IRTP C Use Case Sub team
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 05 September 2012 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Wednesday 05 September 2012 at 1300 UTC. 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-c-20120905-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#sep

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG co-Chair
Hago Dafalla – NCUC
Barbara Knight – RySG
Mike O'Connor – ISPCP
Rob Golding – RrSG
Volker Greimann- RrSG
Jonathan Tenenbaum – RrSG
Angie Graves – CBUC

Expert:
Keith Gaughan

ICANN Staff:
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Hello this is the operator speaking. The recording has been started. Please

                 go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Andrei. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IRTP use case sub-team meeting on the 5th of September 2012.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Hago Dafalla, Barbara Knight, Michele Neylon, Volker Greimann, Avri Doria, and Keith Groman. On staff we have myself Nathalie Peregrine. And Berry Cobb just joined.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and now over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie and thanks especially much for sort of whipping this together on no notice and welcome to the rest of you.

Let me welcome Keith to the call. Keith there's absolutely no pressure to speak but we are delighted to have you join us today because we're sort of working on a puzzler that we could use your help on. Is he not on the call yet Michele?

Nathalie Peregrine: He just joined.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good. Oh good. Welcome Keith. I don't know how much of my little introduction you heard but we're absolutely tickled to have you on the call and so don't be shy. If we start saying something that's like completely disconnected from reality, it's your job to stick up your hand and let us know that we've deviated from the realm of possibility in what we're doing here.

Keith Groman: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: So you have a complete pass to kick me in the shins if anything seems peculiar.

Just to quickly fill you in on sort of who else is on the call. Barbara Knight is with VeriSign and she's the policy - one of the policy leaders at VeriSign so she really knows her way around the dotcom domain for example. Michele Neylon is this weird guy from Ireland that we all dearly love and you probably...

Keith Groman: Yes I try to avoid him whenever I can.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's a smart move. I get that. And Volker Greimann is -- oh gad I can't remember who you work for Volker but...

Volker Greimann: Key systems (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Key Systems. Yes I was about ready to butcher that so I'm glad you chimed in. Volker's not too stupid. He knows his way around the registrar world pretty well.

Volker Greimann: Thanks I think.

Mikey O'Connor: Avri Doria is let's see which hat are you wearing these days? Are you in a non...?

Avri Doria: Sorry are you talking to me? Sorry I was unmuting.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Avri Doria: In this group I'm in the NCSG also a bunch of people but I also work for (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Huh?

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's see who else is in? Me, I'm kind of a curmudgeon (unintelligible). I started at ISP a long time ago and fell in love with the early domain name world and have sort of hung in every since. So I'm retired. I have too much time on my hands.

Nathalie Peregrine is with the ICANN staff and is the person who makes all this meeting magic happen and keeps me out of trouble on that. And Berry Cobb used be used to be on in the business constituency and has now joined the ICANN as a policy staff person and does a lot of the writing and fact-checking and keeping us on the straight and arrow.

So what we're working on today is the picture that's on the screen. And I'm going to just briefly go through it again partly to retell the tale for those of you who haven't heard it before but partly to sort of highlight a puzzler that we're working on today.

If you look down the left what we found is sort of four use cases, and Keith for your benefit what we're trying to do is separate the process of changing registrars from the process of changing registrant which right now...

Keith Groman: Go ahead. And also ccTLD used to do that. They called the changing of registrants a trade.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Oh that's a good term. I might want to steal that.

Anyway what we're trying to puzzle through in the gTLD space is how this might impact the policy. And so I drew a first draft picture of this that said there's four use cases and I drew sort of four imaginary screen shots, if you will, where the first case is changing the registrar, the second case would be changing the registrant but without waiving a safeguard that we're proposing

that would put a certain length of time lock on the domain once it's changed registrars or a registrant has changed so that if - the goal here is to prevent registrar hopping and stealing domain names basically.

The next one do both at the same time but still leaves the safeguard in place. And then the fourth one we proposed was to change them both and at the same time waive the safeguard because one of the needs that we're trying to accommodate is the situation where a person has bought a domain and wants to be able to very quickly be able to move it to another buyer. And so these are the use cases that we're puzzling through.

