GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
30 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 30 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-20080930.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC
Barbara Steele - Registry c.
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC

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

Absent - apologies:
Adam Eisner
Mike O'Connor

Coordinator: The recordings have started sir.

(Paul Diaz):   Thank you. And Glen if you would please, could you do the roll call?

Woman: I'm sorry, Glen just stepped out. Do you have access as well to the

                tool?

(Paul Diaz):   I do.

Woman: I don't have.

(Paul Diaz):   Not a problem. I will read through. On the call today myself (Paul Diaz) as Chair of Network Solutions Representative, the (unintelligible) Constituency.

We also have Kevin Erdman from the IPC, Barbara Steele from the Registry Constituency, Sébastien Bachollet. Did I pronounce that properly (Sébastian)?

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes.

(Paul Diaz):   (Sebastian) you are NCUC or (ALAC)? I'm sorry.

Sébastien Bachollet: ALAC

(Paul Diaz):   We have Mike Rodenbaugh from the Business Constituency, James Bladelfrom the Registrar Constituency.

For staff we have Maria Koningsand Olof Nordling. And Glen I'm sure will be joining us, rejoining us in a moment. And regrets this week from Adam Eisner. Hopefully other colleagues can join. And if there are any other regrets that have been conveyed to Glen she can put them into the record later.

Okay everyone, thank you for being on the call today. A couple issues I'd like to - some administrative issues I'd like to take care of right at the top.

Requests from Marika and the public comment period. If you all have looked at the list we've only received a handful of comments.

Very importantly the intellectual property constituencies already submitted their response, very much appreciate their giving that in as quickly as they have.

A couple other responses unfortunately - sorry about that, unfortunately not very well focused on our particular PDP but (unintelligible) there anyway.

Since we - our publicly published calendar had the comment period due to close on the 29th we are going to close the initial round for now.

Of the course the registries as part of the constituencies have until this Friday. So encourage everybody. I know registrars are finalizing their comments. Other constituencies as well, please get your comments in by the end of those - this week.

But we will sort of close the public one right now. That will give staff opportunity to begin to summarize the responses begin preparing the initial draft.

Another issue, on the list we've been seeking interest from folks on having a meeting while we're in Cairo. We would - we need to come to a decision on this today please. Because again staff will need to make arrangements both finding a room, setting up a bridge for those who won't be joining us to dial in et cetera.

We have questions on the table for everyone. Do you feel that we - it would be beneficial to have a meeting? For what it's worth in my networks solutions capacity I would just say I don't see a big problem in taking a week off. There's certainly a lot of other things going on in Cairo.

However as I noted on the list in (both chair) wide open to whatever the group wants to do, just ask that we make a decision on today's call so that again staff can start making any arrangements if necessary because resources are starting to close up pretty quickly. They need to get a jump on that.

So for those who are on the call today, since we do have, you know, a pretty good number represented, you know, with the - with what I've said, is everybody still basically in agreement with what they had originally posted on the list.

They would like to have a meeting. Please just if you would, you know, quickly chime in or if you've changed your view please let it be known.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. You know, originally I was thinking that it may be a good idea for us to get together. But I think that you made some very good points regarding, you know, just the openness of the meeting. And it may be better to go ahead and take a week off and reconvene after the meetings.

(Paul Diaz): Okay thanks Barbara. Others please.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It's Mike Rodenbaugh. I agree with you (Paul) with Barbara. I think that there's just a really, really packed schedule already in Cairo. And I

know several members of this working group that have been pretty active I think are not going to be there. So I'd just assume put it off a week as well.

(Paul Diaz): Thank you Mike. Others?

Sébastien Bachollet: It's (Sebastian). It's - I agree with you except that I think it could be a good idea if we can even if it's just 10 minutes to gather together just to be sure that we know each other face to face for the one who will be there.

(Paul Diaz): An excellent point (Sebastian). Question for you Mike. The council I know is still working out their agenda for the first weekend. And at some point we will be updating council on the status of this group.

Will we also be presenting at one of the council's public meetings, sort of a quick update for the public? Or how does that work?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well usually yes. Usually there's the working groups do, you know, a longer update session on the weekend meetings so the council can ask questions and all. And then just a brief public update during the public meeting on Wednesday.

