dive right into the Item Number 2 which is the finalization of our work plan.

Now this was circulated on the list. It was discussed extensively at the last call and it was posted for review and edits on the list.

And Marika, did we receive any substantial edits to this document since I last spoke?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, the only comments or edits were - that remained are the ones that are visible in the document that were made here by Avri. And I think I made a couple, of a few small edits. But we didn't receive any further comments.

James Bladel: Okay. So I think that, you know, as we discussed during our last call that we would consider this final if there were no substantial comments and that of course we were, you know, it wasn't carved in stone. If we - circumstances required that we were to edit it as we went along we would do so.

Is that someone on the phone? Okay. I thought I heard someone trying to come in.

So can we put it to the group? Anyone opposed to calling this our final work plan and submitting it to the council as our work plan for this Working Group with the understanding of course that if we get ourselves into some sort of a bind that we will edit it as necessary?

Looks like we've got a couple of green checkmarks so no opposition. Okay let's call it final Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James Bladel: Excellent. So we can move that to the next - so we can move on to the next item in the agenda. And I'm not sure how to get out of this document, looks like someone although we've already did.

Marika Konings: Yes, I'm doing it for you.

James Bladel: Thank you. You might want to teach me how to do that someday. Now if we can move over to...

Marika Konings: (Just) stop sharing.

James Bladel: Stop sharing, got it. I don't - I guess I do have that button, okay.

So we can move over to Item Number 3. This is the stakeholder group and constituency statement input template and outreach plan.

I think we had some minor changes to this plan. Oops, where'd it go?

Marika Konings: Yes I just pulled that down because I just realized I put up the old one. Give me one second and this is the latest one.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks.

We had a couple of minor changes to this plan, I think it was the third bullet point and some of the - the footnote there at the bottom.

There was some discussion on the list I believe early last week about whether it was registries and registrars that would discussed the use of the proprietary registrar identification numbers. And I think that - did we get that clarified in this version Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So actually scroll to the end of that document, the last question I think they incorporated it as (Barbara) had suggested and indeed to address the question of registries or registrars or basically just put both in.

And I don't know if that's something the Working Group can agree with because that's I thought - because some suggested it would be more appropriate for registries to respond to this.

And I think (Barbara) originally suggested that the registrars might have feedback as well so maybe the solution would be to just, you know, pose the question to both and see what feedback comes back.

James Bladel: Okay, I'll go ahead and operate through the queue right now. (Barbara) you're up first.

(Barbara): Yes this is (Barbara). Thank you. Yes I think that that is exactly right. I mean you can kind of put it out there. And to the extent that registrars also want to respond to it I think that's great.

We did get some information on the queue from I think Michele had added some information relative to some of the registries that are - he's identified that are currently using proprietary IDE.

One of the changes that I would propose that we make to this statement is just in the second line there, change the where it says currently being used by registrars at the use of IANA ID, that would be preferred (technical).

If we do that in that second line to and whether the use of IANA IDs instead would be preferred or beneficial.

James Bladel: Okay I'm sorry I'm not following which - where exactly would we want to make that change?

(Barbara): It's in the second line there where it starts information as to where proprietary IDs are currently being used by registrars - oh I'm sorry, registries.

James Bladel: Yes?

(Barbara): Take that, the that that's right after registries and change it to and whether the use of IANA IDs instead would be preferred slash beneficial.

James Bladel: Okay so strike that and add whether.

(Barbara): Exactly.

James Bladel: Okay I agree with that. Michele you have a thought on the same subject or something different?

Michele Neylon: So just echoing what (Barbara) was suggesting that I'm in favor of getting feedback from both registries and registrars.

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: I've mean obviously - well it impacts - we're the two groups that it impacts. So obviously what our feelings on this from both groups are - is what's most beneficial to anybody.

James Bladel: Wow that was - it really hurt. Can we ask folks to mute that's whenever possible? Thanks.

So question for Michele and for (Barbara). Now we - it's my understanding that these IDs are pretty much, you know, this is inside baseball for registrants and other parties that this is not something that they'll encounter or need to know. Is that correct?

Michele Neylon: No. That's incorrect.

James Bladel: Okay so this is not just a registry registrar communication protocol?

Michele Neylon: Well it is but it's - what would happen is that say for example if you - I know that the idea of this now would be just - is so strange to you. But like I say, can imagine if you actually wanted to move your domains to of better registrar than GoDaddy? Deadly science, nobody wanted...

James Bladel: I'm listening.

