

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

11 September, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 11 September 2008. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-irtp-a-pdp-20080911.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Participants present:

James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Adam Eisner - Tucows
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michael Collins - CBUC
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative

Staff:

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

Absent - apologies:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.
Marika Konings - Policy Director

(Sebastian): A3 Acrobat something.

(Michael): Oh, I.

(Sebastian): You want me to be?

(Michael): Yes.

(Sebastian): Or you want.

(Michael): Yes, that's what's.

(Sebastian): Oh, you want. That's not working.

(Michael): That one's not working. If you take the S out of the HTTPS.

(Sebastian): Okay.

(Michael): Just go HTTP: to that same link. That will work. I sent an email to the list, but I sent it about two minutes before this meeting started because I realized that I gave Glen the wrong URL. So if people are trying to get into Adobe and not getting in with the URL that Glen sent, just take - just go in with regular HTTP instead of HTTPS.

(Sebastian): Oh, it's not working either. But maybe it will come, I don't know. It's not working for the moment.

(Michael): Oh, too bad. Well I think we may be better off just using the stuff on the wiki.

(Sebastian): But I - on the wiki it's great.

(Michael): Good, well let's just stick with that and not try and shoehorn this into an Adobe connect session. Sometimes new toys are a wonderful thing, but....

(Sebastian): But what it's trying is that usually I got to the Adobe connect so that it's not the same type of link when I am on the - my a conference codes. It's another name, I guess.

(Michael): Well if you check our email list, I just sent a note to the list, new URL, you might just try clicking on that and seeing how that works. My apologies, that was my mistake. Glen foolishly took a URL from me.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: That's between you and Mike. How could I not do that?

(Michael): I know. I'm sorry. I made a mistake there. Anyway, I think we're probably going to have - this is probably the group we're going to have.

James Bladel: James Lidel joined.

(Michael): Oh, hi, (James).

James Bladel: Hi, I didn't think I was going to make it.

(Michael): Oh it's great that you could. We're sort of - I'm sort of in the middle of giving up on the Adobe connect stuff. I put a link out on the wiki in the background document's section through a new tape that's got all three of the diagrams that (Marika) sent us. And I'm thinking that we might just use those instead and just use the wiki instead.

What's interesting to me is that we have sort of three versions of the same chart from three different registrars and I was thinking it might be interesting to just go through and compare them because they differ.

And so, can everybody get to that wiki page?

Man: I'm there, (Michael).

(Michael): Okay. (James) can you get to that?

James Bladel: Just a moment.

(Michael): Yeah, the link is in the CAD area of the Adobe Connect. If you just.

James Bladel: Yeah, I'm there now.

(Michael): And (Sebastian) you can see the wiki page, right?

(Sebastian): Yes, no problem.

(Michael): Okay, so I think we're all good. (Adam) can you see?

(Adam): Yep, I'm on it.

(Michael): Okay. Well if I could jump in here real quickly, (Adam) is the other registrar on the call taking a look at the documents from GoDaddy and Network Solutions. Is there anything that jumps out at you as unusual or different or?

(Adam): Not yet, I've been looking at them pretty closely but on a high level they seem largely the same. I mean, I know their the processes are described a little differently here, but thus far on a high level they actually seem quite similar to me.

(Michael): Okay.

(Adam): I actually feel a little less doubt. I didn't realize - I also have a process flow I can happily post as well, just didn't think to do it before the call.

(Michael): Oh well that would be terrific. Can you just - if you want, you can either email it to me or you could go ahead and edit the page and upload the file if you feel it's interesting from a wiki perspective.

(Adam): Yeah, I can throw up on the wiki. I might have to extract it from a PDF which might take a second. But.

(Michael): Well and maybe.

(Adam): I think I have something to share as well.

(Michael): Oh, great. You know, I think if nothing else, we've accomplished something by simply aggregating all of these different drawings. And I'm - since I'm sort of the most clueless one of the bunch, I'm glad to hear that you're feeling like they're pretty similar, just drawn differently, because the difference in the drawings sort of threw me off. And so if you're feeling like the process that they're drawing is really pretty much the same process, maybe we're ahead of the game - further along than I thought we were.

(Adam): Yeah, I mean, (James) is there anything that sticks out to you? In looking at it all, it seems largely similar to me.

James Bladel: Yeah, it just - as you mentioned just some differences in terminology perhaps and - but for the most part no.

