GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
23 September, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: **The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 23 September 2008. 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-a-pdp-20080923.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michael Collins - CBUC
Barbara Steele – Registry c.
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC representative Adam Eisner - Tucows

Invited Guest:
Scott Hollenbeck from Verisign

Staff:
Olof Nordling
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:
Kevin Erdman - IPC
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.

Coordinator: The recordings have started, sir.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Glen if you will please do the roll call.

Pleasure we have Paul Diaz, who is leading the group, (Mike O'Connor) from the business constituency, (Barbara Steele) from registry constituency, (Adam Eisner) from registrar constituency, (Michael Collins) from the business constituency, (Mark Trachtenberg) from the (IPC) and we have apologies from two people just let me pull up their names for you, I'm sorry. We have (Kevin Erdman) and (James Bladel, I'm sorry I was so long.

Paul Diaz: Not a problem, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: And then from staff we have (Marie Konings and Olof is with us today along and myself.

Woman: Can we request that Scott Hollenbeck is here as well?

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Glen. Scott Hollenbeck is our guest speaker helping with registry prospective and I'm sorry Glen did you note (Mike O'Connor)?

Glen   Yes.

Paul Diaz: All right everyone, thank you very much for joining us again sorry we are getting started a little slow, I was late myself today. We are going to dive right into it as (Barbara) has just mentioned for us Scott Hollenbeck from VeriSign is with us today hopefully to share some of his technical expertise. Help us with our discussions of potentially using EPP mechanisms to facility the sharing of the registrar email, basically issues that we have raised or started to discuss surrounding our first charter question. And just for the record and I always encourage everybody to kind of check through the week as of

yesterday evening I did not see any additional public postings to the open list for the general public.

We will to continue to monitor that and just as a reminder our constituency statements are due no later than the 3rd of October, if at all possible getting them in sooner is always appreciated, but just to remember that deadline is coming up pretty fast, and I look forward to everybody's input there.

If it is good with the group since we have Scott on the call it makes most sense to me probably to use his presence and focus on this first question. Scott I'm not sure if you have actually seen the language, if you have it in front of you, but just for the record what we we've been change with here is addressing the question whether there could be a way for registrars to make registrant email address data available to one another? The question is currently, there is no way of automating approval from the registrant as there is the email address is not a required field in the registrar then who is? This slows down and complicates the process for registrants especially since the registrant (unintelligible) will be adding contact.

In our previous discussions and working group we noted of course that this applies only to the thin registry models IE.com and .net. And (Barbara) offered and graciously accepted so we have you here today to kind of focus on the idea if there is any mechanisms any opportunities we talked about the pull function in EPP or perhaps anything else that we haven't considered yet that might help up an opportunity to address this question of sharing the registrant email address and to help simplify automate, speed up etcetera transfer request.

Barbara: And this is also keeping in mind that obviously the registrant email
                     addresses only available in thick registrant. So the mechanism would
                     have to be something that would allow registrars if will to be able to talk
                     directly to one another and I'm not sure if that is possible so...any light
                     there?

Scott Hollenbeck: As you all just noticed by definition a think registry does not
                     maintain registrant contact information so the information so the
                     information does not exist in the registry database. Short of changing
                     either EPP and or the definition of what a think registry is there is
                     nothing that can be done that way. The registrar's maintain that
                     information and so as Barb said it might be easier to focus on
                     mechanism for inter registrar information sharing.

Man: The question is whether EPP might be modified to facilitate that?

Scott Hollenbeck: As I said it could be, if the definition of a thin and thick registry is
                     also changed.

Man: Why would that have to change, why would VeriSign have to do with
                     anything differently if the EPP protocol such that registrars can share
                     that piece of information correctly?

Scott Hollenbeck: Because right now we do not maintain any registrant information in
                     thin registry, what you are talking about is either adopting some or all
                     of the, what it is currently called contact information that exists only in
                     thick registries.

Man: I understand what you are saying, I'm not sure you are understanding what I'm saying, but I'm not asking for VeriSign getting any additional information we are just talking about using the tool in order to allow registrars to exchange a piece of information directly.