Michele Neylon: No, if you were transferring domains between registrars you would be - you would have to go to a Web page at some point where it would be displayed something along the lines of, you know, we have received your request to transfer the domain from registrar X to us or I can't remember the way it's worded off the top of my head.

The problem is that the only way you can actually populate the data there is based on the information you have.

So if the - what - the information coming back isn't consistent or isn't easy to kind of see all you - you end up with on some of those pages is you see something like transferring to and then you have a registrar ID which is a proprietary thing or transferring from and again the same thing can display.

And I've seen this happen with - on our system and on several of the other registrars. So it's not just, you know, black knight programmers can't do things or (Enon)'s programmers can't do it or GoDaddy's can't do it. It's a thing I've seen on multiple registrars.

James Bladel: So we require this to go to a customer, a registrant?

Michele Neylon: Yes, like as in the Web page you go to the - it's the Web page you go to for the FOA stuff to do the click through agreement...

James Bladel: (Yes).

Michele Neylon: ...both for - both - and depending on what way you're set up you might end up going to it from both the losing registrar and from the gaining registrar depending on what things are - what way things are going.

And the information that is displayed there like obviously if you're the gaming registrar you know who you are but you might not know who the losing registrar is because of the - because the only information you might be able to access is this proprietary ID in the Whois.

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: That's where I've seen it displaying.

James Bladel: Thanks for clarifying.

Michele Neylon: All right.

James Bladel: Okay so we have a couple of changes suggested here then. The first one is do we remove the word that, in the very last sentence of this document that we strike the word that and that we add and whether in place of that. And that was (Barbara)'s change. Do we have any opposition to that?

And we'll call that - I think that's a much better change in terms of meeting and readability. So thank you (Barbara).

And then Michele I'm sorry, did you have a different specific change or were you just supporting (Barbara)'s?

Michele Neylon: I'm being supportive of (Barbara).

James Bladel: Okay excellent.

(Barbara): Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay and were there any other suggested changes? Marika go ahead.

(Eric): Hi. Sorry for the delay, (Eric).

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, there weren't any sort of change that were suggested on the list. But one other thing the Working Group should probably give consideration, the timeline or the deadline and what we want to give to constituencies and stakeholder groups to provide their feedback.

I think the current bylaws say that it should be 35 days. I think in a new PDP we're saying a minimum of (unintelligible) days.

But as we're also looking at a, you know, a holiday in-between, you know, might be something for the group to consider whether that line should be for stakeholder groups and constituencies to provide this feedback.

James Bladel: Okay so were required a minimum of 30 and the typical is 35. I think that with the holidays we can probably be a little flexible there and offer even 40 days. But I think that anything beyond that would probably start to affect our calendar.

Was there anything in the workplan that - do we want this to coincide with the closing of the comment period I'm assuming or is closely thereafter as possible?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm just trying to see what do we actually have in the workplan. I think I probably assumed 35 days. But from earlier discussions just - I mean of course it can't be staggered a bit because, you know, the Working Group can start with the public comment received as part of the public comment period and once it has finished (unintelligible) that echoing to the constituency statement.

So (unintelligible) sometimes certain stakeholder groups are also tend to submit their comments to the (unintelligible) board. So there might be a...

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Well 35 days is probably it seems like it's the norm and it seems like it would work pretty well.

But I have a queue here so I'll go with Avri next. Hi Avri. Thanks for joining.

Avri Doria: Oh hi, yes. Sorry I was late.

Yes, in terms of looking at the work plan we did have it closing on 22 December. And then - well no on to January.

So I don't know if there would be a big problem if you're sort of saying pushing that an extra week. But that would be a change to. I don't know if you guys went through the workplan and approved the initial work plan but it would be the first change to that which is of course okay.

So the only problem is is 2 January realistic if you consider that many people including ICANN itself I think are off from before Christmas until January 2 correct?

Is it - is ICANN closed that week? Do I remember correctly?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, we are - well we're closed between Christmas and New Year's. That's correct.

Avri Doria: Right. So we had the deadline as the first day back. Moving that a week is probably reasonable. I know we can just change the workplan to reflect that.

James Bladel: Okay so we did except the workplan but...

Avri Doria: This (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yes. Well and it wouldn't be a dramatic change. I think as Marika mentioned that we could start but the public comments that we would have received...

Woman: Right.

James Bladel: ...during that first week. And then we would probably put these at the bottom of the queue.

And, you know, we could also shoot for because that's - I'm looking at Tuesdays here and I think that next Tuesday that would be the 3rd.

We can look at the - closing that, you know, that end of that week which would be the January 6 week which would be a Friday. And then that should leave us the meeting of the 10th.

