GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference

9 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 9

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-20080909.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.
Adam Eisner - Tucows
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michael Collins - CBUC

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

Absent - apologies:
Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC

Coordinator: Your recording has started sir.

(Paul): Very good. Thank you. Glen, could we go through the roll call please?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes certainly. On the call we have (Barbara Steele), Registry, Paul Diaz Registrar and leader of the group. (Michael Collins), PBC Business Constituency, (James Bladel, Registrar, Mike Rodenbaugh, Business Constituency, Adam Eisner, Registrar and (Mike O'Connor), Business Constituency. Have I missed anybody? And (Marika) and myself from staff.

(Paul): Very good. Thank you Glen. And you saw (Sebastian)'s note...

Glen DeSaintgery: And (Sebastian) is excused, yes. And probably I think (Wendy Seltzer) too.

(Marika): And Marc Trachtenberg just sent a note saying as well that he will be unable to attend.

(Paul): Very good, okay.

(Marika): In the midst of ongoing litigation.

(Paul): Excellent, okay. Well here we are again folks. I want to thank (Marika) in particular, all staff for getting the public comment period open. We were getting a little concerned there.

I'm not sure what the delay was but we have everything out both to the constituencies and of course now a public comment forum established for this working group's work. This is PDPs work. It literally just started last night so there's nothing there.

I will monitor it regularly and encourage everybody to look at the link that's been provided just to see what other members of the community are suggesting that. And obviously we can discuss any comments that come up on our regular calls.

Again, also just to keep in mind the timeline that we sketched out for our constituency inputs in this first round. We need those in to staff managers. That would be by (Marika) by the 3rd of October.

So just to keep that in mind that deadline will come up pretty fast, don't want to forget. And at least at the beginning we really would like to hold tight to this timeline that we've kind of come through by consensus.

For today's call then if there are any other questions or administrative issues anyone? No, okay. You know, then we might as well I guess kind of return to some of this discussions that we were having.

We were going to move through the three issues that have been set before us. And, you know, we kind of kicked around last time which one to start with.

I guess for simplicity sake we have to address them all so we might as well start with number one. Does anybody really feel strong, would they prefer to start somewhere else?

No. If not then okay, why don't we just take it from the top. You know, our first issue as you'll recall if you do not have it in front of you we're addressing there to take on the question of making registrar and email addresses available so to facilitate transfer requests. As it was noted in

the payment registry models, registrant email address is not a required field in the who is output.

So the question becomes well are there other mechanisms we might avail ourselves of that could make these addresses available to registrars to facilitate us as a transfer? Or perhaps even take up the question of making the registrar email address a required field in the who is output?

Previously we had talked about perhaps leveraging the poll function MEPT. And there was some initial feedback that that might - kind of a neat idea might be a little difficult in terms of implementation.

If anybody has additional thoughts or whatnot, please, I don't want to dominate the call. Please weigh in on Issue 1.

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

(Paul):   Please (James).

(James Bladel: Thank you. I just had a question for just to establish my understanding. Registrar email address is universally across all registrars and across all TLDs being captured and maintained by the registrar. Is that correct or is that an assumption on our part?

(Paul):   Yes. That is my assumption but I would have to think that all registrars for their own records to communicate with their clients with their customers will have that data point in their own databases. Again, the distinction being that there is not a requirement to make that publicly visible via the who is. Does anybody else have a different

understanding?

(James Bladel: That was my understanding as well. I just wanted to make sure that that's not just my looking through a small window at that. I wanted to make sure that's true for all models of registrars.

Woman: Do we have other registers on the call that can confirm for at least their registrar that they are collecting it and have it in their databases?

Adam Eisner: It's (Adam) from (Tucas). We do have that.

(Paul):   Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I guess what we do know is they all at least have an administrative email contact because they do have to put that into (who), right?

(Paul):   That's correct.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm wondering about how often that - those two pieces, essentially two different pieces of data are actually different. Now often they're...

(Paul):   That's a good question as well.

Man: Good question.

(Michael O'Connor):Well then there's also the question - this is (Mike O'Connor), sorry. Isn't there also the question of how often that data is essentially (pulled)?

(Paul): Well but that then starts to touch on the who is issue yes, that we've decided to stay away from.

(Michael Collins): I'm not that's a relevant (unintelligible) transfer. It's probably relevant for some other discussion.

(Michael O'Connor): And I suppose if it's bogus they're never intending it anyway. So maybe we can sidestep it that way too.

(Barbara Steele): Well in some cases it may also be a privacy service. So it's not really clear who the true registrant is.

Man: Yes, right.

Man: Well and we should be careful with that. Again, we're starting to tread into the who is discussion. But in some cases the privacy service is the true registrant.