Scott Hollenbeck: What tool?

Man: EPP.

Scott Hollenbeck: EPP is a registrar to registry protocol it is not registrar to registrar.

Man: Okay that helps, I understand that.

Scott Hollenbeck: So if you saying not giving any additional information to VeriSign the registry you've just eliminated EPP from the discussion.

(Michael Collins): Scott, this is (Michael Collins). I know you work for VeriSign and at least the dot com and dot registry and dot net registry are thin but can you speak to us about whether the EPP would be helpful in a thick registry and how it might be used?

Scott Hollenbeck: You know think registry the registry does indeed maintain this information. So there would be no protocol change required, what you might have to implement is policy change. Such that, both registrar that are involved in some kind of transfer transaction can get access to the contact information instead of having to go through how is. Once both registrars can see the registrar contact information, the email addresses are there, they are available and they can be retrieved as well.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Scott Hollenbeck: The information command.

Woman: Okay.

(Michael O'Connor):This is (Michael O'Connor), I have a question. My apologies for all the background noise, I'm driving so if it's annoying I'll drop off and on again. One of the idea emerged with notion of perhaps paring to different sort of policy approaches, one for thick registries and one for thin. How practical do you think that is?

Scott Hollenbeck: Is that a question for me?

(Michael O'Connor):Yeah, and I guess it would be, not to put you on the spot - the notion being that the think registry doesn't any contact information in it. You're right EPP doesn't help much, but for the thick registries it seems like EPP would work if and if so what we can do is say all right we'll sort of have a two thread policy discussion. We'll have one policy discussion for thick registries and one for thin and I guess I'm just curious to see if it strikes you as something that feasible from your prospective?

Scott Hollenbeck: Well from my prospective, you mean a technology prospective I'd say yeah sure, as soon as you kick it up into the policy realm, I love it. Nothing for me to do right. But let me ask (Barbara) or someone else on the call are there any other presidents where ICANN has treated a policy in two different ways depending on if a thick or thin registry was involved, and if the answer to that is yes?

Barbara Steele: I have personally have not seen anything, I would almost think that this question would be better posed to the registrars, who would have to deal with basically deal with ways to operate depending on who they are sending the command to or how they are dealing with.

Mark Trachtenberg: This is Mark Trachtenberg it seems to me while that is possible it just seems to be not really efficient. When you can have on procedure that both thick and thin registries as apposed to two procedures one for each, it just seems that one policy and procedure is so much more efficient.

Paul Diaz: This is (Paul), and I mean if we all can look at just everything ICANN has tried to do in the last couple of years its always to move towards consistency and it contracts and its relationships etcetera a level playing field not two sets of rules or many sets of rules for different players. I think it would be difficult for this working group to make a recommendation proposal that would clearly distinguish two classes of actors.

Man: I'm look at how difficult it would be to get one policy approved to have a (unintelligible) system which essentially comprised of two policies would just make it that much more difficult to actual accomplish anything.

Woman: As I recall in the beginning of our discussion it was also the question EPP could maybe be used for registrar to registrar communication or by - then it wouldn't matter whether thick or thin registries but by where registrar could exchange information concerning (unintelligible) information of registrar with each other. It that something that would be feasible in your opinion, or with your knowledge from EPP?

Scott Hollenbeck: There is probably some subset of EPP that could be usable or useful to registrar and a registrar to registrar interaction. It would mean work for the registrar; they would need to operate an implement EPP server functionality which they don't do right now. But they have already got the data ostensibly in some database of there own so possible, theoretically, yes.

(Michael O'Connor): This is (Michael O'Connor) again, what about a third party, not a registrar not a registry necessarily but some third party performing the same sorts of functions that the registries would perform in a thick registry basically maintaining that sort of information that shared information as the center to which registrar and registry described ,would that work? So essentially, the EPP server would be neither at registries or registrar but some third party that everybody could subscribe to and collect that kind of information?