I'm wondering if I could pull up the workplan again because we should have all of the constituency statements back by the week of - by January 10 for that meeting.

Avri Doria: Yes, that would work.

James Bladel: Okay so Marika do we want to put it out there with the 6th? And then I see Bob's, I think he's agreeing. And Simonetta is agreeing as well.

So everybody want to just kind of think of us as shooting for January 6? I think that that's reasonably accommodating given the holiday schedule but also keeps us pretty close to our workplan.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Okay, I'll change that and I'll update the templates and I'll work with Glenn to get that sent out to the different and stakeholder groups and constituencies as soon as possible.

James Bladel: Okay excellent. And does this have to go to counsel for approval as well Marika or can we just put it out there?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's (unintelligible) information. I don't think -I'll double check the Working Group guidelines but I don't think approval is required. It's more information (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay excellent. That then brings us to Item Number 4 on the agenda which is discussing our approach for tackling our charter question.

So this is our first toe in the water of our actual substance of our discussion, the pandering out the approach that we would need to - or charting the path that we would need to tackle these issues.

If I can take off any kind of a chair hat and just editorialize for just a second here, it seems like on the surface of it we have one very straightforward question which would be Item Number C.

We have one sort of I don't know if you want to call it a medium question which Item B which seems straightforward but might have some tricky considerations that we would have to examine.

And I think that Item A is the real big one that we're going to probably have to break that down into smaller working questions. And that may actually even involve some sub teams to examine some specific issues and put those under a microscope.

So that's kind of my just off-the-cuff take on the charter question. I don't know what necessarily that translates into an approach.

But maybe we can start at Item C and grab the low-hanging fruit first and just kind of - I'll take a - I'll open the queue here and we can take a discussion on what folks think is a good approach just looking only at Question C.

And Question C reads what are the process transfers could be streamlined by requirements for registries to use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs?

I see one hand in the queue and it is Mr. Neylon. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I think we really need to wait on feedback from the Registry Stakeholder Group before we can move any further with that.

I think we're going to get comments and feedback from them. But if they turn around they're going to go - and throw up their hands and go oh, this is a terrible idea or they'll go oh this is fine. This is easy, I mean that's obviously going to dictate what we can and can't do.

James Bladel: Yes, okay. So I mean again we're just discussing the approach here. So that's a good approach is to first get some feedback from registries.

Michele Neylon: Yes I mean the thing that is strange to me that one, is - it's going to be very binary in that if the registry's going to say no, no, no and presuming they actually provide a reason for the no, no, no, apart from no we don't want - like the idea without explaining it then that's pretty much it. But we can't really do much until then.

For B I'd like to guess - personally I'd like to get input from SSAC on this and to see - and maybe APWG or something just...

James Bladel: I'm sorry wait. All right did you move on to B?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Sorry. I went from B to C to B.

James Bladel: Oh okay. Well we just wanted to kind of make sure we had all the stuff buttoned up for C I guess first so...

Michele Neylon: Okay well see anyway, that's my way of doing it. I'll shut up now.

James Bladel: Any other thoughts on C?

Michele Neylon: C?

James Bladel: Part Charlie?

Michele Neylon: On Charlie, oh I'm sorry, it's me. Shut myself up (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Say I'm going to just go ahead and put myself in the queue. I agree with you Michele. I think that we need to get some feedback from the registries on exactly how extensive this is and why, you know, why it's important to leave it.

You know, we need to judge the status quo versus the perceived benefit that we would have from changing it to IANA IDs. And I don't think we fully understand both sides of that equation yet.

We also need to understand that it's - so for those registries that are using proprietary IDs is there a security issue involved? Is it - I don't know that we've ever had anyone spoof a registrar in his communications to a registry or if that's even possible, you know, because of all the security measures that are in place.

But I mean I suppose it's - nothing is foolproof so that's one consideration.

So I guess I would like to understand their justification and the pain that would be involved in changing it and then the benefits that it would be for registrars and others to streamline the process.

And a lot of those things I think will come out of the feedback from stakeholder groups constituencies.

Hi Simonetta. You're up.

Simonetta Batteiger: I have a question on that one. I'm wondering if when we are sending our request for input to the registry stakeholder group on that particular point should we then ask them for reasons why they would not want to have this done in case they are opposed to it so that we make sure that they actually give us a reason rather than just saying no we don't like it or maybe give an explanation for why they set up something other than the IANA IDs in the first place so you get a better understanding for what - where they're coming from.

