

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP  
Transcription  
Tuesday 12 January 2010 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 12 January 2010 at 1500 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-b-20100112.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG – chair  
Chris Chaplow - CBUC  
Berry Cobb – CBUC  
Anil George – IPC  
Kevin Erdman – IPC  
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC  
James Bladel – RrSG  
Michael Collins – Individual  
Paul Diaz – RrS  
Eric Brown – gTLD Registries

Staff:

Marika Konings  
Glen de Saint Géry  
David Giza  
Olof Nordling  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

none

Gisella Gruber-White: Michele would you like a quick roll call?

Michele Neylon: Please. I would appreciate it.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's IRCT call on Tuesday, the 12th of January. We have Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, Kevin Erdman, James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Paul Diaz, Michael Collins, Chris Chaplow.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Olof Nordling, David Giza and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. I do not have any apologies for this call. And if I could just please remind everyone to state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: All right, thanks. All right, good afternoon everybody. Earlier today I assume that Marika will have sent you out a spreadsheet. Did you all get that?

Man: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Maybe I'll rephrase that question. Is there anybody who didn't get that? I'll take the silence to mean no. Originally we had planned on putting the spreadsheet up on the Adobe Connect.

But because of the way it has, you know, some - various different tabs and what have you, that would prove to be a little bit impractical. So everybody has a copy. So it would be useful if you could actually open the file.

And I think David was going to walk us through some of it. Is that correct David?

David Giza: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So David - okay David if you could take over and talk to us about this wonderful bit of work you've done for us?

David Giza: This is David Giza and if you look at the bottom of the spreadsheet you'll see that we organized this using a variety of tabs. Registrar ranking by size, registrar ranking by company complaints, registrar domain name transfer data.

We have a legend that defines the terms that we've used. The grand totals which are displayed in both column and pie chart fashion. And then we have

the individual monthly analysis totals from July 2009 through the end of November 2009.

And so what I thought I'd do is start first with the tab called DN, domain name transfer data. And just briefly provide you with an overview of how we analyze the data. And much of this will be consistent with what we discussed a week ago.

But now you have the actual document in front of you. And so you'll see as you examine that tab that the columns at the top start with the INID, the registrar name, the contact email address at the registrar, the C ticket department and that's the category of complaint.

The actual C ticket number that our system generates, the date we receive the complaint and then in Column G the date that we forwarded the complaint to the registrar which is typically within five to in some cases seven days.

You'll notice in some cases that data is longer in large part because we've received a response from the registrar indicating that they need additional time to investigate the complaint.

And then as you move across the columns from H to R those are the individual categories that were identified for purposes of documenting the specific transfer complaint or reason.

And then finally, in the other category there we captured information that was actually quite useful for ICANN but probably is not going to be useful to this group. And then finally at the very end we wanted to keep track of how often transfers were completed.

And if a transfer was not completed there is a reference in that column accordingly which simply says no. At the very bottom of that spreadsheet we

ran the totals for all of the columns. And then we decided to group the totals first by grand total and then we group the totals individually by month.

And so if we jump to the grand total tab and this is where we left off last week, you'll see a colorful pie chart there. And you'll notice that the three top areas of the pie chart are consistent with what we discussed last week.

And that is that the two primary areas of complaints are EPP (off info) code, about 24%. The reseller category again about 24% and then failure to unlock the domain, 15%. And so if you add those three together you're clearly over 50. Over 50% of the complaints fall into those three categories.

There are other categories listed in the pie chart. And then if you want to look specifically at the data on a month by month basis - for example, if we click on the July tab what we've done here is we've tried to rank the data by C ticket transfer complaint category in descending order.

So the most common reason for a transfer complaint in the month of July is listed at the top. And then as you scroll down you find that for example, in July who has issues are only four complaints received regarding who has issues.

And that pattern repeats itself in August, September, October and November. And so as all of that data came together the first thing we did was we just did a quick registrar ranking by complaints. And that's the second tab on the left on the bottom.

And in that particular tab when you open it up you'll notice that again this is ranked by number of complaints. So at the very top, you know, our largest - let's say registrar who received complaints was (ENOM) at 171 complaints during that five month timeframe.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: One question. In this listing when you say (ENOM) is that all (ENOM) accreditations or just the main (ENOM) accreditation?

David Giza: No. It's the entire family...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: So why do you list GoDaddy separately from Wild West?

David Giza: Yeah, that should have been consolidated into both. I think that was just a, you know, it was probably just an oversight on our part because we were supposed to consolidate these into families.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That's fine. That's fine.

David Giza: So what we did is we ranked the complaints, you know, starting at the top with the highest number of complaints per registrar for that five month period of time. We added a column for domain names under management and then we calculated a percentage of transfer complaints by the size of registrar.

And you'll notice as you scroll through this list of over 100 registrars, you know, that the numbers start high at 171 and they go down to essentially one complaint. You'll also notice the second category here is registrar are not identified by the complainant.

There were 158 of those complaints and we're going to be making some changes to our system to address instances where the complainant fails to identify the registrar.