Mark Trachtenberg: This is Mark Trachtenberg I think the probably there is who would maintain that system. I mean this is incredible valuable and sensitive information, I mean it goes through all the issues we see with who is policy debate you know what entity can be trusted really manner into that valuable and sensitive information?

Man: I would just like to offer to just what (Mark) saying you know now we are going to talking about having to create a new contracted party because the information that is going to be shared is not readily available. Therefore, it is sensitive information and there is certainly going to the registrar and the registries whoever is involved in the process it will be that everyone will want to have guarantees for the protection of that information. What immediately jumped to mind is you

do have a contracted party already sort of in the mix looking at Iron Mountain you know we are all doing the data escrow with them but having been involved with working with them they are not a real time organization by any stretch and I think the whole purpose is there any way to make this data available, we are looking to simplify and speed up the process.

Recognizing again, our constant between security and simplicity and convenience you can just focus on the convenience side, I don't think somebody like Iron Mountain is a position, I think anybody would be hard pressed a third party to be in a position to provide this sort of data exchange that the folks are looking for in this question, business time near real time.

(Michael O'Connor): This is (Michael O'Connor) again and I guess what I would like to do is separate the questions into technical and the policy since we have a technical person on the phone I guess the question I'd like to pose is technically would that be feasible because then from a policy prospective which I think and a business prospective which are the issues, we have a different discussion.

For example in another industry one of the ways that credit card information is handled by a third party that is owned by all the credit card issuers that would be (unintelligible) that it would seem to me that something like that could be explored but only if it is technically feasible, if it is not even technically feasible then its not worth it and having a policy discussion so.

Man: And truthfully its software and anything can be done. I don't see it being technically feasible either. It would mean having to maintain a lot

of this data in real time, I well, as a registry employee I can't see any benefit to a thin registry operator basically saying I'm going to hand you everything I've got just so that you can essentially set yourself up as having all of the same data that I've got.

Barbara Steele: Or even the registrar.

Man: Look, truthfully there is already a solution for this out there in protocol spec-land, it is called (Iris), I-r-i-s.

Woman: What is that?

Man: It's been called universal who is in the past; it was designed to be a who is replacement service. It provided different levels of access depending on who is asking the question. So, for example if registrar were to stand up (Iris) servers it could have one view for the general public and it could have another view for privileged entities like, registrars or intellectual property attorneys, trade mark attorneys, law enforcement people so on and so forth.

Man: How would administer (Iris) or how would?

Man: Well what do you mean the protocol or the service?

Man: I mean who would administer the service and decides who gets what level of access?

Man: Whoever is operating the server, so a registry would operate an (Iris) server, they decide, I guess to ICANN policy, who will get to access to a registry operated (Iris) server. Similarly registrar would operate their

own (Iris) servers and they would have to implement then and deploy them according to our policy decisions are made.

Barbara Steele: This is actually something we discussed in the registry constituency as well because there are various privacy laws in different countries so one of the things that has been indicated by a couple of the registries is that do use a tiered approach to who has access, or who has information I should say.

Man: This (Iris) server if it was brought up by SSAC as well and one of the advisories that they did about who is (unintelligible) go back and look at what they said about it.

Man: So for two accesses, I mean what are the two tiers? One that gives the registrar email address and the other that doesn't?

Scott Hollenbeck: It could be looked at that way.

Man: I mean you are required to give all the other information by the registry contract.

Scott Hollenbeck: It could be. I mean it could be that registrar get one view the general public gets another you know government, law enforcement people get a third.

Barbara Steele: So its basically unlimited depending on how a registrar wants to implement it.

Scott Hollenbeck: That is correct.

Man: Aren't the registrar required to give most of the information already, so it seems like most of the information already so it seems like the only piece of information that registrar are not required to show through who is on there website or if (port 43) is registrar email address.

Barbara Steele: I personally don't know that there is anything to stipulate what they actually have to show. I do know that there is information that they need to collect.

Man: I mean in the registrar accreditation, the information that they have to show who is.

Barbara Steele: Okay.

Man: So the only thing they are not required to do is registrar emails address.

Barbara Steele: So maybe they would have just two tiers, you know one that would provide that extra information for the registrar emails address and then the more public view which does not.

