

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
12 August , 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 12 August 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-wg-20080812.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
Adam Eisner - Tucows Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Steven Vine - Register.com Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.
Kevin R. Erdman - IPC
Michael Collins - CBUC
Mark Trachtenberg - IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent

Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative
Margie Milam - Markmonitor Registrar c.
Mark Klein - Sedo Registrar c.
Megan Carpenter - IPC

Coordinator: I have started the recording.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you (Bernadetta). We have Paul Diaz on the line from the registrar constituency, Barbara Steele, registry, James Bladel, registrar, Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency, Marc

Trachtenberg from IPC, Michael Collins, business constituency, Adam Eisner, registrar, Steven Vine registrar and Kevin Erdman from IPC.

Then we have for staff Marika Konings and Olof Nordling and myself.

Paul Diaz: Excellent, thank you Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you Paul.

Paul Diaz: Okay everybody, good morning and thank you for being so prompt. Thank you also everyone for providing us statements of interest, really great having that administrative thing taken care of right away.

For the call today we have a couple of administrative things, administrative type things I would like to first address and then we can move to the charter questions.

If you've all seen on the wiki site, Marika and Glen and others have been very helpful in posting up a couple of things that we need to discuss today or at least begin discussing.

If you can see on the wiki at the very top are documents for discussion at today's conference call, we have two things there. A template for the whatchamacallit, constituency statements, potential template that we've put together as well as a draft schedule for this working group.

And I don't really mind which one we address first they're going to be interrelated, I think we're going to cross over. But for the group I have a general question please and would like to get the discussion started here.

As the schedule has been set out and/or the template for constituency statements, it is currently envisioning that the various constituencies would provide preliminary inputs fairly early in our process.

In other words it looks like we're asking the group to - asking our colleagues to provide their views on the three questions before us sort of in parallel as we're going through them ourselves.

And the draft time table reflects that, that we would solicit these and try to get the statements back by mid to third week of next month in order to work towards a tentative goal of having our work done by end of October.

The question I have for the group is are you all comfortable with that approach or would you prefer more traditional we work through the questions, have some preliminary proposals address questions and then put those thoughts to our constituency colleagues for their comments and input.

I don't have a very strong feeling either way and really would like to open it up to the group for discussion. Can you all still here me?

Man: Yes, very good.

Paul Diaz: It is a strange feedback sound, is everybody else getting that?

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay, if you did hear me, the thoughts then on the where in our timeline, at what point we solicit our colleagues and the various constituency's input on the questions that are before this working group.

Marc Trachtenberg: This is Marc Trachtenberg. I guess I would be of the opinion of sooner rather than later, only because in my constituency, my experience that people have many opinions.

And so it would be helpful (unintelligible) as early on in the process as opposed to alter on when we're closer to a final work product, trying to incorporate those many different opinions into the final work product I think would be more difficult.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof. I would concur with that based on past experience, but - while although we set time limits, there have been delays in delivery of the constituent's statements so I think it's a good thing to give them as much time as possible to come to a consolidated statement from the constituency.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, good point Olof. Barbara?

Barbara Steele: I just basically wanted to add that I concur. I believe that you know given the number of members in our constituency and the matters at hand before the constituency at this time that we would want to put forward to them sooner rather than later.

Paul Diaz: Very good. So there seems to be consensus around this, is there anybody who feels that it would be - it makes more sense to seek the inputs later in the process, or are we in agreement?

Okay. That's fine then, the draft timeline that has been sketched out fits nicely with you know has been suggested. So I'd ask if you'll have it available if you could pull up, open up the template for these constituency inputs.

And it's going to look very familiar to everyone since you know it repeats in large degree the charter questions and the format is laid out in a very easy to understand manner as is typical for these processes.

Of course we have three questions before us so it's presented as issues one two and three. And if you all can see that, on the first issue the red text right now I will admit is mine.

And what we're noting here, the question asks, sorry, it says right now that the constituent responses do note that this should not include any proposed policy change effecting WHOIS policy as it is outside the scope of this PDP.

And just wanted to let the working group know that I have contacted as the chair and vice-chair of the GNSO just to make sure that that was an accurate statement, and they have concurred.

