

**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 04 September 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 04 September 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120904-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

James Bladel –RrSG co-chair

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Roy Dykes – RySG

Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair

Angie Graves – CBUC

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Hago Dafalla – NCUC

Barbara Knight – RySG

Phil Corwin – CBUC

Mike O'Connor – ISPCP

Rob Golding – RrSG

Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG

Alain Berranger – NPOC

Volker Greimann- RrSG

Jonathan Tenenbaum - RrSG

ICANN Staff:

Berry Cobb

Glen de Saint Géry

Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies

Bob Mountain – RrSG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Paul Diaz – RrSg
Matt Serlin - RrSG
Marika Konings

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Devon). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTPC call on the 4th of September 2012.

On the call today we have Alain Berranger, Hago Dafalla, Kevin Erdman, Mikey O'Connor, Michele Neylon, Simonetta Batteiger, Angie Graves, Barbara Knight, James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Jonathan Tennebaum, Philip Corwin and Roy Dykes.

We have apologies from Chris Chaplow, Bob Mountain, Paul Diaz and Marika Konings. And from staff we have Glen Desaintgery, Berry Cobb and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you Nathalie and welcome to the IRTPC PDP Working Group call for September 4. And welcome back to several folks that were on vacation as well as all of the folks in the US. I hope you had a nice, pleasant extended holiday.

So as for our normal order of business does anyone has any updates or declarations to be made about their statements of interest? If so please raise your hand now.

Okay hearing none we then entertain any comments or additions to our proposed agenda that was circulated on the mailing list within the last 24 hours and is currently posted on the right-hand column for those in the Adobe Chat Room.

Any updates or changes to that? Okay I see a couple of hands. We'll start with Mikey. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. It's Mikey. I just wanted to see if I can pass some IRTP process diagram.

We had a good meeting and we have another one scheduled for tomorrow. But until we get through that second one we haven't really got a whole lot to report today.

So I'm happy to give it another go but I think it'd be nice if we could skip it this we can pick it up next week.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think we have enough in the way of other materials and other items on our to do list to cover this week. But my only question is do you know if anything else is waiting on that diagram or is that kind of a standalone assignment?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not sure. If something comes up I'm happy to, you know, dump it back on the screen again. It's just that, you know, we've got some puzzlers that we're working on. And rather than share all those puzzlers with the whole group I'm hoping we'll figure them out tomorrow.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey, appreciate the update. And what we'll do is we'll just make a note of any items that we've determined are where that diagram is on that critical path to getting those issues resolved and, you know, maybe something that you could take back into your meeting tomorrow.

Next up is Michele. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just very briefly James have we - we could have done -- I might have missed it -- but have we discussed whether we're meeting in Toronto or not?

James Bladel: There was a brief exchange of emails and now I'm struggling to remember if that was with the entire list or just one of those sub groups or just perhaps between staff and co-chairs. But we have allocated time in Toronto to meet for this working group.

The question is whether or not that meeting will be a working group meeting, you know, a face to face meeting or whether that would be I think ideally a presentation of our initial report to the community in Toronto.

So I think that we do have the time allocated. It's just a question of how far are we along and can we use that as presentation or do we need it to continue to develop the recommendations?

I'm hoping it's more of a coming out party than an actual workstation. Does that answer your question the Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, fine. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay great. Okay so let's dive into Item Number 3 on our agenda which is the review of the public comment review tool.

And I'd cover our previous discussion we were ready to close off the review of our comments received during the public comment forum, the response forum and the workshop in Prague.

This was circulated to the mailing list to the sound of deafening silence. So I think that we wanted to close this off during our last call but we wanted to give everyone one final shot to make any edits or changes to this tool.

So if anyone has any last minute changes we're going to consider this adopted here in about five minutes.

Any other thoughts, comments or last minute suggestions, if so raise your hand. Otherwise we will consider this phase of our work to be complete.

Okay excellent. And I did want to note that this is an important part of the ICANN process and I think that we did a very thorough and comprehensive job of reviewing all of the feedback received from all of the various channels. So excellent work everyone and I appreciate everyone's efforts on that.

Item Number 4 was the process diagram that was tagged currently by Mikey.