(Michael O'Connor): This is (Michael O'Connor) so what's the status of (Iris)?

Man: From what prospective?

Man: The protocol that is out there is fully approved by the (IETF)?

Man: From a policy implementation prospective -- it has gone nowhere from a policy prospective. I do believe that there are some folks that operating (Iris) servers either as parts of test beds or as limited

production services. And part of the problem is until there is policy that says you got someone that needs to use it, there is a cost associated with building and deploying it and no one wants to spend the money until it's going to be need and used.

Man: There are also additional administration costs as well, for example how do you authenticate who is a registrar.

Man: Yeah, that is a huge one and gets us back ultimately to the who is debate. Because how do you identify sure, if someone can identify themselves as an FBI agent and there are probably ways to get that somebody identifies themselves as an inspector in the local police force and pick any country outside North America, how are you going to vet that, how are you going to vet them? Guys this becomes who is part two all -- it's the same issues surrounding (Iris) from a policy prospective are some of the core complaints surrounding the who is issue.

Man: This is (unintelligible) there will be probably even larger issues because (Iris) is much more capable.

(Michael O'Connor): This is (Michael O'Connor) (unintelligible) more capable we could we are not a who is work group, we are a transport work group, could we consider (Iris) as a solution just for transfers and only and use the off code, the transfer off code that is already available to the registrar and through the registrar to the gaining registrar and an authorization means. And not worry about FBI and all the other possible (Iris) uses?

Scott Hollenbeck: I don't know if I understand exactly what the question was?

(Michael O'Connor): The question is, we are not a who is work group so we are not really concerned about who has access except the gaining registrar and if we use the off code, the transfer off code that is used today as a means to gain access to (Iris) information and only that no other access, couldn't that solve all our problems with who has access to the information?

Man: So how is the off code used in this scenario?

(Michael O'Connor): The gaining registrar would have to provide it in order to get the registrar email address. Okay (Mike), help me think this one through. So in the system we have and admin contact from (unintelligible) and I want to make a transfer it they get the off code, but the off code is then provided and what the in order to unlock or reveal the registrar email so that there is -- I'm a little confused because...

Man: Basically what you are saying that the registrar to the beginning registrar they initiate their transfer, they submit the off code to execute the transfer then the begin registrar sends the off code to the losing registrar which unlocks the (Iris) server to at the losing registrar provides the registrant email to begin registrar?

Man: That is my question.

Man: That is what you are proposing?

Man: It was more of a question than a proposal, but yes.

Barbara Steele: I believe that all the registrars would have to implement (Iris) for the solution to work and again it goes back to the cost and whether or not they want to cross that bridge to do that, make that investment.

Man: And (Michael), just so that I'm clear, I thought that one of your concerns is that the existing transfer policy allows both an admin and registrar to initiate a transfer quest, ultimately the registrar is the final, by all, end all and authoring and approving. Or in some cases coming back after a transfer and say, wait a minute I never let that go, in this exactly just throughout if it's the registrant that is initiating the transfer request or you're done already, right? You are going to know what the registrant email is (unintelligible) the registrant. So the concern here that we have been focusing on the last couple of times we've raised this issue is, when it is the admin contact that is starting and we are trying to find a way to figure out if there is a way to vet that request to make sure that we won't have an scenario where after the fact a registrant shows up and say wait a minute I never approved that.

Man: Well, as (Michael O'Connor) said and I apologize for the background noise, but as (Michael O'Connor) said we need to - we are kind of separating the technical from the policy and but they are dependent upon one another. We cannot have the gaining registrant confirm with the registrant that it proves that the registrant made the transfer unless the gaining registrar can acquire the registrant email address. So it would require a policy change where by - to add the security that I would like to see would require a policy change that only the registrant can approve a transfer. However, if the registrant cannot acquire contact with the registrant it -- that policy would not work.

Man: I'm sorry did someone want to get into queue? Is that you (Mike)?

(Michael O'Connor): No, I was muted.

