

**AC Attendance - 41 Members**

Alan Greenberg  
Alan Woods  
Alex Deacon  
Andrew Sullivan  
Avri Doria  
Ayden Férdeline  
Benjamin Akinmoyeje (Nigeria)  
Benny Samuelson / Nordreg AB  
Beth Bacon  
Bradley Silver  
Brian J Winterfeldt  
Chuck Gomes  
Daniel K. Nanghaka  
David Cake  
Dina Solveig Jalkanen  
Erica Varlese  
Evan Smitih  
Greg Aaron  
James Galvin (Afilias)  
Jenn Taylor Hodges  
Kathy Kleiman

Klaus Stoll  
Laura Margolis  
Marc Anderson  
Mason Cole  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)  
Michael Hammer  
Nathalie Coupet  
Olga Kyryliuk  
Roger Carney  
Sam Lanfranco  
Sara Bockey  
Scott Hollenbeck (Verisign)  
Steve Crocker  
Steve Metalitz  
Susan Kawaguchi  
Tapani Tarvainen  
Tim OBrien  
Tom Undernehr  
Vicky Sheckler  
Volker Greimann

**On Audio Only:** none

**Apologies:** Rubens Kuhl, Kal Feher, Rod Rasmussen, Michele Neylon, Stephanie Perrin, Statton Hammock

**Staff:** Caitlin Tubergen, Karen Mulberry, Lisa Phifer, Marika Konings, Trang Nguyen, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland

**AC Chat Transcript:**

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group teleconference on Tuesday, 27 February 2018 at 17:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_oAu8B&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpdYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=O48fbvuyf9tKXilTzmFiAdpFxZH\\_GFHvJNdy8IZRjck&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_oAu8B&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpdYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=O48fbvuyf9tKXilTzmFiAdpFxZH_GFHvJNdy8IZRjck&e=)

Julie Bisland:If Adobe Connect is not functioning properly, please check your plug ins: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_tinyurl.com\\_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpdYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=RJGRPuB69ceTzFCOiNmCdYUecyYJOnqqqSWzs-hKliA&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_tinyurl.com_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpdYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=RJGRPuB69ceTzFCOiNmCdYUecyYJOnqqqSWzs-hKliA&e=)

Alex Deacon:Hi all

Tim OBrien:hello all - I will be going mobile for the latter half of this call, catching train to visit clients

Julie Bisland:thank you, Tim

Nathalie Coupet:Hi all

Michael Hammer:Greetings  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All  
Olga Kyrliuk:voice is interrupted  
Alex Deacon:Audio is great on the phone  
Marika Konings:Audio is fine for me  
Ayden Férdeline:i can hear  
Susan Kawaguchi:I can hear you fine  
James Galvin (Afilias):just fine  
Alan Woods:I am fine too Lisa  
Marika Konings:@Olga if you are on Adobe Connect audio, you may want to try connecting to the phone bridge instead.  
Olga Kyrliuk: now is fine  
Andrew Sullivan:I am not sure why we'd constrain the "mired in detail" to "middle of last year" ;-)  
Michael Hammer:You had me at mired...  
Steve Crocker:What obligations, if any, does the person being contacted have to respond or act?  
Alex Deacon:Hold that thought Steve.....  
Susan Kawaguchi:@ Steve Crocker that really depends on contact initiated and the applicable law  
Michael Hammer:Contacted by whom, Steve?  
Lisa Phifer:Charter link: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_E4xlAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=wQOyD98CwOur1wAVzNULTfI76b0kKDy4Lhw1PflCxpA&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_E4xlAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=wQOyD98CwOur1wAVzNULTfI76b0kKDy4Lhw1PflCxpA&e=)  
Lisa Phifer:Phase 1 outputs page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_p4xlAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=PHeqIpljFMZW9s8uTL3sclRblqGhWbz20jgeB0-Yp3o&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_p4xlAw&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=PHeqIpljFMZW9s8uTL3sclRblqGhWbz20jgeB0-Yp3o&e=)  
Lisa Phifer:Beginner's tutorial: <https://participate.icann.org/p73xek0tdqa/>  
Steve Crocker:Susan and Michael, are you implying that the person being contacted may have some obligation to respond or act depending on whom is making contact? Will the status or category of the person making the contact be evident to the person being contacted?  
Lisa Phifer:@Steve, please hold that thought, we're getting there  
Sara Bockey:FYI - I will need to drop at the top of the hour for a conflicting meeting  
Michael Hammer:I'm not implying anything Steve. You stated "What obligations, if any, does the person being contacted have to respond or act?". It is not clear to me who you believe is contacting "the person".  
Lisa Phifer:We are now on slide 3  
Kathy Kleiman:People contact me all the time about selling my house -- but I don't respond.  
James Galvin (Afilias):clarifying question  
Lisa Phifer:@JimG, Alex will take questions in just a minute  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):6 Mar is going to be travel time for many of us  
James Galvin (Afilias):just to be clear, the use of "entity" in the second and third question is a reference to the "who" in the first question, right?  
Lisa Phifer:@JimG yes  
James Galvin (Afilias):and second, these are just tentative purposes, right? We have not yet committed to them, right?