But it's also interesting to note that in many of these cases the information received was also, you know, transmitted to us through email. And as a

result, I think there's another system enhancement that we'll need to budget for in this coming fiscal year.

So that when that information is received via email we have a way to follow up with the complainant so that we can specifically tie it back to a registrar. And then if you go to the very first tab on the bottom left, registrar ranking by size, we took that same data and we just simply reranked it based on the percentage of transfer complaints by size at registrar.

And of course the ranking then changes. And this data I think is useful as is the registrar ranking by complaint. And so you'll notice now that, you know, for example, our top 25 list has dramatically changed but you'll see a couple of names in there that are still consistent with let's say the top 25 ranking for registrars by complaints.

And so what we found in the data as you've seen here is that for five months, you know, we believe that this is a very statistically accurate analysis that can be very useful to the working group as we think about, you know, what are we going to do next here with this information.

And so I can give you just a quick overview of some things that we're doing and then, you know, open it up for questions. I have a meeting scheduled with (ENOM) in the first part of February, to specifically review their IRTT transfer processes.

And not just because they were the number one registrar listed on registrar rankings by complaint. That meeting had actually been scheduled earlier in the year.

But now is I think a wonderful time to sit down with the (ENOM) compliance team as well as their operational team and get a better understanding of the processes that they deploy successfully or not, as the case maybe, to handle and manage transfer requests.

And my plan is to summarize that information and then put it in a document that'll be useful for this working group so that the working group will get the opportunity to get behind the curtain a bit and actually learn more about how (ENOM) for example, handles, you know, transfer complaints.

You know, perhaps another registrar in the working group would want to produce a similar summary document to, you know, to help facilitate discussion and understanding of the process.

But if not, you know, I'll certainly have something for this group probably by the middle of February after our early February visit with (ENOM). The second thing that we've identified from this is that we clearly need to automate this activity.

And so we're working on a plan right now to budget for the software that we need to do this work on a continuous basis without having to go through the extraordinary, you know, manual effort that you see in front of you here, in terms of collecting this data and then analyzing this data using an Excel spreadsheet.

And then I think, you know, third there is a - as you look at the percentages of transfer complaints by size of registrar although those numbers are miniscule in terms of the percentage, you know, they do begin to tell a story, you know, a story that, you know, I think clearly identifies that every registrar is struggling at some level.

Be it, you know, a small number of complaints or a somewhat large number of complaints. But every registrar is struggling with the transfer process. And so it - in my view it supports what we've talked about earlier, that information education, you know, further standardization within, you know, within this industry around how transfer complaints are handled could be very useful.

And, you know, certainly if a clearinghouse or some other central point of contact were utilized effectively to not only communicate information but to oversee the management of transfer complaints.

You know, perhaps that might be one solution from either a policy perspective or an operational perspective that could add value, you know, to, you know, to the nature and number of complaints that we see in front of us.

Our goal over time is to reduce the number of transfer complaints. But I think as I mentioned before, the run rate here appears to be pretty steady year over year in terms of the number of complaints we're receiving.

And so again, on average, we're looking at about 200 or more complaints, you know, per month. And that number has been generally, you know, flat to somewhat increasing over time.

And so it tells us that there's work to do and it also tells us that, you know, that this working group hopefully will begin to address, you know, some of the underlying problems associated with at least those top three categories of transfer related issues and perhaps our work can go deeper than that.

So if there are any questions or comments...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Olof here. Just a very sort of small comment but anyway, if you look at the very first registrar ranking by size but actually there you start with the lower scores on top - on tops. So those would diffuse complaints in relation to their size come up first.

So actually it's the lowest 25 that are - well should be the worst within (unintelligible).



David Giza: We're actually going to put a different ranking chart together where we're going to take the domain names under management and establish break points, you know, 500,000, a million, you know, more than 2 million and then rerank the - this information and data around a better chart or graphic that shows categories of domain names under management.

Olof Nordling: But you follow what I'm saying?

David Giza: I do. I do.

Olof Nordling: I mean I would like to see the chart really upside down.

David Giza: And I'm sure we can do that too Olof. It's just a question of just, you know, flipping the data.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Michele this is Mikey. And David thanks to you and your team for putting this together. I had Olof's same comment which is that the first tab is in the opposite order than the second tab. So in the first tab the...

Michele Neylon: If you - if you use - if you run a filter for sorting it, it'll come out a bit better I think Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Well yeah, but I think that conclusions that David was reaching were in error because he's not aware of the fact that in one of the lists the worst performers are at the top and in the other list the worst performers are at the bottom.

So just to amplify all of these points - this isn't talking about the splits business David. This is just recognize that in tab one the order is reversed

and all you need to do is resort the page. You know, I did it reflexively because I just assumed that that's what was being attempted.

But David you started to draw some conclusions from those lists and you need to be aware of the fact that they're in opposite order.

David Giza: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thank you.

David Giza: That's right.

Mikey O'Connor: Now in terms of some conclusions to draw from this I emphatically support your notion that this process should be automated and be going on all the time. And hopefully published on a fairly regular basis. Because this is - this falls squarely in the which gets measured gets done category.