(Paul): Yes. And at least germane to this discussion I would offer wearing my Network Solutions hat that the required field, the admin contact that we have experienced numerous cases where that address is hijacked in some way off. And somebody will use like a Hotmail account. It's pretty easy to take it over.

They then - the hijacker attempts to process a transfer. And the registrant email trumps. So the true owner, the registrant can come back and challenge the attempt to transfer even if the transfer goes through. They can challenge it.

So from our perspective the - not requiring the publication of the

registrant email is a significant - there's significant security benefit to it.

(Michael O'Connor): You know, that gets me to the question that was sort of on my mind -- again, this is (Michael O'Connor) -- which is can we step back and define the problem that we're trying to solve with this?

Is this an effort to make transfers easier? And the reason I ask that is because I think (Tim) on the last round of this raised the important point that there's always a tradeoff in securities between ease of use and security itself.

And, you know, the point you're raising (Paul), I think is a really important one. Certainly there are lots of instances where having an automated process relying entirely on email could make it much easier to hijack a name which might be setting our cause back depending on what the real - you know, the real underlying problem we're trying to solve is.

(Paul): All good points (Mike). My reading back through some of the old materials prior to this PDP being established, the sense that I have is that the question was developed truly to help facilitate or speed up transfer requests that in some instances if that registrant email is necessary there has to be communication between registers. And there was a - seem to be a community sense of frustration that while many registrars are fine, there's a clear point of contact. They man the phone. They will, you know, work with their colleagues there are a number of registrars who are difficult to get in touch with.

And so I think this question grew out of that sense of frustration. And in some cases it would be so much easier "if they could just reach to

some source and have the data that was necessary available to them to facilitate the transfer request."

Fair enough. I mean it's a legitimate point. However I've already said and I would echo what you've just said, the tradeoff between, you know, making things easy and making things secure need to be in our minds. And certainly we don't want to create a situation through this particular working group or any of the future PDPs for that matter where in the interest of expediency we wind up creating enormous security risks.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes. And when you describe that, you know, in a way that underlying problem might not be the email address. The underlying problem might be the unresponsive registrar. And that maybe we should tease that apart and see if this is really the right way to solve that problem.

(Barbara Steele): I guess that was going to be my question as well. And I don't know if we can get some input from the various registrars on this. And that is to the extent that a transfer request is initiated by the registrant, I mean today, how do you go about doing that validation?

Is it simply an outreach to the registrar of record to obtain that information, to do a manual validation?

(Michael Collins): This is (Michael Collins). I think I may have another - be aware of another problem that this addresses.

Okay. Can you all hear me? I can ever remember whether I'm muted or not yet.

(Paul): No, we hear you (Mike). (Mike), just before we raise your point of (Mike) if I can ask...

(Michael Collins): Go ahead. No problem.

(Paul): (Adam) or (James), I was going to respond to (Barbara) but I wanted to give you guys a chance (Barbara)'s question about current process and a manual validation process, the transfer request. Can you speak to that?

Man: I missed the first half of what she was -what (Barbara) was describing.

(Paul): (Barbara) if you could just...

(Barbara Steele): Do you want me to paraphrase or do you want me to...

(Paul): Yes, if you could just say it again for the rest...

Man: Sorry.

(Barbara Steele): Okay, basically the question I had is for the registrars. And today when a registrant initiates a transfer request, how does the registrar that's gaining that domain name go about validating with the registrar of record, the email address of the registrant?

(Paul): Exactly.

(Barbara Steele): I mean what is the manual process in place? I'm assuming it has to be manual in all cases because not everybody has a, you know, the

registrant email address published even though it sounds like some of the registries that are thick registries actually do make that information publicly available.

Man: I'd have to actually check with my transfer team to be honest. I think there were a couple of different ways they might go about that.

(Michael Collins): I may be able to answer that as well. This is (Michael Collins) again. Having recently transferred a few hundred of my own domain names, I do not think that the registrant has to be a party to the initiation of the transfer or the approval. It's the admin contact that does that.

As an admin you can initiate a transfer and approve it. However, the registrant can block it or nix it.

But if the registrant does not, a transfer can be completed. And then the registrant can potentially ask that the transfer be reversed.

You know, and I think that's where part of the problem lies is that some of - and I'm talking about from my experiences aftermarket, dealing in aftermarket domain names is that, you know, once the transfer's been completed that, you know, that a transfer of, you know, that's essentially delivery of the goods and oftentimes the seller is paid.

And the seller, you know, if the domain has been hijacked, the admin contact, you know, may not in fact be the registrant.

I mean there is the security issue. But there is also the case that one can argue that, you know, that the registrant didn't stop the transfer. I

mean it just creates a lot of confusion when you can't get an affirmation that the person initiating and approving the transfer were not authorized to do so. It's just...

