GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group
teleconference
16 September, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 16 September 2008. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-a-pdp-wg-20080916.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michael Collins - CBUC
Kevin Erdman - IPC
Marc Trachtenberg - IPC

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

Absent - apologies:
Adam Eisner - Tucows
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative

Paul Diaz: ...thank you. Glen, if you would, could you do the roll call please?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes certainly. We've got Paul Diaz the leader of the group; (Mike O'Connor), Business Constituency; (James Bladel registrar Kevin Erdman, IPC; Michael Collins, Business Constituency; and (Mike Rodenbaugh) also Business Constituency and the Liaison to the Council. With Marika Konings and myself from staff.

And their regrets again for the record Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, and the regrets for the record are Sébastien Bachollet who's the (ALAC) representative, (Barbara Steele), Registry and (Adam Eisner) a Registrar from Tucows

Paul Diaz: Thank you very much Glen. Good morning everyone and welcome back. We, here we are again talking about the transfer policy.

As we were chuckling before we started the recording checking the public comments list we've only had one comment so far and I'm not sure how constructive it necessarily was. A registrant complaining that somebody took his name after he forgot to renew it for well over a month. Sorry. Read your contract. But we will continue to monitor that list of course.

I would also remind and encourage discussion about the template that we've put out for all of our constituencies. I know, speaking for the registrar constituency that we do have an active dialog underway, hope all of the others do as well. And as a reminder the deadline for those comments are no later than the 3rd of October. That's a little over, what, it's about three weeks now, three weeks remain. Pardon, two and a half weeks so the clock is ticking.

For today's call if I could, excuse me, (Mike O'Connor) or (James), anybody else who is on the call that the separate sub-group call last Thursday, for those who have not had an opportunity to listen to the recording and/or please to share with the group the kind of state of your findings, if we might expect inside documentation, a revised work flow chart, anything like that that you could share with the group I think that would be very useful for the rest of us now.

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mike O'Connor), let me jump in. I wrote sort of a summary e-mail to the list and viewed that as the date of plan in terms of documentation.

I think the call was quite productive, very lively and we gave ourselves some action items. The first observation is that we realized that the process flow diagrams that Marika found were great, however they were customer facing process flows and because of that tend to mask a lot of variability that goes on in the back office part of it which makes a lot of sense. We certain expect that customers would be pretty confused by the fact that there are many different ways to get things done.

But one of the actions that we gave ourselves, especially some of the registrar participants we're going to go back and see if they could dig out some documentation that might give us a better view of what's going on in the back office. The difficulty with that is that there's a lot of proprietary information in those. And so folks weren't sure whether they were going to be able to come up with much.

And I don't know that we really gave ourselves a deadline. It would probably be a good idea to (unintelligible) group again and sort of see how we're doing.

So anyway, I think the next big observation is that at least in terms of exchanging e-mail addresses it would appear, and again we want to confirm this, but it would appear that there's a difference between thick registries and thin registries with regard to exchanging e-mail information. It looks like EPP based registries and the registrars that use them already have an automated mechanism to do this.

(James):   (Mike) this is (James).

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah. Go ahead.

(James):   I did investigate that a little bit internally and learned that there is a significant variance in how much information one can get over an EPP info command if you're not currently the registrar of record. So that in those cases even still who is at a minimum has used either to augment or as the full source of information to get the transfer contact information, so.

(Mike O'Connor):   That's a helpful update.

(Michael Collins):   But I, this is (Michael Collins). Can we presume by that though that the mechanism is there it might be modified to provide more information?

Man: (James)?

Man: Absolutely (Mike).

(Michael Collins):   That's a question not necessarily for you (James) but just kind of the group as a whole.

Man: No that's absolutely correct (Mike), (Michael) sorry.

(Michael Collins):   No problem.

(Mike O'Connor):   I'm (Mikey).

Man: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   Yes it is there and if you are the registrar of record an info command, and again, I hate to speak in absolutes because there is a significant variation between different registries even among specific registries, but the info command would for the registrar of record would provide just about every data field that the registrar can manipulate.

(Michael Collins):   And just a question, and this once again's probably better put to someone that runs a thick registry, but could not that information also be provided to any registrar that happens to have the auth code? I think that might provide the security to keep just anyone from getting that information, and help to tie it to a transfer function.

Man: And excellent point.

Man: We might want to capture that question.

Man: Yeah, I'm...

Man: So we can run it back.

Man: Yes (Mikey) I'm trying to jot this down quickly but (Michael) it might be easiest if you could just dash that note off to the list. As you heard at the beginning, (Barbara Steele) couldn't be here today but I know she monitors the list and will probably listen to the MP3 as recording as well. But for our record and again, so that we capture all of this in our report later on, it helps to have things in writing as well.

(Michael Collins):   I will be happy to.

Man: Thank you. It would be great that way we can get a discussion going there and get it fleshed out.

(Kevin):   Well, and this is (Kevin). I have a question on that point, would it be possible to mandate what access would be provided by that info command? You noted that there was a variation among the registries about how that is actually handled and would that be something that would be in the purview of our recommendations to require through the registrar agreement that full access be given to that sort of info command with the appropriate credentials?