(Michael): I'd probably be a little distressed to find out that there was a huge difference in the process, but I'm sure we would have, you know, heard about it from our compliance or abuse teams or whatever.

James Bladel: I think that maybe the differences would occur with the - the registrar differences would occur in the tools and mechanisms to lock or.

(Michael): Right.

James Bladel: Secure or guard against unwanted or unexpected transfers.

(Michael): Right.

James Bladel: And we can call them all different things, you know, if we want to call them, you know, transfer watchdog type services or something like that.

(Michael): Right.

James Bladel: But once those are all removed, it seems like the process is pretty standardized and uniform

(Michael): That's good. Now I have a question for the registrar type folks, in the case of a thin registry, I sent out a little picture yesterday because I

was curious. Do you have to establish direct connections between the two registrars when you're transferring, air wise? So, for example, if there were 100 registrars in the galaxy of registrar, do you have to establish essentially a pair-wise connection between you and each of the other ones whenever you transfer between yourselves?

James Bladel: That's correct; we establish a connection to their Whois systems.

(Michael): So the glue is Whois?

James Bladel: For thin registries that is correct. Is that your understanding as well (Adam)?

(Adam): Yep, yeah it is.

James Bladel: Yeah, and I think one of the issues that we encounter, and this is completely out of scope for the group here. One of the issues that we see and I'm going to say this diplomatically, and (Adam) chime in please at any time, is that sometimes there will be anti-abuse or throttling systems where a registrar is preventing someone from harvesting their Whois data. And a high-volume registrar, let's say GoDaddy, dealing with a mom and pop registrar will get caught into that because, you know, when we do a high volume of transfers, it can look like it's harvesting because it's so out of - such an outlier from their normal traffic patterns.

(Adam): Yep.

James Bladel: Additionally, I think all registrars with a wink and nod will put a link in the Whois data text block that's returned to say where it's coming from.

And you know, that they offer competitive registrar services. And then other registrars with a similar wink and a nod will strip that out before returning it to the customers. So, you know, (Adam) your thoughts on that, I mean. I'm sure I'm not telling anything here that's a state secret.

(Adam): Yeah, no, no, no, exactly. The, you know, on the subject of Whois blocking that's probably one of the number one requests that comes through my desk in terms of smaller registrars who seem to be, you know, problems that we have connecting to smaller registrars, problems - smaller registrars sometimes do have connecting to us. Typically not a problem with the larger guys, I find. But typically a mid to small size sort of issue largely.

James Bladel: That's interesting. So you know, one of the issues that it seems interesting from a scope perspective is this - I know that we keep swirling back to Whois, but Whois is carrying more freight than I ever realized.

(Adam): You know on a thin registry level, if you have problems connecting to Whois at all, the whole process - transfers process breaks down.

James Bladel: That's a perfectly stated sentiment there. That is the - a key link in that process. And you know, as far as scaling, (Mike) I agree with you and I did reply to you individually about some other ideas. But one thing I think that - I don't think is even up for discussion is that new GTLDs and TLDs going forward - I don't think that it's going to be any worse than registries, I think that's a legacy. But I could be sorely naive in that point.

(Michael): Well, you know, I mean this call is a very informal unstructured call as you can tell, partly because I'm running it. But, you know, there's another idea out there in my head which is if Whois is the glue, and Whois is sort of locked up in a stalemate over issues that are clearly outside of the scope of this working group, have the registrars ever thought about creating a different entity to essentially replace Whois in this glue function so that they don't have to rely on this protocol that's very difficult to change, very difficult to make operational improvements to because of some of the other issues that are surrounding it?

James Bladel: Boy, that's a dynamite question.

(Michael): Well, and here's - and I'll - sometimes I'm cagey and I wait until people get out on a limb, but let me tell you where I'm headed with this. (Dan Warner)'s got his gizmo that he does out of (Fabulous) - I've forgotten what he calls it. But it's a deal where people can throw domain names into the hopper and they appear all over the place....

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: The main distribution networks?

(Michael): Say again?

James Bladel: The main distribution networks?

(Michael): Yeah. Now that's a neutral ground, I think, at least when I talked to (Dan) about it, he intended it to be that way. And I'm wondering if something like that could be - this would probably have to be an operational agreement between (unintelligible) rather than a policy

thing. But could you expand that to essentially replace Whois in this glue function and at the same time get rid of the snarl of scaling problems?