Both of them have told me that they said they felt that this working group recommending changes to WHOIS policy is outside of our mandate.

That's just sort of the one highlight I wanted to make sure the group...I think for the benefit of everybody it might be easier, you know we still have a little time and as far as the seeking the comments excuse me, finalizing this template, we don't have to do this until next week's call.

So next time for all of us please would be to go to the wiki to look at the draft. If there are any things that you would like to see changed and whatnot, to please make those changes or you can send me a note or Marika a note and we will make those changes for you.

And then at next week's call let's you know agree to the final text that we can then start passing around to our constituency colleagues to get their inputs. Is that successful to everybody?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Excellent. All right.

James Bladel: Hi Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: Yes James.

James Bladel: Question, is it possible to modify this document so that it is not stored as a native word document and we can edit it directly on the wiki? Otherwise I'm concerned that we'll have different versions floating around.

Paul Diaz: Very good point. Anybody on the staff that might have more familiarity with the wiki setup, can we do that easily enough?

Olof Nordling: We can do both, this is Olof.

Paul Diaz: All right, then taking James' advice that's a very good point, we'll make a section you know called the draft constituency template, basically move that document down and make it part of the wiki text so it's easily - easy for everyone to see and to input any edits, suggested changes, etcetera.

Okay, fantastic. Okay then, those were if you will the administrative issues we had to get through. With that I'd like to turn to our charter questions. As we discussed last week we thought we would take them in order.

Is everybody still comfortable with that or is there perhaps questions as they've been posed number two or three that you would really strongly prefer to start with?

All right then. So then we'll start from the top. The question before us was could there be a way for registrars to make the registrant email address data available to one another?

Again, per the guidance from GNSO council, changes to WHOIS are those sort of things are beyond this working group's mandate. However we do have a proposal from James posted to the list talking about using the - James why don't you explain your idea so I don't put words in your mouth.

James Bladel: I wouldn't claim or presume to think it's thought out thoroughly enough to be an idea or a proposal.

It's pointed more toward kind of a written musing. But it was the idea that I think that the thinking out side the lines a little bit the pull message system that right now is somewhat of a one way conduit of information between registries and registrars could conceivably be modified to facilitate a very limited inter registrar communication.

If registrars had the ability to create pull messages for one another, that might be a both authenticated and secure channel for the transfer of this kind of information.

And I just wanted to throw that out for the group to discuss.

Paul Diaz: Do others have thoughts? Did you have an opportunity to reflect on the proposal?

Kevin Erdman: Well this is Kevin Erdman. One thing that springs to my mind on this particular question relates to the contractual relationship between the registrant and the registrar being under a particular national law which would also govern how its information was purveyed.

And opening this up to other registrars who may be in other jurisdictions who have other national laws control would put an additional you know complication to that whole contractual relationship between the registrant and the registrar.

That's all.

Paul Diaz: That's excellent Kevin, I'm taking notes so if I pause just bear with me for a second.

That is some very keen insight. I would ask the group, it strikes me on first blush that this is moving us back into the whole WHOIS type debate realm.

And so I would ask given the guidance that we have, does that mean that the group feels that James' proposal would perhaps bring us into another area? Is this something that we need to seek some guidance on?

What does everybody think?

James Bladel: Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead James.

James Bladel: Are we assuming that, I'm probably going to torture this question a little bit so bear with me. Are we assuming that the registrant email address is not present in the WHOIS data block associated with a domain or is it necessarily outside of that?

Or can it be in both places? I mean do we have any assumptions or scenarios that we're using to chase this question?

Paul Diaz: After a question, not just for me, for the group my response James would be that the registrant email is not a required output field in WHOIS. Of course that information is collected by registrars but they're not required to publish it.

And so the assumption that I had is to assume that it's not there, that it's not publicly visible right now. Some registrars do publish it, but again it's not a requirement so therefore to assume that it would not be there.

Other thoughts?

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin again. My impression is that it's certainly typical these days for registrant, the actual registrant to email address to not appear in the public records, or the publicly accessible records I should say. I don't know if that's a big issue.

Paul Diaz: Okay, any other thoughts? Okay James so then I guess based on you know Kevin and my views on it, I think it's fair to assume that that data field is not in the publicly available WHOIS. It's fair to assume that.

