Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP

Transcription

Tuesday 31 August 2010 at 14:00 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 25 May 2010 at 1400 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-20100831.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Michele Neylon – RrSG Chair

James Bladel - Registrar SG

Paul Diaz - Registrar SG

Barbara Steele – RySG

Oliver Hope - RrSG

Matt Serlin - Registrar SG

Robert Mountain - Registrar SG

Chris Chaplow – CBUC

Mikey O'Connor – CBUC

Berry Cobb – CBUC

Anil George – IPC

Kevin Erdman – IPC

Simonetta Batteiger - Registrar SG

Michael Collins – Individual

Baudoin Schombe – At Large

Staff:

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Eric Brown – RY (all Tuesday calls)

Operator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: All right. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the IRTPB call, the 31st of August. And on the call we have James Bladel, Paul Diaz, Barbara Steele, (Oliver Hope), Simonetta Batteiger, Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, Berry Cobb, Kevin Erdman, Chris Chaplow, Matt Serlin and Anil George and we are trying to call out to Baudoin Schombe who should be on the call any minute.

And for start we have Marika Konings and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. Thank you very much. Michele, over to you.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Good afternoon everybody. Sorry I missed last week but I believe that James did – looked after you wonderfully as always. Or at least that's what he told me. Somebody was – somebody mentioned

there on the chat about SOI updates or DOI which sounds to me like something involving alcohol.

So I'm not too sure about the best format for handling this is but I suppose the simple question is if anybody has any changes to their disclosure of interests could they please let them be known. Marika may be able to clarify this. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Disclosure of interest is actually a different thing from a statement of interest that's normally provided at the start of a working group. As I understand, the disclosure of interest is more related to the agenda for a specific meeting and whereby members are requested to disclose whether they have any specific interest on the topics of the agenda.

We are working on some instructions or some further clarification on, you know, what that means and how that can best be handled at a different, you know, start of a meeting. And I know that some elements are still on the discussion by the, you know, the relevant work teams. So, you know, more information is forthcoming but I think at this stage the intention is that members state at the start of the meeting if they have a specific interest in one of the issues that are – that is on the agenda for that specific meeting.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. I've already been very vocal in my criticism of how some people are trying to handle it in some other working groups. I'm already on the record on that, that it become – can become a bit unyielding.

Just to cover my own declaration of interests, I'm a registrar so therefore if there are problems involving transfers, this causes me a massive headache which costs me money and time and headaches and that's pretty obvious.

If anybody has any strange disclosures that they'd like to share with us that we haven't already worked out please go ahead but I think most of you it's pretty clear why. But anyway, I'll await further instructions on this.

I also believe from the call last week that it was decided not to delve too deeply into the ETRP stuff at the moment. Is that correct James?

James Bladel: Yes, this is James speaking. Acting on the suggestion of Paul and I think the group, the consensus was that we would defer that and discuss comments on other topics first because there were fewer of them and they seemed slightly less controversial.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Okay. Are there any other issues that anybody wants to raise? Marika has her hand up again.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just have a question. Are you already moving to gen Item 3 or do we first pause at the gen Item 2 because I would like to say something on that.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry. Yes, okay let's – let's for once, let's do things in order so that I don't confuse people too much. Yes, (b fact) from ICANN compliance. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I sent out a response to an (article in) conversation that was started on charter question E in relation to denial reason seven and also some comments that relate to (denial) reason six and some other further comments have been made on that and actually just wanted to propose, because I think, you know, I think we're all heading in the same direction but I think conversations through email, you know, makes it difficult and as well as slow because I'm checking internally as well with different departments and I'm getting their input.

But, you know, I think we're, you know, thinking along similar lines and I think the email that James sent on, you know, focusing on the issues of, you know, not having locks that are not visible and (waste) for registrants actually to, you know, remove any locks that are there, I think basically it boils down as well to the main point that, you know, that are there from our perspective.

But what I would like to suggest is maybe to see if I can get (Pam Middles) on compliance and (Dan Halloran) from our legal staff to join one of our future meetings possibly in two weeks' time so we can actually have, you know, not face-to-face but a conversation around these issues which might make it easier to maybe come to some kind of agreement on where we're heading and how that could be best addressed.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I would – personally would agree with that. Does anybody else have any comments or thoughts on that? Paul?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Michele. It's Paul. To Marika's point, the exchange in emails sometimes can be somewhat disjointed. We may be focused on one particular thing and missing the broader exchange. Therefore, very,

very much appreciate the opportunity to have (Pam) and (Dan) on the call so we can talk it through.