James Bladel: Just off the cuff, and I'm not familiar with the domain distribution network, but just off the cuff, it certainly seems like getting that from a practical standpoint, getting that degree of cooperation amongst all registrars, I mean, you could probably get the big folks, you know, two cows network solutions and GoDaddys and register.com to hop on board with a plan like that. But there would be a significant portion of non-compliance and that.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Well, yeah, and that doesn't even touch into some of the legal issues that (Barbara) raised today on the list.

(Michael): Yeah, and I haven't read the list today, unfortunately. I guess where I was headed with that is that you know, you could think about doing that incrementally. You wouldn't have to necessarily have everybody do it at once.

You can start with the big ones and then say to the little ones, you're welcome to participate if you want and here are the benefits, but if you don't want to that's fine as well. But essentially sidestep some operational log jam around Whois which given all the posse troubles with Whois, seems like a really difficult one to modify and yet it's the operational glue that drives the whole process for the thin registries.

For the thick registries it seems like the registry -- Now, in the case of a thick registry, is Whois the vehicle or is the registry the vehicle for these information exchanges?

James Bladel: I believe it's the registry, (Adam) is that correct?

(Adam): Yeah.

James Bladel: You just connect to their registry and all the information you need is there, there's no need to contact the registrar record.

(Michael): What we've really got under the covers, this series of diagrams doesn't really show it, is that under the covers of this process we've got two separate information processes who exchange information. One relying on Whois in the case of the thick - thin registry, and the other relying on the registry when you have a thick one there. Is that a summary that we could put in some sort of little menu report?

James Bladel: Well the thing is about - or at least about our document is it really doesn't go into the registry role in, you know, in a whole lot of detail.

(Michael): Yeah, this is - these are really....

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: There's a behind the scenes for some of these steps between - this is really just describing the relationship between the customer and the two different registrars.

(Michael): Right. And see what I'm thinking is that what we probably really need to document is the behind-the-scenes process. And that what we've got is really two of them. And that - and the reason that I'm interested in that is because maybe the - when we circle back around to the policy discussion, that we've really got to write sort of two versions of the policy. One for thick registries and one for thin because in the case of all the agony over email addresses in this question that we were working on right now in the larger group, that question is essentially moot if you've got a thick registry, right?

Man: May I ask this? When you figured - you're checking with the registry for the information in cases of thick registries, it's still Whois data; is that not correct? Who's still a Whois lookup it's just where the Whois looking to be done; am I right or wrong?

James Bladel: I don't think that's correct. I believe that they're doing an info command through EPP and while it may return data that's very similar to Whois and it will return different data whether you're registrar of record or just somebody else, I don't believe you're actually using the Whois channel - is that right (Adam) or?

(Adam): I don't want to say it's right for every registry just given how different they are, so I'm not 100% sure on every case, but (James) is largely correct. In most cases it's an info command to the APP, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Adam): Now that source of data could be - I don't even know to be quite honest with you, I'd have to go look.

Man: It does, however, materially change the conversation that (Barb) and I were having by email in through the group earlier today then. Because I think the word was that, you know, if it was - the registrar information was contained in the Whois, then it wouldn't take a registry or most of the registries, at least the ones that she checked, I think. So that kind of - if it's not really Whois but rather some other info command that's used, it really kind of materially changes the conversation that we were having.

(Michael): I'm going to go have a look when we get off the call. I'm going to talk to some folks back here and see where we're largely pulling them from from our major registries - the major thick ones we use anyway.

James Bladel: Yeah, I'll do the same.

Man: I think this is quite tasty.

(Adam): I think the fact that you're dealing with two real different, you know, approaches here is something that we've crossed over before, so yeah, I think it's definitely helpful.

(Michael): Yeah. Now, that gets us to the back to these charts which is I think another observation that we've just come to that's pretty important - is that these charts are customer facing charts which are fine, but they don't really describe the information flows that happen underneath that.

James Bladel: Yeah, they're - I mean, it's funny because the two (unintelligible) actually got three because when a name moves from retailer to reseller, we largely mimic the transfer process. So, you know, these are largely designed to make it simple for our registry and to

understand as opposed to going, well, if you're transferring a name through a thick registry then having to explain that and yada yada.

Man: Yeah. Yeah.

