ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO - CPH TechOps Meeting Session 3
Sunday, 21 October 2018 at 13:30 CEST
Note: 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Marc Anderson: Okay good afternoon everyone this is Marc Anderson and welcome back to the afternoon session of the ICANN 63 Tech Ops Group Meeting.

This afternoon we have a panel or not a panel, a discussion. We have a topic hosted by Roger and Jody. And so I guess Roger are you going to start? Jody is going to start. Okay so I will turn it over to Jody who will lead us through this next session on registry mapping and registry transitions. So over to you, Jody.

Jody Kolker: Thanks Marc. Can everybody hear me? I hope so. So this is a topic that we have covered before. I think the first time we covered it was Amsterdam was just a start and then in Vancouver we went through kind of a registry – pain points for registry transitions or just implementing TLDs with new registries and then moving TLDs from one backend to another and the pain point.

So what Roger and I would like to do here is I am going to go through a quick summary here of what we found in the past.

We will go through – we will run through a summary as slow as I can and then Roger will run through the registry mapping that Roger and (unintelligible) have been working on in the IETF which will solve some of these.

But then we would like to kind of do what we did this morning. The breakout session maybe one or two or two or three groups and just basically discuss how can we address some of these problems? And are there any other problems that we may have missed on this list because I am sure it is not complete. The summary that I have here.

So maybe 15, 20 minutes here and then 30 minutes as a group. And then come back and do the same thing we did this morning. And hopefully we will solve world peach or something and we will all be much happier. If you can go to the next slide slowly.

So here are some of the pain points we have during transitions or implementations. One of the first things is command request and response formats. They can differ between registries and when a TLD is moving from one backend to another you can get differ error codes, et cetera. Or the commands just basically work differently too.

And it would be nice to be able to figure out what those are before we get into production. You know be able to test that out in OT&E. OT&E environments what we found, a complaint that we have had is there is not enough time to test it in OT&E.

And then what we found is that the differences between OT&E and the actual prod environment can differ greatly actually. Or basically all of a sudden you are live and your customers suddenly they have done something that you haven't been able to test in OT&E. And it is different between OT&E and in prod. So obviously something we want to avoid.

The premium – go ahead.

Richard Merdinger: Thanks. This is Rich. As an example of when they are different we will find TLDs that set up their OT&E environment. And if you said this I apologize I didn't hear it.

But basically they set it up for sample TLD as opposed to having the actual TLD running. So we switch over and there can be mistakes in configuration files where the wrong strings are being used because we had to customize it for like dot sample or something along those lines.

So it is not just that the code base is different. They are configured differently requiring a reconfiguration. So the first time they are really tested is in prod.

Jody Kolker: Thanks Rich that is absolutely true. Premium names what we have found too is that in OT&E there isn't a list of premium names that we can actually register or there might be three.

What we would like to be able to have is the same premium names that are available and live to be available to be registered in OT&E too in order to test the different tiers, the different price points, et cetera.

We have different EPP logs – portal logins for individual TLDs. This is kind of a bit of pain point. If a backend provider has 50 TLDs there might be 50 logins, user names and passwords which becomes very operationally expensive when you need to change the passwords. Doing that 50 different times is time consuming work.

Contact validation differences can be – can happen when we are moving between TLDs. We have seen this with some registries. TLD will move from one end back into another and suddenly we are not able to register domains because we were accepting this format and we were able to register the domain name with those contacts in the old system but in the new system it is not allowed.

Contact might ID migrations have been a little painful. What are the new contact IDs in the new system? I am not sure how to solve that issue.

Transition timing. We would really like it to occur on a Tuesday or Wednesday not on a Saturday.

It kind of makes it rough when you spend all Saturday fixing things and then you wake up on Sunday and you still have problems. It would be nice to have that on Tuesday or Wednesday so we got the whole week and we have our whole staff there so we can address any issues that may come up.

Communication for transitions. Sometimes the documentation is relatively sparse about when it is going to happen, how we are going to do it, et cetera. And we would just like to be notified months in advance of this of the transition.

One of the things we have talked about too is an open call during the actual transition just in case there are problems. It doesn't need to be constant we are doing this, we are doing that. It is just was there an issue instead of waiting for an email to come out to say, hey we are going to be two hours behind or something like that.

Go ahead Rich.

Richard Merdinger: And to throw out again this is Rich again real quick. It is not so much that we want to be on a call so we can hear when the registry has had a problem.