And as we discussed here just a few minutes ago we're going to go ahead and defer that until our next meeting and capture any items that we feel are attached to that in our call today which brings us to Item Number 5.

And Item Number 5 is where we will spend the lion's share of this meeting and perhaps the next one as well is discussion of the remaining open questions.

Now very handy with the thing compiled by Marika and staff and it's certainly being displayed on the screen.

There are nine open questions associated with Charter Question 1 which is the change of registrant issue.

There's one open question with regards to Charter Question 2, the FOA.

And then I guess Berry correct me if I'm wrong there are no open questions with regards to the Charter Question 3. Is that correct?

Berry Cobb: That's - yes, that's what I understand. Yes.

James Bladel: Okay so it sounds like were kind of off the hook necessarily for Charter Question 3 or at least we've reached some consensus on this group as well as the, you know, within the community through all of our feedback that's on that - on our initial recommendations in that issue.

So we'll certainly go back and take a look in our initial report and make sure that everything jives with our understanding. But it sounds like that was going to be the least one.

So perhaps can I recommend that we start with a recommendation - I'm sorry, with the open question on Number 10 which is the only remaining open issue on Charter Question 2 or Charter Question E which is the time limiting of FOAs.

And I'll read that question out to the group. Essentially says that the Working Group needs to review the transfer process and off info codes and a form of authorization influence transfer process as well as process differences between change of registrant and change of registrar.

Starting to sound like this may touch on the diagram that Mikey and the subgroup are constructing. But I would open a queue here on to what it is exactly that we're trying to resolve.

Is there concern that the off info code and the FOA are somehow colliding or that we're treating the FOA as though it is an authorization of some kind or that - I'm looking for I guess some clarification on the group. What is the question that we need to put on the table here?

No takers. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm merely rushing to fill a void because I - in order to really answer this question what I really ought to have in front of you which I don't is the initial report because I can't remember what we said in there.

But I know that there was pretty brisk discussion about the use of some of these codes.

And since I was right in the middle of that, you know, I think I just can't remember where we landed in the initial report as to how reusable and what the role of those codes was going to be. But I imagine that that's where this discussion came up.

James Bladel: That sounds familiar Mikey. Also sounding familiar is something that's not stated here which is what wasn't just about time limiting FOA. It was more about event driven changes to the FOA so that they would expire on certain events.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and the scope.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: (Unintelligible) see that, yes. Maybe Simonetta can shed some light here. Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well I'm not sure if I can shed some light but I just wanted to say that as far as I remember there was a discussion on the lack of a definition of what an FOA is versus what an off info code is and that the two are kind of like used interchangeably that for some people the - having the ability to produce an off info code basically means that it - that the authorization for a transfer from one person to another.

And I think maybe because of this lack of policy for this change of registrant more or less at the same time with the change of registrar does kind of

become the practical way to give this authorization is that you just (form the) off info code and thereby enable that other person to get the transfer done.

Whereas the FOA is the way they're currently worded and the way their stories make absolutely no sense and in this authorization process.

Because if you read the word, not the FOA it's really only written for a transfer on the top of some - the same registrant to the same registrant from one registrant to another but has nothing to do with giving the authority to somebody else that you allow them to now take possession of a name.

So I think that all of these things together is where off codes and FOAs and their respective roles are just completely unclear.

And I think we came across this thing because they were - off info codes were basically used as the - as a mechanism to say to someone else here you have my okay to make a transfer on the name because the fact that you can do it because you have this code versus what the FOAs are doing basically becomes meaningless in this process, just becomes a click, click, click of the browse button.

But the copy of the actual FOA makes no sense in that process.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Simonetta. I will put myself in the queue here for just a second.

I recall there was a - some discussion and some analogies that compared that to I would say an FOA is not meaningless particularly in the perspective of a registry that is pretending to address or investigate or resolve a dispute, transfer dispute. I think the FOA then becomes fairly important.

I think that one of the analogies that we were discussing in Prague -- and I didn't mean there was agreement on this analogy, just that it was on the table -- was that FOAs were the legal paper trail that established control and that

the off info code was the practical method that allowed someone to affect control for the password the domain name.

So we were saying something along the lines of if domain names were a car then the FOA would be the title or registration to that car and that the off info code would be the car keys that would actually start the engine.