Man: All right, we will have to think about this one and Scott we would very much appreciate your taking time out to be on the call because I think helped us understand on the technical side there are possibilities, but there will be some fundamental policy questions.

Scott Hollenbeck: Most definitely.

Man: That need to be addressed and I don't want to use the metaphor a cart and a horse but both are obviously very important but at least helped us clarify on a technical side if I understand correctly, there could be opportunities but again it require basically complete adoption of those technologies, thinking of (Iris) here. And probably the only way you get that full market adoption is if it becomes a requirement, a mandate. Okay, does everybody else understand it the say way?

Man: Yup.

Man: All right, are there other questions why we still have Scott with us, we don't want to unnecessarily keep him on the whole call.
Perhaps Scott, for the folks, especially the some how could not join today when they are listening into the MP3 recording and if they do have questions, can post to the list and perhaps (Barbara) if you would, relay them to Scott, anybody for that matter, from the technical expertise again.

Woman: Can I ask one last question maybe Scott?

Scott Hollenbeck: Of course, sure.

Woman: What will be a higher investment going forward like EPP or the (Iris) option, I mean, I know it's very difficult of course to estimate but just from your knowledge?

Scott Hollenbeck: Well given the number of people that would have to implement (Iris) fully for this to work I would have to imagine that would cost more. You know EPP - wait I take that back. The registrar would have to implement an EPP changes as well and the registries would have to implement it, so it is probably a wash.

Woman: Okay, thanks.

Scott Hollenbeck: Okay, while I'm here (Barbara) had also asked some questions offline about EPP authentication and the kind of services it already provides. Does anyone have any questions about that?

Man: Anyone, Mike, the sub-group?

Man: Yeah well all of here, well of course I've got a question, how does it work?

Man: I'm back, getting in and out of mute here is quite tedious. I do have some questions about authentication, I'm not sure that we need to soak up Scott's time now, but it the authentication in EPP and the authentication in (Iris) roughly comparable or are there interesting differences that would make it easier or harder to do things?

Scott Hollenbeck: They are roughly comparable.

Man: Okay.

Scott Hollenbeck: The both ultimately use some of the same technologies to use the same security services.

Man: Is there one that just from your experience purely a personally that you would prefer?

Scott Hollenbeck: (Iris) was designed for it to provide this kind of query service, so in a perfect world if there were no policy considerations my preference would be for an (Iris) implementation. That is not reality, so that that for what's its worth.

Man: Right, let me then extend it beyond just the authentication to the threats and scope of the whole systems comparing (Iris) and EPP. Do they do roughly the same thing or is one designed to do one thing and one designed to another?

Scott Hollenbeck: It's the latter, EPP is provisioning systems, (Iris) is a look up system.

Man: Okay.

Scott Hollenbeck: Ultimately the data tends to flow through EPP into some repository and potentially into another one where it's made available for public query using (Iris).

Man: So, wouldn't be able to eliminate EPP by adopting (Iris) (unintelligible)?

Scott Hollenbeck: Completely correct.

Barbara Steele: And I guess to address (unintelligible) question can you just give a quick overview on what you provided to me on EPP and security and...

Scott Hollenbeck: Yeah, sure. EPP provides a couple of identification and authentication services, starting right when the registrar tries to connect to EPP server. It uses (TLF) which is sometimes mistaken for (SSL) you know to provide confidentiality and authentication and you know the connection is encrypted and both the server operator and the client so in this case the registry and the registrar have to have digital certificates that are signed by some recognized certification authority.

When the registrar tries to establish a connection the registry looks at the certificate says is this coming from someone I know and is it coming form assigned - from an authentication that I trust and if those answers are all yes, it will allow you know, creation of the (SSL) or (TLF) connection.

There is also IP addressing in place that most registries so that we ask the registrars, tell us which machines you'll be connecting from and we are going to disallow connections from any other machines.

Man: Right.

Scott Hollenbeck: So, once the registrar you know can establish a physical connection to the registry the registry will respond to the connecting attempt by kicking back a greeting a little banner of text. It says I am the EPP server at VeriSign for example. The registrar can look at then and interpret the text and say yup, I thought I was talking to VeriSign

this thing tells me its VeriSign I feel comfortable about that. The registrar is then required to provide a registry assigned user ID and password you know to long into the server, before it can do anything interesting. It registers domains it can't initiate transfers, it can't look up information until it is authenticated and identified.