The problem that we ran into is in use case one. And what we were saying in use case one is that this is the way the current inter-registrar transfer policy works, this is what it's for. And so I want to move my domain from one registrar to another, there aren't any other parties involved and because the registrant, i.e. me, hasn't changed, the registrant information must remain the same. And the way the safeguard option isn't needed because we're not changing registrant.

The puzzler is that when you're in a thin registry like dotcom or dot jobs, it's fairly tricky to figure out how we pass the registrant information between the registrars so that they can validate it.

Keith Groman: As it stands it's actually impossible. I basically have a large library that I continually have to modify depending on the ways those other registrars change their Whois. It does parsing and all this and tries to extract as much information as possible but because of the diversity of formats and some perverse things that some registrars like to do such as randomizing the positioning of things within the Whois information it's next to impossible to actually extract the registrant's information.

Mikey O'Connor: And that kind of confirmed where we wound up the call, this little sub-team call last time and then Bob Mountain who unfortunately I have screwed up the

meeting time so he's not able to be on the call today because I made a mistake so I'm going to have to buy him a beer at the Toronto meeting, Bob went around and checked and confirmed that.

So I think the question on the table is what do we do given that puzzler? And let me throw out a few notes that we took on the last call and then I'll sort of...Keith the way we do these calls is there's a little way for you to raise your hand. See how Volker did it? I'm going to pay him his 50 bucks later. And there's a button on top of the screen that looks just like that that you can click in you want to jump in the queue.

So the way we do this is we manage conversations in queue just to kind keep things straight. So if you ever want to jump in Keith by all means do that but try and use the little hand flag if you can.

Keith Groman: Yes I had to read over the tutorial before I joined the call.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay.

So here are the notes that we took. Now these aren't necessarily accurate or true, these are just the words that we said while we were on the call. And the puzzler - there are several other puzzlers.

One is right now there is - one of the things that we talked about was the difference between registrant information at the domain level and the account level. And Volker I wasn't sure if you were helping demonstrate the hand flag or if you really wanted to talk.

Volker Greimann: A bit of both. I just wanted to chime in and say that this is also one of the issues that we've been dealing with in the RAA negotiations with ICANN. And one of the things that's going to be part of that result of the RAA negotiations is specification on Whois and that will include a standardized Whois for our

registrars. And that would make parsing registrant data much easier for the future.

So there might be in my view at least most of the problems that we have today might already be solved at the time when the new RAA comes into effect.

Mikey O'Connor: Can you give us an assessment in your view of the likelihood of that? Is that a part of the deal that's likely to be in there? Is there a lot of contention?

Volker Greimann: Regarding the standardization of Whois and ensuring that registrars amongst themselves have full access to the Whois data by excluding them from volume limits and stuff like that, that's very high consensus and is probably I would estimate a 90% chance that it's going to be in there.

Mikey O'Connor: That's very cool. And timing? Any thoughts on timing?

Volker Greimann: Timing very interesting, not yet fully understood by ICANN what timing will include -- minimum two years, maximum five years as it comes into effect. As certain registrars just recently signed the new RAA we will have to make sure that the old RAA, the new RAA would have to be timed that it will hit most registrars at the same time. So it might still be some time in the future but we are still negotiating about that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes okay.

Volker Greimann: The earlier we can get that the better because that was one of the registrar demands as well. So this is something that we might see earlier rather than later.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh cool all right. Well that might be the way out of this puzzler because another way out of the puzzler and part of the reason that Barbara is probably

on the call is because this puzzler is an artifact of the thin versus thick Whois architecture and there's another working group that Avri and I are on -- team, not working group yet -- working on the charter for a thick Whois policy development process. And that's another way out of this puzzler.

But if the odds are 90% that might be enough...Avri let's step back on this and then say well let's presume that what Volker says is true that, you know, there is an actual mechanism to exchange registrant information. Is that enough -- Avri's also been Keith the co-chair of this particular working group that we're a subgroup of so I'm kind of asking Avri to put her co-chair hat on -- is this enough that we could write policy to it do you think?

Avri Doria: This is Avri and I guess I should speak before Volker who has his hand up.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that might be an old hand.