And clearly this is helpful for registrars and registrants to see this. Is the intent that this is going to go into our report? Presumably since this has gone to the list it's out in the wild on the internet and is not secret data right?

David Giza: Well at the moment, you know, this information has only been, you know, published with this working group. And so our team will, you know, as you pointed out, you know, cleanup the data here on this particular tab and put it in reverse order.

And then our intent was to post this information on the contractual compliance Web page so that it would be available, you know, for the public's review and use through our Web site.

Michele Neylon: I think David what he's getting at is that it's already public because...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...IRTT list archive is public.

David Giza: Okay. Then again the only thing we need to do is just, you know, cleanup the spreadsheet.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. You may just want to post a note to the list clarifying that so that when somebody reads the archive they get a reminder that this data is, you know, to be reviewed with a certain amount of caution given the fact that it's - those two pages are in reverse order.

Because there are people who already have the spreadsheet who may not notice that.

David Giza: Noted.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Though I would say in David's support if the data itself is correct it's just the order it's presented in isn't.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And I didn't notice it all until the conversation. And then...

Michele Neylon: Well I have the advantage of having seen previous iterations of the spreadsheet. James.

James Bladel: Hi. Thanks Michele. And like Mikey mentioned David I want to extend a thanks to you and your team for putting together this analysis. And I have a couple of questions so if I can beg your indulgence for a moment here I'll go through them. I've written them down.

I tried to hold them all for the end of your presentation. So the first question was what is the advantage do you see in setting up break points versus categories of registrar size versus working with the actual numbers?

Is it because those numbers of names under management are constantly changing or they're difficult to tabulate or I guess what is the - because to me it seems relatively straightforward to use the raw data and then work from there and then give you a higher degree of accuracy and resolution in understanding the problem.

David Giza: Yeah. We were just simply thinking that, you know, that there are other views of the data that might be useful, not only to the working group but to the community. And so one suggestion from my team was to use a domain name under management ranking scale as one way to display the data.

But you have the raw data and to your point you can work with that raw data as effectively as if it were displayed under a, you know, a different view based on, you know, a number of domain names under management.

James Bladel: Right. Well okay. And I guess I don't have any strong feelings either way except that if you were to go with the idea of categorization I think that that could possibly cut against my employer which is larger I think in terms of (unintelligible) management than the next two or three or four competitors combined.

So I think that we would either need our own category or I would recommend we go with the raw data. So then the second part of that was, you know, I found that rather than using percentages when the numbers get infinitesimally small sometimes it's useful to use - just multiply them out by, you know, ten to the fourth or something and call it parts per 10,000 or parts per 100,000.

It seems to throw everything back into a scale that sits a little bit better with human eyeballs.

David Giza: That's a good suggestion.

James Bladel: And I think you mentioned something about - and maybe I just misinterpreted it but is it the goal of this group to continue to pursue or to ever achieve zero complaints with transfers?

Because my point to that is that, you know, we have millions of names under management and several under registrars are in that (live) category as well. And transfers are not only a complex process but they are also one that has various security vulnerabilities that we've already - that we're discussing in this group.

So it seems as though there should be what I would call a natural level of incidence or a natural frequency of incidence where we would be concerned that, you know, that we should be getting humans involved to investigate a certain percentage.

And then I don't say that in a way that sounds defeatist or cynical about our - about the mission of this working group but I just think this is best - to be expected and that's something that we should always looking to reduce. But we should be realistic that no policy is going to wipe that out entirely.

And I put that question to the group as opposed to just compliance.

Michele Neylon: Well I would agree as well. I don't think you're going to ever get 100%. We see things all the time where a lot in just in (GTLDs) but across the board where you have domain names registered to a company and that there's an internal dispute between the directors. You know, like...

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: You know, there are two people who are direct - who both own 50% of the company. They both want to do total - they both want to do totally different things with the domain name, you know. Yeah, we got stuck in the middle of that one.

That's great fun. Mikey do you have any thoughts on what James was saying?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I was running right down the same track. This is Mikey. It seems to me that the next step in this - this is sort of a classic quality management topic.

And the next - now that we have the first round of information which is how many incidents happened the next thing we need to know is the costs and the types of resolutions. Because now you set a goal and you say the goal should be blah.

Not ever zero because as James points out in any process there's always going to be some noise. But what you need to do at this stage is find out the largest cause of the problem and solve that root cause. So it's - this is back to David.

Is there any thinking in terms of tracking the disposition and cause of the complaint? In other words, it's great to see this. I love this a lot but the thing that would really be helpful is in those complaints what was the problem that caused them to happen?

And the only way to do that is to sort of track a post complaint resolution or a disposition status. Are you - do you have any plans to track that kind of information?

David Giza: We've certainly thought about that. And one of the enhancements that we're going to be proposing for the coming fiscal year is a modification to our C

ticket system that would allow us to track more information that we receive from registrars when they respond to our five day notice.

Because today our system doesn't allow us to collect and/or track that data. And so the budget for next fiscal year is going to include a request for, you know, again for some funding to make some modifications to our custom C ticket system here.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again, just following up and this is to the group as well. Maybe what we ought to do is formulate some sort of recommendation out of this group supporting that budget request, so that poor David isn't going up against the jaws of budget splashing bosses unarmored.