(Barbara Steele): Right. I mean I understand.

(Michael Collins): ...it creates a question of who really owns and controls the domain name.

(Barbara Steele): Right. I mean I am definitely aware that the admin contact, you know, obviously has the right to initiate a transfer or authorize a transfer as well.

But, you know, the registrant also has that right. And in fact, you know, if there is a dispute over whether or not the domain name should have been transferred, the registrant has the ability to trump if you will the admin contact.

(Michael Collins): And but the approval request will always go to the admin has been my experience.

(Barbara Steele): Okay.

(Michael Collins): By - from the gaining registrar, the gaining registrar will send an approval request to the admin contact, not to the registrant.

So if you don't have the admin contact you can - the registrant can probably block the transfer but I'm not sure the registrant can successfully complete a transfer because the admin contact still has to approve it. That's been my experience.

(Barbara Steele):   Does that seem to be consistent across all registrars?

(Michael Collins):   At least the two or three that I've worked with recently. I can't speak for more than that. We have some other registrar people that might be able to answer that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Go back. It's Mike Rodenbaugh. Maybe we should go back and determine what was the original purpose of the administrative contact. It sure seems to mean that one of the reasons was to be able to approve or reject transfers.

And this whole issue about, you know, there being two different potentially authoritative email addresses is really the root of the problem here. Maybe the answer is to just make the administrative contact more clearly authoritative than it already is today.

(Paul):   That's an interesting point (Mike). Well of course and I just wonder, I don't have in front of me the other issues that will be taken up in future PDPs.

I think this particular question of, you know, the admin versus the registrant what was the original thinking on that, that particular question while very important is beyond the scope of our particular working group.

But I wonder, I'm not sure if it's going to be addressed in one of the future PDPs. And if not, could we perhaps get it into one of those future charters?

Does anybody by any chance have the other PDPs, the questions that will be addressed available...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Paul): ...available?

(Michael O'Connor): Yes. This is (Mike O'Connor). I'm just quickly reading through it. Do you want me to just briefly remind you of what those other ones are?

(Paul): Sure (Mike). Why don't you let us know. I'm going through my old notes too. I think I have it somewhere.

(Michael O'Connor): Well there's a background, under the background documents on the - on our wiki page there's a link to the policy issues, PDP Recommendations Report March, 19 March. And that's what I'm reading from.

I don't think I want to read them all from you. Let me just - oh, here it is.

(Paul): Yes.

(Michael O'Connor): PDP...

(Paul): On B7. That's what I was looking at as well, right.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes. I think that - okay.

(Paul): Yes, for everybody, PDP B7, the question specifically will state quote, whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are

needed especially with regard to disputes between a registrant and admin contact.

The policy is clear that a registrant can overrule the admin context. But how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar.

So at least looking at it quickly I think what the two (Mike)s and (Barbara), what we were just discussing right now will be addressed there. And again, well it's a good question I think that is really kind of beyond our charter in this particular working group.

(Michael O'Connor): Now, I just think that maybe we should note that there could be relation...

(Paul): Oh, okay.

(Michael O'Connor): Resolution of that B7 issue could actually resolve this issue.

(Barbara Steele): But does it actually resolve it or does it just, you know, beg the question as to, you know, whether or not, you know, either one could initiate an offer as a transfer?

Man: That's really the root of the problem in my mind because how that became the case and whether that makes sense. I mean, but shouldn't there just be one authoritative person for every domain name?

(Michael O'Connor): I think there may be one of what happens if that authoritative email address gets hijacked.

Man: That's the question that were faced with.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes. And, you know, that gets us back to this tradeoff between ease of use and security I think.

Like I admit to having a change of opinion on that when I was originally looking at this. I was gunning pretty hard for ease of use.

Man: I think we should not jump to conclusions on what would be easier and what would be jeopardizing security. We should really just get the options out there that. We (have to) really come up with it.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes, that's too. I have a question about that which is is there kind of a process diagram of all the little steps that happened back and forth?

One of the things I'm finding really hard to keep track of is sort of who does what first to whom. I'm just wondering if there's a diagram that's out there that I could go look at that would help me navigate the conversation. Has anybody ever done that?

(Barbara Steele): I'm not aware of one.

(Paul): Yes, that's a good question. I'm not aware of one either.

Man: Would that be a useful thing for maybe a subset of us to go off and try and just maybe over the next week try and sketch out a little diagram that we could use as a basis for discussions?

Because it would at least make it easier for me to say ah, that's the link that we want to make sure does (thus and so) rather, you know, rather than...

(Michael Collins):   That would be beneficial not only to this work group but possibly to future work groups.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes. I mean I'd be happy to sort of - I'd need to have a person who actually has some knowledge of working with me. I'd be happy to take a crack at drawing such a thing. But we could use some smart people to tell me which thing came first.