James Bladel: Okay we might just take a look at that. I think that we left the language fairly open-ended. But we can certainly take a look at that and whether we need to insert just a quick phrase into that last section of, you know, a, explains whether or not you do this and then - and why you think it's important.

And just kind of leave them, leave the answers to this idea that, you know, things should be justified as opposed to left open ended. (Barbara)?

(Barbara): Hi. This is (Barbara). Yes, just a follow-on to Simonetta's concerns. I've already sent out kind of a list of questions to the registry stakeholder group members to just get them to start thinking about this.

And so I've made some notes here as well just to make sure that we get details surrounding, you know, why they're not being used and what the level of effort is to try to put them in place where they're not currently being used -- things like that.

So I will definitely in the response back in the statement for the registry stakeholder group make sure that I provide as much detail as possible.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (Barbara). So in your opinion since you're kind of representing that entire stakeholder group that we're asking this information of do you think that the constituency input template needs to be changed or you're just going to make sure that they include some justification?

(Barbara): I think that we can go ahead and leave it as is. I mean if we want to put some addition language in there that's fine just to make sure that it's clear.

And if we're anticipating - I think that it's going to be most important to get that feedback from the registries because they're the ones that are going to be impacted with whatever development costs would be associated with it.

Now there could be also some impacts to registrars who are currently using the information that's provided. I think it could simplify their situation. But the may also need to be some adjustments on their end.

So maybe we go ahead and put some additional information and or, you know, requests in here.

Anyone else have any thoughts?

James Bladel: I'm fine with that either way. I think that if you're going to shepherd their responses then I think we can rely on you to make sure that they don't leave us hanging and give us...

(Barbara): Okay.

James Bladel: ...opinions without justifying them.

(Barbara): All right, can I get any feedback from I guess the registrars that are currently on the call to say whether or not making a change from proprietary to that IANA IDs would impact them from a development standpoint?

James Bladel: I can - I'll let Michele go and then I'll put myself in the queue behind him. Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: It probably would have an impact but I would see it as a positive one as opposed to a negative one.

I mean from our perspective anything where stuff is standardized it means my programmers don't have to go off and write extra code to, you know, make intelligent guesses.

So I mean probably it might have some impact but if so I wouldn't see as being negative because I mean the IANA IDs is available as an XML download for Christ's sake.

So, you know, if we had - if I was able to match one against the other I could do all sorts of funky things and make my life easier.

(Barbara): Right, so the benefit would outweigh any development costs that you may have?

Michele Neylon: Oh yes. I mean definitely from our perspective. I can't speak for the registrars. But from my own personal perspective I wouldn't see it as an issue.

I mean I could see (Rob)'s agreeing - actually both (Rob)'s are agreeing. I mean one is saying it would only take him a minute. I do know how long it would take the other one.

But, you know, I'm sure James will probably say now that - might say something slightly different. But from our perspective I don't see it as an issue.

(Barbara): Okay.

James Bladel: Yes I'll say not a minute, probably take a little bit longer than that to get every word that that touches. But I think it would be a good investment of time and development resources because of the simplicity in this and the reduction of issues that it's going to create down the road, you know? But I want to echo a lot of what Michele's saying.

Michele Neylon: Actually do you mind if I just come back very quickly James?

James Bladel: Yes go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just one thing just to bear in mind. I mean and this is part of the reason why I'm pushing a lot for the kind of standardization stuff is that if there's - if there's going to be potentially hundreds of registries in the future and in the not too distant future then fixed in fixing this kind of problem now should remove a lot of headaches in the future.

Because I mean it might be one thing if there's 900 odd registers now and only you have a dozen or so registries that you can kind of reverse engineer something. But that doesn't scale when the number of registries suddenly goes up to 500 or 1000.

James Bladel: Agreed. (Rob)?

(Rob Lastelle): I can actually only see (flash) lines for getting them to do it. It would make transfers an awful lot easier if we knew sometimes who they are coming from. That's in other words possible with things like .info because of the proprietary numbering system.

When we built our system we set it all up based on configuration files. But from our point of view there's only one place our number for the org is ever mentioned.

So that there are other places I'm sure where it's been put into people's code at various points and may take some registrars longer to find an update. But I can't see any downsides to doing it at all.

James Bladel: Yes thanks (Rob). And that reminds me we even had an incident I think a few months back where a small registrar was - we are trying to get an FOA and we were using a proprietary ID but their name had changed.

And since we didn't update our existing database we were calling them by this older name whereas an IANA ID we could just reference the current list from ICANN and I think that we would mostly eliminate that issue.