David Giza: Yeah Mikey, thank you. I would absolutely appreciate that assistance. As many of you know this is going to be a, you know, a difficult, you know, budget cycle for ICANN. And so all budget requests are going to be reviewed, you know, very intently.

And, you know, community support for particular budget items or initiatives would be greatly appreciated.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I'd be happy to sign onto anything like that and I'll drop off here.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Just in terms of the ticketing system, I don't want to get kind of into - drawn into this too deeply but David do you have an outline of what you need the solution to be able to do?

David Giza: We have pieces of the - we do have pieces of that outline already prepared by my staff. And so we're actually consolidating that information right now because this is the start of ICANN's fiscal year 2011 budget process.

And so for those of you who don't know, you know, by February 1 I need to have my first draft budget completed and presented to, you know, executive management at ICANN for review. So pieces of that exist but we don't have all of the pieces completed yet.

Michele Neylon: Right. It's just because - the thing I suppose is that in some respects - I mean I think I've said - this has come up before. Maybe - it sounds to me like your main problem to date has just been you need to do some ticketing system that can take input via email and via Web (call).

((Crosstalk))

David Giza: I think we have a good system. But it's a system that needs, you know, incremental improvement in multiple areas. And so we're continuing to build on the foundation of the C ticket system.

But I do believe that the foundation is strong. It's the additional, you know, data that we need to track and warehouse and then the additional reporting capabilities that we need.

You know, a variety of tools quite frankly that, you know, can be either bolted on or built into the C ticket system to provide a much more robust way to collect and analyze, you know, consumer complaint data.

Michele Neylon: So you're talking about warehousing data?

David Giza: Well if there's a way to...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I was winding you up.

((Crosstalk))



David Giza: I know. I know.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: He was being bad.

David Giza: I know.

((Crosstalk))

David Giza: He's taking advantage of the fact that it's early morning here in California.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. You poor dear.

David Giza: Yeah, thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. If your deadline is February do you need a statement from us sooner than stately pace with which our proceedings are likely to produce a report? Like do you need a memo from us in the next two weeks or can it wait until the next round of your budget cycle?

If your budget is due on February 1 and that memo would be useful I think we'd probably be able to put something together to help you with that.

David Giza: Actually a document, you know, prior to February 1 would be helpful because that's the first round of budget review.

And as many folks know, that's management's first opportunity to ask questions and then to, you know, to make recommendations in terms of, you know, of how that budget is structured and to what extent those numbers are generally decreased as opposed to increased.

So some form of written recommendation around improvements, ongoing improvements or modifications to our C ticket system would be appreciated yes, before February 1.

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe we form a little subgroup gang and write something up real quick for review at the next meeting?

Michele Neylon: How about we don't overdo - hit a fly with a sledgehammer? How about - something you - Mikey if you could throw together something very quickly, circulate it to the rest of the list and if people don't have an issue with it we'll agree on it?

Mikey O'Connor: Sounds like a plan to me.

Michele Neylon: I really don't want subgroups.

Mikey O'Connor: You're no fun. Everybody else has subgroups, why don't you like subgroups?

Michele Neylon: Because I actually like my working groups to be ones that actually get something done before all my hair goes gray.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...much hair.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. I know. That was the entire point. Moving on. I'm sorry David. Mikey is terribly badly behaved.

David Giza: No actually it's been pretty entertaining. So I'm fine with everything that's happened so far.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else have any other comments on the spreadsheet that David has circulated?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, Chris here. I was just wondering David, I think it's great work, but is there any information about what was the ultimate resolution of the complaint or it's just that it's been not back to the registrars to be sorted and then you haven't been involved after that?

David Giza: There are instances, quite a few instances, where registrars will tell us specifically what they did to resolve the complaint. But that usually occurs after we again, manually follow up with the registrar through an exchange of emails or in the exchange of phone calls.

And that information is not, you know, collected and kept in a central database. There are files that exist but those are usually separate files that reside on, you know, one or more PCs.

And that data again would have to be manually collected and analyzed if we wanted to go a little deeper into the specific activities or actions that registrars have taken to, you know, to resolve the complaints that they've received.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah. So this might be incorporated into the future system?

David Giza: Correct. Correct.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks. Yeah.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Just one observation. It would be useful - I mean personally looking at the data, it would be useful to see what the actual final resolution was.

Because from my understanding and I would appreciate it if you corrected me David, you're classifying the - you're classifying the (complaint) based on what the complainant is providing in terms of information. Is that correct?

David Giza: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: So you're working on the basis that what they are saying to you is truthful and accurate?

David Giza: That's correct. We forward that complaint onto the registrar and it's the registrar then who makes the - performs the investigative work required to make a determination on whether the complaint is valid or not. And then the registrar takes action or not as the case maybe.

Michele Neylon: So in that case, hypothetically speaking, I'm not saying that this is the case but just, you know, being hypothetical, if for example if a complaint related to an EPP (key) it could just as easily transpire that the registrant was, you know, copying and pasting in the key with the leading space or something silly.