And I'm not sure we need to do it on the call but maybe between now and next week try and get something like that out there.

(Michael Collins):   I'd be willing to help you get a register on board that might add a little more credibility since my limited experience is (unintelligible).

(Michael O'Connor): Well and again we can always edit it. You know, I wouldn't feel like we need to have the definitive answer but maybe in a couple of tries we could get to something that we could throw up on the screen and say okay, now we're talking about this part of the process. So it's just a thought. I'd be happy to help with that.

(Paul):   (Michael)...

(Michael Collins):   I'm sorry.

(Paul):   No problem (Michael). I was just going to ask that one of the other registrars, do you have any bandwidth to help with this?

Adam Eisner: I can help out that.

(Paul):   (Adam), okay.

(Michael Collins):   Thank you.

(Paul):   Then (Adam) if you would, you know, working with the two (Mikes) -
                     two of the three. This is going to be very confusing.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes, you can call me (Mikey) if you want to. That always helps just
                     a little bit.

(Paul):   With (Michael Collins) and (Mike O'Connor).

Adam Eisner: Yes.

(Paul):   You know, and don't kill yourself but I think you all make an excellent
                     point that not only will it help here because these issues are going to
                     come up in the future PDPs whether we're all part of those or just
                     maybe helping out your colleagues in the future as well - much
                     appreciated.

Adam Eisner: Great.

(Marika):   And this is (Marika). I'm happy to help as well where needed from a
                     staff perspective.

Adam Eisner: All right.

(Barbara Steele):   I'm happy to provide input as well from a registry perspective. This
                     is (Barbara).

Adam Eisner: Great.

(Paul):   There we go. Awesome teamwork. Okay.

(Michael O'Connor): Can we quickly pick a time that we can get together? You know, I've got a conference - well I've got a domestic US conference bridge that we could use. But maybe we can get GNSO call going sometimes Thursday or Friday this week. Friday is wide open for me.

(Barbara Steele):   I can't do Friday I'm afraid.

(Michael O'Connor): How about Thursday?

(Marika):   I'm happy for you guys as well to go ahead and, you know, (my) support where you need it.

Man: Thursday's for me in particular are super.

(Michael Collins):   Works for me.

(Barbara Steele):   (Unintelligible) Thursday's as well.

(Michael O'Connor): Thursday, same time as this call?

(Michael Collins):   Okay.

(Barbara Steele):   That's fine. All right.

(Michael O'Connor): (Marika), could you chase down a conference call bridge for us so that we could...

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do that (Mike).

(Michael O'Connor): Oh wonderful Glen. That would be great. And maybe we'll try the Adobe gizmo as a way to see the same thing on the screen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, so just a bit before the time I connect with you to get the Adobe up I'll send out the same link.

(Michael O'Connor): Terrific.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks (Mike).

(Michael O'Connor): Let's schedule an hour. I think we'll make a lot of progress in that hour.

(Paul):   Okay, excellent work guys. And obviously, you know, if you have anything to report back feedback to us, you know, post it to the email list and we'll look forward to going through it whenever it's available.

(Michael O'Connor): Well will for sure have something for next week's call.

(Paul):   Wonderful.

Okay, going back through my notes (Michael), I realize I cut you off a ways back just to try and come back to (Barbara)'s question. But I'm not sure perhaps you got the question subsequently. (Michael Collins), did we address your first thought or do you want to have the floor again?

(Michael Collins):   I apologize. I (unintelligible) listen to the previous conversation.

(Paul):   No problem. I'm sure it will come back.

                      All right, and (Barbara) then just from Network Solutions perspective,
                      my understanding is that when we have these instances that we have
                      to reach out manually to another registrar to facilitate a transfer request
                      that colleagues in our customer service, you know, they have a
                      database of points of contact. But there are instances where they're
                      dealing with a new registrar for the first time.

                      In those cases we will first turn to the ICANN provided radar database
                      registrar or something or other database. I'm sorry, I forget what the
                      acronym spells out but it's a - something made available to registrar's
                      that's supposed to include up to date points of contact.

                      Unfortunately still we find that there are some instances when a
                      number that's there doesn't go through. And then, you know, we
                      ultimately end up playing, you know, who is 6 degrees of separation.
                      Who knows somebody that can get us in touch with someone at that
                      registrar.

                      So in some cases we ourselves experience the frustration that I think is
                      coming through in this particular issue number one question that, you
                      know, oh we only wish there was some other way to do this rather than
                      playing telephone tag with a whole bunch of different parties. But at
                      least that's been our experience.

                      And again, for the vast majority of the cases, you know, we either have
                      an existing relationship or we can draw upon that ICANN provided

resource and get in touch with the person we need to and facilitate the transfer request.