So, you know, I could steal your car keys and drive off. That doesn't necessarily mean I own the car.

So, you know, I think that's kind of where we were discussing these things in Prague. I don't know that that addresses all of the issues or all of the use cases.

I'm starting to think that this is one of those issues that requires more comprehensive diagram that Mikey and the sub team are working on.

But I think that we can at least - I'm not ready to say that FOAs are meaningless in these context because they have been used quite extensively for so long for millions of transfers.

It just seems like that would be a pretty profound statement to say that there - that there's no use for them. Go ahead Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi. This is Barbara. James I think you put it very well and I agree that, you know, FOAs or not insignificant here because I do, you know, agree that they are used very extensively and throughout the dispute process as well as, you know, there's a lot of references to them just in the policy itself in being able to produce, you know, something that proves that the registrant came to their - to the registrar that they want to transfer to and said yes we want this.

Whereas the off info codes, you know, really is - it has a- it goes further I guess than what an FOA is because our FOAs are exclusively to be a

transfer to one registrar to another and as Simonetta put it, you know, really relating only to a transfer of registrar versus a transfer of registrant.

But that the off info code really is the systematic I guess key if you will to being able to make changes relative to that domain name. And while yes they're used to authenticate if you will a transfer any time a transfer request comes in to the registries the off info code has to accompany that and it has to match what's in the registry records as well in order for that transfer transaction to actually be processed.

So in addition to that it can be used for, you know, any number of things relative to domain name. But, you know, right now they really are only being widely used to authenticate the transfers themselves. So I agree 100% with what you were saying James on that.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Barbara. And some and has her hand up as well putting some interesting thoughts in the chat. So Simonetta can you weigh on those?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes I'm just wanting to clarify doesn't mean to say that there's no use for something like an FOA.

And I just want to make sure that everyone is aware that what the copy is and what it sounds right now really only makes sense if there is a registrar change but not (really the) registrant change.

And what you look at what you need to actually get a domain name transferred from one registrar to another and in the case of a sale for example and the registrant changes both at the same time everyone uses the off code. Nobody has a use for the FOA in actually initiating the transfer process.

Now that - there needs to be some kind of communication between the registrars on the registry around this FOA piece as well because it's currently a part of the IRTP policy that's true.

However I think that there's just practically speaking, what people used to get a domain name transferred to another registrant is well is the off code. And nobody really can use the FOAs in a way that makes sense for that process.

So whatever new thing we're coming up with needs to address that the current wording of the FOA is not good for that scenario.

James Bladel: Okay. So what we're saying is that we should either create a separate authorization for change of registrant or change the language of the existing FOA to account for this other use case, this change of registrant?

Because since there was no policy at all for a change of registrant it's not covered in the FOA is that correct?

Simonetta Batteiger: That's correct but it's not just that. It's also I think when the - when we put this question or this open question item in there we also thought about whether or not time limiting the FOA is the way to go or if it is better to think about time limiting the off (rescission) code.

And I think those two and then the lack of clarity of how these two pieces are practically used together, domain name transferred from A to B is where why we still have this open question. So we need to think about all these things.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Simonetta. Mikey, you're up next.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. I dug up the initial report and just wanted to refresh us on what we recommended.

What we said in the initial report is that Section 2 of the IRTP be revised to insert a section which says once obtained an FOA is valid for 45 or 60 -- we haven't decided yet -- calendar days or until the domain name expires or until there is a change of registrant, whichever occurs first.

And then we note that there was rough consensus about that but some said that their support was conditioned on a second recommendation.

And that recommendation would be that the standard FOA is enhanced to support FOAs that have been pre-authorized or auto renewed by a prior registrant who has chosen to opt out of that rule that we are proposing in the first part where it expires.

James Bladel: Yes, they can only opt out of the timeframe. They can't opt out of the other two events. Is that correct?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes, that's right. And now let me get to the puzzler that we're working on in the Diagramming Group which is that right now in a thick registry it's relatively easy to figure out who the registrant is. And all of this language is hinging on the registrant.

However a thin registry that's much more difficult to do. And sort of collided with this problem when we were working on the diagrams last week and then Avri and I are also on the Thick Whois Drafting team and had confirmed in the initial report there that right now there's no really reliable way for registrars to exchange registrant information in thin Whois environment.