James Bladel: So then building on that a little bit and going back to touch on Kevin's concerns, would that kind of blending the two together if we used a secure and authenticated exchange, which would be in this case the transfer or registrant initiated transaction.

Would that satisfy some of the data disclosure issues because it is not necessarily the EPP and the pull messages are not a publicly accessible communication channel.

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin again. I think that answers the question from, I would say that the obvious privacy question. But it doesn't necessarily totally resolve the question because the contractual relationship between the registrant and the registrar is more than just the privacy concern.

You know what I would think is that the biggest potential problem would be if these email addresses are more readily available than they already are, then it would be easier for folks that hijacking to get relevant information to be able to perform those transactions.

Paul Diaz: That's a good point Kevin, a very good point Kevin. I mean security concerns, we don't necessarily want to make the system any more insecure than it might already be.

James, if you're aware of anybody else, the pull message, just the mechanics of it, how do you follow up on Kevin's point, how readily available accessible is that, have there ever been instances where that database or that mechanism has been hacked in some way?

Would we be opening up a Pandora 's Box if we were to approach James' - take up James' approach and try to use it as a conduit for sharing this sensitive data point, the registrant email.

Or is it a pretty secure system that is sort of immune to potential hijacking attempts or other bad actions?

James Bladel: And I would defer that question to Barbara and some of the other folks from the registry constituency. My initial reaction is that it's fairly secure, but as far as any previous history of issues with that or known vulnerabilities, I would stay away from that.

Marc Trachtenberg: Is there any way we can elaborate on the actual mechanics of the pull message?

James Bladel: To my understanding the pull message exists in the provisioning system between the registry and the registrar. It is a secure system that a registrar must authenticate to in some cases there are multiple layers of authentication in order to create or renew or transfer some of the basic operations that someone can perform on the domain name.

And it is the edge or the front end for the - for a registry like bear sign or some of the others. All the registrars would connect to this, the pull message system is a means by which the registry can create messages for the registrar and put them in their mailbox essentially on this system so that a registrar can get messages from the registry.

And my proposals is that registrars would - the system would be extended to allow registrars to leave messages for one another.

Marc Trachtenberg: The existing system, the messages that are provided, are they just predefined discreet pieces of data or are they in some cases freeform text?

James Bladel: I think they are XML so that - and I'm a little nervous about saying what can and can't be done easily, but I think that they're XML so that they can be readily extended to include a text block or something that conforms to a field schema.

But that's just a swing at this point.

Marc Trachtenberg: So under your proposal would the registrar send the email address to the registries and - through this system, and then the registries would then forward it on to the gaining registrar?

Or are you proposing that the system be extended so that the communication goes directly from the losing registrar to the gaining registrar?

James Bladel: I think both of those methods are acceptable and on the table, but in either case the registry system becomes the intermediary.

Marc Trachtenberg: I mean it would seem that going through the registry would seem you know one, not only more secure but two, would require less build out of the system.

James Bladel: Well that's where I would ask Barbara to chime in.

Barbara Steele: Yeah, this is Barbara. Quite honestly I from a technical perspective really don't have insight into it, but maybe what we should do, I could probably find somebody on our technical team to perhaps attend our meeting next week to answer some of these questions.

Because I'm really not comfortable, you know speaking to how it technically works.

Marc Trachtenberg: Do you think in the meantime before the next meeting that person could put together a brief document and post it to the wiki. That way we could have a better understanding before the meeting and make more - a better use of our time on that call.

Barbara Steele: Sure. Let me engage someone from our technical team to do that. So basically we're just looking for the functionality of the pull messages and how easily we would be able to extend that to allow messages to

be passed either directly between registrars or from one registrar to another via the registry.

Is that a correct assessment?

James Bladel: I think that's correct Barbara. Right now the pull message system is a one to one between their registrar and registries and it is a unit directional channel from the registry to the registrar so there's really no way for a registrar to send a message back to the registry using this system.

So either case would require some significant extensions or enhancements to the system.

Barbara Steele: Okay. All right, let me see what I can find out and I'll have some information posted to the wiki this week.

Paul Diaz: And Barbara, this is Paul. I would ask...