For anybody who's not had a chance to see the emails, so I just want to put back into the record the point that I was making yesterday saying that the suggestion at least as I read it in the prior feedback from staff, the suggestion that we change the rules in the IRTP and make affirmative consent to have a name locked a mandatory requirement I think is a very, very bad idea for security reasons.

I refer everybody to the list. And hopefully that was, again, one of these taking things somewhat out of context. That was not the intention of staff but I think it should be pretty clear to people that's the classic unintended consequence.

By making that sort of requirement it seems almost assured we're going to have large numbers of folks who will not affirmatively respond, therefore their names will not be locked and will be that much more vulnerable to a potential hijacking or takeover situation and therefore was not ag- not meant in anyway in favor of that proposal.

But, again, let's have the broader discussion with legal, with compliance on the phone, make sure that we're all on the same page because I think everybody's interest is doing the best thing for registrants. But, you know, how we get there and what we propose is we have to be very, very careful.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And just a comment on what Paul says. I think, indeed, you know, you're absolutely right. I think, you know, on the line thought was that indeed there's a need to make locked visible and not have, you know, invisible locks and, you know, do the best as a registrant to make sure as well that if, you know, those kinds of locks, they need to be visible and there needs to be obvious ways for a registrant to unlock them in a timely manner.

So, you know, I absolutely agree. I think, you know, I think we're heading in the same direction but probably benefit from further discussion to see how we can, you know, work that in in the IRTP and as well hear from compliance how, you know, what they need to actually enforce those kinds of provisions.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody else? Any thoughts on this? Okay. Marika, could you just let us know how you get on with organizing a timeslot with them and…

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I actually already had an exchange with (Pam), and you know, although she's based in Sydney and this time of day for her is basically midnight, she's willing to join our call on the 14th, I believe it – yes, next week is the – so in two weeks' time so I just need to check with (Dan Halloran) if he's available as well. For him it will be 7:00 a.m. so we're in…

Michele Neylon: Well I mean…

Marika Konings: …in complicated time zones but hopefully we can…

Michele Neylon: Well even…

Marika Konings: …actually stick to our regular meeting time.

Michele Neylon: Well I mean, the ult- I mean from my personal perspective – and I don't know what other people think – but if we could have one – at least one of them on the call, ev- and from time to time, it would be helpful. That's from my own view because I was – when David Giza used to join the calls it made things a lot simpler because we were able to ask the right, you know, what do you think of X and, you know, what is your experience with Y and, you know, it removed a lot of this kind of sitting around waiting for people to off and come back and stuff.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is the reason – you know, I agree but I think, you know, at this point in time it might be the complicated thing, the staff, you know, the compliance iss- offers and as well that (Pam) is located in Sydney where, you know, our meeting time doesn't really map to here hours there.

But, you know, she's indicated that, you know, on the (one of phase) issues she's welling to participate and, you know, for the time being on other issues, you know, I think it might help if I'm go in between, a lot of it might be a bit slower but hopefully we'll be able to have more regular communications in the near future.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Anyb- any other points on this? Okay then move on. I think th- is there an echo on my line or is it on somebody else's line?

Marika Konings: I don't hear an echo.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I dare not ring back in because I've already taken 15 minutes. Okay how far have we got with the public comments?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We covered the first three comments and you'll see in the Adobe connect the notes from our previous meeting and would like to encourage everyone to review those and let me know if, you know, I missed something or misstated anything.

So if we would skip the comments on the ERTP for now it means that we would go to charter Question B which is Comment 29 would be the first one on Page 6.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. Okay then so would you like to go to – walk us through some of these Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. I'm happy to read them out. The Comment 29 is from the Internet Commerce Association and they basically say that the – there is from their side no support for changing the current practice and adopting a rule that only a registrant and not an administrative contact can initiate a domain name transfer that does not modify contact information.

Michele Neylon: Okay so does anybody have any thoughts or comments on that? Okay. Go on. Go ahead, continue please.

Marika Konings: It would be helpful where we were trying to do the document…

Michele Neylon: Hold on.