Lisa Phifer:"who" = entity associated with domain name registration to be identified or contacted for the purpose

Lisa Phifer:@JimG, yes, still possible purposes

Lisa Phifer:Except for the two for which we already have rough consensus: Tech Issue Resolution and DN Management

Dina Solveig Jalkanen:"If WG member would like to join DT, please send message to..." where? to the coordinator?

Lisa Phifer:@Dina, send email to staff supporting this WG: Lisa, Marika or Caitlin

Dina Solveig Jalkanen:I see, thanks!

steve metalitz:@Jim and building on Jim's Q. 2, this is also not an exhaustive list of possible purposes, correct?

Lisa Phifer:@Steve, also true - we still have at least one and probably more additional purposes to cover, after we finish pass on those already fleshed out

steve metalitz:Thanks Lisa.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):can we vote for changing "Criminal Activity" to "prevention of Criminal Activity" (due to the first sounds weird as purpose :)

Lisa Phifer:@Maxim, the purposes are CI investigation, CI notification, CI reputation - but of course the DT can suggest refinement of those labels...

Kathy Kleiman:This drafting exercise seems to make sense for "purposes" we have agreed upon - but for the others - isn't this a little ahead of our work?

Kathy Kleiman:what page is slide 6?

Lisa Phifer:@Kathy, we are laying the foundation for using the F2F to make progress on additional purposes should we get that far

Kathy Kleiman:ah, page 6 :-)

Lisa Phifer:DT1's output can be found at [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_download\\_attachments\\_74580012\\_DT1-2520-2D-2520TechIssues-2DResearch-2Dfinal.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOdpYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=E579KDQ62\\_7kS9WlboxEhoxXbF\\_DcC5Sauk0a-gmxE-c&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_74580012_DT1-2520-2D-2520TechIssues-2DResearch-2Dfinal.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOdpYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=E579KDQ62_7kS9WlboxEhoxXbF_DcC5Sauk0a-gmxE-c&e=)

Lisa Phifer:If I recall correctly the snapshot on slide 6 come from the 3rd page of the DT output

Kathy Kleiman:make progress on additional possible purposes... but why? We haven't agreed on these possible purposes yet. Why spend time on them now? It's assuming we will agree...

Lisa Phifer:Slide 5 is a more current version of DT1 output for the topics already discussed: definition of the purpose, and data for the purpose

Marika Konings:@Kathy - the idea is that having a better understanding of the responses to these questions will also facilitate the discussion on purposes.

Steve Crocker:In listing the purposes and tasks, I think it would be helpful to be explicit about which party is benefitting. For example, with respect to technical issue resolution, is the person making contact trying to alert the people managing the domain that they have a problem \*that would be to their benefit to resolve\* or is the person making contact trying to get attention to a problem that he has?