(Paul):   Yes I - please (Barbara) or (Michael), who...

(Michael Collins):   (Barbara) go ahead.

(Barbara Steele):   Okay, I believe and I'm not sure if it's the transfer policy itself or if it's the transfer dispute policy that stipulates that each registrar should have a transfer point of contact to which inquires can be directed. It may very well be the dispute resolution policy.

But what I'm wondering is maybe is that something that we could expand to also allow for, you know, a validation of registrant email address in those cases where, you know, it's required to validate that on the part of the gaining registrar?

I believe that enquiries to those transfer points of contact are required to be responded to within a certain period of time. Again, enforcement may be an issue but it may be at least a possibility.

I believe that ICANN actually publishes those lists of transfer points of contact for each registrar as well.

(Paul):   Yes, they certainly do through the radar database. I don't know if they're still publishing it sort of in a - to an open environment. Because you do need to login with a password and ID.

(Barbara Steele):   Yes I know from our registry perspective we rely on them too, you know, periodically provide us with an update. And if we haven't

received one in awhile we will reach out to them too, you know, to get the most up to date listing.

(Paul): And by any chance does anybody have knowledge to address (Barbara)'s question, where in existing policy we would find, you know, have it spelled out where, you know, there is an obligation to provide an accurate and current point of contact?

I don't. I will have to look it up. I was hoping maybe somebody knew the answer.

(Michael O'Connor): Or do you say where is that obligation? Is that the question (Paul)?

(Paul): I think so (Mike), whether it's in the transfer policy itself or the dispute resolution policy and...

(Michael O'Connor): I think it's in the RAA and by extension the registration agreement.

(Paul): Yes. I think it also appears in one of the policies specifically focused on transfers as well. Clearly in RAA there were always be an obligation to have accurate contact information.

But I think we can get even closer with something. I'll take that on and, you know, find the citation for discussion so that we can determine maybe that's part of the solution here, getting some enforcement compliance around those obligations.

(Michael Collins): This is (Michael) again. Sort of in a different direction here than a point of contact. I think that I can summarize the problem I think needs to be solved (to us). And I'm not opposed to pushing it off on the

following PDP if it's more appropriate.

But I think the problem is back to the security issue is the dependability of a transfer that's occurred. You know, just because a transfer has occurred today -- we remember that the registrant has the ultimate authority not the admin contact -- is that a registrant does not have to participate in the transfer. They do not have to initiate it, nor did they have to approve it for a transfer to occur.

So it seems like a just a real problem with the system where the registrant being the authoritative contact it will not required to be a part of the transfer so that so it's a security issue. The fact that the - a transfer can occur without dependably knowing that the authoritative contact has approved it.

And so then you end up with disputes that are unnecessary or the potential for disputes that are unnecessary. And whether we solve it resists registrant email publication or whether it's solved through, you know, some successive policy. I think that's what we have to look at avoiding unauthorized transfers not trying to correct them after they occur.

(Paul):   Other thoughts, responses?

Man: I agree and I would just like to point out that any time any approval process that uses email is probably vulnerable to those types of problems.

(Michael O'Connor):Yes and I'd - this is (Mike O'Connor). I think the PDP Number 7 question is really the one that nails that issue (Michael). It really does

say whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfer are needed especially with regard to disputes between registrant and admin contact. I think that's really where that one gets addressed.

I think this one originally was really trying to solve the ease of use unresponsive registrar problem rather than the contention between registrant and admin contact problem.

And it may be that they're just so closely coupled that we need to acknowledge that.

But at least the weight it sits right now I think the issue you're raising (Michael) gets handled in PDPB.

(Paul):   Yes (Mike), I agree for both (Michael)'s and would ask (Michael Collins), you know, for the record if you could at your first convenience, put together a quick email to our list raising the concern that you have.

(Michael Collins):   I will.

(Paul):   That way it's a matter of record. And when we develop both our initial report and a final report, you know, we'll be sure that this point doesn't get lost in the discussion because it is an important flag for that PDP, the forthcoming letter B Number 7.

You know again, I don't really believe it's within our manage to dig into right now but it's certainly something we should be making clear for (unintelligible) to work.

(Michael Collins):   All be happy to (unintelligible).

(Paul):   Okay. Very good discussion so far folks. Other thoughts here? Other issues to raise?

Are we fairly confident that the discussions we had previously about perhaps using EPP and the reasons why we really may not be able to use EPP? Are we all comfortable with the -where we stand on that discussion or do we need to revisit it or perhaps debate it some more?

(Michael O'Connor): This is (Mike O'Connor). And again if my ignorance is a problem for the group I'm happy to step back. But I just don't know the difference between a registrar, a thin registrar or registry where ETP fits in, that whole constellation of...