Marika Konings: …actually is to, you know, incorporate the working group's review on the comment, so should I just put then no view or does the group agree…

Michele Neylon: Well James and (Bob) both have their hands up so there might be some sub views.

Marika Konings: Great.

Michele Neylon: James, go ahead and then (Bob).

James Bladel: I'll defer to (Bob). Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Okay (Bob). Go ahead.

(Bob):   Thanks James. I – maybe you can explain it. Maybe I'm a little thick. I'm not quite sure I understand the point. You're saying that only registrants and not the administrative contact initiated the meeting transfer. Where does the did not modify contact information fall in there? Are they saying that if the – only the registrar can initiate a transfer that also includes the modification of the contact info? Maybe someone could clarify that for me. I'm just a little confused.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody want to ta- answer that or shall I? (Bob), do you remember that we've discussed this before, the difference between the registrant and the admin contact?

(Bob):   Yes, I understand that perfectly. I do – what I don't understand is where this (alby) modified contact comes into play. Wh- how does that?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Oh right. Sorry. Sorry. Go ah- I can't an- speak to that. James, go ahead?

James Bladel: I don't have an answer for (Bob) and I'm kind of asking the same question.

Michele Neylon: Is our friend from the Internet Commerce Association on the call today? I don't think he is, is he? He's not.

Michael: That would be Michael is still – Michael is on the call but I'm no longer with the Internet Commerce Association.

Michele Neylon: No, I know it's what's his name – Phil Corwin.

Michael: Phil Corwin.

Michele Neylon: Phil Corwin – is Phil Corwin in this group? He is, isn't he?

Michael: He is not. I don't think so.

Marika Konings: I don't think so either.

Michele Neylon: So, ah, okay. Sorry, it's about the only working group I'm on that he isn't in. Sorry. Is there more to the comment then the bit – that text Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The comment itself starts off with – in relation to the UDRP question. Basically starts off saying we have no objection to

consideration whether the domain should be locked when it's subject to UDRP proceedings so long as the matter is considered within the context of a balance in comprehensive PDP in a UDRP reform.

And then as – oh no, sorry. I'm going too quickly here. Relating to the question on thick Whois – where this comment is made. And I'm just wondering, I'm – I was trying to pull up the issues report because I'm trying to think if somewhere on the issues report we actually spoke about this possibility of having different rules for, you know, a change that doesn't involve a change of registrants.

I know we spoke about it but I don't recall exactly what we said in the issues reports. I'm wondering if it's in relation to, you know, discussion around that issue. So basically the comment is made under a heading that's called, "Thick Whois for All DTLDs,"

So it starts off saying the (IT) has no objection to the initiation of PDP to consider whether all GTLDs should be required to maintain a thick Whois to – as to better facilitate the secure transfer of all registrant contact information.

Until such a PDP is initiated and reaches its conclusion, we do not support change in current practice and adopting a rule that only a registrant and not an administrative contact can initiate a domain name transfer that does not modify contact information. And however, we will not object to ICANN providing additional advisory guidance to registrars on this issue.

Michele Neylon: Okay, is that a bit clearer for you (Bob)? And I see James's hand up.

(Bob):   Go ahead James, sorry.

James Bladel: Yes, this is James speaking. And I guess I'm trying to get my mind around where we're going with – are we discussing each – the substance of each comment and trying to arrive at some sort of a working group position now or are we just reading through them or – what are we doing today, first of all, because I don't want to dive too deeply into this if we're just going over the comments.

Michele Neylon: Well we're going to making co- we're looking at the comments trying to understand what they're saying and then seeing if we agree, disagree or feel any way ab- towards their comments. I mean…

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: In some – I mean…

James Bladel: I guess my opinion is the thing that's missing in this particular comment is a why or an alternative idea because as we've discussed, you know, through the lengthy discussions of ETRP and DTRP as well as mentioned in the (SF), you know, having one user that has all or nothing control over a domain name is part of the security and hijacking headache that a lot of folks are dealing with.

So I guess rather then see the wholesale rejection of any changes of that idea I guess was – I would like to understand why just because we've now collected at least three or four different beta points that show that this is a problem and something that should be at least open minded to looking at. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks this is Mikey. I think that one way we could dispose of this one is something along the lines of acknowledging that the last part of that comment is confusing and that we don't really understand that – the objective there. And then move on.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: It's almost as though that was a throw away sentence that has been sort of vacuumed up a little bit out of context and I suppose one option would be to go back to Phil and ask him to clarify it. But, you know, the sense I get since it was in the context of the thick Whois point that he was making is that maybe his fingers just ran away with him on that one.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just pasted in Adobe chat the relevant section of – relating to Issue B where we talk about this and my view's comment is directly in response to this paragraph in which we actually specifically ask input from the community on this proposed recommendation where we talk about, you know, possibly making a chance, you know, when it comes to a change of control or not.