So I think those are good points and I think that the benefits probably outweigh whatever development efforts would be required.

So does that answer your question (Barbara) at least among the registrars that are on this call?

(Barbara): Great, thank you. I appreciate the feedback. I think given that we probably can go ahead and just leave it as is. And I'll just make certain that I solicit the feedback that's going to answer those questions as to why not if there is any pushback.

James Bladel: Okay, appreciate that. Excellent.

(Barbara): Sure thing.

James Bladel: Okay, well the queue is clear and so maybe let's take a look at Charter Question B.

Now this is a discussion of time limiting the FOAs. And I think that there are some interesting considerations here both from a transfers perspective, I think from aftermarket perspective. So we're looking for Bob and Simonetta to weigh-in as well and possibly from a security perspective.

So Michele you had a thought on there so I'll invite you to raise your hand and - but it looks like you're a little slow on the draw so we'll go with Mr. (Mountain) first. Hi (Bob).

(Bob Mountain): Hi. Thanks James. This is (Bob Mountain) speaking. I guess, James, I had a question. Is your exa- is the text here where it's saying that the - it's implying that the time will be limited in the case where the name was locked? Is that just an example or is that the definitive use case that we're concerned about here?

James Bladel: No, my understanding (Bob) and I would definitely ask others to weigh in - that was just one possible scenario where this would come into play. My understanding was just in the general abstract case, does the FOA have an expiration date?

And maybe that's something that we need to address that question first. But I don't know if that answers your question. I took it as more of a specific example of a general issue.

(Bob Mountain): Yes tha- okay, thanks James. That was my assumption but I just wanted to first of all clarify that. I guess a, you know, from an after market standpoint I'll

just state that I would be concerned about time limiting an FOA (and match), you know, domain owners with a - with domains to sell large or small.

Generally intend for them to sell and time limiting an FOE would impose a extra step, maintenance, that they would need to, you know, conduct that they don't have to today.

Most of these people, when they want to sell a domain, they list it for sale and it stays there until they sell it. So I would want to go on record as being somewhat concerned about the extra work that something like this might impose on a domain owner who's looking to sell their domain. That's all.

James Bladel: Okay, well I have a couple of questions on that. And I generally would just like to understand that process a little bit better. So if you don't mind, maybe (Makali) and (Simonetta) can weigh in as well. So the question is, does the current FOA have any time constraints at all? Or is it once you've given the authorization it's there and - you know, forever? Is that a correct assumption or?

Man: For policy, James, or in practice?

James Bladel: Well, let's start with policy and then let's go to - I mean, you know, we don't have to solve this issue today. We're still kind of just hammering out the approach, right. So I think that's the first question we need to understand, is what are the practices and what does the policy say?

(Makali): It's (Makali). James, as far as I'm aware, and this is why this question ended up on - within our charter - to the best of my knowledge, there is no reference to a timeout in the current policy.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks (Makali). And so, you know, I think that, you know, and some other registrars may say, well you know, we have a short time period. And others might say, well, we'll treat it indefinitely. And others might say, well it's

a - especially an after market registrar might say, well you're listing is only paid for 30 days so your FLA is only good for 30 days or something along those lines.

So (Bob) I - (Bob) and (Simonetta), is your experience that registrars implement it differently? It's all over the map or?

(Bob Mountain): Yes, my understanding is that it's not clear in the policy statement. That - I would agree with (Makali). I guess that's our position as well. And that the sort of indefinite nature of the FOA is certainly a very, you know, appropriate way from an after market standpoint to handle it.

James Bladel: Okay. All right, go ahead now with (Makali).

(Makali): Okay, (Bob), you know I love you to death. You are one of the sweetest, nicest guys I know.

Man: Uh-oh.

(Makali): But I have to violently disagree with you on this, violently. I mean, realistically speaking, domain name policy is - should be set up so that it serves all registrants and all users. And while I can appreciate that making a change here might involve a little bit of extra work for you and for your clients, sorry but, you know, they're only a small number of the registrants.

I mean, the fear I have with the current setup is that it is open to abuse. So, for example, let's say, for example, that James and I, we both have a domain name registered with Go Daddy and James sells the domain to me.

But prior to the domain changing over - changing between accounts within Go Daddy, James had already unlocked the domain and had started a transfer to, say, (prove.com) or one of their registrars.

So under the current policy, then that FOA with (prove) is still open even though the registrant has now changed ho- now changed hands - or changed rather. I mean, I - there is an inherent danger there.