Man: You know that's an excellent question (Kevin). When (Michael) dashes his note out you could please respond to it. I will also go back to council, I would think that that's fair within our mandate, our charter question one is - is there a way for registrars to make the data available to one another the registrant e-mail address available to one another, I think it's fair enough for us to certainly look at it. Of course if we come out with a strong recommendation that it should be done in a certain way and that would become binding on registries, that may be more problematic because then we're asking for a policy change that's going to also lead to reconfiguration of certain systems.

It might get a little trickier but I think it's certainly well within our mandate to address the issue to identify in our report and you know, make a recommendation if we believe a certain best practice should be adopted across the board.

Man: And to, I'll watch for the messages on the list but to respond to
            (Michael's) question, I think that some of that may be already occurring
            that if you pass along the auth info code you are giving the information
            as though you were the registrar of record. The thing is is that I'm
            trying to think of the process here and would the auth info code be
            available to the gaining registrar at that point in the process. That might
            be something we'll have to take a look at.

Man: My experience is that most registrars including TRW, require you to
            provide the auth code as a customer wishing to, desiring to transfer in,
            they require the auth code up front. So as a registrant that wants to
            transfer my domain name, I have to provide it to the gaming registrar
            so they should have it.

Man: Right, but that's also one of the reasons why they're looking for the
            registrant e-mail in the first place, correct? To send them the auth info
            code.

Man: No, the gaining registrar does not send the auth info code, the losing
            registrar would have to send the auth info code and once I, I would
            have to go to the losing registrar, I guess they'd call it registrar of
            record, I'm always confused by that term, the registrar of record has to
            provide to the registrant the auth info code and then the registrant who
            wants to transfer to a new registrar takes that auth info code and
            submits it to the new registrar. So the new registrar has it, has the auth
            info code and then could use that to acquire the registrant e-mail
            address and then send a confirmation e-mail to the registrant.

            So I think that we're moving here off of the flow chart that we started to
            talk about on last week.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Did you have any luck finding any of the back office charts in your...?

Man: No, unfortunately one of the principles that I wanted to discuss that with was not available last week. I will continue to look into that and confirm that that sort of thing is open for public discussion.

Man: Yeah or you know, even with big chunks of it blacked out it would...

Man: Right. Better than nothing.

Man: Yeah. Better than nothing.

Man: Yeah. And I'll go back to Network Solutions as well. I mean I know who to speak to and they'll have a couple data points this way.

(Mike O'Connor):   You know I think the main thing there is just to get a couple of examples to start from rather than starting from scratch and so once we've got one or two I think we could either pull one together ourselves or we could hand the ball to Marika and let her sort of consolidate it into something we could work from. Because having that back office version of a chart would help this conversation a lot, sort of which party gets which piece of information when I think is the function of a chart like that.

Man: Yeah. I think it would be helpful (Mikey) but just taking what (James) said, some of this, there may be some redacted documents.

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah.

Man: Some black outs because certain things we'll want to, we'll be sensitive

                    to. And ultimately not for the sake of the you know we want to advance

                    the work of this particular work group but for security reasons because

                    if we're you know, publishing this stuff and bad guys start figuring out, I

                    mean this is, could become the definition of social engineering.

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah. Just a map by which people could break in, I agree. Do you

                    want me to carry on now or?

Paul Diaz: Do you have more guys? I mean this is very, very helpful. I know a

                    good number of the folks that are part of the group were on the call but

                    for those who couldn't make it, so certainly if there's more.

(Mike O'Connor):   Well I think there's only one more big conclusion that I put in that e-

                    mail and that is that we may have a fork in our recommendation in that

                    if it turns out that EPP is a vehicle to, and we have to confirm some,

                    you know, all this stuff that we've just been talking about, but if that

                    turns out to be a vehicle to exchange the address then we may have

                    recommendations that have two parts. One for thick registries and one

                    for thin registries because thin registries can't, they don't have the

                    information they have to rely on.

                    Who is, who has emerged as the operational glue between registrars

                    during these transfer processes in registries. And we've spent a fair

                    amount of time sort of discovering that and I think that a question for

                    this group is, or at least one that comes to my mind is the problem

                    posed by who is being such a radioactive topic in ICANN and at the

same time being the operational glue for transfers presents, just presents a difficult situation for making recommendations.

But I think we have probably a fork here where we've got one set of recommendations for EPP registries and another for thin registries, probably the last (pager point) that came up.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And just for the record (Mikey) everybody's running EPP now, that's just the software, you mean thick and thin, the distinction between the two.

(Mike O'Connor):   Oh really? Does EPP run in a thin registry as well?

Paul Diaz: Yeah. It's just the software Extensible Provisioning Protocol. And for sure we will be careful in our report to define all the acronyms that we use much like we did in our template.

Just reading the summary e-mail I'm again, recommend everybody look this over. (Mikey) sent this out on Thursday at 1:43, you say that (some of us) are finding out more about this, who are the someone's and what would it, what is that you were trying to find out? That letter was unclear.