Man: (Unintelligible) and stuff of course?

(Michael O'Connor): Yes, you know, I mean need someone to take me by the hand offline and just walk me through all that.

I would hate to - I guess the reason I raise that is because I would hate to miss an opportunity just because we missed seeing a way to get it done because we didn't understand the - all the possibilities.

(Barbara Steele):   I can give you the nutshell version of the difference between thick and thin. Basically all registrars would need to be thick because they would they would have registrant data within their database.

A registry is thick if they too have the registrant data and, you know, all the various contact information for deleting in the database.

It would be considered a thin registry if there is no registrant data available in the database.

So I believe most of the registries out there are thick at this point. Verisign I can say however is still operating a thin registry. So we would have information only relative to the domain name, the registrar that is managing that domain name as well as name server, create dates -- that type of information. Does that help to clarify?

(Michael O'Connor): Yes, that sure does. Thanks a lot (Barbara). That's terrific.

(Paul): And like ETP - okay that...

(Michael O'Connor): (That) supports a thick registrar registry right?

(Paul): Well (Mike) - I'm sorry (James). Who's jumping on?

(James Bladel: This is (James). Yes (Mike). The differences or one of the practical implications of what (Barbara) described is that when let's say between we have a customer of ours at Go Daddy that wants to transfer a domain to (Paul)'s registrar, the registrant information is not held by the registry. So ours systems actually have to do a who is query with (Paul)'s systems. So it's a - there's an intra registrar communication component as well.

(Michael O'Connor): So is there an elephant in the room? I hate to bring this up. You can throw things at me if you want. But what if Verizon's registries became thick?

Man: Verisign.

(Michael O'Connor): Verisign. Working on cell phone today, sorry. Verisign. I mean is that just - I don't know, I mean maybe that's nuts, but it seems like we're sort of tiptoeing around that. And maybe that's something that it's probably outside the scope of this particular question but is that what we're tiptoeing around?

Man: But would that solve this problem?

Man: I don't see how.

(Michael O'Connor): Well it would provide a mechanism to avoid the registrar, registrar query which is what we're doing now. Because now they could go query the registry correct?

I mean I don't want to derail the conversation folks.

(Paul):   Right. I think that it's - this particular question comes up in so many different forms it is really just outside of the scope of this PDP getting Verisign to become a thick - adopt a thick registry model.

I guess just for the argument's sake here in our particular PDP, if we were to be - wave our magic wand and voila there it is, now Verisign is a thick registry model, we would have to wave the want a second time say oh, and by the way, all the data that is now required to be published would look like the other thick registry models in which case this question could become moot because the registering contact - the registering email would now be, you know, one of those required who is output fields.

But again that's the question of moving Verisign to a thick registry is well beyond the scope of this - of our work - the work before us.

Man: At least be noted as something that we've got.

(Paul):   Yes. Okay, very good point.

(Michael O'Connor): What and - you know, it would be interesting to know - I mean again, I'm a business guy and I understand the need to justify financially and operationally a suggestion.

But it would be interesting to know sort of the list of issues that could be addressed by that, not just this one but, you know, you mentioned others and essentially build a case for Verisign to make this decision.

Man: No you're definitely outside the scope.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes.

(Barbara Steele):   And I can - I'd like to just chime in for a moment here. I mean there has been historically I guess some arguments why Verisign should not be a thick registry. Some of those may have gone away with the divestiture of any registrar interest that we've held in the past.

But I do know that there were concerns regarding Verisign having registrant details at one point.

(Michael O'Connor): I'll give it one more and then I absolutely promise I'll stop disrupting your group (Paul). If we don't do that here but we raise it, what would be the mechanism to have that conversation?

Man: If the question - issues report from staff if you got enough votes on the council that would kick off this sort of process or we could discuss it, you know, if we're also just informally. But if we're interested...

(Michael O'Connor): Okay, that's enough disruption. Thanks folks.

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, they're good questions (Mike). That's not a problem. But is Mike Rodenbaugh. But I mean that's the way you would handle it, might be a pretty tall mountain to climb I think.

(Barbara Steele):   I'm sure there would be a lot of discussions (facing this). And I won't, you know, side rail the conversation here rather because I do feel that it is outside of this particular, I guess, charter.

(Michael O'Connor): Yes, clearly true. Sorry gang. I'll be quiet.

(Michael Collins):   May I ask for some background information on the unresponsive registrar? I'm not aware of this extent of the problem. Is it the who is that's not available? Is that the unresponses issue?

(Paul):   In the case of a thin registry that would be one potential issue.

(Michael Collins):   That the admin contact would not be available, they would not be - if it was public who is available that would disclose the admin contact. Is that one of the issues?

                If it is, I think we could address it a lot more directly than this.