The other side to it as well as from an after market perspective, surely the security of a high value asset such as a domain name would outweigh any little bit of extra work that some of them would have to do.

I mean, if their - if a domain is changing hands for \$100,000 or \$200,000, surely refreshing the FOA every X number of days wouldn't be that cumbersome.

(Bob Mountain): Can I re- may I reply James?

James Bladel: Can I jump in real quickly here and then yes, I will, give me - go to (Bob) for a response before we go to (Simonetta), but just real quickly, we're not - I just want to ask folks to please, you know, try to resist the temptation to dive into the actual substance of the issue.

We're just discussing the approach here - what sort of questions do we need to gather, what information are we missing, you know, what sort of dependencies are we trying to uncover? So before we debate the actual nuts and bolts of the issue, let's make sure we have our approach nailed down.

I know that's kind of a fuzzy line that is very easy to cross but I would ask that folks keep that in mind. So I'll go to (Bob) for a response and then if - and then (Simonetta) right after that. Thanks.

(Bob Mountain): Yes. Okay, so this is (Bob). My apologies for diving in. I've done exactly that. But just (Makali), I am not opposed to an FOA indefinite without conditions. I think under the appropriate conditions that a, you know, the FOA could then, you know, become inactive or invalid.

So I'm not disagreeing with you on that at all. It - I think it's a matter of what those conditions are and then what's involved, so.

James Bladel: Okay, (Simonetta). And then I have a question as well so after (Simonetta). Go ahead (Simonetta).

Simonetta Batteiger: I mean, I have two items. You asked whether or not from an after market point of view and what the current policies and practices are, so - and in terms of - there is nothing in the policy so we definitely know that there are folks out there including some of our (own products) that take advantage of the fact that FOAs don't expire.

It's something that facilitates trading in the after market world and it's not just amongst the (namers). It is also giving the opportunity to end users all around the world to have access to names for their Web sites which they would like to purchase anywhere.

So it's - part of this is something that enables an easy transfer that way is the fact that there currently are no limitations around those FOAs. So in terms of our (trojan) which is your second question, I think it would be important for us to understand what's currently being done and why, what it enables, what's the implications, (be a) few court restrictions, what are the reasons why you want restrictions, what are the use cases for that so that when you know that, okay (Makali), for example brought up this concern that if a domain changes hands from Registrant A to B within the same registrar, yet an FOA mixed with an external party might still be open.

Well, I don't think anyone would have a problem with the fact that an FOA expires the moment the registrant record updates, for example. So I think it would be important for us as an approach to understand what are those reasons for why we're even looking at the question, what are those security concerns.

Can they be addressed in some way, shape or form with (risk) and a policy around the FOAs that kind of says, okay, if this and that happens, then the FOA expires. In all other cases it can stay active. Or is something like that possible?

And so I think we need to understand what the concerns are and we need to also understand what the use cases are of what's currently being done because the FOA does not have an expiration date on it and then weigh what are we - what we limit if we change the rules and what can we maybe do if we make a rule that isn't a blanket rule for everything but has certain use cases in mind.

It's just an idea from my - from the view on the approach and then obviously on that charter question, we should look at the input they're getting from the public comment period and obviously when reaching out to registrars. And if we can find a way on the charter question to reach those folks who actually actively trade domain names, they're not really represented in the workgroup very well.

And outside of (Rob) and myself, who are kind of - I don't even trade names myself. I just help people trade names on our system, but I think it would be very interesting to get some feedback from domainers and other people who (fell) on trade on (unintelligible) the main portfolios, to get their input and (thoughts) and concerns around this FOA idea.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (Simonetta). I have one follow up to your statement and then I have a couple of questions of my own. So the follow up would be, would you and (Bob) be willing to, you know, at least seek out some of those large portfolio holders and direct them to the public comment period so that we can get their feedback and get it into the record?

Simonetta Batteiger: (Yes. Certainly).

James Bladel: Because I agree with you, they - you know, that's a segment of the community that isn't always participating in ICANN discussions. I'm sure it's not sexy enough for what they want to do. So, you know, maybe if we can actively steer them towards the comment periods, we can get their thoughts as well.

So I had just a couple of quick thoughts here. One would be, you know, for the approach, I think that we need to - we're back to the traditional portability of our security discussion or are we?

You know, we need to understand how the policy - if the policy currently does not set a time limit to the FOA. We need to understand how that's beneficial to not just the after market. I think that's a specific use case, but just in general how that's beneficial to streamlining the transfer process.