Marika Konings:it doesn't mean that by agreeing on a response to these questions, there is automatically an agreement that the purpose is a legitimate purpose.

volk r Greimann:steve +1: the purpose Definition is worthless if the benefitting parties are not defined.

steve metalitz:@Jim are you referring to the entry under "rationale for registration data access" "domain contact.... who can help resolve technical or operational issues....etc.")?

Greg Aaron:with respect to technical issue resolution, there could be a range of beneficiaries. But not all of them use the RDS or RDS data.

Michael Hammer:One of the interesting things that has become clearer to me is that the end game of limiting access to contact information is going to lead towards an ecosystem of "connected" and "outsiders". Those who have the ability/knowledge to contact through other means will have a significant advantage over those who can only rely on crippled whois/rds.

James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - I'm not sure I understand the context of your question. I think I want to say yes.

Lisa Phifer:It may not always be the account holder - for example, a proxy-registered domain name has the proxy as the account holder

James Galvin (Afilias):cant hear Chuck at all

Sara Bockey:ouch. audio is nightmare

Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:impossible to hear anything

Michael Hammer:Because the person who wanted the domain decided to name the proxy as the account holder.

Julie Bisland:steve has to close mic when Chuck is speaking

Lisa Phifer:In that case do you want to reach the account holder in that case or the entity using the domain name?

Michael Hammer:You don't have a choice.

James Galvin (Afilias):@michael - yes!

Michael Hammer:But that was their choice.

Michael Hammer:There are consequences to decisions.

Julie Bisland:Tim: mic is muted

steve metalitz:@Jim, trying to answer question #1 on slide 3: "who needs to be identified and contacted" . You said the DT had already answered this and I was just trying to figure out where in the DT output.

Sara Bockey:Can't hear tim

Lisa Phifer:@Michael, my point is that the purpose should identify the entity you really want to reach or identify, which may not always be the account holder

volk r Greimann:could hear Tim earlier though, though silent

tim obrien 2:sorry mobile client having issues

Michael Hammer:But if the entity made the decision that they don't want to be contacted directly, that is their choice.

Greg Aaron:Not sure I understand. In the current ssystem, the domain "owner" decides who to contact about what kind of issues. We just have four traditional types of roles (Registrant, Admin, Tech, Billing). Steve, are you suggesting the domain owner have a more free-form ability to say what the issue classes are?

Julie Bisland:i unmuted Tim's mic, we can see if he can be heard

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):really weak

Andrew Sullivan:barely here

Tapani Tarvainen:I can hear Tim now but very quiet

Lisa Phifer:@GregA, in this assignment we are trying not to assume definitions for those 4 contacts or only those contacts - we are trying to think about the questions and provide answers that are more conceptual and rely less on implied definitions

James Galvin (Afilias):@steve - the answer to the "who" question is the first bullet on slide 5 at the bottom. I would say the "rationale" box is part of the answer to question two.

volk r Greimann:the min issue with this is that a normal registrant would not know about the issues he could cause by misconfiguring his domain. he may not even have someone knowledgeable enough to resolve the issue.

Michael Hammer:Then (s)he will suffer the consequences Volker.

steve metalitz:@Jim, OK thanks, I thought we were being asked not to answer this question just be reference to existing Whois categories. But I may have misunderstood.

steve metalitz:\*by reference\*

Michael Hammer:At least normal registrants aren't configuring BGP <G>.

volk r Greimann:suffer the consequences?

Steve Crocker:@Lisa, yes, we need additional nomenclature. I have been using "account holder" as the term that designates the person who has de facto control of the domain because the account holder has the keys to the account and therefore specifies \*all\* of the relevant information, i.e. everything from the name servers to the credit card info,. If the account holder is acting as a proxy for someone else, perhaps we need a term to refer to whom the account holder is acting on behalf of. On the other hand, do we care? Isn't it sufficient to treat the account holder as the single, ultimate party responsible for the domain name?