So we've got a brainteaser that we're working on their. And we've - Bob has reached out to some of the registrars and has I think pretty much confirmed that indeed in a thin registrar environment there's very little information exchanged about the domain except the domain itself and the FOA and the off code and stuff like that. But there's no registrant information.

So just to throw that into the hopper for consideration. Maybe Michele can clarify that for us. That's it for me.

James Bladel: Okay thanks the Michele. Thanks Mikey. Michele you're up and you're going to fix everything for us right here right?

Michele Neylon: Just one thing to note with regard to this thick thin registry debacle. Part of this might be resolved if the Whois output for thin registries, in other words the Whois output that all registrar spit out if that's standardized which is one of the proposals on the table is part of the RA negotiations at the moment.

The second thing is that yes, Mikey is right at the moment as far as I know there's no easy way for us as a gaining registrar to exchange anything beyond the minimal data with the losing registrar.

If losing registrars Whois server is off-line we can't even initiate the transfer. We can't - we don't know where to send any of the FOAs or anything like that. This is an issue for thick registries. So anything that were to fix that would make life significantly easier.

And while it may be resolved in a thick registry .com and .net still account for the bulk of domains.

And Rob Golden you owe me an - you owe me emails. I'm going to murder you afterwards.

On the FOA thing from Simonetta, I'm rather confused by her comments. I don't - I mean I'm confused.

I mean the key thing is that you start to transfer with an EPP key to transfer between registrars and then they'll have to be FOAs.

I mean you'd be - you cannot do a transfer without putting in FOAs. So I'm completely confused as to what she's been talking about because if she's making it sound like the FOA is - isn't compulsory.

For a transfer between registrars it is compulsory. So that confused me completely. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. I think Simonetta's saying that's not exactly what she was driving at. So I'll let her respond. Simonetta?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes my question is I understand there's an FO. So basically both the losing registrar and the gaining registrar can and should (unintelligible) based on the (law) sorry, the - should sign an FOA to their customer and have them confirm it.

However what I'm wondering about and I don't know -- that was my question to you -- you don't actually send each other the FOA from the other site.

So basically if you're the gaining registrar you don't send the FOA that you got from your client to the losing registrar and/or you don't get back from the losing registrar or send from the losing registrar the FOA that they provided from their customer or do you?

Michele Neylon: No Simonetta you don't.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No you don't.

Simonetta Batteiger: So there is no exchange in that sense. There's a collection of...

Michele Neylon: Nobody ever said that there was. But you're obliged to ask to get - to send the FOAs and get the answers.

James Bladel: Let's make sure we're, you know, trying to not talk over each other so okay. Go ahead Michele. And I think Simonetta you had a question specifically for Michele or were you asking the group?

Simonetta Batteiger: No for Michele because I mean you said James that there is an exchange of FOAs.

But I just wanted to clarify...

Michele Neylon: That's...

Simonetta Batteiger: ...there's no big change in the sense for - in the sense of one registrar sends it to the registry or to the other registrar. Usually vendors know dispute. When there's a dispute I understand that the registrars involved in the transfer are asked by the registry to produce the FOA and then send it to them.

But regularly on any normal transfer the only thing that is standardly always sent to the registry to initiate the transfer is the EPP code or the off code is - I just want to ask if that's correct?

James Bladel: Yes that's correct. And I - and if I...

Michele Neylon: That's correct.

James Bladel: ...stated that I should not have or certainly didn't intend that.

My understanding is that the FOA sent to the registrant by the gaining registrar. The registrant acknowledges or grants the authorization.

And then the gaining registrar retains that probably to never be seen by the light of day again unless in the rare case that there is some sort of a dispute over the transfer.

Then it is the responsibility or the obligation of that registrar to produce that authorization. But otherwise it is just kept on file permanently.

So that's my understanding. So Simonetta did you - you still had your hand up?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes. I just wanted to kind of like point out what Rob Golden has been put in the comments in the chat that in (Aspen) what's been used for each transfer to tell the registry please make the changeover is the EPP code and not the FOA.

I understand that the FOA is always asked by the gaining registrar all - what - whoever the registrant is and now also by the moving registrar is a notification piece.

However to actually request the transfer what registrars are using as the EPP code is that correct?