Volker Greimann: That's my old hand yes, sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. I don't know that you would put policy on something that's not written but you could certainly write the recommendation such that you are recommending the same thing that they're doing and deal with the issue of binding all these things together.

                So if it's something we think is happening with fair certainty we could certainly include in our response assuming we got consensus for this as a response -- see what happens when you tell me to put on that silly hat?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes. I love it when you do that.

Avri Doria: But anyhow assuming that we have the consensus we could certainly put in a recommendation that this be done. You know? More than that I don't think we could presume it done but, you know, certainly the people that hop between

these same groups can sort of make sure that recommendations come out pointing at the same thing.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so...All right that's pretty appealing to me because I was completely stumped on the last call and if we've really...

Now let me try an idea out on Michele and Volker and Barbara. From your respective points of view is the RAA approach maybe the better language to try and fold into this rather than thick Whois? Thick Whois...well I'll just leave it at that. Any thoughts on that?

Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Okay the thick Whois thing I can see that going round and round and round for a long time and dong forget thick Whois will only effect one entity, mainly VeriSign, and VeriSign have just gone through a contract negotiation with ICANN so what's the likelihood of them agreeing to further changes to their contract before the expiry of their current contract?

The standardized Whois as Volker mentioned and that Keith alluded to because Keith was looking at the technical specifications for that with regards to the RAA, personally I can see that as being much more achievable as it was contractually binding. Whether or not all registrars signed a new RAA at one go or if it was staggered over a couple of years, it would still solve a lot of problems for us technically.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so what if - now I'm going to go back in - well wait a minute, let me just let Barbara chime in and Volker as well before I zoom off in another direction.

Barbara any thoughts on this?

Barbara Knight: I pretty much agree with everything that Michele has said. I think that probably the more feasible and realistic approach would be the RAA approach with the standardized Whois.

I guess my question would be is again what that timing is going to be because the effective dates of that could very well be staggered unless there's some way they could come to agreement that people would do an amendment to their RAAs. I'm just not sure how that would work. I don't think that that's the approach that ICANN has ever taken. So timing is going to be critical.

And then you also have the roadmap and the development that would be needed for registrars to be able to accommodate that standardized Whois format as well. So, you know, I'm sure they would also have to take that into consideration in determining when they would even be able to comply with it.

But my guess is if they know that it's coming with a new RAA then they would be able to kind of get it on their roadmap so that once they do sign the new RAAs they'd be able to accommodate the requirements. That's my two cents.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Barbara. Keith go ahead.

Keith Groman: Yes there's another way of solving the problem that just popped into my head. What could be done -- and this would help with problems involving Whois privacy and publication of sensitive details and all of this -- is there could be an additional - when the transfer completes there could be an additional message put on the message queue confirming the completion of the transfer giving the registrant information.

So let's say Whois privacy was active on the domain, the losing registrar would rather than having to - or rather the gaining registrar or us having to parse through the Whois and guess maybe something that's essentially jumped to them because Whois privacy is on the domain would get the actual

details submitted to the current registrar, the same sort of thing that would actually end up being escrowed. So that's another alternative although the technical details would kind of have to be hammered out and something like the private mailing list.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I think one of the tricky things - I mean the way that this use case works is that if you look down at the bottom here, the idea here is that at the time of authenticating for the transfer would be when the verification that the registrant information is not changing. And so the sequence is the opposite sequence because what we need to do is be able to verify that in advance and then if it turns out that the registrant information is going to change, that's not a big deal but we now change use cases.

We change from the use case we're talking about here to the use case where -- and we don't really have this one well documented; I'm going to have to come up with another use case but it's one of these -- where it's basically saying oh you're changing registrars and registrant that's fine, you can do that. And so the validation as to which use case we're in has to take place before the authentication rather than after the transfer and that's a...

Keith Groman: And that's an...Oh sorry, go on.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead. No, no you go.

Keith Groman: All right. An alternative. I'm just going down the more EPP-based route would be rather than could be on the message queue afterwards. This would be a little complicated because it means the registry would end up mediating communication between two registrars but there would be some kind of a command that would I'd say be able to provide the domain name, the authorization information and that would via the registry allow one registrar to query another registrar's contact details for a certain domain. That's a possibility but that would actually be rather complicated to implement but it's possible.