So, you know, maybe people can take a second just to review that. It might be easier to pay – to put his comment into context.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any takers, anybody? No.

Mikey O'Connor: Hang on. I'm reading.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well (on that) from a secondary market perspective I could see how if you require that the registrant is the only person who is authorized to start a transfer practical speaking in terms of how communication flows with, who gets what type of email, I think that a lot of registrars wouldn't necessarily always require that just the registrant can respond to the acceptance of the transfer request and things like that.

So I could see how if you changed the rule from it can either be the admin contact or the registrant to it must be the registrant only, how that would hinder trading names. So in that context I would agree with the comment of so Phil Corwin that this is not – this wouldn't be nice for the secondary market and would make it harder to trade names.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Yes, I would just follow up with that and I think that we had some earlier conversations when we were discussing some of the challenges where – of disputes between admin and registrants when they were two separate entities and one was selling the name and the other was not.

And I think that in some respects this might clarify the secondary market into which party has the ultimate authority to sell a name and which party buyers should be dealing with. So I think that, you know,

right now there's some ambiguity there and I would think that perhaps that was a way of clearing that up.

Michele Neylon: Michael Collins, Simonetta and then Mikey.

Michael Collins: Yes, I wanted to agree with James. I think the reason that we discussed this, and I probably had some input, was for that reason, was that having only one authoritative party could help to resolve disputes before they occur and help to avoid disputes over domain name transfers and however, I think we decided that because the – you know, this isn't – there isn't a thick registry for dot com in particular and some other TLDs that it wasn't something that we could suggest as a change but that we would consider – that we would suggest that, you know, that a move to pick registries might be a solutions for this as well as some other problems.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: James, I would agree with you that if that were practically working that this would be nice because it would actually clarify roles. But I think from where we are currently with registrars in fact having different operational features in place, it would not be a practical solution at this point in time.

Michele Neylon: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, it's Mikey. I found that recommendation that we made in the middle of the text that Marika pasted into the chat. We recommend that only the registrant can affect a change of control while both the

registrant and the admin contact remain eligible to authorize a transfer that does not modify contact information. That's where that came from.

And so that's the context that Phil is making this point. We certainly debated this enough in the prior realm. I suppose we could open the debate up again. I tend to agree with James that issue is the two parties having control over the same name problem and them basically going in different directions.

And I'm not sure that we tied this entirely to thick Whois. I'm – I guess I'm not terribly swayed by the argument that, oh, it's operationally hard so we shouldn't do it. I think it's perfectly okay for us to say this is the right thing to do and put out a reasonable implementation expectation so people aren't unduly burdened by it.

But I tend to stick with our recommendation. I think we beat it up pretty hard and came to a good recommendation there.

Michele Neylon: Okay. (Bob) and then Simonetta again.

(Bob): Yes, this is (Bob). I guess I – sorry, Mikey, I was not part of that debate that you referred to. I guess the only thing I would ask is does this pass the test that there is enough of a problem to merit – because it sounds like we're – it sounds to me, Mikey, like we changed – the recommendation you're referring to is a change from a currently done.

And I guess the only question I would ask is at the risk of, you know, anybody can rehash, is did it pass the test that it was enough of a problem, was that problem quantified and did that – did the working

group agree that it would justify and effecting a change in the way it's currently done.

Michele Neylon: Simonetta and then James.

Simonetta Batteiger: That was exactly my comment as well and that just practically speaking again I've been working in roles where I had to have access to systems like our online backing system or other pieces that corporations need to have access to and in some way domain names are a little bit like that.

So with personnel changing over sometimes it's really tough to have just one log in and if two people are actually able to do something like agree to a transfer for a lot of entities that might be really nice to have and it's currently possible. And it – I'm just wondering are we making all of this a lot more complicated over and issue that might not be that big.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes and I don't know that we're prepared to release, you know, any specific data. I can tell you that this is an issue such that we had a team to resolve these types of disputes internally and it certainly attracted the attention of the (SX) and this point where they issued an advisory report.