James Bladel: I think that's - I think I'm following this. Rob you're typing very furiously into the chat. Would you like to get into the queue or...

Rob Golden: Yes okay.

James Bladel: Michele I'm going to have Rob jump the queue here if you don't mind because he's typing I think and we've got a three-way conversation going on here. So Rob if you would please.

Rob Golden: Yes I mean simply that the idea behind forms of authority and the original stuff that used to happen many, many years ago was that you had to send sent out a fax (back and forth) to VeriSign and registrants.

Since the move now to EPP realistically the authority to then - to the gaining registrar is the EPP code because without that you can't do the transfer.

The only person who should have that is the registrant and it's generally in our instance the registrant whose ordering the transfer or the registrant's agent who that's given the right to do.

And in terms of the yes it can go, that's the emails that bounce backwards and forwards sent by the registry to the registrant and the admin contact saying these people have said they want to transfer the domain is it all right, it's sent by the losing registrar. It's authorized by the registrants and it's controlled by the registry.

So time limited FOAs it's kind of like how can you because you only get the FOA sent out when the registry tells you somebody wants to move their domain name.

And the registry themselves will expire that after ten days why other automatically launching it or automatically denying it.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Rob. Michele you're up next.

Michele Neylon: Far be it from be to ever contradict Rob but he's managed to confuse me a little bit. Registries don't send FOAs. I'm not sure why he thinks they do.

I mean they do in ccTLD world. But in the gTLD world there are notifications that are sent by some of the registries, not all of them. And I've never sat down and actually worked out which one's send what. But they're just notifications that are sent to you as the registrar.

So for example VeriSign sends you one to say that there's a pending transfer which you get by email and then you get ones from VeriSign to confirm that the transfer has completed.

PIR sends - send one or two as well. They're not as verbose. Now when it comes to the FOA I suppose there's two things here.

If you look at the mechanics at a peer EPP level FOAs are not part of EPP. They're not a core part of us. If you took FOAs out of the equation EPP would still be happy.

The way we've implemented this is that if we send an authorization - we - when we get a request for a domain transfer to us we send an FOA to the registrant. Because it's got nothing to do with - the registry doesn't come into play here.

We are sending it to the registrant. If the registrant does not click on the thing to say yes I want to go ahead with this transfer then we don't do anything further.

It's, you know, it times out, it dies a painful death. We haven't had their authorization so nothing further is sent to the registry.

Now if they do click on the thing say yes they want to go ahead and do - and transfer their domain to us which of course I'd encourage them to do, once they've done that then we record that we've received their authorization for the transfer and then the stuff goes over to the registry and is communicated to the losing registrar.

No somebody who's more expert in EPP might be able to argue with me but that's my understanding of it is to how that would happen.

And then after the five days or before since the - since our last change to IRTTP it seems to be happening a lot faster than the domain transfers registrars.

Rob Golden: Lovely.

Michele Neylon: I, you know, have I missed something somewhere Rob?

James Bladel: Well there was - if I could jump in here I see there's a lot of traffic going on the chat here.

And I think there's some discussion about the continued use or significance of FOAs in the environment where EPP is and EPP off info codes are the standard.

And I think that there is a correct observation that EPP - or FOAs do not anticipate the change of registrants.

So using the standard FOA as it's currently written with current language does not fit that use case.

So let's see if we can bring this in for a landing because we've already burned more than half of our call on this one question.

Shame on me because I thought it was low-hanging fruit but let me see if I can bring this in for a landing.

So the understanding is that the FOA which is part of our question should the FOA be time limited?

And I think that let's be careful here that our question does not say are FLAs - FOAs still useful or important or have they outlived their purpose?

Or we can certainly weigh in on those issues but let's just make sure that we're acknowledging that we are sort of straying outside of what the charter question is asking us to do.

It's not an existential question or a verdict on the significance of FOAs. It's - I don't want to sound like a bureaucrat here I mean. But if there's an opportunity to clean things up and make them more efficient we should.

But the charter question specifically is asking about a timeframe for expiring a validity of an FOA.

And I think what we're saying in our initial report is there should be some time limit. The registrant should be able to opt out of time limits.

In addition to time limits there should be event driven expirations to the validity of an FOA such as transfer, change of registrant or a domain name expiring.