Man: I have a question on this.

Paul Diaz: Sure, please go ahead.

Kevin Erdman: So I guess even if this would work, (unintelligible) problem that some registrars collect this piece of data and others do not?

Marc Trachtenberg: Well I think pretty much every registrar collects the data. I don't think it's a matter of collection, it's a matter of display.

Paul Diaz: I believe that's correct Kevin excuse me, I believe that's correct, that it needs to be collected, some registrars may, I know we call it a primary contact, that's synonymous with registrant.

But that's a critical data field, we currently do not publish it because it's critical, but we definitely have it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. So I want to go back also to the scoping issue. You know with complete respect for what Avri and Chuck might have told you Paul, you know I don't know exactly what you asked them, and questions to the council really ought to be going through me.

And I think the WHOIS was specifically mentioned in this request and the notion that you know making a piece of data that is collected by everybody, you know publishable in the WHOIS record is not necessarily you know outside the scope of this group.

So I just want to leave that on the table and not completely discount it. I didn't know it was a piece that was in fact collected by everybody, that definitely makes a difference in my thinking on that.

Marc Trachtenberg: Even if it was published though, I don't know if that really - it's not how relevant it really is to this discussion because that presupposes that there'd be some type of manual review process for the transfers where the registrar could you know access WHOIS data and then verify it.

Whereas I think what we're looking at is more of an automated process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Through this other tool.

Marc Trachtenberg: I mean that was my understanding. I don't know...

Mike Rodenbaugh: It should be fine. I'm also a little concerned I don't understand why you would collect what you call a primary email address, you know at network solutions, yet not publish it, but then you collect something called an administrative email address which everyone in the world believes is the primary email address and you publish that.

You know what happens when they're different?

Marc Trachtenberg: I think that's part of the issue.

Paul Diaz: That's very often the issue.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think it's a big part of the issue. We need to dive into it a little bit and not be frightened about a scoping issue.

Paul Diaz: All right.

Marc Trachtenberg: I think that's - you know it's not so much being frightened of the scoping issue, it's more that there's obviously a lot of conflict having to do with WHOIS and despite numerous attempts people have not been able to change anything about WHOIS.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, but that's a (unintelligible).

Marc Trachtenberg: If we start going in that direction we're likely to be stuck in that quagmire as well. And so we might be better served by trying to find

alternatives to forcing public display of this information when it seems like there may be some other technical possibilities for achieving our goal of expediting and making more efficient the transfer process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I agree completely we should look at all alternatives. I just don't want to take any alternatives off the table on the second call for reasons that I don't quite understand.

I don't see why this particular small issue is in the whole WHOIS you know realm, needs to put us off track. You know I don't think we need to get into a broader debate, I just need to discuss you know whether it's a viable alternative or not and then leave that up to others.

Marc Trachtenberg: Well I guess the question I would have for you is, if WHOIS were within the scope and we were to you know recommend display of the registrant address, how would that really facilitate a more efficient transfer process?

Mike Rodenbaugh: And that is a totally fair question. I don't know the answer to that right now. Although it seems to me that that seems to be the piece of information that if everybody had it, this process would go a lot smoother.

Marc Trachtenberg: And I think that's the whole point of our question. You know how can we provide this information without necessarily going through WHOIS?

How can we ensure that only the necessary parties have access to this information for the sole purpose of expediting transfer and ensuring that transfer is actually legitimate.

And so I think that's a separate question from whether it should be displayed in WHOIS because I don't see how public display of the information at all helps the transfer process. In fact it could be detrimental to the transfer process because it gives bad actors access to the information.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, but you know at the moment, okay I can see this quickly devolving into a WHOIS debate maybe, but (unintelligible).

Marc Trachtenberg: No, I'm for public display of all information WHOIS. But...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, well good, that's not where we're at today.

Marc Trachtenberg: Yeah, but for the purpose of this working group, you know I think that is a little outside the scope of our question.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, this is Paul, and wearing my Network Solutions hat I would just say that you know when it comes down to what goes into WHOIS, there will always be the tradeoff between convenience and security.

And I think you know requiring making the registrant email which basically trumps everything else publicly available is going to open up tremendous security concerns.