It could be any number of other issues. It might not actually be what is being reported.

David Giza: It's possible. And to your point, you know, as we begin to track the disposition of the cases that will provide greater clarity.

Now what I could do is go back into this data sample and pull out some files from each month and see if we can, you know, track them through to conclusion based on the registrar responses that we received and have, you know, filed, you know, in our working system and see if that information would be helpful for, you know, for this group.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yeah. Thanks Michele and David. We're going to keep pushing you to - towards - you and your team towards omniscience. But - no, it's a joke. I mean we'll never get there.

But I think it would be good to have some mechanism by which if a self recorded transfer problem turns out to be incorrect or miscataloged by the registrant that the registrar has an opportunity to correct it.

So if a registrant raises a complaint and says the registrar won't give up my (off info) codes, me EPP (off info) codes and the registrar says no, it's a case where they had a typo in their (who is) address so it was getting sent to the wrong place.

You know, it's a different problem than that that was originally reported. So I think some sort of a feedback mechanism either from the registrar or from your team capturing the disposition as you mentioned to change the category from what - something not quite such as self reporting, self diagnosing system that would be great.

Michele Neylon: Good point. I see (unintelligible) Michael Collins is on there.

Michael Collins: It is. Not to beat you up on this but I would have to confirm that I think I'm also concerned that the resolution maybe different than the initial reported problem. And for example, just last week I think I mentioned at least online to - on the side to people that I was having trouble with the transfer.

That turned out to be a problem with me copying the (off info) code. I was missing a character that was hard to see at the end. And it wasn't joining it with the (off info) code when I double clicked on it automatically. And, you know, so...

Michele Neylon: Sorry. Did we just lose audio from him?

Mikey O'Connor: That was dramatic wasn't it, the way he went away?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Michael, I know you like to make big exits. I don't think that was intentional was it?

Michael Collins: Am I gone?

Mikey O'Connor: No. Now you're...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: You're back now.

Michael Collins: Oh. Well I don't know where I was in my longwinded speech. I don't want to go over the whole thing again.

But in any case I'll just say that I agree that this could be skewed quite a bit and there probably needs to be a category for, you know, just really a dumb registrant who doesn't understand simple instructions.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not sure that's quite the category name we want on there. But...

Michael Collins: Oh, I'm totally speaking about from my one potential complaint.

Mikey O'Connor: No, I, you know, I think that even that one isn't really dumb registrant. It's simply, you know, this is quality management. What that is, is a root cause of a problem that probably a lot of people have and sometimes it goes into best practices to suggest to people to use visible characters.

You know, systems that generate (off info) codes but it's...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...guys. There's a VeriSign mandate performance of the EPP code.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. So we can...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...that. But...

Mikey O'Connor: Well if there was data to support it. See this is all the reason, all the more reason why you need that resolution data so that you can say 40% of the problems that people wind up having are caused by character confusion in (off info) code.

Well then you go to the VeriSign standard and you say how about we change it? I mean that's just quality management. It's simple.

Michele Neylon: Just a comment from Berry Cobb in the chat. The discussion starts to fall within the realm of incident management and problem management.

These two processes complement the ticketing too so that they insure that incident gets resolved, root causes found and I'm not so sure I know what he means of validation of data entry. And validate the data entry possibly. Berry could you clarify what you mean?

Berry Cobb: Just basically that James' point that the reported incident matches the actual root cause. And so that they sync up properly for reporting purposes.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. Chris and then James. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, thanks. Just a quick comment. It's interesting isn't it that the - where we started with the asset hijacking report with that sort of hair curling information actually turns out to be only 3% of the problems in terms of complaints?

Mikey O'Connor: Ain't data the coolest thing though?

Michele Neylon: No, what?

Mikey O'Connor: I love my data. You cannot move me. I stand fast.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: Yeah. Thank you. And Chris to that point yeah, 3% may seem like a low number. But when we're talking about, you know, 3% of houses are burglarized each year or something like that I think it's, you know, I think we need to be careful making that kind of - drawing that kind of a conclusion, just because I think that we're not seeing, you know, the attempted but thwarted hijacking attempts.

Certainly that would never hit this type of data. And, you know, so it's still - I think if you are that one particular domain name registrant that has your name hijacked it's a pretty devastating incident.

So I just want to be careful about saying that that means we shouldn't necessarily spend so much time talking about the security vulnerabilities and the transfer process because I think they are important. But I wanted to get back to something Mikey said.

And he said something about the format of the (off info) code as a - and I think it was Michele as well - the format of the (off info) code specified by VeriSign.

And to my knowledge there are some rough limitations or guidelines but the registrars actually generate the (off info) codes for each registration. And that raises an interesting point where Mr. Collins might assume where he was making a user error when he was just copying and pasting the (off info) code.



The more conspiratorially minded of us might say that perhaps the registrar did that intentionally and put some ASCII characters in there that were, you know, difficult to see like an apostrophe or a comma or something as part of the (off info) code that a human wouldn't expect.

But a computer would reject the transfer in order to just slow the process down and hope that a certain percentage of registrants would just give up on the transfer. So I think it's - that it's something that maybe we could take a look at Mikey.