Man: Yeah, it should be seamless because it used to be in to the registrar, so they shouldn't have to learn thick and thin.

(Adam): Oh, good lord, no man, heavens no.

Man: Right.

((Crosstalk))

(Adam): But at the same time I think that it's important that we understand the differences because they bear on the policy issue. If, for example, I mean, I'm sort of raising my eyes heavenward and hoping that most of the thick registry transfers are actually enabled through EPP rather than through Whois. And if that's the case, we might have a lot more flexibility in terms of what we recommend for thick registry transfers.

And at the same time, we probably need to acknowledge the constraints of the Whois glue in the thin registry transfers. And then, you know, the two cows, that third example is in a way -- did you get a copy of my little PowerPoint that I sent out last night?

James Bladel: I did. I actually thought it was very useful for training internally here in terms of illustrating how thick and thin works.

(Adam): Well I think that another version of that last page has two cows in that middle zone and resellers around the outside.

James Bladel: Well I would want to - GoDaddy also has a reseller program and I would just want to emphasize that transactions between resellers or between resellers and the registrar record are - while they certainly affect registrants are - from an ICANN perspective are supposed to be transparent.

(Michael): Right.

James Bladel: And not covered by any particular policies.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): I would caution us about going down that road or including those types of transactions in our discussion.

(Adam): No, I agree.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yeah, I just sort of mentioned it as a, you know, it's even more interesting to note.

(Michael): Oh yes, it's very interesting.

(Adam): That's about it.

Yeah, I agree, it's not really - it's an internal thing largely as opposed to a ICANN thing.

(Michael): But you know, absolutely had this - certainly there's no policy implication, I'm more of an ops guy than a policy guy and so I always get sort of fascinated when I run into operational stuff like this, but one of the variance of that drawing that gets really twisty is if you have the path from a resell - a GoDaddy reseller going sort of to the GoDaddy commons and then across to the two cows commons and down to a two cows reseller. That strikes me as possibly yet another information flow diagram under the covers again.

James Bladel: Well, but from a - just playing devil's advocate here, that shouldn't be from both policy and from the registrant shouldn't necessary be dissimilar from just a transfer from GoDaddy proper to two cows proper.

Man: Agreed.

James Bladel: What's going on there at the reseller level is.

Man: For the registrar to manage.

James Bladel: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): So the information flow remains between GoDaddy and two cows in that one. Is that what you're saying?

James Bladel: Right, in the fact it never left.

(Michael): Yeah. It never went actually all the way out to the reseller.

(Adam): Right.

(Michael): Yeah. Okay. I'm off that one. I get that. Never mind.

James Bladel: No, I think you're being very thorough and comprehensive in trying to identify all the possible permutations, but some of them are.

(Michael): Yeah.

James Bladel: At least equivalent if not identical to one another so we can reduce through - or put some reduction around the problem a little bit.

(Michael): Now, if - let's go back to the sort of the under the covers version of this process as well. Have either of you guys probably in your technical teams or maybe with EPP documentation, got under the covers versions of these kinds of diagrams in your organizations that you could share?

I don't want to try and draft that if there's already documentation that describes it.

James Bladel: I don't know off hand, but I can have a look on my end. One thing I would caution is that on the thick registry level when you're talking about EPP, it can vary significantly is what I guess I would say. Registries love to introduce their own versions of EPPs like, you know, slightly technically different, so, you know, for example, doing - we're

doing UK right now and the UK EPP implementation does not look like your standard STK for a regular thick registry sort of data.

(Adam): Oh, for heaven's sakes.

(Michael): Yeah, it's - well that's one of the challenges I'm sure (James) can sort of attach to - it's just the challenge that you have as a registrar in making everything on the front end look different, when on the back end you could hypothetically be dealing with dozens of different systems, policies and procedures, although they all consider themselves to be very similar.

James Bladel: Anyway, so long story short, Yes, I can have a look around for that. I'll try to keep as ubiquitous as possible, but that doesn't necessarily mean it would represent the same process for every EPP thick registry.

(Michael): Wow! And I think a generic, I mean, you're absolutely right, it's much more we're presenting the customer with a blanket and then behind the scenes we're stitching together a quilt.

(Adam): Yeah, exactly.

Man: If you're - pardon. It's my fault.

(Michael): Go ahead.

Man: If you're talking just GTLDs and eliminating the CTLDs the variance is it great or is it more - is it more consistent?