Putting the chair's hat back on, Mike what I would ask and believe me, I want this process to be totally transparent and I hope I didn't step on any toes not going through you, just because I've never done this before and ask Chuck and Avri a very high level question.

But if you know you have a concern or you know would like to take it up with the council as council liaison, please by all means why don't we you know take that initiative and come back to the group, you know keep them - define the issues in such a way maybe you will get a different answer.

It just again in the broad way that I had asked, you know they both came back and felt that it was beyond the mandate of this working group. But so that there's no concerns that you know we're unnecessarily cutting off potential avenues for discussion, by all means, go back to them and then let us know if they have a different view.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Great, thanks Paul. I mean I'm not you know wedded to a specific process on this, I just don't want us closing off avenues at the outset of a working group that don't necessarily need to be closed off.

Paul Diaz: All right, and Barbara if I can coming back, whichever of your colleagues you may speak to, I guess for the benefit of the working group as well, when you ask them you know to put something together on the wiki about the mechanics of the pull message and everything, if you would also have them please have in mind or begin to address the level of effort.

What level of effort there might be involved, are there any changes that might need to be instituted, etcetera, so that if we as a group think this is a good idea and pursue it as a recommendation that we're also sensitized to something that can be done but I'm just making this up, it's going to take six months for the engineers to write some new code or something, whatever that may be, it might take six hours.

On the other extreme, whatever that we at least are sensitive to the sort of impact any recommendations we may make, what they'll need for the real world.

Barbara Steele: Okay, I can definitely do that, and what I may do is you know put forth these questions to the constituency asking for volunteers from any of the registries that may be there, you know absent any you know and also I can volunteer up some people as well.

But I just want to make sure that you know any of the registries have the opportunity to speak to this.

Paul Diaz: Excellent, again much appreciated. Because at this point, all gTLD registries are using PP, is that correct?

Barbara Steele: I am not 100% certain but I feel that most of them are and I'll verify that as well.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Other thoughts, comments or concerns on this proposal? Okay, then we'll look forward to whatever feedback we can get next week and we can follow up.

I guess as we've gone over this, has anybody else had any other ideas, any other proposals in addition to what James has put on the table that we might address now?

Okay then, then we'll look forward to follow up next week, and I guess now why don't we begin to touch on number two. All right, the second

question before the group, whether there is a need for other options for electronic authentication.

Suggestion being something like a security token in the FOA.
Authentic, electronic authentication due to security concerns over the use of email addresses.

So I guess this one is asking us does the working group believe there's a need for other things and the follow on, if so, I guess some suggestions of what those electronic authentication things might be.

If we break it down, take the first half just as it has been proposed, whether there is a need for electronic authentication options due to security concerns.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. It's my understanding that any registry that's using EPP also requires the auth info code to accompany the transfer request from the registrar.

So does that give us I guess an added layer of authentication or do any - I guess is anyone on the call feel that that you know would not be an adequate or appropriate solution?

Man: Barbara, could you just restate the solution again? The first part...

Barbara Steele: My understanding that any registry operator that is currently using the EPP protocol requires that a transfer request be accompanied by the auth info code.

So the registrar would be providing that to us, we of course have that in our systems as well to authenticate the transfer as well. So would that not be an additional needs of electronic authentication that would be - would give us I guess the level of comfort that we're looking for here?

Or does anyone I guess feel that that does not give us any additional security or comfort?

James Bladel: Barbara this is James. I think that's an excellent idea. My understanding of the auth info code would lead me to the opposite conclusion which is that I would be concerned that it's a little too powerful and that registrants might get careless about it or might get out into the wild and we would see a rise in things like domain hijacking.

Because that is if I'm not mistaken maybe you can correct me on this but that is the key that registries are looking for, for transfer or change of registrant or any of those types of operations.

Is that correct, or?

Barbara Steele: I don't know that it's required for a change of registrant, but I do believe that it is required for you know change of registrar.

James Bladel: Okay, so I think it would be useful for our purposes but I would be concerned about how we would handle that carefully to prevent it from becoming a vulnerability.

Man: But I mean it's already used. I'm not sure I understand your comment James.