(Paul Diaz): On Wednesday. Very good. Okay. I know that they're still working out scheduling. Nothing's been set yet. Obviously we'll communicate that once staff and council have worked it out with the rest of the group.

Mike Rodenbaugh: And, you know, if there's a scheduling conflict on the public update or something, you know, me or somebody else could probably give that.

(Paul Diaz):   Sure, all right.

                 Let's see, others. (James), what are you views?

James Bladel :   I don't have strong feelings in either direction. But I tend to agree with (Sebastian) if we can perhaps informally convene just to put names and faces together. I can't see any harm in that. And it should be a very light requirement in terms of resources. We could even meet in a lobby or for coffee or something.

(Paul Diaz):   Very good point. I know (Kevin) you're on the call. Will you be joining us in Cairo?

(Kevin Urgman): No I won't.

(Paul Diaz):   Won't. Okay, so at best it would be a dial-in for you. All right, well just doing a quick tally we've run through folks, it seems most feel that it's probably better to take a week off from a formal meeting.

                 As the - again, as the schedule gets a little clearer for us all we will, you know, figure out a way, an opportunity for us to informally meet on the margins of whether it's a coffee or one of the meetings or perhaps even if we're given time at that public meeting on Wednesday.

                 So stay tuned for that. But (Marika), at this point I would say you don't have to worry about trying to make any room arrangements or dial-in connections and things like that.

(Marika):   Okay.

(Paul Diaz):   Okay. Face to face, okay. Last issue, just wanted to thank (Marika) and everybody who's helped contribute the diagrams that you've probably seen on the list that spell out the process flow for transfer under EPT have been posted, very useful, very illuminating and I'm sure will be a great help for future PDPs focus on transfer policy issues as well.

If you've not had opportunity, I really encourage everybody to, you know, check. They are both on the wiki and of course on our mailing list.

(Michael Connor) I guess cannot join us today. But I would - I wonder anybody who was involved in the subgroup that he was sort of informally leading, were there any other discussions, subsequent to that first meeting?

From my notes it was - I'm not clear if we decided to hold off on that or if there was going to be any other discussions.

Bottom line the question for the group would be is there anything more to add beyond what (Marika)'s presented us or does that basically flush out and summarize the understanding, the learning that you all gathered?

James Bladel :   (Paul) this is (James).

(Paul Diaz):   (James).

James Bladel :   I wasn't aware of any follow-up meetings beyond just the one. It's possible I wasn't invited.

(Paul Diaz):   No I believe that's right (James). Again my notes aren't the beset, but I think we agreed at the last call to - after the last presentation I guess that was two calls (back). Just hold off and wait.

James Bladel :   And I think that's where it is - it remains.

(Paul Diaz):   Okay. Obviously like everything with this working group it's always open to more information and deeper understanding. So if anything else is developed, you know, certainly communicate it to the group whether on a list directly to (Marika).

We can always add to those wonderful flow charts and graphics if necessary.

Okay those were the just sort of the quick admin things. One thing that we didn't get to last week again with the very, very helpful guest appearance if you will of VeriSign's Scott Hollenbeck, we were also supposed to discuss perhaps having a similar guest appearance from somebody from the (S sec) to help us - illuminate us with some of their findings, research, et cetera on issues that surround domain hijackings and problems with the transfer policy, weaknesses with the policy really with a specific focus on I would think charter question number two that talks about electronic authentication measures.

But honestly, any of the charter questions, the question for the group here is do you all feel that that would be a worthwhile endeavor inviting somebody from (S sec)?

If so, how soon would you like to try and get them? Before the initial

report so that we can incorporate some of those things or perhaps afterwards when we have a better idea of where the community stands on issues and that we can have them tailor their responses through that initial report?

Anybody thoughts? What do you all think would be best?

Man: I have - you made a call last week. I took on the task of reaching out to (Nominus) about their PGP situation. In doing that I went through (Dave Piscatella) who's an ICANN staffer to the (S sec). And he's given me back some information about different electronic authentication methods which I'll send over to the list right now.

I'm just thinking it might be better to just frame a couple of written questions to (Dave) and he can come back to the list with the actual resources that the (S sec) has created in the past.

(Paul Diaz):   Excellent recommendation Mike. Other thoughts? Everybody agree with Mike's idea?