And of course me and my background I'm not necessarily going to assume that was an error. I think that that may have - there's a possibility that that may have been by design.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I would never have thought of that but it does - I would support the notion that perhaps in the discussion in the report. This is a great example that we might want to talk about from several perspectives.

One being this quality improvement perspective and making the user experience more reliable. But also perhaps - I don't know if this would drive you folks crazy or not but maybe we actually specify a standard be defined for that (off info) code that is easily human readable. And promulgate that out.

James Bladel: It's simple enough. Why couldn't they just be limited to the characters that are allowed in domain names?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Alphanumeric and hyphens.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Except that in fact then you get into the confusion with zero and O and some of that. The actual - there is actually a standard for the (capture) kinds

of characters which is more restrictive than just ASCII because of the ability to confuse some characters.

And so we might want to actually encourage a more restrictive set than just that's what's in domain names, for that very reason that it - you can actually improve data input quality and accuracy by eliminating a couple of kinds of characters.

I don't have the standard right at the end but there's an ASCII standard out there for that that we might want to encourage people follow.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele here. Just - I pulled up the email from VeriSign regarding the change in format. And as of 15th of November 2009 the (off info) code for all new common net registrations is just - has been set to a new password standard.

The (off info) will need to have at least eight characters consisting of one number, one alphabet and one special character. That's - that is the thing. And the numbers are zero to nine and then you have obviously letters of the alphabet which I'm sure we are all familiar with.

And the special characters include apostrophes, commas, double quotes, colons, semi-colons, greater than, less than, equals, ampersands, percentage, dollar, hash, at and several other charming characters that are a pain in the neck to find on certain keyboards.

Mikey O'Connor: You see, this is the classic...

Michele Neylon: Okay, the first...

Mikey O'Connor: ...security dispute between usability and security. What they're following is the discipline of raising password security.

And what they may have done is caused the problem that Michael Collins had in that by insisting on special characters they made it less human readable and thus less, you know, thus increased the probability of error.

And, you know, this is a classic security discussion design debate that I think warrants at least some treatment in our report. And what would really be useful is let's presume that complaint ticket system is perfect in every way and is now tracking resolutions of these complaints.

If we saw an uptick in the kinds of error that Michael was describing we would then have some data to be able to go back to VeriSign and say maybe you should reconsider the standard for the (off info) codes and thus close the loop.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika and then James.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thank you Michele this is Marika. I just looked ahead at the other (PDPs) that are still outstanding on the IRTT related issues. And I actually noted that nothing is specifically related to the (off info) codes.

So as it doesn't fall specifically within the scope of this working group which I think already has another - quite a lot of other important issues to address a possible alternative would be to consider making a recommendation that, you know, seeing the data and seeing the number of complaints relating to the (off info) codes for a future IRTT working group.

To take that issue on board as well and review how that can be improved or determined what the actual issues are related to those complaints and address it in such a way instead of maybe trying to deal with it within this working group.

Michele Neylon: One thing I would ask Marika is I mean surely if we, the registrars, were to all say to the registries, look your (off info) format is causing us more headaches than anything else, why can't you change it to something simpler?

I mean if they - if we could get the registries to agree to that would we really need to go through an entire PDP and God knows what else three letter acronyms that could drag on for years?

Marika Konings: No. If that's the main issue and that's causing, you know, the number one complaint with ICANN and if we can solve it of course, you know, I'd much rather try that we solve it in another way than this PDP.

But I'm just wondering if indeed we know that that's the main problem that is causing all the complaints that ICANN receives in relation to that. So I'm just wondering instead of, you know, maybe spending too much time within this working group that indeed, you know, please follow the track by talking directly to the registries to address that issue.

And maybe separately, you know, if that's not the only issue of - that needs some further investigation, to include it as a recommendation to the council saying look, we've noticed, you know, in discussing this with clients and reviewing the data, that this is one of the, you know, top three areas in which complaints are received.

We don't see it on the list of issues that, you know, are still coming down the pipeline on IRTT. Maybe it's worth considering adding that and seeing whether that's something that can be done to, you know, reduce the number of complaints in relation to them.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James and then Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Okay.

James Bladel: Yeah. I think I'll let Mikey go because I just lost my comment there and I was engaged in a side conversation. So go ahead Mikey and then I'll jump in behind you.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Just to follow up I think that one of the concepts that I'd like to introduce is the notion of low hanging fruit. This isn't - this little (off info) code thing isn't necessarily in the scope of what we're doing right now but it's a darn good idea.

And so, you know, to Michele's point I think it would be great if that initiative could just run forward then the registrar sit down and formulate a little paragraph and fire it off to the registries, you know, looking up that (ANSI) standard for human use of complex strings.

And, you know, we noted in our report as either as just low hanging fruit that we stumbled across in our analysis or in an appendix or something. But, you know, rather than wait for the IRTT process to handle it in a formal way if we've got a good idea like this, let's just get the effective parties involved and go fix it.

Michele Neylon: James?

James Bladel: Yeah. Real quickly Michele you were reading from apparently a bullet and/or an announcement from VeriSign regarding requiring strong password conventions on (off info) codes.