Mikey O'Connor: Well it's extremely difficult in a thin registry because the registry doesn't have that information.

Keith Groman: As I said this would be - it would basically be mediated - the registry would be mediating communication between two registrars. So the first registrar would launch the command, would send the command to the registry, the registry would then send it to the current registrar who would then send back the information to the registry who would relay it back to the new registrar. But that's very complicated to implement.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I can kind of hear people's moans and groans over that one. Volker's got the language in the chat here. Volker is this out of the...?

Volker Greimann: It's the first two paragraphs from the proposed Whois appendix specification.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh cool I'm going to steal that. Let me just post this in the - I'm going to start taking notes in a different way here because this PowerPoint thing is cute but it doesn't do notes very well. So let me just change tools real quick.

Volker Greimann: There are still some points that have to be negotiated so I didn't post those but this is pretty much a done deal.

Mikey O'Connor: All right that's very cool. Thanks Volker.

And then, you know, we can sort of as we're getting down to the report publication we can circle back to you and the rest of the folks that are working on the negotiation and just make sure that our language isn't getting out ahead of yours and bring those back into synch really easily. Yes okay.

Volker Greimann: I think a lot of this is already copied out from - ICANN proposed this draft and a lot of this derives from the Whois specification in place for the new gTLD

registries which have a thick Whois requirement and for those I think much of the same text is already used.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. And does this...?

Volker Greimann: If you look at that you will probably find a lot of matching text.

Mikey O'Connor: Does this proposal - I mean the tricky bit of course is a thin Whois. If we had thick is this wouldn't be a brainteaser at all because we could just go query the registry but what we need to do is make sure that this will work for thin and if does, I think it's...

Volker Greimann: Well the idea behind it is that it will work for thin at least between registrars as registrars will have the ability to wipe their IP addresses from being blocked by for example query limits that some registrars have. A registrar would always be able to get the data and having that in the standard format as well would help parsing and making sure that the registrant data is correctly imported with the new registrar without a problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me go then back to the kind of puzzler use case which is the change registrar use case. Is the service level as proposed Whois -- shared Whois -- fast enough that if let's our registrant comes in and I don't know which sequence whether it's starting at the new registrar or the old, we can go fix that later, but what this scenario presumes is that the registrars that are involved could query during this process and know actually be able to use it for validation.

Is the thought here that the service level agreement would be that the response times would be fast enough that one registrar could query the other essentially in real time or is this more of a batch kind of SLA or has SLA not even really entered the conversation?

Volker Greimann: Well the service level timeframes are still under discussions because we still think for a registrar it's probably not as necessary to have the same availability or query response times as a registry but it's going to be near real time yes. So we'll have response times in the realm of milliseconds rather than minutes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay because, you know, I think that's the tricky bit here is if this is something that's query-able during a change registrar authentication cycle then it seems like we're kind of home free. But if it's five minute, ten minute, one hour I don't think that's a showstopper but I think we have to accommodate that when we describe all of this.

Oops I'm building a queue like crazy sorry. Keith go ahead then Michele.

Keith Groman: As it stands for transfers to even be feasible basically Whois querying has to be practically real time otherwise the losing registrant is essentially preventing the gaining - the losing registrar is essentially preventing the gaining registrar from contacting the registrant for confirmation so it needs to be real time even right now even if that may be a delay of a half second or so. It has to be close to real time.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes a half a second I don't think is a showstopper but, you know, we do have other currents in the ocean of all this. Michele jump in.

Michele Neylon: Just on this SLA thing I mean ICANN released various documents which are in the public domain regarding both the Whois specification which talks about a potential replacement for Whois, it also gives an example of the standardized output and it also goes onto the SLA. The problem is the SLA that ICANN have given is a bad copy and paste from the SLAs for registries so it's completely pointless.

Mikey O'Connor: So it's extremely high right now, huh?

Michele Neylon: No it's not. Mikey it's not a matter of high or low, it's technically inept.

Volker Greimann: That's why I said we're still under discussion but the result is going to be a very fast near real-time response.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay.