(Marika):   This is (Marika). Just as an add-on, I know Mike you asked us all the question about some more research on the different highjacks that were mentioned in (Dave)'s initial response.

And I did reach out to (Tim Vine) from register.com who was a registrar in question for the ICANN (Iana) highjack.

And (Paul) actually I have sent a message to you as well to the (think network solution) was involved in one of the other ones.

Because there are some reports online about, you know, describing what happened. But I think it would make sense to maybe get the feedback from the actual registrar to see, you know, if - what if anything would have made a difference to prevent those highjacks if there's anything that we could - the group could consider in the work we're doing now.

So I haven't heard anything back yet but I'm still hoping that I would get some feedback on that that, you know, we'll be able to share with the group.

(Paul Diaz): Yes, I'm happy to weigh in as the network's solutions representative now. The case that you're referring to (Marika) dealt with the domain name Comcast.net. Comcast is a large Internet service provider and cable company here in the US back in May.

And I'm reading from a - you know, sort of our press release quote now. At the end of May someone gained access to Comcast account through use of the customer's login information. And then subsequently redirected the DNS pointers.

The domain was - Comcast.net was redirected for about two hours. And we quickly worked with the customer, helped them get their site back online.

It's important to note is that the unauthorized access is not due to a breech in our system. And it was not gained through social engineering on our end.

Some of the public reports were quoting the hackers in fact saying that

they gained network solutions some way. That's patently false.

We network solutions are not at liberty to go into any further detail about what may or may not have happened in Comcast side. But, you know, ultimately it was a weakness on their side. And really that's about all there is to share with the group. Because it wasn't on our side there's really not much learning or knowledge that we can impart for the group.

This particular case is just another example however, of what we've already said in previous calls that email can be a fundamental weak point in the transfer process or management of domain resources for that matter.

And in this particular case it was definitely a shortcoming on the way that the client, the registrant had set up their - or I should say were managing their email account.

So at least for the Comcast example that's about all we have to share and hopefully it's not a whole lot to offer.

For the group I'm not sure about the other examples but we may also find ourselves in a kind of tricky place in that those who were involved or have a lot of information may be very sensitive about imparting too much because then we could be teaching bad guys, you know, how to effectively hack various systems.

James Bladel :   (Paul) this is (James).

(Paul Diaz):   Yes (James)?

James Bladel :   Thanks. That's good information. I know it's a very sensitive area. And without discussing any particular incident I can say that our experience is very similar in that the vast majority of issues with loss of - I want to call it high jacking or loss of control of a domain or its DNS is in the vast majority of cases is traced back to a compromised email address.

And in those cases many of them are through a free email service such as Yahoo!, Gmail...

(Paul Diaz):   Sure.

James Bladel :   ...Hotmail -- those types of things. So what you've described is I think very typical.

(Paul Diaz):   Yes and unfortunate common experience for registrars.

And for the group, you know, this focus in our charter questions by talking about options for electronic authentication is part of the transfer process.

The charter question focuses on email use as part of the transfer process, not the use of perhaps one of these free email accounts just as email account that the registrant decides to us.

Kind of a fundamental distinction because we cannot force the client, the customer, the registrants to use or perhaps not use a particular address. And as we've seen over and over again, the free ones whether it's notable politicians and media people using Yahoo! accounts or folks using Hotmail, Gmail or what have you, it is not very

difficult for somebody with malicious intent to take over that style email account.

And that ultimately throws systems into disarray and unfortunately is - not unfortunately but is truly beyond the scope of what we're trying to do here.

James Bladel : I agree, but it's beyond the scope of issue Number 2. But I would just playing Devil's advocate and not at all suggesting that we go down this path, but I have heard of some situations where different shopping cart vendors and payment processors are starting to discriminate against free mail addresses.

You know, so I think it is possible to make the distinction. I just I'm not sure what the implications would be in our industry. But I think that this is becoming a problem in other industries as well.

(Paul Diaz): Yes, that's a very fair point. And again as we've often touched in the course of our discussions as working group to date, you know, let the market decide.

I am aware of registrars that will as part of the registration process will warn customers about or against the use of free email accounts or will have, you know, text as part of the registration process just, you know, suggesting that, you know, people use an account that they feel is secure that they, you know, can maintain control of. It will not get compromised et cetera.