(Paul):   Yes I'm sorry I'm still not quite sure I'm - so I think in a - when we're

dealing with thin registries or even if it's a...

(Michael Collins):   Thick or thin registries I suppose would be the most appropriate one. When I heard that the real background to the problem that brought up the discussion of this - of our first issue here was unresponsive registrars. And my question is unresponsive in what way? I'm unaware of the problem. I'm just trying to learn more.

Is it that the admin email address is not available through who is? Because that's the first responsibility I suppose of the losing registrar is just to have admin who is address available to the gaining registrar.

(Barbara Steele):   The admin address should be available. I believe the registrant address is the one that's not available.

(Michael Collins):   Right. I understand that. But I'm saying that - but I'm hearing that the background to this really is just that the registrants are non-responsive. And that answers my question is on unresponsive or non-responsive and to what information, to what - in what manner?

(Paul):   This is (Paul) and I'll wear my Network Solutions hat. What I've heard from my customer service colleagues, the unresponsiveness comes in - it could be an instance where the information is masked behind privacy service and you need to reach out to a registrar colleague to get the information that's behind that privacy.

(Michael Collins):   Well is that part of the responsibility for removing that privacy borne on the registrant or the admin contact that's initiating the transfer or no or you're - or is that part of the unresponsiveness of the registrar that they're not removing it at the request of the registrant?

(Paul):   And you just answered yes. It could be the case. I mean typically, you know, the customer if they had a privacy service will understand if I want to move it out I have to remove that service so that we can, you know, get the ball rolling so to speak.

And if the registrar of record, you know, is putting up any sort of road block, yes, that could be an issue. And so the gaining registrar if it were us, we would try and help the customer and, you know, communicate with the registrar record trying to work it out.

And sometimes we simply can't get through whether they're not responsive in some way.

(James Bladel: This is (James). I'd like to just point out that in the cases where certain privacy services are the registrant of record, and for example in our privacy service the privacy's - one of the terms is the privacy service rejects all transfer requests.

So it needs to be, as you said (Paul), it needs to be removed. And the onus is on the, let's call it the beneficial user or the customer of the privacy service to remove that before requesting a transfer.

(Paul):   Yes. And underscore obviously this shouldn't become a discussion on the merits or details of various privacy services. But obviously there are many different models in the marketplace right now -- privacy, proxy, what have you.

You know, in some cases the way a particular registrar has - is operating that system would be easier or more difficult for use (James)

terms, the beneficial user to remove the service in order to expedite the transfer.

If they're having a hard time, maybe they just don't understand, don't want to deal with it, therefore they ask the gaining registrar to get involved, try and help them work it out. In some instances, you know, there are complications and difficulties.

(Michael Collins):   Thank you. That helps me to understand the background a lot (better).

(Paul):   Okay.

We - in our charter in the template the second bullet point we ask folks to identify examples of best practices, examples or part and - examples or best practices, the email address used to facilitate automated approval.

Has anybody given any thought, want to start a discussion on what some of those best practices may be?

You know, I agree with (James) noted earlier that, you know, any time we're dealing with an email based authorization process that there are opportunities for mischief and problems.

So the question becomes, you know, what might be done or what is currently being done. And, you know, we've drawn real well the examples to hopefully better secure the use of email.

(Michael O'Connor):One of the things in the security world that people often suggest is

that they're out of band channels. So that if you're doing something by email there's at least one confirmation that's not using email but using say Web or telephone, using a different channel to make it harder to do the whole transaction with just one just by cracking one vulnerable component, in this case email.

Are there examples of that out there in the registry, registrar community that we could point to? Because I think out of band stuff is a good way to improve security. And if it's done well could still make, you know, make it fairly easy and quick to use.

(Paul): Well it's probably not the best example. But there is quite a bit of direct registry to registrant communication occurring in some of the country codes such as Canada dossier. Is that something like what you're thinking of (Mike)?

(Michael O'Connor): Well know. I was thinking a bit more mechanically. You know, if I'm fiddling around with my bank account online and somebody gets my Web password and the whole conversation takes place via that Web dialogue, that's not as secure as if when I'm conversing with my bank I do some stuff by the Web. But then they send me an email that I have to confirm...

(Paul): Right.

(Michael O'Connor): ...using a different band.

(Paul): But what I'm getting at is for dossier there are some transactions that are initiated with the registrar. And then the registrant and is prompted to go to the registry Web site and log into their account there and

confirm with their registry.

So they have to kind of confirm with two parties or I think this is especially true when creating a new registration and dossier that requires - is (Adam) or anybody more familiar with dossier?

Adam Eisner: Yes, I was just going to say that on a high level that certainly it is a good example of another out of band channel. But it's also an example of sort of arduous process...

(Paul): Yes...