James Galvin (Afilias):@stevemetaltiz - thinking a bit more about it, i have a slightly modified answer. I think that the rationale in the box describes what role we're trying to find. so, I'm saying technical contact but if we start from the premise that that is not well defined, then the rationale box helps that.

Michael Hammer:If they have broken something related to their domain and DNS, it is typically their problem. If they are causing problems for others (not necessarily related to DNS) they may find out the meaning of "dropped route" and/or blackholled is.

Lisa Phifer:@SteveM you are correct - we are asking DTs to not rely only on existing data element names or assumed definitions of these elements. We are asking DTs to describe the entities, what roles or responsibilities they play with regard to the DN registration, and what the party trying to identify or contact them is hoping to accomplish

Kathy Kleiman:Can hear you faintly...

Kathy Kleiman:Better!

volk r Greimann:mike: we give the registrants the resources to configure their domains every which way possible. and some play around with these tools to do something else and have no clue what causes the issue

Sam Lanfranco:@Steve Crocker: @Lisa, yes, we need additional nomenclature. I have made what has been taken as a frivolous suggestion that we actual have a glossary team to help nail down terms with agreed use. I table the suggestion one more time.....(-:

steve metalitz:@Lisa, thanks, so am I correct that where this is addressed in the DT output is the entry under "rationale for registration data access" ( "domain contact.... who can help resolve technical or operational issues....etc.")

Michael Hammer:And that is their problem until they cause problems for others. Some people might be nice and try to reach out and help. To the extent that friction increases, people may choose not to do so.

Tapani Tarvainen:expected to be able to talk Techie?

Michael Hammer:Others may decide to self-help by not accepting packets.

Lisa Phifer:@SteveM, I agree that's the starting point for this DT's answer

tim obrien 2:sorry learning the mobile client nuances

volk r Greimann:the mobile client is less than stellar - avoid it if you can

Tapani Tarvainen:"Domain Owner's License" :-)

Marc Anderson:This seems like a good time to remind everyone of Rough Consensus agreement # 36: 36. Purpose-based contact (PBC) types identified (Admin, Legal, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy,Business) must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide.

Andrew Sullivan:I \_think\_ I agree with at least part of what James was suggesting (and yes, tend agreement the other week)

Lisa Phifer:Defining roles and responsibilities with respect to the domain name registration does not necessarily translate into a policy-required contractual obligation

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think we mix contactability and searchability of a person

Lisa Phifer:@Marc, thanks for the reminder

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the first does not require disclosure of the contact and the latter requires it

Alex Deacon:All - I need to drop for another meeting. apologies for leaving early. thanks.

Alan Woods:i need to drop also alas ... apologies.!

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ Greg re: contactability by non-contracted parties to the registrant is important for a variety of legitimate purposes, and am troubled by discussions that contactability by non-parties is unnecessary

Steve Crocker:Is there a formal requirement for the person listed as the registrant to actually be the registrant?

volk r Greimann:no

James Galvin (Afilias):I support the idea that the only obligation on the registrant is that they be contactable. I'm explicitly asking the question why we need any other obligation on the part of a registrant? Remember, we're starting from a clean slate and I think this is an important question given that.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Vicky, the issue is fineability of the party which shared private data of the person with third parties with no legitimate reason

Andrew Sullivan:@Steve: what do you mean by "actually"?

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Steve if you want to retain control of the domain name you should always be listed in the registrant field currently

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Susan, actually you need to pay bills

volk r Greimann:there may e a beneficial owner behind the registrant. but the person listed is held to be the registrant

Steve Crocker:By "actually"I mean is the person listed as the registrant related to the person who has control, authority and/or responsibility for the domain name?