They might not particularly call out a Hotmail account or a Yahoo! account et cetera, but they are trying to educate the registrant during

the process.

Fundamentally again it's difficult to say you can't use it. And those who are discriminating against, it might be interesting to see, you know, how that effects their business practice.

Again though, for the particular questions that have been put before us and whatnot, I think that starts taking us beyond the scope of our particular challenge here with this working group.

Other thoughts?

(Mark):   This is (Mark). I think it also it is kind of beyond the scope of our mandate. And additionally, you know, to try and implement that type of system, you know, would effectively prevent people who can't afford commercial email from having domain names. It would be a huge political hot button issue were we to attempt even to go down that path.

(Paul Diaz):   Yes and, you know, sometimes it's an excellent point (Mark). And welcome this morning.

Also, you know, a lot of times you hear in the follow-ups, you know, why did somebody use one of these three email accounts. And this - their domain eventually gets hijacked, et cetera.

And the folks often say they use something like that because, you know, they know they're just using that account for the registration purposes. And they don't care if spam goes there.

So of course, you know, it brings us - that's why this is definitely

beyond the scope because it starts introducing all right, so what do you do to mitigate spam and whatnot?

And again, they're market solutions, but it's the simplest way for some people's mind is to just use a free email account. Okay that's their choice. But it, you know, it comes at some risk.

(Mark): Additionally I'd like to point out that a lot of those social engineering techniques work just as well in commercial email accounts as they do on free accounts.

Man: Good point.

(Paul Diaz): Very fair point, yes.

Just to go back to previous question about the (S sec) and Mike Rodenbaugh's offer, you know, once we all have a chance to digest what Mike was provided he'll post it up to a list. Maybe in the intervening week between now and next Tuesday we can think about the questions and on next week's call, work with staff to - work on the call pardon, to, you know, determine what particular questions we put to them, what additional information does the working group feel we need, et cetera.

So that'll sort of be an action item for all of us. Please check the email, you know, digest whatever's been provided by (SX). And then we can figure out how we need to follow-up, how we can tap into their expertise to, you know, help us better understand or answer the charter questions in front of us.

Okay. With all that done then, you know, we've sort of spent most of our time to date focusing on the first two charter questions. There's always things I'm sure that will come up. And by no means do we feel that we need to - that we're done and moving on. Anytime somebody has an additional thought, idea, wants to go back, please raise it.

But I would like to try to start spending a little more time focusing on a third question now, this idea of a partial bulk transfer.

Olof Nordling: (Paul), before we do that...

(Paul Diaz):   Yes Olaf?

Olof Nordling: ...perhaps I could just draw your attention to an email I sent to the list yesterday on - follow-up on what's happening at the (.SC).

And in conclusion there's not much we can learn from that in the sense of nifty way to change registrar. Because registrars as of today have had a very limited role. And indeed it's possible to change. But the information about registrar in their system is only indicative so it has no formal meaning.

But they're on their way to introduce what would be the full fledged registry, registrar solution. And I sent around some information about what their procedures will be for that.

So while just to straighten out a question mark that I heard was posed in a meeting that I didn't attend while I was on holiday, but not much to look for in the sense of clever ideas when it comes to change of registrar or transfers in that context.

Of course they've still got their secure system. But even that it's only based on CA search or something of this sort. So it's - they're planning to improve the security of the system as well. So that's just to round off on that.

(Paul Diaz): Yes and always thank you for following-up Olaf, appreciate the input even if as you say, it might not be super specifically helpful to the particular of this group.

Olaf I did have a question for you. Since data C is one of the higher profile registries that has already implemented DNSSEC.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

(Paul Diaz): Are you at all aware with the behind the scenes management DNSSEC, in any way does a transfer impact that particular security protocol by changing registrars in any way?

My conceptualization of it I'm not sure if it does. But I'm just wondering if perhaps if more registries start implementing DNSSEC, might that impact anything that we're doing here in this working group?

Olof Nordling: Interesting question. It's a bit the world upside down in Sweden because the role of registrars today is basically that they canvas the market and they get hold of the customers. But they - and they frequently provide hosting services and the like.