And then we can understand as well what risks that might present. And if there's a way to address those risks without having a negative impact on the after market community. So, for example, if there was a time limit but it was a specifically long time limit like 90 days or something like that, you know, it seems like that would possibly address a lot of the - or some or most of the security issues, you know, with - while still being flexible enough.

You know, I don't know. I'm just throwing some ideas out there about why we would need to gather - import from all areas and then just try to balance all of those different needs.

One question I had for the after market folks, because I don't really understand how these multi registrar networks operate, but if you were to have let's say a standing FOA where I wanted to list a name for sale and I pre-authorized an FOA, doesn't the FOA specifically limit the transfer to one registrar?

Meaning, for example, if there's a network or a syndicate of registrars all participating in a particular after market and I use - I put my FOA out there to preauthorize the transfer, doesn't that mean that it has to go only to Registrar X in the syndicate and not some of the other participating registrars?

So that's one question. I see (Bob)'s got his hand up. But I wanted to put one other question out there which was, is this question at all dependent upon what we come up with for Question A? Because right now I think that Question B and the discussion on the FOA is somewhat dependent upon using registrar or the ROTP as a change of control?

And you know, if there is some sort of outcome of question A that challenges the idea that a change of control or introduces a new process, does this become a moot point? So those are just some of the questions I think that we might want to include in our approach. And I see that as I have shaken the tree sufficiently here to generate a queue. So I'll start with (Bob). Go ahead.

(Bob Mountain): Okay. Thank you James. This is (Bob) speaking. I guess our terms of service are that the FOA is - applies to members of the reseller network which would include, you know, many registrars, so the preauthorization or the pre-FOA then applies to, you know, whatever registrar's part of the network and is the destination.

So that's, you know, certainly our (intimation) of it. The - so yes, I guess that's the answer to your question A. Your second question, James, I don't know. I can't comment on that. I would defer to someone else in the queue on that one.

James Bladel: Okay thanks (Bob). (Makali).

(Makali): Oh sorry, I had myself on mute. Yes, I think you're right. I mean, if - there's no way - at the moment, there's no way to - for anybody beyond our registrar's

internal systems to trigger anything with regard to a change of registrant in a thin registry.

And more importantly, the FOA resides with the gaining registrar, not the losing registrar. So how can you inform the gaining registrar that the FOA that they have has now been nullified?

There is no way to do that that I'm aware of. I mean, technically you can't send any PP message down a queue from a registrar to another registrar just like that. I mean, there's no mechanism for that.

So I suppose in some respects if you want to go down - if you want to look at doing things down - in that particular fashion, then there's no way to do that unless you re- you handle the change of control in charter question A.

James Bladel: That's a good point (Makali) and then looking at it from the other side, suppose I have an FOA for a sale I'm really excited about and the deal falls through, how do I cancel and FOA if it has an indefinite lifespan?

How do I take it back? And, you know, maybe this is a question that we'll need to understand in our approach, is if an FOA is mortal, what event or actions can trigger it to be rescinded or is that even a security concern?

And maybe that's a question that we need to understand there as well, is that has anyone ever lost a domain name due to an FOA being out there that they had forgotten about?

Is the after market the only group that this even really applies to? I mean, these are questions I think that definitely constitutes part of our approach. (Simonetta)?

Simonetta Batteiger: Oh, I think you kind of hit the nail on the head with saying that A and B really tie together in that regard because at the FOA as is, my understanding

it's kind of like an extension of the IRTP which only had in mind a use case of a domain transfer from one registrar to another while the owner wouldn't change at the same time.

In that case, if the thing never expires, it's completely irrelevant because the only person who would ever really have to use it is one registrant. And now when you're bringing the second person in the mix where you have a seller and a buyer and you have two registrants really that kind of are on either side of the domain transfer, you're really faced with this FOA that for that particular use case, even today, makes no sense whatsoever.

So it - I don't think it really makes that much sense to look at B from an after market point of view without having an idea for how to tackle A.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay, good point. Thank you. Well, we have about nine minutes left. And we can take a look at A. I think that that is the, as we mentioned earlier, that is the big one, that's the gorilla in the room when it comes to this particular working group.

Which, for a little background for folks who weren't in IRTPB, how this came to be, this question came to be part of our charter. We discovered that there is no, you know, I want to say prescribed ICANN can approve policy that says this is how you transact or change the control of a domain name from one registrant to another.

And I think that in the absence of something formal like that, a number of conventions and, you know, if you want to call it ad hoc or of, you know, if we can call it innovative market based solutions has sprung up and they have their benefits and that they have their drawbacks as well.