Vicky Sheckler:@Jim/Steve - we have also discussed the concept of accuracy of WHOIS data, which is in ICANN's bylaws as well

Susan Kawaguchi:but you can control the account and pay the bills but not be the registrant of the domain name

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):for the domain, and contact is not that important compared to the payments

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):from the registrant's point of view

volk r Greimann:and yes, it is advisable to list yourself

Lisa Phifer:Refer to WG Agreement 30. At least one element identifying the domain name registrant (i.e., registered name holder) must be collected and included in the RDS.

Andrew Sullivan:@Steve: then in one sense, trivially yes. In another sense, maybe not: maybe it's your lawyer or a staff member or something.

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Maxim it is very critical depending on how you use the domain name and where you offer services

Lisa Phifer:WG Agreement 31. Data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Susan, I think it might happen (for example old domains "inherited " by company ... and all they need is to "replenish that account")

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Maxim that would be a great way to lose control of your domain names

Steve Crocker:@Vicky, so far as i can tell, the focus of ICANN's accuracy efforts to make sure the contact information \*looks like\* meaningful information but I'm not aware there is any requirement to make sure the person listed in a particular role really exists and is responsible for the domain.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I do not mean that I am protecting this, just saying it happens  
tim obrien 2:so we have to be part of the cool kids club to know who talk to regarding a domain issue??

Andrew Sullivan:@Tim: ideally, if RDS is working, no.

Michael Hammer:Only if the information isn't available in whois/rds

Michael Hammer:.

Lisa Phifer:@SteveC, there are RAA requirements around syntactic and operational validation, but not currently around identity validation for contacts given in WHOIS. Identify validation would confirm the party reached is the party intended.

Andrew Sullivan:But I wish you luck contacting certain operations groups if you're not on one of the various trust lists

Michael Hammer:That's true Andrew.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also the person might not understand English, for example

Michael Hammer:One of the nice thing about trust lists... there's so many to choose from.

Andrew Sullivan:I sincerely hope we're not about to re-excavate the ground recently laid over the idea of validating the identity of the person listed in the registration contacts.

Susan Kawaguchi:Account access and being registrant is two different things

Susan Kawaguchi:just having account access does not necessarily allow you to control the domain name

Susan Kawaguchi:I often ran into that issue with acquisitions

Susan Kawaguchi:most notorious was when the acquisition handed over the control of the account but the Registrar was listed as admin contact and would not approve any actions I initiated.

Susan Kawaguchi:\$100,000 later in attorney fees it was resolved

Steve Crocker:@Susan, tell me more. I have been laboring under the understanding that the person who has the keys to the account with the registrar does indeed have complete control over all of the information associated with the domains in that account. Can you give me an example of when this would not be true?

Steve Crocker:@Susan, ah. I typed too soon. Nice example.

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Steve, you would think that is way it should work but it really depends on the registrar and how they manage their internal processes.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Registrant might have own Registrar to ensure control :)

Lisa Phifer:@SteveC, my account login at my registrar does not have to correspond to the party identified as the Admin Contact. If I have control of my account login, I have control over my domain name.

volk r Greimann:Steve: Transfers also need approval of the domain owner or admin, so control of an account where the domain owners are different may still not allow transfers

Susan Kawaguchi:to truly control a domain name you need the registration updated to information you control AND control of the account. And to ensure that no one else still remains on that account.

Lisa Phifer:That said, if I need to reset my login/password, I am asked to prove I'm the registrant or admin contact, and that's where it gets tricky if I'm not.

Laura Margolis:I agree with Steve, and it would be much more easier to have only one responsible party

Kathy Kleiman:+1 James -- good questions!

Steve Crocker:@Lisa, Susan said she ran into an example where the registrar required approval from the admin before allowing the account holder to change the admin.

Michael Hammer:+1 Lisa. REgistrant might be a role account but the registrant might specify specific individuals to the registrar who are authorized to admin.

Lisa Phifer:SteveC, yes, I have too, see above.