Adam Eisner: ...that drives registrants crazy.

(Paul): It's not painless.

Adam Eisner: It's more secure, yes. But the pain level both on the administration level for a registrar and the just I don't understand at all level for a registrant is a mess. And seriously, you know, anyway, I could go on...

(Michael O'Connor):I think if we could find some good examples where, you know, it was both secure and easy.

Man: Yes. I mean (James)'s reference is a good example of something - the spirit of what they're trying to do I think is good. Unfortunately both, you know, CA, UK, things like that where you do go out of the regular channels does make it mind-bendingly confusing for most registrants.

(Michael Collins): This is (Michael Collins) here. (Mike), my understanding is while it might not be foolproof there already is some out of channel. But you

cannot completely initiate a transfer by email at least not - I don't think with most registrars.

With most registrar's you're going to have to get an off code by some means other than email typically logging into your account on the Web and acquiring the off code and then going to the, you know, that's just losing registrar and then going to the gaming registrar and initiating a transfer.

And then an email confirmation comes - a confirmation of that transfer request comes to the admin content by email typically.

(Michael O'Connor): See that maybe the...

(Michael Collins):   That may not be enough that that's I think...

(Michael O'Connor): Well, you know what I was thinking is that, you know, where we are concerned in this question is if by making that email address available too easily, you make it too easy for somebody to hack an email account and steal a domain.

But if we could verify that simply hacking an email account is not sufficient to steal a domain because of this out of band stuff then we could get friskier on the ease of use side and not worry quite so much about the security side.

That again is where it would be nice to sort of have an understanding of the process.

Because if there's an out of band process built into this already then

we might be able to be more relaxed about automating the email transfer process.

(Barbara Steele):   It's my understanding as well that EPP registries also require the off info code as part of the command that's submitted in order to initiate the transfer from the registrar to the registry. And that off info code is used to also validate and authenticate the transfer.

(Michael O'Connor):Can people get us info codes strictly through email or do they have to log into a account at a registrar (again)?

(Barbara Steele):   That I would have to defer to the registrars to answer because I'm not sure. I know that registrar are required to provide off info codes to registrants. The mechanism that they use in order to securely do that, I don't know, can we have a registrar speak up on that item?

(Michael Collins):   I don't believe we would send that out via email.

(Michael O'Connor):Could I get in - could I hack into an account at your registrar if I had the email account?

You know, you read the stories of how people take over domain names. And the one I kind of vaguely remember is some guy's Google mail account got appropriated by a bad guy. And the bad guy then was able to change everything in the account at the registrar and then essentially take over the email account and the account in the out of band communication.

(Paul):   Everyone, I hate to do this because this is a very good conversation. I'm making notes so that we can continue it next week. But it's the top

of the hour. Unfortunately I have another call that I have to be on and actively participate in.

So I have to ask that we push the pause button on this one and, you know, let's continue this discussion next week's call.

Perhaps also gives everybody an opportunity to go back and figure out what their organizations are doing for registrars and, you know, come back and be able to respond to this.

I have some initial thoughts (Mike) but I wanted to confirm with the colleagues who actually do the sorts of things before speaking. So I'll make sure I have a definitive answer from a Networks Solutions perspective.

But, you know, again, this I think is a very, very productive call -- lots of good thoughts and discussions.

Would also ask that you know, as we said earlier and anybody for the record, you know, ideas and thoughts that you're raising so that we're sure nothing gets lost.

It's always a lot easier when we're doing the various summary reports to refer to written comments not just having to plow through these MP3 recordings.

So if you can, feel free. Post your thoughts, your ideas to the mailing list. Get them out there and get the debate so that again, we're sure that we have everything accurately captured for the reports for the record.

And with - yes?

(Michael O'Connor): One quick note. (Marika) has sent me three examples of the processes. (Marika), could you just fire those off to the list? I think they're great examples. They have some conflicts in them but they'd be terrific for our call on Thursday and might be beneficial for the rest of the folks to see as well.

(Marika): Okay. I can send it around but would you like me to have a go at trying to combine these so it might not be necessary to have that call and then we could maybe work on it by email or...

(Michael O'Connor): Well why don't you have a go at combining them but then let's have a call around it anyway.

(Paul): Sure. I think that's a great idea. Do both. And don't kill yourself trying to figure out differences and whatnot (Marika). I think just presents the information, put it there on the list for everybody to see. And then this little subgroup can thrash through it and hopefully develop the insights that we're looking for.

(Marika): Okay. I will already forward now what I just sent to (Mike) and (Paul) during the call, so send it to the group.

(Paul): Fantastic. All right everybody, thank you very much for your time. We'll be back this same time next week. You all have a good week. We'll talk to you then.

Man: Thanks (Paul).

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

END