One of the big questions is we are seeing a problem. Are other registrars seeing it? Crap. No? It is us. And it really helps us get to it immediately so it is just an open dialogue. Thanks.

Jody Kolker: Thanks. And then the last issue here has turned out to be does very well. Actually one of the transitions we did have one engineer (unintelligible) contact when we had questions or issues with the OT&E environment or during the transition.

It was nice to deal with an engineer immediately instead of going through the different tech support and getting escalated all the way and then finally getting somebody on the phone who could actually fix the issue and sometimes understand the issue.

There is also the connection policy and session management. How many connections are we going to get? And how many times do we have to log out, et cetera? I mean those can differ between, you know, it is just one of those things that we have to deal with I guess. I think slowly.

Marc Anderson: What is the – how many times do you have to log out? Can you give me a little background on that one?

Jody Kolker: Sure. Different registries will require you to – there is an absolute time out where you have to log out in 24 hours and then log back in with your EPPs connections. Usually we like to keep the EPP connections open so that they are available without having to go through the whole SSO verification over and over.

Which we need to know when those connections are going to time out and that is what we are looking for.

Marc Anderson: Okay so it is basically how long you can keep – how long the connection will stay live.

Jody Kolker: Right.

Marc Anderson: That is what you are – okay got it thanks.

Jody Kolker: The next slide we have. All coded requirements can be different between the two. Sometimes there can be resets that are happening that we would like to know about beforehand to make sure that we are having – that we know what the passwords are basically or the off codes on the domains.

Another issue that we have is IP whitelisting. Registries usually only have certain days that they are going to whitelist IPs. It is a back and forth to try to get the whitelist open. Make sure we have the IPs open for the servers so we can actually do something.

Richard Merdinger: Jody I have a question for you. This is Rich. Do you ever run into a situation when there is a change of a registry backend? Where the white IP white listing rules are different such that being able to white list multiple endpoints as opposed to a single endpoint?

Jody Kolker: Most registries allow us to have more than one server but there are definitely differences in how many submits you can white list. And then size of those submits.

Tobias: Tobias speaking. Just to add something. Sometimes you – I hear an echo. Why if there – so some registries have – allow submits to be whitelisted (unintelligible) allow only IP addresses.

So there is a huge difference in there because sometimes what we have seen is we provided a submit and they just cut off the (unintelligible) and added the IP address that was really helpful.

Jody Kolker: Thanks Tobias. You know other differences are while we covered the report differences this morning. There is also the contact and host garbage collections. Sometimes some registries there are different times when they will get rid of contacts if they are not actually being used. Same thing with hosts.

There are also differences between services provided. Some registries will have registry lock or a portion or that or some kind of implementation. There is also consolidate or sync commands where you can change expiration dates, et cetera.

It is just I don't know if that is so much of a pain point as just a difference. Sorry. All messages can be different between registries which can cause issues. And the extension supported kind of goes with the one above that or the differences of services.

We need to know the extensions that are supported for every registry. And when they move between backends that can cause some issues and how they are supported also.

Host attributes and host objects that is not so much as a pain point. It is just a difference that needs to be known. There is a registry support host attribute or host object.

And then also the registry billing difference whether you have to pre-fund an account or post-fund account. Just a difference to be known. And then I think I could go on and on about gTLD and ccTLD differences but I will let that one go for now.

And so here is the pain points that we have. We have tried to develop something that might be able to help that and I will turn it over to Roger. Go ahead. I guess are there any questions first of all?

Tobias: Tobias speaking. Just to add another registrar pain point of the thing about error messages and error codes. Because I think or at least it is not on this list but yes that is also a really pain. Thanks.

Jody Kolker: I think I had that on the first slide but I am going so fast you probably didn't get that. Go ahead Roger.

Roger: Thanks. So people that have been involved with the TechOps has probably seen a lot of these because like Jody said we talked a lot about this in

Vancouver. These are probably the big ones coming out of the Vancouver group.

And fortunately like Jody said. Some of these can be solved fairly easy with some technology. Others are probably a little harder to solve and probably going to be policy and not technology that solves it.

But what we have been working with Verisign on is a registry – I think it is called registry mapping right now. I am not sure if that is going to stick or not but it is an EPP message that actually will detail what a TLD – how the server is configured for a TLD.

So it takes into account several base things, you know, how a contact is created? What the limits are? What are some of the rules around that host? Is it objects or not?

Some of those high level things like that. But the power of the extension that we are working on is actually that the extension is extensible so that you can add in – all the servers are RFC compliant but they all make different decisions and RFCs allow that.