But really I don't think that – and maybe the problem is both the confusion on this call and with the ICA's comment is that perhaps this working group jumped to too quick of a conclusion by saying, you know, that only the registrants should be able to authorize transfers.

Perhaps what we're really saying is we need to understand the difference between the role of the registrants and the administrative contract – contact in general. And I think that much of our earlier discussions would be – would – you know, we're pointing out that not only would this enhance domain name security but it would clean up the inventory in a lot of the secondary market activities where there is a question of whether or not the two parties that can authorize the sale of a domain name are in agreement.

And we use the analogy of the old ICMB air force missile launch keys where two people had keys and they had to turn at the same time. And I think that that is an interesting security feature. We would just need to discuss whether that's even appropriate.

And I think what we're really trying to say in this particular sentence here or this recommendation is we need to clarify what those different roles are. It says very clearly that the - registrants, you know, can overrule the administrative context but it doesn't really say how that is.

So – and I think maybe we just need to spend some more time on this.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Any other comments or faults at this juncture?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara, I have my hand up.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry Barbara, I didn't see that, apologies.

Barbara Steele: Yeah, I mean, one of the things that the registry constituency mentioned in our statement and I think it's a couple down from here is

the fact that there is the option of the losing registrar to confirm with the registrant that the, you know, that the transfer request is a legitimate request. Now obviously it's not required and it doesn't hold up the transfer if the registrant doesn't respond.

But, you know, perhaps if it was more consistently used it may help to prevent, you know, some of the fraudulent transfers that occur if, you know, the name is, you know, a very high-value name it seems that the registrant would be I guess watching for that type of confirmation to come through perhaps.

So it just may be another option that's out there to try to help circumvent it while still, you know, kind of having that two-key approach that was just mentioned.

Michele Neylon: Matt.

Matt Serlin: Thanks Michele.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Congratulations on the new arrival by the way, Matt, this is the first time I've had you on the call.

Matt Serlin: Thank you, thank you, appreciate it. I'm a little tired but I've been paying attention so far. So, yeah…

((Crosstalk))

Matt Serlin: …but that's a good point as well. But I just wanted to kind of pick up on what James said and agree essentially that I think actually looking at defining those rules a little better and making it clearer is probably a good step.

But I still agree with Michele that the intent of what we put together here I still support, you know, I still think that having one authoritative party that's responsible for authorizing the transfer and in my mind it's the registrant over the admin is the way to go.

Now whether or not we need to look at the actual wording and tweak that a little bit, you know, it's something that we can work on. But I think James is probably right that, you know, spending some time identifying what the role of the registrant is versus what the role of the admin is and who's authorized and can do what is probably a good exercise.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Okay let's move onto the next comment there. This is from the registries saying that requiring (unintelligible) would have as a potential side effect that registrant contact information is more readily available for individuals with nefarious intent to obtain access to the information as well.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi. James speaking and I don't mean to pick on the registries here but are they then suggesting by this comment or implying that those registries that are thick are a security risk and should consider becoming thin?

Michele Neylon: Barbara do you want to jump on that one or do you want to take one for the team?

Barbara Steele: Well I guess I'll have to take one for the team but, you know, I don't think that that's the case. I think that in some cases I know that the registries obviously – that VeriSign operates – two of them are thin, one of them is thick but due to, you know, various privacy laws and such we have varying levels of Whois access available for (.name) for instance.

So, you know, we have a summary level and then we have an enhanced I believe and then a detailed view that's available with an additional contract so that the information isn't out there and, you know, fully available as far as registrant details are concerned.

So I think that – and I think that there may be some other registry operators that have to do a polling of the registries to confirm this but I think that there are some others that have, you know, perhaps some additional information that's not as readily available even though they do have thick Whois. So I'm not certain that all of the registries actually publish the registrant details which I think is one of the main items that was under discussion as being resolved by having a thick Whois.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. I'd put myself in the queue. I think this comment suggests – is going more to display rather than collection so I think it's possibly causing, I mean, the thick Whois does not necessarily mean that the registry will display all of the details.