And my question is was that something that they did unilaterally or did that come through the (RSET) process or, you know, where is that coming from? Because I think if we had had an opportunity to review and comment that in advance I think some of us probably could have foreseen that would have increased that frequency of transfer problems.

Michele Neylon: I'm looking up their (RSET) page now just to see if I can find any information there James. I'm looking here - hold on a second now. It doesn't say in this announcement that I've got from VeriSign, where this came from.

It doesn't say it at all so I assume that it came from them. Is there anybody from VeriSign on this call? Is what's her name from VeriSign on the call today?

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the...

Michele Neylon: Barbara?

Coordinator: ...operator. Excuse me. Are you needing operator assistance sir?

Michele Neylon: No. No, no. Thank you.

Coordinator: Apologies for the interruption.

Michele Neylon: That's okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...is Barbara Steele and...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...not on the call.

James Bladel: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: She's not on the call today. And James I'll forward you the email that it have here. But I don't know where this came from. I'm having a look at the (RSET)

list now. Maybe somebody from - does anybody from staff know anything about it?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm actually asking (Craig) about it. He's our registry liaison. And if I hear something back from him by the end of the call I'll let you know. Otherwise, I can maybe provide you with an update on the next meeting if you note anything else.

Michele Neylon: Right. And as I'm looking at the (RSET) page here and I can't see anything. It looks to me like it might have been just some kind of - what they might have considered a minor operational change. I don't know.

James Bladel: Right. Okay.

Man: That's why we have the - that's why we have the (RSET) so that we can catch these things before they blow up on folks.

Mikey O'Connor: So this is Mikey. And David if you're still on the call...

David Giza: I'm still here.

Mikey O'Connor: ...this is a perfect example of very constructive, very focused conversation based on good data. And it's this kind of data and the collecting and managing and providing of this kind of data that the ICANN community can benefit from.

And I'll try and capture the essence of that, you know, in the little memo. But when you talk to your budget overlords you might just refer them to this part of the MP3 and say look, you know, this is a conversation where there's no battle at all.

There's just clearly a problem that's causing errors in domain transfers which is resolvable now that it's been identified through the analysis of good data.

And what we really, really need is that subsequent to the resolution part of your C ticket system to be able to actually capture these resolutions and presumably track the trend.

Both when the change went in, you know, I would be willing to bet a nickel that if we had good data on domain transfers that we saw an uptick in the kind of error that Michael was describing, the moment that that standard went in.

Because they lengthened them, they made them harder to type and they made them harder to recognize with that change in their standard. And so this is just a final rant about the value of good data improving operation processes.

David Giza: Thank you Mikey. I appreciate that. And as soon as you have that draft memo or document together, you know, please send it my way.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. I'll put something together and circulate it to the list and you should have it by this time next week.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I just heard back from (Craig) and he said that he's not aware that a request like that from any registry has gone through in (RSET) process.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments or thoughts or reflections or anything? No? Silence has descended?

Mikey O'Connor: Anything?

Michele Neylon: I knew you'd have something Mikey. God almighty knew that. Okay does anybody - apart from Mikey have anything they'd like to add?



Mikey O'Connor: Oh, you're hurting me.

Michele Neylon: I know. I know. And I do it so well. Just going back to the - to the spreadsheet from David which we were looking at originally. David you have listed on one of the - on one tab you have listed registrar ranking by complaints.

And then on the other tab we have the registrar ranking by size. Now I noticed one thing that kind of confused me a small bit in this particular version of the data - of the sheet. Where's it gone to?

Oh, yes, you have the - down at the bottom you have put all the (terminees) and registrars together in one group.

David Giza: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: So based on this then none of the other registrars in this - in the rest of the list were terminated?

David Giza: Correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Just for my own personal - my own - I don't know if anybody else would kind of find this useful or not, it would be interesting I suppose, to see if like say compliance issued something against the registrar in question.

In other words, let's say for example if you have a particular registrar that compliance has already sent warnings or whatever you call them. What is the official thing? It's...

David Giza: It's - well there is - it starts with a compliance notice and then it escalates from there into a breach notice.

Michele Neylon: Right. Okay, so is this - the thing is obviously if for example my registrant is completely inept and incapable of doing a copy and paste when EPP code from point A to point B that's hardly my fault, or GoDaddy's fault or Tucows' fault or anything like that.

But if I'm refusing to give the client - the registrant the EPP code then obviously I'm in breach of something. I'm just wondering, is there a way of collecting whether you've actually followed this up with the registrar.

In other words, you know, this is - this registrar here, you know, is - there is a problem but we are dealing with it, if that makes sense.

David Giza: Yeah, the way to do that is to go back and look at the manual files that we've - we have around the disposition information that registrars provide to us when we contact them.

And from those files we could determine how often we had to issue a compliance notice to a registrar who failed to take action after receiving the transfer complaint from ICANN. And then I - I know that there have been a few instances where we've had to escalate that issue into a breach notice.

And I do know that there have been breach notices issued where, you know, a failure to address or resolve transfer complaints is one issue among perhaps, you know, other issues that the registrar needs to take corrective action on.