So what - if we know the discussion to just those questions that are outlined in our initial report - and I know - don't know if we can but if we could is that - is the only question then remaining how long?

How many days should an FOA be valid by default? Is that the only remaining question?

If we set all this other stuff aside and just focused on those very narrow questions from our initial report any thoughts on that?

I mean I see we only have 20 minutes left in our call but I'm trying to draw a very large circle around this as much as possible and start to narrow it down a little bit.

Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Keeping this simple brief and to the point adding a time limit to the FOA, yes. So we have a time limit whatever that is. They get a limit. I mean that's the basic...

James Bladel: Yes.

Michele Neylon: ...that's the basic question.

And as for the wording and all that other thing, you know, should we - should they - should the wording of the FOA be revised?

I would say yes in the same way that I would say that the wording of a lot of other things that are included on the - included as part of ICANN policy should be revised, revisited from time to time.

Am I saying changes? No I'm saying it should be revisited. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Michele. And I see that Rob also agrees with you with a green checkmark.

I propose that we address this open question thusly -- and this is just me putting something on the table so we can all throw rocks at it -- that we address our initial report with time limits or FOAs should be valid for a limited time, that registrant's should be able to grant or opt out of the time limitation by granting a indefinite FOA or renewal FOA -- however we want to phrase that.

That there are certain events that would cancel the validity of an FOA such as a change of registrant or a domain name expiration that, you know, by necessity a registry cannot opt out of.

That the current language of an FOA is not appropriate for change of registrant use case but could be revised to or revisited -- I think to use Michele's language to be done so.

And then the second paragraph or the second section of this issue would be a discussion of FOAs and how they're used versus EPP codes or whether not they're still effective and whether or not they're just busy work I think on the part of registrars or are they a critical piece of resolving disputes, you know, for the perspective registries?

All of that other stuff which I think is important and I think that outside of the confines of this particular group one wonders if these questions are ever asked or discussed or if anyone ever will.

I think that, you know, we don't want to lose those discussions. But I don't know that outside of putting out - them out there is part of our deliberation I don't we have a recommendation forthcoming.

I mean what is the recommendation that's forthcoming, that we should get rid of FOAs, that we change the language? You know, I don't know what we're driving at.

We're saying a lot of things here but I don't know that we're driving towards a recommendation beyond what we already have in our initial report.

So that's kind of where I thinking we're going with this. I see that Michele has his hand up. I know Avri joined the call late but I'm definitely looking for a sanity check from the co-chair here on whether she hears a consensus around some other points that I'm missing. But go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Just for the record in case I forget to say it but I've already keep saying it quite a few times anyway, I would be strongly opposed to removing the FOA or something similar completely for the simple reason that

I think you need to have some kind of audit trail, something more than just and EPP key to move a domain name between two registrars.

Because it's far, far too easy for somebody to get their hands on EPK key -- oh I really can't pronounce easily -- EPP key if that was the only thing to stop a domain from being transferred but from one registrar to another. Like that that would scare me quite a bit. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Michele. I think everyone who's been weighing in on this including Simonetta and Rob are saying essentially the same things in the chat. Let's preserve the FOA, let's preserve the meaning of it by maybe perhaps addressing the language issue.

I agree with you in that world where there is no FOA then this becomes a possession that 10/10 of the law type of an environment.

You have the EPP code you own the domain name, you know, end of sentence. And I think that, you know, we've all been around the block enough times to know that that's not the case.

So, you know, I think that the registries would probably agree as well if they were ever put into a situation where they had to untangle some sort of a dispute you know, they'd like to see that there's at least some documentation trail.

So let's see if we can bring this in for a landing. Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. This is Mikey. I kind of - Simonetta just put something into the chat that I sort of want to highlight because it may be the way out of this.

And that is that the puzzler that we're working on in the diagramming exercise is that at least in thin Whois environments .com, et cetera, it's very difficult to figure out who the registrant is between registrars.

And one way out of that is to eliminate two of the four use cases that I threw up on the screen last week and basically treat all transfers as a transfer of registrant and a transfer to a different registrar every time.

And the reason that I'm suggesting that is that that way may be the way out of some of the difficulties that we've been running into.