Susan Kawaguchi:@ Steve and more importantly would not allow transfer of the domain names

Susan Kawaguchi:some of these issues have been resolved with ICANN policies but not all.  
volk r Greimann:the owner change policies actually made Susan's work harder  
Benny Samuelsen / Nordreg AB:IRTP-C .. just saying  
Susan Kawaguchi:I have allowed domain names to delete and then do a snap back because there was no path to gain control of the domain names in an account  
volk r Greimann:ouch  
Kathy Kleiman:Contactability does not equal identification. Good point!  
Steve Crocker:Ideally, one of the positive results of this WG will be clarification of the authority structure related to domain names.  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Tech guys want to contact, Legal guys to identify first  
Andrew Sullivan:Well, be careful what you wish for. I am sure the reason the process is "get validation from contact being removed" is to avoid theft of name control  
volk r Greimann:ideally. but there are so many variations of control and ownership...  
Susan Kawaguchi:A common mistake I see in acquisitions is that people assume once the domain name is "pushed" into an account you control but then the registration information is not updated you cannot make changes to the registration.  
Andrew Sullivan:which is harder to do if multiple contacts have to confirm a change  
James Galvin (Afilias):@steveC - yes regarding authority structure!  
Susan Kawaguchi:I have unwound so many domain names in that situation usually from an acquisition or employee going rogue and registering a domain name themselves "because it is so easy" they didn't need help.  
Lisa Phifer:@All, we are jumping back to slide 4 to review due dates/next steps  
volk r Greimann:,,oh! that chain the Whois has not worked for us for years! no ideas where he is now!"  
volk r Greimann:the guy in the Whois  
Lisa Phifer:List of DTs and members currently: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_q5BEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a\\_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=8kx7ABFwAYvRmpAK2oOm3j3ZIklemDYQOUyTICUJtE4&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_q5BEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=FCOWooP4T24H3YuZz5WOpYC77a_91aOmHJRluRHFv0&s=8kx7ABFwAYvRmpAK2oOm3j3ZIklemDYQOUyTICUJtE4&e=)  
Lisa Phifer:Action: DT coordinators to send first draft answers to their DTs by 28 Feb  
Lisa Phifer:Action: DT members to review/discuss on DT email list this week, aiming to provide output by 5 March but no later than 7 March  
Lisa Phifer:Action: For those not assigned to a DT if you want to be and can commit to working on this over the next week, send email to staff (Marika, Lisa or Caitlin)  
Andrew Sullivan:(If someone wants my place, feel free to bump me. I'm mondo busy)  
Michael Hammer:@Volker, if it is a company email account that was used, they can simply create the account.  
Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, noted,thanks  
Michael Hammer:Sad I won't be in Puerto Rico.  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Michael, I heard "we can not restore access to that public mailbox" too many times  
Steve Crocker:Hmm... when is the call on 6 March?  
Michael Hammer:Sounds like a self inflicted problem Maxim.  
Julie Bisland:Tuesday, 06 March 2018 at 17:00 UTC for 90 minutes.  
Lisa Phifer:17.00 UTC are Tuesday calls, except for third Wednesday of every month  
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Michael, it is usually inherited  
Steve Crocker:I will not be in San Juan. At present, I have a conflict for Saturday. I may be able to resolve it and participate remotely. I am ok for Wednesday, 14 March and will participate remotely.



Lisa Phifer:Third Wednesday of each month is at 05.00 UTC, which for some is still Tuesday pm

Andrew Sullivan:if we don't need a meeting to discuss, couldn't status go to list?

Michael Hammer:We finished (slightly) early? I'm in shock.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Benjamin Akinmoyeje (Nigeria):bye

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:Bye all

Lisa Phifer:@Andrew, someone from DT can provide status update but yet please share status with WG list as well

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):safe flights

Steve Crocker:@Lisa, thanks.

Daniel K. Nanghaka 2:Safe flights

Nathalie Coupet:bye

avri doria:bye

Michael Hammer:L8r