(Adam): It's more - I'm talking personally more, but (TPTLDs) but on a GTLD level between registries there's not really - I don't think compared to what I see on the CC level much of a noticeable difference. There are differences, but certainly nothing like the difference between UK and EU let's say.

James Bladel: Yeah, I think you're right (Adam). It's that - the GTLDs are more uniform not interchangeable by any means, but it's the CCTLDs that really kind of throw the doors open to variety, you know, dealing with - without UK and dot CA, Canada is - I mean, is not EPV at all. So.

((Crosstalk))

(Adam): Totally not related, but this is why new TLDs can scare me sometimes.

James Bladel: Yes. But I would mention that while we're doing all of these things behind the scenes, there's really - when we can narrow the issue of issue number one, really focuses on the interaction between registrars with respecting registries.

(Michael): Yeah.

James Bladel: And for a good generic understanding of what goes on behind the scenes in the GTLD, perhaps the EPP RFCs which are public and they read like - well they read like an RFC. But they are out there and that's probably about all I could ever release or point you to.

(Michael): Well that's pretty good actually. If there's an RFC, maybe just fire the link to that RFC off to the list as a starting point for the EPP side.

James Bladel: Will do.

(Michael): How about the behind the scenes drawing of the thin registry process? Which will prominently feature Whois. Is there a good drawing of that process out there somewhere...?

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): I mean, this may be something that the tech weenies in your organizations would have. You know, as they're doing requirements definitions for the code that supports that kind of processing. I'm not sure.

James Bladel: Well you know how engineers like to document things.

(Michael): Yeah, I do. I spent a lot of my career as the CIO of a really large (unintelligible). I know all about that.

James Bladel: Yeah.

(Michael): But, you know, I'm just rolling the dice, I was thinking well maybe we'll get lucky. Maybe somebody out there actually did do a drawing which would be pretty cool if they did.

James Bladel: If we did, and I'm just speaking hypothetically because I don't know, I would have ask internally. But if we did and it included any tricks of the trade that we've learned or any experience that we've gathered in far - this far as for this registrar you have to use this method, for this registrar you have to go to this...

(Michael): Oh, yeah.

James Bladel: ...registrar you have to go to this guy. You know, it might be something that would not be comfortable putting out there.

(Michael): No, absolutely.

Man: That'd probably even be more detail than we need anyway.

(Michael): And it would be, you know, it seems to me it would be maybe one level higher in the level of detail charts and certainly anything that picks of the trade isn't really where we're headed. I'm really mostly interested in getting a head start on a project that we might ourselves otherwise have to do.

You know, it was great when (Mareeka) came up with these three drawings because all of sudden we don't have to draw those. It seems to me that if we can't find sort of two generic drawings, it would probably behoove us to try and draw them. Not on this call, but in a subsequent call. Because I think that this issue is going to pop up in a lot of the subsequent questions that are in this PDP.

And so I'm really just being lazy and looking for this stuff. I am a good enough engineer to plagiarize wherever possible. So if there's something out there that we could steal, that's really what I'm on the hunt for. And so if you guys could just run back into your organizations and see if there's a generic enough version that folks would be comfortable releasing, on - really on both sides, on the thick registry and the thin registry side. I think that would be a huge step forward

and then if there isn't, then you know, we can reconvene and sort of try and noodle our way through it.

James Bladel: Okay. I'll ask. Yep.

(Michael): That would be sweetly cool. And that may be as far as we want to go today on this call. How are other people feeling? I mean, I think we've covered a lot of ground, we've identified that these three drawings are customer facing, we've identified that they are really fundamentally two different processes, one being the in-registry process that relies very heavily on Whois. The thick registry process which we should probably confirm in general relies more on ETT. And that we need to see if we can find diagrams that document those behind the scenes processes. Sort of saying this so that I can go write the notes when I get off the call.

Is there anything else that sort of emerged that we need to follow-up on?

(Sebastian): Hi, it's (Sebastian), just looking through the diagrams, it's interesting to see how they discuss with the one we're looking through the diagram. And for a number if you take the Network Solution one, I think, if I was the customer, I would have some trouble to understand what they want to tell me because if you read you are the customer, you need to check that the domain name (unintelligible) contact is okay. And then the number two, three, and four are between Network Solutions and an administrative contact.