So for example .tel is thick yet it'll display very little, .eu is thick yet it displays very little so I'm not entirely sure – this thing about contact

information for individuals being nefarious I don't really understand where they're getting at; surely it's the same in thin Whois but, hey who am I? Moving onto the next one unless somebody – has anybody else got any other comments on 30)? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is Mikey. I just want to amplify what you said Michele. I think that we do need to be careful to not confuse the operational characteristics of a thick Whois which has a lot of advantages not just in this domain but lots of other places too with like you said, Michele, what's actually displayed.

I think that that's a false dichotomy and we should be careful to point that out; sorry Barbara. But, you know, I really think that this is quite important and want to make sure that we don't waiver on this one.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Moving onto 31, if a confirmation of…

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: Hey Michele?

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry, go ahead Barbara.

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: If I could just add one thing? You know, I think that, you know, the nefarious activity that we were looking at here and, you know, the potential for that basically comes from the fact that if the registrant details are publicly available it just provides potential hijackers with more information to be able to perhaps go in and compromise an email

account, change the information of the registrant and be able to hijack a name so that's kind of where we were coming from from that perspective.

((Crosstalk))

Barbara Steele: …or not.

Michele Neylon: Okay I'm a little confused. I just did a Whois lookup on a .biz and I could do the same on well all to of TLDs. What is the difference that you are pointing at that I'm not seeing?

Barbara Steele: Well I guess – and I'm sorry this is Barbara again. It seems to me that the conversations that we had surrounding this was that most people, just as you were saying Michele, wanted the thick Whois and to have the information actually displayed so that the (gaining) registrar, for instance, would be able to do that confirmation with the registrant who of course has the trumping authority, if you will, over the admin contract to authorize a transfer.

So I guess for that information to be available to the – and maybe I misunderstood but for it to be available to the losing registrar to be able to do that confirmation it would almost have to be publicly available.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James and then Mikey.

James Bladel: Yeah real quickly if I'm understanding this. This is the part I think that confuses me about this particular statement, Number 30, by the registry stakeholder group is that the information is available; it's required to be displayed by the registrars.

So the thick versus thin debate really just determines where you go to get that publicly information in the – publicly available information. But it is available. Now if a registrar is not compliant and does not display the contact – the contact information that they need for – to authorize a transfer in a thin registry than that's an issue for ICANN compliance.

And it's almost sounding here like we're backwardly saying that's a security enhancement for them not to display that. And I just – I guess we're kind of – we've circled around at this and now we're coming at it backwards to where we're saying that we shouldn't have the information that registrars are required to display. So I guess I'm confused.

Michele Neylon: And I would confirm that I'm confused as well James. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Just to add to – this is Michele – just to add to the confusion I think that there is a distinction between information being available say registrar to registry or vice versa and information being publicly displayed that we might, you know, sort of like the last one, we might explore a little bit more.

It might be that, I mean, one of the advantages to thick Whois is that a lot more information is collected and available system to system, registrar to registry, etcetera, etcetera. And to a certain extent there's a bit more flexibility on which of those data elements actually get publicly displayed and then another advantage would be that that would be a choice that's made once for a top level domain instead of registrar by registrar.

So there might be room in the conversation to dive a little bit more deeply into the distinction between sort of the operational advantages of a thick registry and which pieces of the information are publicly displayed. But I'm not sure that's in our scope.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you Mikey. Michael and then I think we'll move on because I think this particular comment I'm going to kick it back to the registries.

Michael Collins: Well I was only going to – go ahead.

Michele Neylon: No, no, go ahead – go ahead – go ahead.

Michael Collins: I was only going to say that I think that in the – for the thin registries the registrant contact information is not required although many registrars may display that information; I think it's only the admin contact information that's required in that sort of – source of – cause for this whole discussion I think.

Michele Neylon: Excuse me I'm typing rapidly here trying to do Whois lookups. Just looking at, for example, godaddy.com's Whois – sorry James – the registrant is listed but there's no registrant email address whereas there is an admin contact email address.

However Paul go ahead.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, thanks Michele. It's Paul. That's the point I've been trying to make on the list; in a thin model the registrant email is not a required field for publication, the admin contact is. In the thick model it's more likely going to appear so in theory at least a thick model could be less secure in that a hacker can see what the email address is and if it's a

hotmail or a Yahoo or something like that it's that much easier to take over.

And as the registrant – appearing as the registrant having taken over that email it makes the hijacking process that much easier. So just following what Michael Collins just said that's accurate that in thin ultimately you have some sense of security in that the registrant email is not necessarily publicly available; it's not required.