I'm not sure it's of baked idea. It's just an idea that's come into my head as I've struggled over the last few days with this puzzler over registrant identification and the tangle that it makes with Thick Whois is that maybe there really are only two use cases.

There's a use case where you transfer and you treat them as transfer registrar and registrant. And there is the use case where you transfer with essentially a preapproved authorization.

Now I don't want to drag us down that in this call but I just want to highlight that notion because that may be the way to walk us out of some of the difficulty that we've been in.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey. And I welcome any effort or any insights that can help us back away from this a bit.

Especially because I believe we're also teetering on the edge of another problem which is the just general Internet identity problem when we start bringing, you know, things like validity of Whois information and who knows for certain who the registrant is.

And I just I think it's there's no bottom to some of those wells. So let's, you know, be mindful when we start to dance around the edge of those issues.

So okay well let's see if we can wrap this up here. So as way as we went down this path I think, you know, I laid out some pretty concrete proposed path forward here.

The one thing that I would like to kind of put out to the group is and, you know, I think we need to cross this bridge now sooner rather than later is this discussion of what the default time limit should be.

So let's narrow this whole discussion to it sounds like we have very strong consensus. It's not unanimous consensus but there should be some time limit to authorization for a transfer if it's granted in advance of the transfer.

And we've I think very clearly established that there are some things that can happen to domain names that will invalidate any outstanding authorization such as an expiration or a change of registrant.

The default time limit though is still an open question. And we've got two things out there, 45 days and 60 days. And I think that we kind of need to make a decision.

So I'm going to propose that I think -- and one of the commenters said this as well -- please have a simple timeframe that is multiples of months.

I would always prefer the shorter timeframe. So I'm going to put 30 days on the table as well as 45 or 60. Does anyone have any strong opinions of why one timeframe absolutely will not work of those three?

I would say 45 is kind of an uneven number in terms of multiple of months or calendar months but otherwise I guess it's acceptable.

I don't want to go too far down into editorial mode here. Sixty days lines up with a number of other existing grace periods but might be considered a long time frame.

You know, I don't know. Let's take some thoughts on this here.

Yes, Simonetta is correct that there was a comment I believe from (Gavin)? I may be messing that up but someone had said something about it being staying away from uneven or odd numbers at times, so multiples of months.

So (Volker) says 60, Simonetta says 30 or 60 be better. And I guess I just realized we're talking about a default times how long they are valid. So I think longer is better.

So I would now switch and say I'm on the side of 60 days because for those folks who are pre-authorizing this in an aftermarket context they will probably want this to be as long as possible presuming.

Any other thoughts here? Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: From an aftermarket point of view I mean -- and this was kind of what Bob and I were sharing with the group -- it is important that there's an opt out thing.

So whether not the standard, as long as the opt out is there is 30 or 60 days we don't care as much.

But I like (Volker)'s point to say make it 60 so that it is something that people are already familiar with.

I think if there is like different timeframes for different things people get confused. And if it's one thing always and maybe there's confusion around this is for this and this is for something else.

James Bladel: Okay so I think what we're hearing from aftermarket is as long as there is a robust mechanism for opt out if the timeframe is relevant then I think there is

a general agreement from (Volker) that 60 days lines up with other grace periods. And then there's the sentiment that I raised that longer is probably better.

But I think we're starting to, you know, and you can kind of see the little slider kind of slide over to the 60 day thing.

Mikey tell us why that's a great idea or why it won't work?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to just raise another dimension. And that is that one advantage to 30 days is that it doesn't line up with the lock.

If it turns out that we arrive at a lock or whatever we call it, and the lock is 60 days it might be useful to have the FOA be shorter than that so that it can't be used to transfer the domain post lock.

So in fact I certainly understand the clarity, ease of use consistency argument. And I don't feel terribly strongly about this.

But there might be a security advantage in having the FOA be shorter than the lock period so that if there's a bad guy involved the domain is still trapped in the registrar after that FOA has expired.

James Bladel: Interesting. I'm going to have to (noodle) on that one Mikey but I think it's an interesting point.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes me too. Yes I don't know that that's right.

James Bladel: Especially when you consider -- and I'm just shooting from the hip here little bit as I suspect we all are -- but especially when you consider that that lock that you're referring to is optional.