Yes, the response of everything else is fine. It's just as a registrar I do not publish the IP addresses of my Whois server because I don't need to. There's this thing called DNS where you have things like A records and (Quad A) records and (C) names. And they look after all this stuff for me.

Pick, pick, pick. People are just never satisfied.

Man: Or these new (unintelligible), what will they come up with next?

Volker Greimann: So, I mean, in terms of what Keith was saying though is true. At the moment one of the several issues that we run into -- and I'm sure any of the other registrars on this call will run into the same issue -- if the losing registrar's Whois server is down completely, unresponsive, sends back useless junk or sends back content in a format that is indecipherable. They were quite small in the grand scheme of things, but we probably hit at least one problematic transfer per week, I would say.

Keith?

Keith Groman: Well I wouldn't say it's that. It's more like every (four nights). But the weird thing about it is they tend to come in batches, for some reason. Yes, it's way more trouble than it's really worth at times.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm going to play this story again given this new knowledge and see how it would work.

So let me just replay the four scenarios because I think that the puzzler, you know, granted timing is difficult, you know, stuff to be ironed out, but at least it's not the showstopper that we ran into last Thursday.

So here's the story again. (On) 1, Mikey's changing registrars. Mikey is not changing registrant information. And so as a result it either gets copied or at least validated in order to fit into this scenario.

And, you know, even to the extent that if it's privacy protected there's a puzzler, but I think that that's accomplishable under this. I think it just remains privacy protected as long as it stays with the same privacy provider.

And it's - that registrant information passes between the two registrars at the time that the registrant is validating both sides of the transaction.

The next scenario is the opposite. In this one the registrant is changing, but the registrar is not. And so presumably in this particular use case - oh I've built up a hell of a queue. I'll stop and I'll go back to that previous use case.

Keith, go ahead.

Keith Groman: What was I going to say? Oh yes, on Whois privacy. Typically I think this is in 99% of cases. The Whois privacy provider will be the current registrar because the current registrar will have to keep the actual information for escrow purposes and then, say, overlay this with them the actual - overlay the actual information with some masking for Whois privacy.

So it's more than likely unless some way around this that I don't know about, thus the registrar - the current registrar will be the Whois privacy provider.

So this doesn't really (cope) with that case.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that in that case we're actually talking about Use Case 3 where we're changing registrar and registrant because presumably then the privacy provider also changes, as (unintelligible).

Keith Groman: We need to have some way of flagging, you know, Whois privacy is actually on for this particular...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think that's actually more easily done. I think the way this works is that in Use Case 1 Mikey says, "I want to move my domain." And then there's a series of questions that says, "Are you changing your registrant information?" If Mikey says, "Yes, I'm changing privacy providers," then the registrar says, "Fine, you're not going to use this user interface, you're going to use this one and now carry on, off you go."

Keith Groman: But the gaining registrar needs to know when to flag this, so the Whois output will need to flag whether or not Whois privacy is on for that domain. Otherwise it could end up, say, transferring that domain from one provider to the other. And if it's not flagged that yes, this Whois data has Whois privacy on, then the losing registrar -- as far as it's concerned -- it's got the correct details and it's escrowing the correct details on all of that.

The gaining registrar looks at its - at the stuff it's after (parsing) out of Whois. As far as it's concerned it's correct information, it's the actual registrants information. Well unless it gets flagged somehow in Whois as being actual Whois (must) with Whois privacy. So that sourcing needs to be flagged in the output of Whois.

As it stands, what we do is - and this (wouldn't be) universal (unintelligible). In our Whois, any of the contacts with Whois privacy on have a specific contact ID, which is (private), (unintelligible) and actually giving the actual contact ID in our system.

But there need to be some sort of more universal way of doing this.

Mikey O'Connor: I found another puzzler. Okay, Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Well speaking from the perspective of a reseller registrar, we see that a lot of our resellers also have their own privacy proxy services or privacy services. Some have trustee services. But let (unintelligible) stand aside. Each of them has a different policy. So it's not always the case that all privacy services are operated by the registrar.