James Bladel: Well it is out there but I guess my question is, is that released to the registrant when they approve a transfer Barbara? Or is that something, some other token that the registrar is passing and then the auth info code never actually goes out to the registrar.

Barbara Steele: It's my understanding that the registrant, the registrar of record for domain name has the auth info code. They are required to provide it to the registrant. The registrant would need that auth info code in order to initiate a transfer to another registrar.

So they would provide that I believe in the request that they would submit to the registrar, the gaining registrar and then it would be the gaining registrar that would you know pass that through to the registry when they are initiating the transfer.

James Bladel: Okay. And my apologies, I was under the impression those were two separate keys, but if they're the same key then we're already using that, you're correct.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul. Let me put a question to the group. As I look at this and I think I'm going to have to go back and read some of the archival information to better understand what the thinking was when this particular question was formulated.

But it strikes me that problems that we experience, any registrar can experience in terms of attempts at domain hijacking email is a vulnerable mechanism.

And the question I have for the group is, is this question getting at email in general needing some form of electronic authentication and then it necessarily carries to transfer requests?

Or should it just be very narrowly viewed in okay some form of electronic authentication solely when an email, excuse me, when a transfer request is made?

If that's not clear what I'm getting at is so often when we have hijacking cases it is because the admin contact email has been taken over by the bad guys. So they now control that email, they start the process.

You know there's a request process and as we've just touched on, if they get access to the auth info code, the name is gone, they are able to move it out.

So again I'm just looking at this and wondering if the question is just very narrowly focused on looking for ways to beef up security regarding the use of emails during transfer process, or is it trying to stretch the boundaries a little bit and speaking on solutions or ways to make the emails more secure.

Marc Trachtenberg: I mean I think we have to look at it from their perspective, this is Marc Trachtenberg and I think we have to look at it from their perspective just with regard to transfers, otherwise it's going to be clearly outside the scope of this working group.

I mean I think additional security could be helpful, my concern is the cost of implementation which will be a concern mostly from registrars.

Paul Diaz: Ultimately Marc I agree with you wearing my Network Solutions hat, I just wanted to throw it out there because thinking about these security problems that is the idea of hacking, spoofing, etcetera.

You know those scope of issues come up all the time, not necessarily in a transfer request arena.

But with that said I agree, I think it's trying to deal with the inherent insecurity of a hotmail account as you admin email is an issue beyond the scope of this group.

Other thoughts or comments? Okay. Does anybody have any ideas on the - and the question that's posed is security?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm sorry, Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, it's Mike Rodenbaugh. I have just an overall question on this issue there. So number two the question is whether there is a need for other options?

So I think we need to try to quantify what is the problem here, how often does this sort of thing happened, that email addresses are hacked and spoofed and domains are allegedly mistransferred?

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It seems to be a fundamental question in order to address if there's a need we need to know whether there's a problem.

James Bladel: Mike and Paul, this is James.

Paul Diaz: Go ahead James.

James Bladel: I'll take that as an action item. I know that we have a department that focuses specifically on these types of issues, so maybe I can gather some data there.

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry who is that?

Michael Collins: This is Michael Collins. I wanted to add a little bit more specific request to Mike's, that is it seems to me there would be a great deal of difference between what - how you could use a hacked email address and a spoofed one.

For example if you could hack an email address you might be able to gain access to the auth info code, but there's some registrars will nail that email that information.

And if you can receive email, you know the admin email address, email then you could probably acquire that.

So I think we have to be careful that using that as an authentication, but just consider that a thought.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. I can speak from VeriSign's standpoint because my team handles transfer disputes that arise and are filed with us for level one resolution.

And since the policy was put in place in I think it was 2004, we have received only it looks like 240 dispute over the course of that time given the number of transfers that we process in any given month I think it's a fairly low percentage of actual dispute being filed.

And that also actually includes court orders that we may receive, so in actuality, actual disputes themselves are probably in the neighborhood of about 200.

I cannot speak for how often an email address is spoofed and you know just the change of registrant is made, you know a registrar to registrar transfer did not accompany that.

I don't know if that information is helpful or not.

Paul Diaz: Okay, again making notes and it is - it's certainly helpful Barbara, it's an important data point. But James if you can provide things as well and any other data, I would suggest that we look at this again.