So it doesn't really strike me that that would necessarily be any kind of extra protection in all cases, just certain cases.

So I think that sort of diminishes the security value that I do agree with you exist but only exists in those cases. Simonetta go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm going to think about this a little more too. But if the domain - if the lock is there because the registrants has changed wouldn't that be one of the use cases where we would say that FOA becomes - expires anyway and/or the other one was if the lock is there because the domain name has changed registrars and that was the other use case where we said the FOA becomes and has expired?

So I don't - now if let's say someone actually hijacked the name and moves it from A to B and then has control over the name and the new registrar I don't think it matters for if it's 30 or 60 days for a new FOA because unless old registrant realizes that the domain is no longer there the new registrant would just go ahead and create a new FOA anyway without anyone else ever noticing.

James Bladel: And I don't want to speak for Mikey but I thought that I understood he was referring to the existing reasons for denial after a domain name was first created or after an initial previous transfer where a registrar can deny a new transfer if it's within 60 days of an old transfer even setting aside the other discussion lock- or discussion of locks after change of registrant.

So I don't know Mikey. I think that there is some benefit there as you discussed in terms of security but I think it's very situational. Is that the right word I'm looking for? It doesn't cover all the use cases.

And so I think I want to say tip of the hat to you for pointing that out but I think that that's still - the scale is still tipping in the direction of 60 days just because of the simplicity and the alignment.

Any other thoughts on this one folks? And I guess I am looking to Avri here. You know, like the thriller movies from the cold war I feel like we both have a missile key here when we're trying to the test whether or not there's a consensus and looking to make sure that you feel like we're going down the right track here or should we do this on the mailing list to make sure that we're covering all those folks who don't regularly attend calls? What are your thoughts Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay yes, sorry I've been quiet. Partly I mean I'm sure that you are appropriately calling it for this conversation.

But since I missed the first 20 minutes until I go back and listen or I missed the first 25 minutes, it's hard for me to personally say yes I heard that too.

What I recommend doing is basically writing that up, sending it to the list and then at the beginning of our next meeting, okay the end of our next meeting, no at the beginning of our next meeting just checking on it and making sure.

And in the meantime I'll listen and have my own opinion. I've spent most of this meeting trying to catch up with the discussion from what was still being said. And as I say I'm sure you're right but I didn't hear it.

James Bladel: Okay so that was a good approach and I think that'll also capture we have a number of apologies this time around so it's possible we've overlooked something.

So maybe Berry and I can write up this question and get that out to the list here today or early tomorrow. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. As I said in the chat it would be extremely helpful if some of you folks who really get the use of all of these FOAs and off codes could join us on this use case call tomorrow which will start an hour earlier than this call

started for you but tomorrow morning because quite frankly I am pretty bewildered. Yes I can send emails. That's a good idea Michele.

I think that the use case discussion and this FOA EPP discussion I had no idea they were so intertwined.

But as I listen to this they're actually quite intertwined. And so we could use a little more expertise on that call.

Again if the call started at 12:00 for you today it would start 11:00 tomorrow is when we're planning that call.

And maybe what we need Berry could you get a full blown call set up for that? The last time we just did it on Bob Mountain's infrastructure. But we might be better off with a full blown bridge and the Adobe room so that people can join.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I'll work with Nathalie for that.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Mikey and yes thanks for Berry for let's - expanding that as much as possible and getting the broadest possible participation.

Well that's - that'll do it for this episode folks. And, you know, shame on me again for thinking that we could just knock out that one issue as low-hanging fruit and that would leave the other nine for our next call.

At this pace I'm concerned that we'll be doing this until the middle of next year so we'll probably have to find a way to make sure that we've got some concise capturing of all the different questions so that we can get them addressed as much as possible on the list so that the calls are just made for thumbs up thumbs down consensus.

But we'll be looking for some increased participation tomorrow. I will make it if possible. Look for that email.

Let's just keep moving forward on these and we'll tackle these open questions one through nine as well as just close our button up Number 10 on our next call which is one week from today.

And thanks everyone. Please keep an eye on the mailing list for further updates. Thank you.

Woman: Thanks bye-bye.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks James. Thanks Avri. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you very much.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: You may now stop the recording.

Man: Thanks all right.

END