Michele Neylon: Okay but just to counter that Paul – and it's Michele. If a thin – if a registrar for a thin domain – that's a horrible sentence – if their Whois service is either A, not working or, B, dysfunctional, unreliable or has stupidly low rate limits you won't be able to do anything with the domain such as conduct a legitimate transfer.

Paul Diaz: Agreed, Michele but for the purpose of the group I think what the registry comment was getting at was not for the off-case that somebody with dysfunction Whois service but rather for the overall process. And again the thin models do not require publication of the registrant email.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey then Barbara then Matt.

Mikey O'Connor: I was just going to amplify what I said before which is the difference between collecting information and publishing it. It seems to me that one of the things that we could explore is requiring that the email address be collected and maintained but at the same time allow either discretion or actually prohibiting the publication of it for that very security reason.

So I think splitting the gathering and maintaining of the information from the publication of it might be a good avenue for discussion.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Barbara and then Matt.

Barbara Steele: The only point that I wanted to make is in a thin registry the registries don't even have within the database any of the registrant or admin contact (unintelligible) technical details at all to even have an option to make it available publicly or otherwise.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Barbara Steele: I guess it being required there really couldn't be a requirement because it doesn't exist in the thin registry's database.

Michele Neylon: Matt.

Matt Serlin: Not to rain on everyone's parade but is this almost a moot point? I mean, the requirements for new gTLDs going forward is thick Whois so essentially we're left with seemingly TLDs that have thin Whois. It seems to me like whatever policy that we come up with should be for the majority of the TLDs which is going to be thick Whois. Sorry…

Michele Neylon: Matt I counter that – and this is Michele. I counter that by simply pointing you at the statistics whether if you look at the number of TLDs using thick versus the number of TLDs using thin then thick wins; if you look at the number of actual domain names registered then I think thin wins.

Matt Serlin: Agreed, absolutely. But again I think it's at least a point worth discussing.

Michele Neylon: Oh I don't disagree, I'm just arguing with you for the sake of…

Matt Serlin: No, I know the numbers don't add up but, you know, maybe that's not the case – Barbara cover your ears – in five years, I don't know.

Michele Neylon: Hey listen we just like picking on you when you're weak Matt.

Matt Serlin: Oh yeah well hey.

Michele Neylon: There's some interesting discussions which I will try to capture on the chat about moving away from using email addresses to using usernames. And a few people have pointed out that there would be a lot of problems with that as well.

Barry you're saying a lot there in the chat; would you like to say something on the call for the record?

Barry Cobb: Yeah, this is Barry. It's not that important I'm just kind of batting around ideas. But, you know, in listening to all of this dialogue about whether the email address should be published or not and if it's very easy for someone to gain access to one's account using an email address if it were published like that then if all registrar accounts were a separate unique username and not an email address that to me seems to me that minimizes that potential threat but I'm not a technical expert in registrar operations so I'm not sure how solid that is but just pointing that out. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Putting myself in very quickly before I let Matt go. Just in relation to Barry's comments about usernames if any of you have registered a .tel domain you would have got a username and a password for the tel hosting system. And depending on how it's hooked up you could end up with a unique username and password per domain or you could have ended up with them all tied back to your email address which is really a purpose to nothing I suppose.

Matt go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Yeah I was just going to comment on the point about publishing user names. Personally that makes me a little nervous and uncomfortable, I mean, you know, part of the fact that a username is hidden is that someone can't call up and, you know, they can call us up and say I'm calling from Google – they don't have any idea what Google's username is. A published address gives someone a little bit more access and information than I think is appropriate.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay I think this is interesting but I think we've better move on a little bit. Actually we're coming – let's try dealing with 31. If a confirmation of the transfer by using the FOA would be implemented consistently among losing registrars it would help to reduce the number of instances when a transfer dispute arises. I think we've discussed that already on this call haven't we?

Now 32 from the registries again; registrars should implement a consistent policy regarding the proof required to undo a domain name transfer. Any reactions? (Bob).

(Bob): Yeah, no – related to the ETRP discussion.

Michele Neylon: Beg your pardon?

(Bob): Yeah, no relating more towards ETRP.

Michele Neylon: No. This was under Charter Question B.