We will necessarily need to look at this again in a subsequent call, we might also want to make sure, tweak the proposed template for the constituencies and you know solicit additional input there.

Other experiences etcetera to more fully you know flesh out what the markets have to deal with.

Marc Trachtenberg: I think we also want to make sure that we specify and empathize here that we're only discussing inter registrar transfer and not change of registrant.

Paul Diaz: Yes, very good point.

Marc Trachtenberg: Because I think if we don't do that we're going to get many, many opinions and many, many long comments about the problems with registrar change as opposed to what's in the scope of our working group which is just transfer between registrars.

Barbara Steele: Very good point.

Paul Diaz: Yep. Okay, and to that end, when we post our template to the wiki, let's please everybody take a look and make sure that we have tight language and that it is very clear that we are not seeking anything beyond the mandate of this particular working group.

Okay all, by my watch we have about eight minutes left before the top of the hour. I put it to the group, do we want to begin discussing number three or is this a decent place to break?

We could circle back, we could follow up information we're trying to gather for one and two and then really focus on three on our next call. What do people prefer?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think just briefly on number three we ought to maybe make an effort which I think we kicked off on the last call to also you know put facts around that.

Is there a really large demand for partial bulk transfer?

James Bladel: Mike, this is James. What - do we - I am in the process of gathering some data and I've been speaking with some of our folks here internally and I'm curious as to one of the questions they've put back to me is what threshold constitutes a bulk?

Is it 100, is it 10,000, is it somewhere in between I would imagine.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Man, that's a really good question too. Maybe if there was just data that just kind of showed on the plot, you know the number of domains in any given transfer request but I guess that's even hard to quantify because at the moment they all come in one by one, right?

James Bladel: Right.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So how do you know if it's 100 for one order? Is it spread over two days, or whatever? I understand what you're saying, maybe that's something we need to get from the constituencies, whether...

James Bladel: One of the approaches that we're taking is trying to estimate how much time and effort is involved on the part of the registrant per transfer, and then what a reasonable amount of time commitment for transfer would be before they would want some sort of programmatic approach to a bulk transfer.

But you know that's just a swing, we could be way off the mark there.

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. Can I enter the queue?

Paul Diaz: Please Barbara.

Barbara Steele: As far as the bulk transfer is concerned, I think we need to also be cognizant of what actually the definition of a bulk transfer is. You know currently as it's in the existing transfer policy, it's when a transfer is done and authorized by ICANN, authorizing the registry operator to transfer all of a portfolio from one registrar to another (unintelligible) registrar.

It does not charge the six or whatever, the transaction fee is for a transfer, and it also does not add an additional year to the term of the registration. So if we're talking about two different things and just the ability for I guess registrars to be able to submit multiple transfer requests in bulk to a registry for processing I think that's one thing.

But I'm not certain that that's necessarily what's intended when we're talking about a bulk transfer in this context.

Man: I think that...

Michael Collins: Go ahead, I'm sorry. This is Michael Collins. I just wanted to confirm that this using this bulk transfer was confusing to me especially since the descriptions didn't seem to fit.

Paul Diaz: Okay, this is Paul. I think it's certainly within our mandate to tighten the definition. And you know if it's controversial we can always seek clarification from council.

But it strikes me that we'll definitely need to firm up a definition of what are we talking about, what does partial mean, what does bulk mean?

And to Barbara's point the implication of transfers, if we're thinking of the beast along the lines of what currently exists, i.e. there are no fees involved or an extension of an added domain here.

Or is this going to be a new beast in which case fee would apply you know the year is extended, etcetera. Those sorts of definitions are something that we as a group will need to more fully address.

Man: I would also like to solicit some input from our colleagues in the registrar constituency to see if this is really a problem.

If it's not really that much of an issue then we don't have to address the other more complicated issues.

Paul Diaz: Fair enough.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think also hearing from Mike Collins and his constituents in ICA you know people that have big portfolios. My experience with Yahoo with managing a bit portfolio was you know our registrar handled all that.

I gave him a list and it didn't take me any incremental time. So I just don't know if that's really the norm though.

Man: I mean I think it's again the question is the burden on the registrar, not so much the burden on the registrant or the domain owner. But then again my question is you know how big is that burden.