So, once the registrar logs in they can start to do some interesting things. Transfers cannot be attempted unless the gaining registrar the registrar that is trying to initiate the transfer can provide a password. And it is currently a password that is extensible there are other mechanism that are allowed, but they have to be able to provide a password or off information that associated with the domain and an association is made when the domain is registered initially and it can be changed at any point during the valid registration period, by the old registrar or the loosing or current registrar however you want to cast that.

So the theory is that either registrar allows registrant to create the authentication or they share it with the registrant. At some point when the registrant decides I want to transfer, they either have the authentication already because they created it or they go to the old registrar and say please tell me give me the auth info. They then take that information with them to the new registrar and say please initiate a transfer on my behalf, you know, here is who I am, the registrar authenticates them in whatever way they have currently implemented and the registrant say in addition to everything you already know about me here is the auth info for the domain.

A new registrar sends in an EPP transfer command, provides the auth info the registry executes the command, tells the old registrar transfer

request you have a certain number of time to respond to it. The old registrar typically picks up the notification that the transfer has been requested, many of them will try to go off and try to contact the admin contact and say hey, we've got a transfer request please confirm or deny it. And then based on the response or lack of response they do something. Many will let the transfer go through; if they get no response other will say nope we didn't get a response so we are not going to authorize it.

Barbara Steele: That actually would be in violation of the transfer policy.

Scott Hollenbeck: Yeah, this policy to deal with some of those things, it is not protocol at that point. So after a certain amount of time, something happens, say the transfer goes through automatically, the protocol also says the transfer can be rejected, all a matter of policy. And as I said, EPP provides a password based mechanism for authentication information but the actual protocol code there is extensible and new mechanism can be added such as, tokens that can provide one time passwords or something. Since there has been no demand for that kind of service and so nothing has been done to expand it yet.

Man: A question or two actually, should not take up too much time, but authentication code the registrar knows it registrar record and ready strand knows it. Is it also recorded in the register?

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes.

Man: And secondly, has there been any mishap with EPP or it is sort of a very, very -- it sounds like a very, very stable and reliable system, is it?

Scott Hollenbeck: There have been none reported that I have ever heard of. No one has successfully cracked it, or otherwise managed to get past the hurdles that have been thrown up. Just the fact that I haven't heard about it doesn't mean it hasn't happened of course, right. But the truth is all the security technologies that are employed with EPP are not - they were not developed solely for EPP they are all basically off the shelf, proven technologies used in other places.

Man: That was a fabulous summary of the process and maybe someone; maybe Marie could go through and sort of diagram that out. Question, is there a pictorial view of what you just described eventually a flowchart that sort of lays out that whole process, something that we can lay our hands on as a working group?

Scott Hollenbeck: I don't think so, I know there is text. All right and if you wanted to brows through lot's of boring (IFT) (RFC) documents that describe EPP, you can find it there. But no, I don't think anyone has actually created you know, this is what a transfer looks like from end to end.

Man: I don't know if others would find it as useful as I would, I'm a pretty pictorial guy but I think it would be completely fantastic to have a picture drawn.

Woman: I would be happy to have a go at that, if Scott you wouldn't mind having a look to make sure that I have covered all the steps that you described here today?

Scott Hollenbeck: No a problem, I would be glad to help.

Man: And Scott a follow-up question on technology, EPP is a fundamentally a pull system in other words when the gaining registrar has initiated the transfer request, it is up to the loosing registrar to query to pull the notification from the registry, that there is a transfer request pending, is that correct? Its pushed out to them or its both?

Scott Hollenbeck: No. Its both, there is a push mechanism to say hey, loosing registrar there some information here that you now need to retrieve and they get that notice via protocol and then they can then come in and pull the actual transfer request to get the details.