In many cases I see that the privacy service does not allow a transfer while it is still in place, so it actually requires the new proxy or privacy service to be entered into the domain information before it allows the transfer to go through, as it is effectively the registrant of record because it is the entity named as owner of the domain name and the Whois.

And in that case the problem does not arise. If it was proxy service it has to be changed after the transfer because it already has taken place before the transfer.

That's one point. The second point, I don't think there's many registrars that allow owner change at the same time as a transfer in most registrars I've seen, and we operate the same way. The owner change always takes place after the transfer has been successfully processed. So the transfer of domain name from one registrar to another is always just a Change of Registrar.

The Change of Registrant can happen sometimes if it's scripted even seconds after the transfer is completed, but it's a different operation.

Mikey O'Connor: I took us back to the page to highlight this, because I want to make sure that this picture is right, Volker.

That's the way I interpreted this was that in general the transfer happened first, and then the Change of Registrant. And that these events could be separated by microseconds so that they would appear instantaneous to...

Volker Greimann: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...the end-user.

But I just want to absolutely verify that I've got the sequence right because this (unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Yes, that's the sequence that usually would happen. Sometimes the Change of Registrant happens before the Change of Registrar. I mean, that's the option of the individual registrant who is transferring this domain into a different entity if he wants to transfer the domain name ownership before or after.

For example, when we do a UDRP transfer, the ownership changes before the domain is transferred out because we first push the domain name into a individual account, then the winner of the UDRP takes ownership and then it's transferred to its new registrar - this is new registrar.

So the Step 2 can also happen before Step 1.

Mikey O'Connor: So here's my sleazy workaround to that scenario. I want to see if this would work. In that case we would essentially execute two use cases. First, we would do the Change Registrant use case. And then not instantaneously, not with the same authentication, not appearing to be one transaction, but actually appearing to the user as two transactions. After they had changed to the new registrant they would then execute Use Case 1.

And so you could still do that in this scenario, but you would do it in, I mean, one of the big criticisms that people level at - level at us is that we are making

the presses very difficult or more difficult for normal users. And my thought would be the UDRP example might be enough of an abnormal use case that people mind doing two transactions to get that done.

Does that (slither) around that puzzler that you were just posing? Or do we really need another use case that actually reverses the flow?

Volker Greimann: No, I think it works the same way. I mean, it doesn't matter for when the registrant changes. It just would change to allow both scenarios. I mean, they both work out the same way, but both ways are possible.

Mikey O'Connor: Well the reason that I did it this way is because what we've -- at least up until now -- done is we've tied this anti-registrar hopping safeguard to the change in registrant cycle.

And if we reverse the order, then the default case could put this, you know, this registrar hopping safeguard in the way of the second.

Oh my gosh, the chat's going crazy. Keith is typing. (Rob), why don't you go ahead. You've been very patient and I'm...

(Rob): Thank you for allowing me.

There is, I mean, I have to agree more or less with everything Volker said. You have to do the two things as separate actions as a registrar. And logically you need to do them as separate actions as a registrant. If a registrar wants to offer a service where it can perform one immediately after the other, that's a business decision, it's not a transfer decision.

When you transfer a domain in a thin registry, you have to go and grab the details by scraping or (asking) very, very nicely from the existing registrar. In a thick registry you optionally get handed the contact, although sometimes you don't even get that.

So Whois privacy has to be taken off before the transfer can happen, otherwise the contact information you get is garbage. And whether or not they want to update the registrant information is not related to the transfer at all. It's either done before the transfer, in which case it optionally locks it from being transferred. Or it's done after the transfer, in which case it's not transfer-related.

I think we're trying to do too many things in (case) statements where they really are separate atomic actions.

Mikey O'Connor: So what I hear you saying, (Rob), is that really these two use cases are the ones that we need to describe. And then if a registrar wants to make them appear - well no, it would actually be three use cases that'd be - because we need to get the Way of the Safeguard use case in there.

But that this one isn't one we actually need to describe in policy.

(Rob): Yes, (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: If a registrar wants to do that they can do that, they can make it look like that, but it's not really something that we really need to accommodate.

(Rob): Yes. I mean, I'm going through a process right now of changing the legal owner, if you like, on a number of domain names the company has, because we're rebranding and we want to show the new company name on all those domains.