There are a lot of shoulds and mays and cans in RFCs. And that is where a lot of the problems come up is that registry decided to do it one way and the other registry did it a different way.

And that is the goal out of this registry mapping is to find all those differences and get them at least I would say documented in one place in one standard format.

So that when we do look to onboard or someone does transition we are looking at the same thing. And not trying to – try to figure out okay now this registry calls it something else in their documentation.

They document it but it is not the same. Named the same or whatever so it is a pain when you go to actually move. We are hoping that this mapping takes care of that problem.

And right now Jim Gould and I have worked on this and we have got the base object down pretty much which is basically security zone list, contacts, domains, hosts is the base.

And now we have actually started to transition from that work into the extensions and what we are doing is calling them policies, extension policies. And what it is is basically mapping a RFC out to all of its options.

So the one that is actually done is the launch phase and every may or could or optional field is documented in there and what options that that server decided to take.

We are working on the fee one right now it is not done. And the proposal in the IETF group is actually when you create an RFC create a policy document with it. And that way at least the shell of it will be there and then the server can say, yes I pick this option.

So once we get this far enough along we will probably start to try to enforce with all the RFCs going through that group.

Do you want to go to the next slide so I can make sure I didn't miss anything?

Yes okay. Rich.

Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger here. Roger one thing that I wanted to make sure was clear is up to this point in past conversations we have been talking about using this mapping concept for onboarding new TLDs or changes in backends. It is equally important and probably even more so as I can't believe we didn't talk about it.

When TLDs change their behaviors or their pricing or their what have you. Having a mapping or an automated mechanism to implement that is also used for when you are not changing backends but just doing updates to the TLD itself.

So it is really just a TLD change mechanism whether that is changes in instantiation, change in a backend or altering of behavior of the TLD.

Roger: Right. And actually I know at Verisign they actually use it for their internal systems as well so that when they configure things and they make a change they have an interface that actually goes in and changes this.

And so all their monitoring there is (unintelligible). But yes it is Rich great for updates as well.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc Anderson for the transcript. Just since you mentioned it I will just give a little background. We developed it initially to help with onboarding.

We were looking at having to onboard a lot of TLDs and basically made our – I think it was like our monitoring systems be intelligent enough to be able to read that feed and be able to see the information in there and automatically pick up those TLDs without having to – having kind of manual configuration done for that new TLD.

You know it is not a theoretical system. It is something we developed to meet our very real needs. You know the entire time we developed it we had the thought in mind it is something we could open up to registrars.

Because they might also see value in being able to use that same information to ease and aid onboarding or transitions. So it is something we are actively using and our systems internally use it.

Roger: Excellent. Okay I think the plan here was to poll hopefully. If anybody has one of the pain point items that they desperately want to talk through. We are planning to break out into a couple of groups. Two, three, four groups and talk about those things and then come back and share what everybody thought and discussed.

So I don't know if anybody has any ones that they are interested in. If not I will have Jody pick a few of them and we can work through them.

Does anyone have anything that they particularly would like to talk about? If you want to scroll back to that first pain point slide. One more up. Yes thank you. Perfect thanks.

Must be working great. Well I know that again some of these we are able to solve with the registry mapping hopefully. But like premium names I don't think – I don't see registry mapping solving that problem. So I think that is a good topic to jump into.

I don't know Jody was there an OpCode one on the other slide too?

Jody Kolker: Oh yes there was.

Roger: I was thinking about maybe from this morning's session actually kind of continuing that kind of discussion on OpCodes. Yes best practices around those.

But anybody else can jump in and suggest one and we can dive in more detail and get working on it.

Okay. We can just do those two topics then.

Jody Kolker: Or anything else that comes up.

Roger: Yes anything else. Anybody has other pain points that they want to bring we can talk about those. So let's plan this – split the room in half and talk about premium names on one side and OpCodes on the other side.

Jody Kolker   You have got one there and I have got one there.

Roger: Yes. All right. I will let you take premium names.

Jody Kolker: Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Okay thank you both. This is Marc Anderson. So before we break I guess we have got an hour left in this session. So I guess how – when would you like to bring it back?

Roger: I would say 30, 40 minutes talking and then bring back and kind of summarize like we did this morning.

Marc Anderson: Okay sounds good. So we are at 2 pm local time here. So if you are following along remotely we will take – we will make it 40 minutes. So at 20 until we will circle back.

                   And we will do – Jody you are taking premium on that side of the room. And Roger Op info over here. And I guess we can go ahead and split up and pause the recording please.