But formally they haven't been registrars in the GTLD sense up till pretty soon. So - but they've got to be in a (Sec) running. So it's a

follow-up question for me to talk about whether that will be simplified by having the registry registrar model now then when we've got DNSSEC order from the start or whether that would complicate matters.

I don't have enough the (unintelligible).

(Paul Diaz): I don't. I don't have a strong enough tech background in particular with this new protocol. But I mean at least at a simple view it - DNSSEC certainly, you know, meets the definition of electronic authentication measure.

I just don't understand in its implementation if in any way it might be extended in some way that that could be beneficial for the work of this particular working group.

So if you would please, you know...

Olof Nordling: Yes, I'll check up with them. I fear that there's sort of response instituted in questions really. But I'll checkup.

(Paul Diaz): Yes.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: I think really it could be a good question. (Sebastian) sorry. It's a good question for our (Sec) people right? Yes, our (Sec) people because they are working on that issue and they make presentation in that moment. And it could be a very good time to help them about that and to see how it could work.

(Paul Diaz):   A very good point Sebastian. Let's keep that in mind and I will make a note as we - as I said, digest whatever is forwarded to the list and taking our follow-up questions for SSEC. You know, we can include that.

Because I think, and Olaf in no way does that mean that you need to get an answer between now and next Tuesday. You know, we can fold that into the question as well. We're asking, you know, with the (.SC) folks, but more broadly still what is our SSEC user understanding. Very good point. Let's include that.

All right, other thoughts, other issues folks wanted to raise?

All right if we could then, I think we - it would be helpful if we start digging into the - our third question, charter question about partial bulk transfer.

Some of the previous discussions, you know, we've used even the term. You know, we provided a clause at the end of the sentence, transfer of only a number of names but not the entire group of names held by losing registrar.

I know from registrar perspective is we're working on our statement. And just the natural questions come up. Well what is the number of names for example?

You know, it would probably help to start thinking about some of the details about what would be involved here, what would constitute a partial bulk transfer, not that we necessarily have to draft out, flush out.

Still an open question whether this should even be accepted or not, incorporated or not. But, you know, for the record, it would probably be beneficial to have a little more thinking that could be incorporated and reflected in our initial draft because I think there's naturally just more questions get asked when this initial question gets raised.

If anybody is started giving some thought to this, please, floor is open.

Fair enough. I honestly haven't given it a whole lot of though either other than questions about what some of the details might be.

Well let's do this. This is probably, you know, something that we are going to want to address, need to address. So let's consider this some homework for everyone for next week in particular and thereafter.

You know, depending on your constituencies position on the issue, if, you know, you're open to the idea of a partial bulk transfer then, you know, I think we need to start flushing out a bit what that will involve, you know, numbers, just details.

We can't have very lose language in any recommendation in the final report that will go forward.

So, you know, would ask everyone again if you're willing to support the idea then let's start tightening up the language and flushing it out.

And on the other hand of course, if you are against it, if you feel that, you know, the existing policy is fine as it is, partial bulk transfer is not necessary, you know, certainly make that point known why and help

those who might be willing to, to accept it, you know, try and bring them around to your view. We can discuss that more next week.

I hate to keep people. You know, there's no need to have a call just for the call's sake to fill out the hour. Granted, you know, we're only a little past halfway through the meeting.

But, you know, if we're not prepared this morning or today to discuss these issues, I would ask everyone if there are any other issues folks would like to address now. And if not then, you know, why don't we close this one off early this week again, (and for) everybody to get there, constituency statements together, get it in, post it to the list, get it to (Marika) before Friday or by Friday close of business Friday.

And again to start giving some more thought to this third question and then finally to - the third thing - oh, to check the list please for what Mike will post the initial inputs from the (S sec), digest what they provided. And let's think about - talk about next Tuesday what follow-on questions we've had for them.

So again, last call anybody, other issues that we'd like to discuss today?

Fair enough. Then, you know, we know what we need to do between now and next Tuesday. Thank everybody for the time, but let's draw this one to an early close today.

Man: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you (Paul).

Olof Nordling: Thank you (Paul).

(Paul Diaz):   Okay everyone.

Man: Thank you (Paul).

Woman: Thanks (Paul).

Man: Thank you (Paul).

(Paul Diaz):   Have a good now. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

                            END