Man: Great, and that would need to be clarified in the any flowchart or whatnot Mike because -- and the notification will it be specific enough to say if there is information in waiting your attention specific to a transfer or is it just information coming into the system and come to find out what it is.

Scott Hollenbeck: It is specific to a transfer.

Man: Right.

Barbara Steele: Does it need a code or something?

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes. Right there is actually a transfer query command that is available through registrars so that they can look at the status of requested - of a pending transfer at any time. And the way this would typically work, the registrar gets notice hey, transfer and here is the details and then they can then go do a transfer query to get all this specifics initiated at, expired at, request by, domain in question - all that fun stuff.

(Michael O'Connor): This is Mike again, it is my job to ask incredible stupid questions, and so here is my one for today. Tom you mentioned that VeriSign runs an EPP server now correct? Does that mean that in addition to the think registries that VeriSign supports you also support thick one?

Scott Hollenbeck: I'll have to ask (Barb).

Barbara Steele: I think that they maybe some confusion over still what EPP does. EPP is a protocol that actually operates on server's right?

Scott Hollenbeck: Right, between servers and clients.

Barbara Steele: Yeah, I can say that VeriSign in addition to operating thin registry and whether you are a tick or think registry really doesn't have any impact on being an EPP registry if you will.

Man: I think we touched on that in the past Mike that EPP as the provision protocol extensible provision protocol has been adopted overwhelmingly by registry operator throughout the world. Then the (GTL) space and the (CCL) space most folks are using it now and I think it got touched on because it works very well, it does what it is suppose to do very, very well.

(Michael O'Connor): Yeah, so here is dumb question number two. Which is could the thin registry be enhanced in a tiny little way to carry one piece of data i.e., the registrar email address?

Scott Hollenbeck: I think it could be but that changes the whole nature of the contents in registry.

All: Yeah, what we talked about earlier, yeah.

(Michael O'Connor): Okay, thanks.

Scott Hollenbeck: Is there anything else for me?

Man: Just our thanks Scott, very, very useful clarifications and we only ask that if other questions come up of a technical nature if we could reach out to your through (Barbara)?

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes, definitely through (Barbara), she can help coordinate and keep it all in sync.

Man: Understood and but truly much appreciate your time.

Scott Hollenbeck: You're welcome. Thanks (Barbara).

Barbara Steele: Thank you.

Man: All right, Mike just to follow-up on the questions about flow charts and whatnot, I did go back to our customer service that handle transfer request looking for any graphics, flow charts, documentation and what we do sort of behind the scenes ourselves, unfortunately we don't have anything like that. Definitely not anything graphic and sort of the training manual that is used and we are sorry that's company information confidential. We wouldn't be prepared to publish that. However...

(Michael O'Connor): Is there anyway to scrub out the confidential part?

Man: Well, ultimately I'm not sure what it gains us, because based on what we have published for the customer face and side and what we just heard from Scott in terms of how the provision system works, basically that is all we are doing. I think that is all any registrar is doing, the challenge is always comes up in these cases where there is a conflict between action taken by an admin and the registrant the registrant contacts us and then we pursue what is in each case almost a unique process of tying to reconcile what went on and making the registrant who is the ultimate authority...

(Michael O'Connor): Yeah. You know I'm pretty enchanted with the idea that maybe (Thomas's) summary could be trans-modified into that sort of universal back office flow that maybe enough.

Scott Hollenbeck: True. Just for the record (Mike), it's Scott, Scott Hollenbeck. I want to make sure we get it right for our report.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes.

Man: And Marie if you offer to take it on, I mean it would probably if you are going to try and turn this into a graphic it certainly listen again to what Scott provided us. Because I know reading through (RFC) documents are quite tedious but he really just boiled it down to it's essence for you so.

Marie: Yeah, I've taken good notes but I will listen to it again and then look at my notes and it should come up hopefully something that makes sense.

Man: And honestly it is very intuitive and that is why it is such a widely adapted protocol. It was put together very intelligently and it works well.

Man: All of the adjusted little stupid, Swedish though and that is maybe we are talking here about a registrant email address but on the other hand if were sure that only the registrant apart from the registrant or record and the registry had the auth enter code then that would be a solution as well wouldn't it?