And at the end of the number six and number seven, at seven we come back to the customer. And we don't have any more than a

technical contact here. Even if I am sure if the administrative contact in fact will receive email and that will allow him, if he sends to the customer right, but to the registrant right, but here low into manage again the domain name again. Then in this diagram there are two different people who are sometime seen as the same one.

James Bladel: So there's no distinction between the customer in these diagrams, could refer to the registrant or the administrative contact.

(Adam): Right.

James Bladel: It assumes they're the same?

(Sebastian): No, it's not assuming that it's the same, it's just assuming that you, the customer, may deal with us. It is not the primary Network Solutions, but, you know, and I am just taking this one. I can take GoDaddy too, I guess. It's very often the case when you have something designed for your customer when you are not the customer. You can't really be your customer. It's impossible. And you miss something. It's why I think all those people need the customer to help them to face the real customer.

James Bladel: Excellent point.

(Michael): Yeah, very, very good point. And does sort of get back to the nub of the discussion about.

(Sebastian): The underground of that diagram, what it's - for the registrar what it's meant for, for the registrars, the gaming and the living one, what does it mean? What is the - when we talk about customer, when we talk

about administrative contact, how you think that the two are different, the same, and how we deal with that.

(Michael): I'm just skimming through the one from (AARIS) so the one that looks like a computer flow chart. And in that one there's no mention of - oh, there's a mention of admin contact in the first box. Then there's a.

(Sebastian): And you see the next box, it's registrant approves.

(Michael): Right.

(Sebastian): That means that I'm in contact, if he calls the registrants in that flow chart.

(Michael): Yeah.

(Sebastian): What it's puzzle me it's when you are at the - when you go down to the transfer access by old registrar, if they say no, then the transfer is cancel. What it would be strange because that becomes selling which come back to the registrant to confirm that he wants to transfer it.

(Michael): So this is raising a separate issue which is that in a way, and again, I'm not sure this is a policy issue, but it's certainly a customer service issue. These processes are described differently to the extent that they describe different roles and responsibilities in different ways. Even though the underlying steps are similar.

One of the driving forces behind the EDP is to make it easier and more consistent and less error prone for registrants to transfer domains from

one registrar to another. And this is an example of something that makes it confusing.

Let's say that I was a customer and I was going from Network Solutions to (AARIS) and I decided to go to both organizations' pages and just compare the transfer process document, I would probably emerge fairly confused just because of the difference in the way these are written, not to mention the infusion between registrant and admin contact that we were discussing on the call on Tuesday.

James Bladel: I'm looking my chart for two cows, we even use the term user. So just throw in another one.

(Michael): Well it's just because, yeah, there's no - certainly I guess there's been no commonality in like the lexicon that's ever been thought of I suppose.

Man: Yeah the firm doesn't, we got user, customer, admin, and registrar.

(Michael): Yeah. And so I'm not sure where we take this point except to highlight the fact that there is this sort of inconsistent lexicon - that's a good way to describe it. It's certainly far away from the email address question that we're working on right now. But in the broader sense of the EDP, it's certainly confusing. No?

Man: Only the diagram is confusing.

Man: Yeah.

Man: But I think the language of the transfer is more specific. The transfer policy is more specific.

(Michael): Yeah. But that's not what the customer receives.

Man: Agreed.

(Sebastian): You see in the discussion about the email address. If you look to the last one diagram the GoDaddy one, it seems to me that it's quite consistent even if they don't explain really what is a customer but let's imagine that the customer knows that the admin contact and so on. But when you look to the Number 2, the customer must unlock the domain and retrieve an authorization card from the current registrar. Why we don't add a sentence or and an action saying that you must also confirm or give a new email address to proceed with this transfer.

(Michael): Can you say that a different way (Sebastian)? I didn't quite follow that.

(Sebastian): What I wanted to point out is that in this you are requesting the - requesting something from the customer and we, at the same time, we are not sure about the right email address to be used or we are not sure to have one. At the same time they ask - they need to ask the authorization code to unlock and transfer the domain name. At that time in this exchange, it could be added to finalize the right email address didn't - wasn't transferred.

(Michael): Yeah, and if you look at Number 4, the destination, there it says the customer confirms the transfer with the ID and T from the email. But we don't know which email address we're talking about, isn't that correct?

(Sebastian): Yep. It's.

(Michael): And the reason we don't know which email address it is is because in Number 2 it's not specified which email address to use.