                   This is Marc if I can interrupt for a second. Would the groups be ready to come back in about five minutes? Okay then consider this your five minute warning then.

                   All right this is Marc Anderson. Welcome back everyone and thank you to everybody who participated in the breakout groups. We are going to have Jody and Roger provide a summary of what was discussed and what we came up with.

And I think Jody lost rock, paper, scissors and will be going first. So please go ahead.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody again. So we talked about premium names. Continuing to talk about grandfather pricing, large list of premium names, how much time we are given to be able to implement these.

We kind of kept going back to being able to get a list of the domain names and in a standardized format I think in the best practice documents that we have out in IETF.

Because what we can get from different registries is different formats for an Excel spreadsheet. Sometimes it might just be a text file and you look in Column H for one, Column G for another one to be able to get the prices.

And we are just kind of looking for something that we can automate and bring down instead of having any kind of manual intervention with it. To be able to at least be able to get the list, get it formatted and get it into our databases so that we can set up our pricing for our ecommerce systems or however our registrar is planning to do that.

Some of the other pain points that we talked about though is the large number of premium names or reserve names that can be. And they may not be available in the sunrise period and then they are released in the GA period which seems like it is skirting policy or rules.

Richard Merdinger: (Unintelligible).

Jody Kolker: Yes absolutely.

Richard Merdinger: Hi this is Rich Merdinger. I wanted to interject. One of the tough things about talking about premium name pain points is invariably starts melding

business models and business decisions with the technical implementations to support them.

We tried to be very careful not to say that practice is bad. They shouldn't do that because that is a business decision. We came together as a group of competitors and partners and make recommendations on how pricing structures ought to work.

So I mean I want to be on the record that we are very careful not to do that. Which means that all the problems he is talking about – some of these things are policy issues that might need to be addressed or dealt with in other ways.

But what Jody is really saying is to understand the complex different ways that these TLDs are being launched or run we need to have mechanisms in place that allow for an efficient ingestion of that data or information about them. So that our systems can deal with it or decide to not deal with situations.

You know if something changes and we are not okay with it on a personal registrar basis so that we can deal with that in an individual way. Just being careful not to step over that line even while we are here.

Jody Kolker: So basically what we came up with is in order to support premium names better please, you know, ask the registries for a list. I think it was even brought up for asking for it if we can't get it. Somehow be able to bring ICANN into the middle of this and be able to get it produced somehow.

I am not sure if that is part of the policy or a contractor. I don't think it is there yet but it is something to consider. Any other – did I miss anything? Anyone? I guess nobody wants to talk. Well except for Rich.

Vlad Dinculescu: Quick question. You mentioned get ICANN to – talking about putting a policy that says (unintelligible) specification (unintelligible). Here are reserve names that must be reserved above and beyond, you know, IGO and INGO.

Now maybe extend the specification to say if you are going to be having premium domain names then you must publish over here someone ICANN Web site as part of something your compute list or (unintelligible) and so forth.

Jody Kolker: Exactly. Something to that point to be able to say please create this list as of this specification so that registrars can download this list and have it. In a specified format so that everyone can implement these much faster and quicker, easier and such. Yes exactly thanks.

Any other questions?

Man: Are we talking about policy here or not? Are we saying that we shouldn't? Because I think that was a good suggestion by Vlad.

Jody Kolker: It is not that we can't talk about policy but the thing is we can't talk about the thought processes and how different people want to do different types of pricing models. That is what I am trying to be careful of.

I am thinking great let's bring that to the subpro and try to get that incorporated into the next (unintelligible). So you want to talk policy vote, you know, have at it. We are at ICANN.

Man: That is my job. That is literally my job. So I think we may want to explore a balance then too. We are talking about details for OpCodes in the session over there. And it made me think that it would be good to know when that was going to change.

So if registries are going to set up premium lists how long is that going to be the list? And when if, you know, if you are going to make a change? And registries need and will advocate for the ability to make changes to their premium domain list all the time.

It would just be good to have some clarity maybe that strikes the balance between registries want to be able to change the list all the time. And registrars need to know what the list is.

Jody Kolker: I would like to comment on that. There is another element of the RA as well as many of the RRAs that deal with notifications for fee changes. And that has been a governing concept for how frequently those lists change.

Because there are two scenarios. One of them is the scenario where a name is either standard price or it is already a premium name and it moves to a different tier before they change the tier value or something along those lines. And that is definitely a fee change.