But I think that all of them make some use or most of them make some use of the transfer policy or overlap somewhat with the transfer policy. So our approach here would be to, you know, first I think understand - in my opinion

would be first to understand, you know, what this, you know, is this truly a hole that needs to be filled in the policy patchwork?

And if so, how do we begin to understand all of the different elements? I think that this is aimed squarely at the after market but I suppose it could also be aimed - here I'm thinking abstractly here. I'm thinking that when you are enforcing a UDRP decision, for example, and taking a domain name from Party A and applying that registration to Party B, sometimes that also uses the transfer and, you know, would that be better served by a more formal process?

So, you know, that's just kind of I think my initial off the cuff thinking for Item A. I think it's a big question. I think it's going to require us to unpack a lot of the different issues there and I think that's going to consume - honestly, I think it will probably consume about 50% of our session time will be on Question A.

So we have a few minutes there if anyone wants to weigh in - not on the issue itself, but on the approach of how we begin to unra- untangle that issue and then I want to make sure that we give about five minute's break between this call - the formal PDP call and then the next one hour session which is (ROTP) training.

So any thoughts on what we need to take into account when we start to (un-tech) Question A? Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Hi James. It's Mikey. I'm sort of taking notes in my little mind manager gizmo and wanted to see if we could sort of do parallel approaches. For Item B, the discussion we just had, there were sort of three big blobs that we talked about.

One was sort of - the first one, understand why we're looking at the question, what problems we're trying to solve. Then there was a pretty extensive

discussion about identifying use cases and scenarios of both current practices and current pro- policy.

And then there was another big discussion about understanding issues and concerns, a big long list for both of those last two. In a way we could probably parallel an approach pretty much along those same lines for Item A and get at least fairly close to a way to unpack it.

So that's just the thought that's emerged from my little notes that I've been taking.

James Bladel: Mikey, I think that's a sound approach. Can I put you on the hook to maybe put five or six questions for Item A and Item B and circulate that on the list?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I'd be happy to just sort of tidy up these notes and circulate that. I think it's easier to follow if I leave it in this framework and I - actually if Marika, you want to make me a presenter, I can show you what's on my screen right now and see what you think. And then if you think this is useful, I can just push this out to the list.

James Bladel: Well, I'm saying the list only because - and I probably shouldn't have opened this topic so close to the end of the call, but can we...

Mike O'Connor: James, in order to finesse the - I don't really want to develop a series of questions but what I could do is push the stuff that I've got so far and we can just pick this up again on the next call.

James Bladel: That would be perfect.

Mike O'Connor: (Giving) that as a hint. Okay, I can do that.

James Bladel: That would be (excellent). Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: You bet.

James Bladel: Avri, you're next in the queue - or, no, that's changing to a green. Okay, so we've reached the - oops, (Simonetta), go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I think in terms of approach here, also we should encourage maybe those registries who have a change of control function and tell us - just share with us some of the learnings and (thoughts) that went into why they did theirs the way they did it.

And I wonder if we could find a few people who have dealt with it on the receiving end basically who made use of that change of control function to give us specific feedback on that one as well.

So I'm trying to figure out maybe I can reach out into our transfer team to kind of like pull out a few cases where some of these ccTLDs have traded and actually reach out to the buyers and sellers relating to that transfer to get some of their feedback and maybe even also get some feedback out of our transfer team who basically work with those transfers every single day, see what they are telling me they like and dislike and what works from those (on board) in that space.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. Okay, so we have reached the top of the hour and the queue is clear. So let's go ahead and just follow up our discussions for there. I think that for next time we will probably have a continued discussion of our approach on these particular questions.

And I just wanted to remind folks that there is now a training session that will be beginning here shortly in the same area but you will have to disconnect and recall this number. The password, Marika, if you want to give that. We - are we clear to give that in this forum?

Marika Konings: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay, so the password is training. And then you would use that to connect to the (ROTP) training session. Same Adobe link. Same telephone number. Just a different password. And we'll start that here probably in a minute or two and then we'll give everyone just a couple of minutes to assemble.

So thanks for your help everyone. I appreciate the rapid pace that we're getting through some of these agenda items and we'll make sure that we keep feeding aggressive agendas to this group because I think that - I can tell that everyone likes to keep this pace and preserve this momentum and I think it's going well so far.

Woman: Thank you James.

Woman: Okay bye.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks everyone.

Woman: Thank you (Jim).

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Thanks.

Man: Thanks James.

Man: (Hey Bill).

Woman: Thank you kindly. You may now stop the recording.

Woman: Thank you.

END