I'm not transferring them to a different registrar, I'm simply updating them. Because of the way our system works, we're also locking them from being transferred for a period, because that's an option we give the (registrars).

Mikey O'Connor: And so that would be this use case, Number 2?

(Rob): That would be the first - yes, that's the first half of Number 2, that the registrar hopping we make (largely) optional.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Yes, so there's really Number 2A and Number 2B, which is the one that puts this lock on or takes the lock off.

(Rob): Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Rob): Sudden changes we don't allow them to take the lock off for their own protection.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

(Rob): What we've historically found is that occasionally resellers all (administrative) contacts decides to randomly move domain names around by updating the registered information to theirs because they have control over the account. And then start moving the domain names.

We have found over and over again this confuses the registrant who we treat as the legal owner of the domain name and who doesn't necessarily want their domain moved to whoever's cheapest this week.

But like, you know, with the person they can wonder up to the (row) to and actually sit down and have a coffee with and talk to, that's why they picked us in the first place. And so they don't want the admins just moving them around.

So change your legal name or change your email address for the EPP codes, we put a forcible lock on. We tell them that we're doing it. We do have a way of them removing it if they really, really object. But we put that on because it's in a customer request over and over again that they come back to us two

years later and go, "I want to renew my domain." And we go, "You moved it 18 months ago. It's not with us anymore."

Mikey O'Connor: Okay Keith, be patient. Hang on a minute because I'm going to recap just a little bit.

Volker asked in the chat, "What's this lock thing?" And let me go to the use case where we described that.

We haven't actually defined the safeguard. But it is kind of like - well it's, yes, it's being taken care of in the chat, (Rob), it's right there.

It's some sort of lock that says, "Oh, the registrant information on this domain name has changed, thus it cannot go through and in a registrar transfer for some period of time.

Haven't described it, we haven't named it, and we haven't defined the length of time. But the goal is to prevent a bad guy from changing registrant information, and then immediately moving it out of the registrar in which he did that.

Our theory is that if we can keep it in the same registrar for some period of time -- 30 or 60 days -- that then when the rightful owner wakes up and says, "Wait a minute, my registrant has been changed," the registrar has both sides of that transaction and they can intervene to unwind it. So the goal is to sort of cage the domain in the same registrar so that it can get fixed.

Let's see if there's - there's a fair amount going on in the chat.

So Volker, are you okay? Can I go on to Keith? Does this make (unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Oh sure, no problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Good, good.

Keith, carry on.

Keith Groman: Okay. Just going back to something that Volker mentioned earlier. He mentioned Whois privacy lock.

The problem around that is that there's currently no policy around this. We run into many instances of registrars who they'll allow a domain to be unlocked and transferred away from them and they will leave the Whois privacy information there.

So unless there's some sort of policy behind that, we still have a problem with the Whois data.

Whether or not it's the - if it's flagged in Whois as, you know, the privacy is still on, the gaining registrar can just put a stop to the thing and say to (them) let's not fight their customer at that (end). Sorry, we can't transfer it because Whois privacy is on and, you know, it's not safe to transfer as is. Or, you know...

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Volker wants to chime in on this now. Volker, you want to...

Volker Greimann: It's my personal opinion that the Whois privacy service, it's the obligation to make sure privacy service, that it's not transferred with its information if it wants to maintain control over the domain name.

That is by either denying the transfer when it gets the (unintelligible) authorization or requiring it contractually. If a domain names gets transferred with the Whois proxy information still in there, it's either bad policy by the Whois proxy service or abuse of the service by the registrants because most proxy services do not permit a transfer with the information still on.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me just capture that. Okay, good deal.

All right, I see us getting very close to the top of the hour. And presuming that's an old hand, Volker...

Volker Greimann: It is.

Mikey O'Connor: ...we'll wrap it up. I think we've cleared the hurdle of the puzzler.

We've got a few minutes left. Am I saying something that's causing - this is a sort of a good time to stack and say are we comfortable with where this is headed?

If we are, then I will probably have to redraw this whole diagram, because I've learned an awful lot today. And I think this diagram, the whole (slide) is completely out of date and needs to be rethought. But I've got a lot of material to do that and I'll bring it back to the call.