I have seen inconsistent behavior where a registry will take a reserved name and release it into a tier. Arguing that it did not have a price before because it is reserved. And that could lead to price washing.

You get a name and it is here. You want to put it here. Reserve it and then put it there and then you don't have the price change right? So it is – anyway that is something to argue a policy but fun stuff.

Man: So then coming back to the technical aspect of it. The EPP object in the registry mapping essentially. Let's look at the technicalities of it all. I mean we have things like A list. (Unintelligible) that says provide a registry (unintelligible) URL that you can put as part of this EDP object.

That says you will go to this URL and underneath that there is another element that says how often do you update this list? So you get this list in

this URL or download it from here, you know, every single 30 minutes or whatever it might be.

So you know you can set up those systems like that. Tell us, you know, how many tiers you have? How often you might change the tiers? I don't know just really going (unintelligible). But have three, four, five tiers for example. Pricing with each of those within the EPP object may be specified as well.

Although pricing changes so I am not sure if that is really actually required. And for example, use of extensions for your fees extension. Which one do you implement? Which version of it do you implement? Is it mandatory for premium names? Is it mandatory for all domain name registration (unintelligible) and so forth?

Let's put that into EPP object because then that essentially will set up your technical policy of how you will be handling premium domain names as the registrar with this registry.

Jody Kolker: Those are very good ideas. I want to take a few notes. I might follow up with you afterwards. I just wanted to support that. I think that is all we have got. Roger?

Roger: Okay thanks Jody. So we had a great discussion. I am not sure that we agreed on any exact points. I mean everybody kind of agreed on high level topics. But the one thing we agreed on is off code should be unique. And let's get that – all those registrars that aren't doing that to start doing that.

Besides that I mean we had really great discussion. (Sara) brought up something that I thought was interesting and I will ask Marc maybe to take it back. Is can we get current registries to provide their policies around off codes?

Can we pull the registry stakeholder group and say, hey can we get this and kind of detail them out and see what makes sense? And if there is overlap great. If there is not maybe incorporate some of those things in. Thanks Marc.

All right let me go down the list. We were jumping around a bit. TTLs everybody agreed was a great idea. Exactly how that gets implemented was a lot of discussion. Everybody kind of felt yes registry doing the TTL would be great but we still have ccTLDs that we have to worry about.

So registrars are probably going to have to do TTL at some point. And again until policy is written I am sure most registries aren't going to volunteer to start enforcing TTLs. So I think that though it was a great idea I think that maybe on the policy side of the house push for registries doing TTL.

But again the ccTLDs are going to have to worry about the registrars are still going to have to do it across their managed domains. So for the time being it just logical that registrars are going to have to do it. But everybody thought it was a good idea to do.

We did talk about – we didn't really agree on how long a TTL should go for? I mean we didn't really go down that path too far. Earlier this morning it was discussed that 14 days sounded good but not necessarily anybody was stuck on that.

Anywhere from 5 to 14 days everybody thought sounded good and, you know, not a year for sure. So what else on TTL? There was some discussion I brought it up from this morning about possibly embedding the TTL into the Op info and making it a part of it so that when you pass it along everybody knows what it is.

It would allow gaining registrars to validate it before even trying it. And they can tell a customer up front saying hey, your OpCode is no longer valid. Can you get a new one?

So the discussion I don't know if anybody in the group felt strongly one way or the other on that. We did talk about it.

Man: Can I add the other thing we talked about. With the OpCodes itself with the checks that you mentioned.

Roger: Right and one of the things that we did talk about was how complex you can make the OpCode. How long? How many characters you were going to allow. And there was general agreement that all the special characters really make things worse not better.

So the idea was possibly just make it longer instead of complex. So that you still get the same amount of security out of it. It is just a little easier for registrants and for code to manage and everything.

Getting into the OpCode a little more. Still has to have the option of no OpCode so we are not going to require every domain have an OpCode. It is up to the registrar to check that when they feel it is needed to be said.

We did say that probably it needs to be at least eight characters long. We are not completely set on that because it was okay how secure does it have to be? And again the characters that we ended up if you end up choosing a smaller character set maybe it makes sense that it is 16 characters long or something. So something that still needs to be talked through.

Talked about registry actually hashing the OpCode and not keeping the OpCode. Just hash it so that when they get it back they can do the comparing. That way it is never out in the wild besides someone's email.

So we brought up the topic of registrants being able to set their pass or set their OpCodes. And not allowing them to actually pick an off code but being able to reset it to something that the registrar can give them.