Man: Sure, I believe that gets to (Michael O'Connor)'s point that consideration of a recommendation policy change that says only the registrant is authorized to do the transfer.

Man: Or rather, but a practical measure sort to speak.

Man: But of course this will get us back to if we make the recommendation how is that registrant email made available if it remains behind the scenes in the dot come and dot net world which all -- offense to all the other registry operators, but com and net the biggest kids on the block by far then what do we do to -- you make the recommendation how do you insure that we don't create unintended security issues and everything else (unintelligible) with it only the registrant can make the change or auth info codes only provided to the registrant then how do the automated systems that registrar everywhere have put in place to go out and pull the information and start processing the request. How do they work, there is a disconnect there. There is more to it than just let's only make the registrant we have consider that sort of the implication, how does the registrant contact information, how is that

made available? And that is a pretty significant change in the current process.

Barbara Steele: Would it also have complications for the registrar as well because I'm not really certain how they govern registrar accounts to know for certain who has access to that account and that it is only the registrant that would have access to that account and how you segregate I guess so that only the registrant would have access to that auth info code.

Man: From the registrant standpoint they have pretty significant flexibility in what they want to do. So for example registrar more typically corporate registrar will create security roll accounts so that you can have one account on everything you give various other people access to the account. And you can specify whether or not the person could for example, initiate new registrations and initiate transfers make contact changes, have access to the auth information, so it really depends on the registrar.

Barbara Steele: I would expect that probably larger registrar have more I'll call it infrastructure to be able to do that. Is it reasonable to think that all of the registrars could also without too great of an expense be able to implement a similar type structure.

Mark: I mean it is just adding expense and requiring technical changes to the registrar infrastructure. And then how do you police that? I mean do you have ICANN client teams going in and look at the code that their using to operate their registrar websites. Do you have ICANN setup an account and go in an audit them occasionally. And I think we have to be kind of practical here and not only general create solution that simplify the process instead of more difficult but also think where would

I look toward the practical prospective of you know how does this actually work and it depend on every registrar implementing it how would it be enforced?

Paul Diaz: Yeah, I think (Mark) makes a very good point the other side of the coin of flexibility. Flexibility is good but it also means the flip side that most folks are going to have to do things a little differently and again the focus of this question is to facilitate transfer if we are going to create a system or recommend changes that will ultimately impact multitudes of different, slightly different models where were are not going to be simplifying we are going to be making the process even more complex because you can longer set-up the processes with a one size fits all, which is what we have right now.

(Michael): This is (Michael) (unintelligible), I'm sorry for interrupting, I really am sorry but I am boarding and I'm going to have to turn off the phone pretty soon.

Paul Diaz: Not a problem (Michael) we will are looking at the hour anyway we only have a minute left so.

(Michael): I just wanted to say that make sure that (Mike)'s suggestion was clearly different than with requiring the registrar to initiate the transfer. I just wanted to say make sure that the registrar approves this (unintelligible). I have never had this idea of having a registrant to be the one who initiates it this is new to me I never really had time to explore or none of us have apparently, but I do see potential problems that and implementation just as a user it looks like it would be difficult for registrar to do it. That is about all I can say, sorry for the back ground noise again.

Paul Diaz: No problem (Michael) and thank you for clarifying that I think I did miss state - you have consistently talked about authorization not initiation and that was my misinterpretation of what you said.

I'm looking at the clock folks and we are at the top of the hour so I think we have to draw this one to a close. I think today was an extremely productive session. Again, (Barbara) if you would extend our appreciation to Scott, it was really helpful and thank you to you of course for thinking to bring him onto the call.

Barbara Steele: You're welcome.

Paul Diaz: We have the next call schedule the same time next week, next Tuesday. I would just remind everyone again, we only have about ten days remain before our own constituency statement to do so encourage everyone to be working on them and working on the issues and we will pick up where we are leaving off next Tuesday.

One and all thank you very much and we will talk to you in a week.

All: Thanks, (Paul) bye.

END