And then in many of those instances registrars respond affirmatively to resolve those matters and so the breach goes away because it's cured. But in some instances as you've seen from the spreadsheet, registrars just simply fail to take that corrective action thereby leading to nonrenewal or termination.

So we could begin to collect that information - we've got the information. We would need to analyze it and then present it in some format going forward, you know, that would be, you know, useful and not just to the working group but to ICANN and the general community.

And I think the best way to do that again, is by enhancing or modifying the C ticket system so that we can, you know, have a much more robust way to collect and analyze disposition data and then report on that through a variety of different methods to get that kind of, you know, data that you're looking for Michele.

Michele Neylon: I mean the thing David from my perspective, is I wouldn't want a situation to arise whereby, you know, that you're using a kind of a minor issue a stick to beat somebody with. I wouldn't want - I mean it's more a case of for your own internal - how do I phrase this?

If you're collecting the information so that you have it to hand when you need to escalate it rather than it being published willy-nilly which I think could be more damaging to people rather than helpful, if that makes some kind of sense.

David Giza: It does.

Michele Neylon: In other words, let's say for example, I drive my car to work every single day. I normally wear a seatbelt. I was going somewhere with that analogy now and I've lost my train of thought. I suppose the point being that if somebody knowing - there's a difference between somebody knowingly committing a wrongful act and somebody accidentally committing a wrongful act.

And that, you know, and that it's not - it would not be fair or equitable for let's say that if compliance starts to track all of this stuff now, the next thing that he - and there's a compliance notification sent against (ENOM) or Tucows or

GoDaddy or ourselves, the next thing that it's published everywhere, you know GoDaddy you're evil, (Black Knight) are evil, yadda, yadda, yadda.

And it's simply because, you know, we weren't aware of something or we made some simple little mistake as opposed to, you know, we went - we set about actually doing something evil and wrong, if that makes any sense to you.

David Giza: I follow what you're thinking. And our contractual compliance team - our goal is to work collaboratively with registrars.

So, you know, all of the information and data that we collect here and that we use we do that in an effort to establish corrective action plans that, you know, and/or programs with the registrar so that, you know these matters can be resolved, you know, short of a breach, you know, and/or, you know, termination.

So I can tell you from my viewpoint we wouldn't, you know, misuse this information in the ways you described because again, our goal is to work constructively with registrars to solve these problems so that we don't have to breach, you know, and/or terminate registrars that are performing according to the, you know, the expectations of the REA.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks. Thank you. Anybody else have any reflections or thoughts on the spreadsheet? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh sure. I've got something. Just another round of thanks to David.

David Giza: Thank you Mikey I appreciate that. It's - I'd actually like to thank my team that worked on this. There were three individuals working over the past 3-1/2 weeks to pull this information together and they really did a marvelous job. So I'll pass your comments along to them.

Michele Neylon: Please do. I mean it's very - as I said to you in an email over the weekend, this is factual. This is not rumor.

Because one of the problems we faced both in this working group and in other working groups that I'm involved with and I'm sure other people could echo this is, we've spend a lot of our time talking about rumors. You know, there is supposedly an issue. This is a terrible issue and this - it affects hundreds of thousands of people. But then when you actually go looking for some evidence of the issue you can't find anything.

So your - the data that you've given us it's like well, you know, here is what the people are actually talking about. Here is a list of them. That's fantastic. Because you can say okay, this is what we have and this is what we're dealing with. It's so much better. Anybody have any other thoughts?

No? God you're all so quiet today. It's fantastic. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: I could fix that.

Michele Neylon: I know you could but I'm trying desperately not to allow you to do that. Okay then, right. How are we doing? How are we doing for time Marika?

Marika Konings: We've already past the hour.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So maybe we - does anybody want us to try and continue on a little bit or can we call it a day and let David go back to having some coffee?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. We've already lost James so I think we should drop off for today.

Michele Neylon: So basically you're saying that if James you have to cut the call short but if I were to leave you wouldn't mind?

Mikey O'Connor: I didn't say that. But it's not a bad idea.

Michele Neylon: Okay. It wasn't bad. I was just checking. Just checking. Just checking. Okay, so can we call it a day? Marika I will forward you on that thing that you were messaging me about.

Marika Konings: Right.

Michele Neylon: David are you in your office or where are you today?

David Giza: I'm working from home at the moment. But I will be in the office probably in about an hour or so.

Michele Neylon: Oh okay. That's fine. I'll probably follow up with you afterwards.

David Giza: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you all for your time. And...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Can I just confirm that we'll have a call next week?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) a message that we'll, you know, staff will be on a retreat that week but as it's - the retreat is in Los Angeles so it will be early morning for me, I'm happy to do the call and I think it will be good if we can continue the weekly run and make progress on things. So...

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...I wanted to stick with that.

Michele Neylon: So we'll have a call next week. Anybody have an issue with that?

Man: Yes, okay.

Michele Neylon: No? Okay, perfect. Unless somebody contacts us in the meantime then we will have a meeting next week. And thanks Marika. And hopefully you'll have a good flight over.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Coordinator: Thank you for participating in today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

END