But still current policy kind of forces you to do that. But today it is implemented two ways. It is implemented where a registrant can actually type in their own and save it that way. Or go ahead and…

Man: I had a question. Has there ever been a case of anyone kind of brute forcing an OpCode to get a…

Roger: We had that same discussion. And we don't know if that has ever been attempted. It is possible but no one has any knowledge of that no. But Jody?

Jody Kolker: I thought I had heard. This is Jody. I thought I had heard of, you know, some registries were implementing things where you cannot retry an OpCode so many times per minute.

So it seems like it is happening if there is a registry that has actually implemented, you know, not a lot of brute force of an OpCode.

Man: I would just add that whether it has happened or not it should probably go without saying. But we want to create a system where it doesn't happen.

Roger: Thanks (unintelligible). Okay other items we hit on. One of the things we talked about was enforcement of TTLs or whatever we do if the registry has to make a change, the engineer and the registry site is going to be fairly large no matter how that gets implemented.

So we just left it as that and any solution that we come up with it is going to cost the registry some time.

One item that was brought up was should the registries actually generate the OpCodes? So the registrars don't even have to know about it. They just request it. They give it to their registrant and the registrant is the only one that knows what it is technically.

Just an idea. Not sure if anybody likes that idea or not. I think we have talked about that a couple of times now. Can the registry just do all of it? Should they do all of it? And again some of it wraps back around to okay but they are ccTLDs so how are you going to handle them in your business model?

Go ahead Rich.

Richard Merdinger: Thanks this is Rich. I am just curious when you are talking about the registry would generate the off code and transmit it to the registrant.

Roger: No it would still be from the registrars. I mean technically they have it for a time period.

Richard Merdinger: Okay.

Roger: But they wouldn't store it or anything. They just request it from the registry. The registry would give it to the registrar to pass it on to the registrant. They just wouldn't store it.

Richard Merdinger: Got it okay. That makes more sense thank you.

Roger: Yes.

Jody Kolker: And the concept there Rich was that the registrar wouldn't be creating the off codes either. And neither would the registrant. You couldn't set it to be Mickey Mouse. It had to be (unintelligible) and your registrar wouldn't be involved in the creation of it either. So they wouldn't be storing the data.

Roger: So that one rogue registrar that is out there can't do what they want to do it that way. Because there is only one of them.

                We needed to talk on the technology here. We don't think and Jody may even know. OpCode is limited to any lengths today.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. Actually I think we talked about that too. I thought it was limited to 16 by EPP.

Roger: And I don't think it is. We looked up real quick and…

Jody Kolker: It is not.

Roger: No.

Jody Kolker: So it is only limited by the registry then.

Roger: Yes. And again getting the registries to actually tell us, you know, if they had those it would be good too. What else do we have here? We talked about variable time TTLs.

                So should there be an ability to either the registrant or registrar. If it was maximum of 14 days. Could the registrant or registrar say well I value this domain so much that maybe I only want it available for two days?

                And there is some discussion around that. And it is like well, registrars can still do that today if they felt that that was necessary. They just, you know, removed the OpCode earlier.

                If it gets to a policy discussion if we wanted that to happen we would have to make sure that it is no more than 14 days and not exactly 14 days. So just something to keep in mind.

I think we ended up actually talking about resetting up OpCodes either after a transfer happens should it be forced? Just two points here. After a transfer happens should the gaining registrar have to reset the OpCode?

Or and something that was brought up with it is should an OpCode be one-time use only? So once it is used it is no longer valid? Again that would be hard to manage. But the other thing was when backends move. Go ahead (unintelligible).

Man: I would just note that I don't think that would be that hard to manage if the registry enforced that policy.

Roger: Yes exactly.

Man: The main transfer of the registry (unintelligible).

Roger: And the last thing we talked about was if a backend move should OpCodes be reset so that now the old owners don't have OpCodes that they could use technically?

Man: That was it. Great discussion.

Marc Anderson: All right thank you both and we are right about at our stopping point for our next break. So I am going to end this one a little bit abruptly so we can have our breaks on time.

But thank you Roger and Jody for facilitating that and leading us through that breakout session. I appreciate you both stepping up and volunteering to do that.

Just from an administrative standpoint we will have a 15 minute break. We will pick back up. We have two more sessions this afternoon. We have

Domain Connect and ID For Me. So we will have those two presentations. We will wrap up our tech ops with those two.

So thank you very much and we will start back up in 15 minutes.

END