I think that's why that would be helpful to solicit that information from the registrar constituency.

Michael Collins: This is Michael. I think it really depends once again how we're defining this bulk transfers I think by definition at least now it's service to registrars to be able to close a registrar or to be able to - for registrars that buy another registrar for example and just combine the portfolios into one registrar accreditation, that kind of thing.

But if you're talking about making it easier for registrants to transfer large numbers of domain names from one registrar to another, it is problematic today.

There are some registrars that make it difficult and - to get the cost code or to complete the process so that you could end up if you wanted to transfer hundreds or thousands or God forbid tens of thousands of domain names from one registrars to another you could be talking about hundreds of hours of time under the current process.

So maybe there is a registrant issue for making transfer of larger name - larger groups of names easier. I'm just still confused a little bit about if that's what we're referring to in this - in our charter or not. I hope it is but I'm not sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I mean it seems to me safe to assume that's what we're talking about here. That doesn't mean it's right, but it is partial bulk transfers, and it does say transfers involving a number of names but not the entire group of names held by the losing registrar.

Michael Collins: For the benefit of a registrant as opposed to a registrar because I think that there is a different incentive. Losing registrars are not necessarily incentivized to make the process easy and efficient.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's an understatement.

Marika Konings: This is Marika here. I just wanted to point out as well that both scenarios have been taken up in the template, because from our side it wasn't clear which one was meant so we basically included them both.

So maybe there should be a question as well, should both of them be in there or is the working group aside and that it should be limited to one or the other.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, me too Marika, yeah, I was going to refer everybody to the draft that we currently have.

And again we will have this posted on the wiki so that everybody can make changes, suggestions, comments, etcetera.

But these scenarios have been envisioned but there is the question, are we talking about one, both, what do we want?

And sensitive to Michael's point, definition we have partial bulk transfer in quotations right now, that needs to be more firmly defined for people to understand what it is that we're getting at.

Michael Collins: And it needs - I'm sorry?

Paul Diaz: Go ahead.

Michael Collins: This is Michael again. As an example of something that we might strive for is a practice that I know one registrar does and that is a - if you

think you're going to list the domain entities that you want to transfer out, and they will give you one off code for that list of domain names.

And you know I don't know if that is something that we could require registrars to do. I suppose we could, but it does make it very convenient.

Marc Trachtenberg: And I think I would ask again, you know is this really an issue for registrars in general and registrants in general. If there was just a few registrants that have this issue, then I don't know that you know changing the policy is necessarily appropriate.

You know you could make the argument that that's just a cost of their doing business.

James Bladel: And this is James. I have to drop off here for another call but I just wanted to echo that sentiment and reemphasize that we don't necessarily want to create policy that - there are no technical or policy barriers to transfers at this point, we're just talking about a convenience and an issue for a very limited market segment.

And I think that that's a take away from a competitive advantage for someone, a registrar that wants to develop a business model to serve that group.

Marc Trachtenberg: And I think we should also consider the security implications as well. If you make it easier to transfer to have a partial bulk transfer, you arguably make it that much easier for you know a bad actor to transfer for 100 domains or 1000 domains as opposed to one domain.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Yes, folks I recognize James has to drop off, others as well. We have used our hour, this...

Olof Nordling: Just a little housekeeping routine, I've now added a link to the wiki page with the template so it's there.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you Olof.

Olof Nordling: Now there is the link to the word document.

Paul Diaz: Very good. But in the recognizing the time I think we need to draw this particular one to a close.

Some of us have action items others you know I would ask please keep thinking about the issues that we've discussed.

We'll be following this up on next Tuesday's call. Please go to the wiki and look at in particular what Olof has just put up for us so that we can start tightening the template up, get it ready to get it out to constituencies because clearly with the range of views just within the group that we have we're probably going to get - hopefully get a lot of good inputs from our colleagues.

And the sooner we can feel good about getting that process underway the better for all of us to have this very meaningful PDP.

So with that I will thank you all for your time. We will have this call again same time next week, next Tuesday the 19th and other questions or concerns, please reach out either on the public list or feel free to contact me directly.

And again thank you very much.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

END