Next, I guess I'm not seeing anybody leaping to the (four). The last puzzler that I just remembered is what does this do to the auth code/(FOA) discussion, if anything?

My presumption is that now that we can presume the eventual reliable transmission and validation of registrant information, that this can coexist with the auth code stuff without a whole lot of change. Is that a reasonable (assumption)?

Man: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, okay. All right. Well I think then we're done for today. Moved the ball substantially forward and really appreciate the help.

Volker, go ahead?

Volker Greimann: Just one final thought maybe to just throw another puzzler into the pile.

My experience with hijacked domains -- either transferred in or transferred out -- that we see usually originate from stolen access to email accounts. Because most registrants -- even if we do advise them not to do this -- keep their account information in their email account somewhere in the nice folder that's titled Passwords or something like that, with that the hackers gain access to the registrar accounts of the registrants.

Then there they access the EPP code and they have the ability to, A, transfer the domain with the EPP code and immediately acknowledge the (FOA) when it comes in because they have access to the email account.

We might want to think about finding some solution that would not rely - would have a different form of lock or a different form of safeguard that does not rely on email or any other form that can be hacked with one hack.

Mikey O'Connor: I actually built that into this and let me show you what I wrote.

What I said in the first draft of this is that the authentication to waive the safeguard would have to be pretty rigorous with exactly the thought that you had in mind, Volker. That if a bad person has just hacked my email account and maybe hacked my computer, that there has to be some sort of out-of-band authentication in order to waive that safeguard.

And I know that I'm treading on sensitive toes when I talk about out-of-band authentication. And those are toes that have been tread upon mightily in a lot of the RAA discussions.

What's the current sense of the - especially the registrar community about something like this? Is this likely to get people really worked up, or is this

something that - for this (one) narrow situation where they're waiving this safeguard we could demand higher levels of security. What's your thought?

You may have been muted. Volker, if you're talking you're muted.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I think the idea that you had there, that's helpful and that would prevent most hijackings that we've seen, at least, in our past experience.

I mean, there's a lot of hijack that's probably going on there that we never know about, but the ones that we do get knowledge about usually have that problem in the background.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Volker Greimann: And having some form of non-email account bound verification -- i.e. not like the (FOA) -- that will help.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Since (Angie) hasn't spoken, Keith, I'm going to jump her ahead of you in the queue, if that's okay.

Keith Groman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: (Angie), go ahead.

(Angie): Hey thanks, Mikey. Or I can just give you some anecdotal information.

I recently had a name attempted to be stolen using my email address. And my VIP account rep from my registrar called me and said, "Hey, we're getting going on that transfer you requested." And I said, "Oh, I didn't request one." And he said, "It came from your email address." And I said, "That's not valid." And I immediately shut down my email account, but wanted to let you all know that that was how it was stopped in my case.

And thanks for Volker's comments. It's really good, thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. Keith, I think you get to be the last speaker today.

Keith Groman: Just going back to Volker's talking about preventing hijacking. The only really effective way of doing that would be to say introduce one-time passwords in some form or another. You know, like sort of a key fob that you get from a bank or the likes. Or you could have an app like that running on your phone.

Of course, that would require some sort of a key from the current registrar or possibly even the registry itself if the registry actually took care of the one-time passwords. I'm authenticating it there because any other form of authentication out-of-band would have some kind of method of working around this. One-time passwords, on the other hand, are pretty safe in that regards.

But if you're dealing with actual physical key fobs, there's some expense to those. But a lot of modern phones can run apps, thus will take the (seat) for the random number generator and all of that and generate the one-time passwords itself.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Okey dokey. We'll let the chat run down just a little bit and call it a day.

Thank you all very much. This has been super helpful, at least for me, and I really appreciate the help.

And with that, we're out of here. (Nathalie), I think we can call this done and shut down the recording and we'll see most of you next Tuesday.

And Keith, thanks a million for joining.

Keith Groman: Okay, thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks, Mikey.

(Angie):   That was a good one.

Man: See you next week.

Mikey O'Connor: See you gang, bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you (unintelligible) the recording. Thank you very much.

END