(Bob): Okay. All right no I just thought based on the question that it was related to the question that – the point that many people have been making around ETRP and, you know, to Mikey's point the (cheat) that would have to be in that rule. I think – otherwise I (unintelligible) apple pie I guess in and of itself, you know, of course consistent policy is a good thing. You know, I think the proof would be in the pudding in terms of working (unintelligible) developing it.

Do we as a group feel that there is inconsistency today and that this would need to – need more to be done to implement a consistent approach as it relates now?

Michele Neylon: Barbara, would you like to say anything on this?

Barbara Steele: Yeah, I'm hoping that I can maybe clarify this. I believe that this was in response to the fact that in the transfer issues that come up oftentimes do relate to the fact that the registrant comes back and says, you know, I didn't authorize the transfer; the admin contact had actually sent it in obviously.

And some registrars what we see here is the registry when we're handling transfer disputes is that some registrars will actually provide, you know, perhaps an affidavit from the registrant indicating that they,

you know, were not aware of the transfer; that they didn't authorize the transfer and what have you.

So I think what we were just trying to get to here is that it would be really helpful even for those that I think don't actually make it to the registry level for registrars to perhaps have a consistent method for what they're asking for if in the case where a registrant is claiming that they didn't authorize the transfer and wants to play their trump card, you know, what the registrars are asking for in order to – in essence authenticate the registrant and what authorization if you will they would accept in order to undo the transfer or send it back to the other registrar. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Any other thoughts on this? No? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think I just want to voice my support for this idea. I think it's a good one; I think we ought to take a look at it.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Any other comments, thoughts? No? Okay…

Chris Chaplow: Michele, Chris here.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry Chris, go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: All right, yeah, just rereading, actually, going back to the original SSAC report and on that Page 8 where the actual incidents of hijacking have been, you know, explained and it, you know, it really just come back to gaining control of the registrar accounts, the username and the password obviously and then the password and as one using an SQL injection attack whatever that is to regenerate a password.

So if the username is the email address that's definitely a weakness point that we should be recommending an independent username I think.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'm sorry, the hand there – it's Matt, go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Yeah I was just going to comment on that last point that Chris made and just I guess caution us about kind of widening the scope of what we're addressing here. And it feels like we're starting to talk about things that are outside of inner-registrar transfer and more overall security and, you know, things like registrar account usernames and things like that.

And I – while I have views on that stuff I think it's outside the purview of what we're charged with doing here.

Michele Neylon: Matt, it's Michele, I would agree. And I also see that James would agree. Chris, I think it's a very valid question; I think it's one that I for one would be more than happy to discuss with you but I don't think that basically that (IRTP) is really the best place to get into this.

Chris Chaplow: Yes okay. I mean, where I'm sort of coming from obviously is sort of stepping back and looking at where the hijacks have occurred at transfer and seeing how they've occurred and just to focus us a little bit back on that and, you know, preventative measures for that whereas…

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: …also the discussions and of the thoughts and the public comments, all the rest of it is sort of at a higher level if, if, if, if.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: That's just where I'm going. Yeah.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Oh which working group was it in? There was some discussion somewhere – and I can't honestly remember where – about minimum security levels. I think it's in the (RAA) – potential changes to the (RAA) discussions that are currently ongoing.

And I think in there – and I could be wrong – but there's a wonderful mush of ICANN working groups in my brain at the moment – there was some stuff from (SSAC) and the law enforcement to mandate minimum levels of security with respect to registrars.

And this is something I think has been bounced around a bit. And I think one of the areas where there could be some level of agreement would be to mandate PCI compliance to be a level since most registrars would be processing credit card payments and therefore would have to be PCI compliant anyway.

But as far as I know at present this is really just something that's being talked about (unintelligible) anything beyond that. Right it's almost 4 o'clock in my time zone which is the only one I care about so it's the end of the hour. I presume we'll just go ahead with our meeting next week and we will continue with the – looking at these comments.

If anybody has any other queries or questions or wants to continue any discussions or anything please do use the mailing list. Any other matters anybody wants to raise at this time?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just note I'll sent out the chats to the mailing list as well as I think there's quite some good discussion there and, you know, might stimulate some further debate around these issues.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. So if nobody has any others – any thoughts or queries or questions or whatever I shall this meeting to a close and speak to you all next week. Okay, thank you.

Mikey O'Conner: Thanks Michele, good call today.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Bye-bye.

Barbara Steele: Bye.

END