Man: Well that should be Number 3. It's just says customer, but it could - it is - it's probably if you look at the, you know, the transfer policy, the admin contact email address. That Number 3 is referring to.

(Michael): Yes, it's almost always the admin contact email.

James Bladel: Yeah.

(Adam): So it's, I think, maybe we're criticizing these things for simplifying the language for the benefit of a customer.

(Michael): Right.

(Adam): Like if a customer probably understands customer better than he understands admin contact and registrar or domain name over - you know, all the names - all the things that we know and understand, I think, that most often these are just simplifications to help a customer understand that they're the customer and the customer stands for in this case admin contact and/or registrant and/or domain name holder, etc. I don't think it's a bad thing.

(Michael): Well I think it might be a bad thing because I think in that simplification what we may have evidence of is a way that a naive customer, not

knowing the difference between the powers of their registrant address and the powers of the admin contact address leaves them open - leaves themselves open to being hijacked simply because they don't understand that. And that it might be useful to - again I don't know where the policy angle is at this, but it might be useful to spend some energy clarifying that.

You know, for example, let's say that we had three keys to the house - pardon, you know, in a car, a car is a better example. My car has two keys, one is the key that I can give to the parking lot attendant and it will only drive the car, but it won't get into the glove compartment and it won't get into the trunk. Whereas the other key will get into everything. That's really sort of the difference between the admin contact and the registrant email. Is that one of those keys has much more power than the other and I would bet that most customers aren't aware of that.

Man: I think you may be right (Mike) in the structure is part of the transfer process. I think if you were giving someone his simple instructions on how to start this car you might not need to deal with the, you know the security information that you just dealt with. I think that there might be room for separate communications to a customer about security and about understanding the difference between the registrar and the admin contact.

In fact, I've learned this this week, I didn't realize how much difference there was and I've been involved in this for all these years.

(Michael): Yeah.

Man: I'm probably have - if I go back and look, I think probably - I use the same email address for my domain holder for the account holder in most cases and some of the admin contacts.

(Michael): Oh, I know I do.

Man: I'm wondering too, but I still think that if you're trying to keep illustrations and communications simple so people can understand them and not have questions, you sometimes want to reduce the thing that you're teaching people in one particular way. Security is another issue that, you know, while it's related from a policy standpoint might not be the best place to communicate security to someone who's trying to learn how to transfer possibly.

(Michael): Yeah.

Man: I don't have a problem with these illustrations that summarize everything as just customer. To me that is a reasonable translation.

(Michael): I think that the.

((Crosstalk))

Man: For a code - for a document that's oriented towards customers, not a document that's oriented towards policy.

(Michael): Right, but the policy issue - well it depends on which policy issue we're after.

(Gene): Hey, (Mike) this is (Gene).

(Michael): Yeah, go ahead (Gene).

(Gene): I just wanted to let you know that I'm going to have to step out now.

(Michael): Yeah, exactly.

(Gene): Hopefully this was worthwhile.

Man: (Gene) before you leave, can I ask you one brief question?

(Gene): Sure.

Man: I noticed - I was reviewing actually the communications that started that actually prompted my comments to you and to (Mike) this morning that then (Barbara) faulted us on. And I think it was actually something you wrote, and I quote "From a quick check of GTO, the newest data shows the registrant email is also displayed falsely for registries." So (Mike) pointed out all the (unintelligible) was accurate and that sent me off on a - you know, kind of a side tangent about whether, you know, the displays Whois data is really the issue, not the thick or thin.

But at that time I didn't realize it, well maybe this thick registries - you're not actually using the Whois, you're using EPP. So my comments might not be as relevant as I thought. And if you wanted to correct that for me for the whole group, I would appreciate it.

((Crosstalk))

(Gene) Let me go.

Man: Or just discuss that.

(Gene) Let me confirm that that is indeed the case, I mean, I think you may be right for some of the thick registries we may use Whois. I don't believe that it is.

Man: Okay.

(Gene) But let me confirm that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well that's reasonable. But if you find there is some value to correcting that, I'd appreciate that.

(Gene) Okay, I will look into that.

Man: Thanks (Gene).

(Michael): Okay gang, this was I think a great call.

Man: Thank you.

(Michael): I'll take a crack at summarizing it and we'll reconvene next week on the regular call. Thanks a lot.

Man: Great, thanks all.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Excellent.

(Sebastian): Thank you.

END