(Mike O'Connor):   The someone's are folks who work at registrars for the most part and what they were going to go back and do is find that back office set of flows rather tan customer facing.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Yeah.

(Mike O'Connor):   I should've been clearer but...

Paul Diaz: No problem and I'm part of that now as well, I just committed to doing that. All right well thank you all, this is very useful. Did you all have discussions; will you have a subsequent call? Were you going to wait to see, discuss it and this, the regularly scheduled call and take it from there? What was the thinking about next steps?

(Mike O'Connor):   I think what we were thinking was that we would see how the information gathering went and then bring it back to this group rather than, we didn't schedule another call.

Paul Diaz: No problem. Well speaking for myself and any others that have action items I know I just need a little time to do this, I would ask if it's okay with the rest of the group, you know, maybe we come back at our next week's regularly scheduled Tuesday call, present the information, if we can post it to the e-mail list sooner certainly do that, but by no later than a week from today try to have answers for the group and then we can again, determine if we can, what our next steps will be, if that seems okay.

I just, I know between now and then a lot's going on for myself so I would appreciate a weeks worth of time to get some answers to this, these questions.

(Mike O'Connor):   I think that would be fine. If you'd like I'll send a note to the list sort of reflecting that so that the other folks who have similar action items and aren't on the call today can...

Paul Diaz: Yeah. Great idea. Especially our registry reps because they certainly need to weigh in on this, that would be excellent. Thank you (Mikey).

All right then, excellent. Well very, very useful. I hope everybody, that it's helping bring certain things into focus and obviously there are other areas that we still need to explore but we will return to it next week and, or on the list in the interim and we'll certainly look for the inputs from registrar and registry reps for those outstanding issues that we still have to address.

All right then, for the rest of the call I'm not sure how folks would like to proceed. In our discussions last week we were still on more or less addressing issue one, some of our other questions may have taken us a bit off topic but it's all been good. You know looking back on the notes I'm not really sure exactly where we broke last week. I believe there was a question that was hanging and I'm sorry, my notes they weren't very clear.

If anybody recalls or has a question from last weeks discussions or let's just open it up even broader -- are we comfortable with where we are right now in terms of our discussion of issue one, the need for additional information that we've already discussed and looking ahead to next week hopefully having some more answers? If there's more we'd like to discuss, happy to entertain it. If not perhaps we start looking at issue number two.

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mike O'Connor) again.

Paul Diaz: Yes (Mike).

(Mike O'Connor):   I think we probably need to drill a little bit deeper into the sore tooth of who is for thin registry stuff. Just aside how far into

recommendations about who is we want to dive because what's emerged from that call is that even though who is has a whole lot of radioactive privacy issues around it and very locked up discussions in ICANN, it is also the operational vehicle for communications between registrars and registries.

And it's sort of an elephant in the room. I think we need to spend a little bit of time just deciding what, the degree to which we want to make proposals that actually directly bear on (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay. Very fair question and open it up to anybody. What are the thoughts on how we will address in our recommendations any things that will impact who is as it currently exists or recommendations for changes in the way who is information is used to facilitate transfer requests?

(James):   You know perhaps, this is (James), perhaps we could point that out, acknowledge it, but I wanted to go back to our earlier discussion of how far we wanted to step into the quicksand that who is has become. I think acknowledging that you know, perhaps here's another area where this is, has potential consequences or side effects of any changes to who is policy and something that needs to be taken into consideration during that group but I wouldn't really be comfortable going too far into that subject, just my opinion.

Man: Yeah.

Paul Diaz: And for what it's worth I share your views (James) and not that I'm punting on the issue (Mikey), but I think it may help to have this conversation after next weeks discussion of the information we find

when it's a little clearer to all of us what exactly is being done behind the scenes with the who is information. Where are the pain points?

It might be easier to have the discussion once we have a clear sense of what we might be recommending in terms of changes, if there are any changes that the group may want to recommend.

My gut feeling right now is that we all recognize it is, who is is such a sensitive issue but rather than kind of beating around on possibilities, maybe it's worth having a discussion once we have a little more information within the group and we can, we have a clear sense of what it is we might identify as recommended changes and then figure out, okay how do we couch those, how far do we go? Do we even want to go there, etc.

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah. Well and one idea that I had is to give it a new name or add a name to the pile and call it something different so that...

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry (Mikey) what is the it?

(Mike O'Connor):   Who is.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   Something like operational dash who is or I don't know, some way to side step the morass because I agree, walking into the quicksand is not something that I would....At the same time because there are such huge operational needs being met at this time. You know I hate, I hate to miss the opportunities that it presents.

So I think that your notion of waiting a week and seeing what the pain points are is a good one, (Paul) I could go with that. But I think at some point we do need to circle back around...

Paul Diaz: Agreed. And...

(Mike O'Connor):   ...how deep we want to go into it.

Paul Diaz: Certainly. And remember everyone that you know, we have already had a good discussion on this within the group and we did include (unintelligible) who is in our template, so you know, we would expect to see some recommendations, thoughts, etc., coming from both the public and from the various constituencies and having a discussion within our group on how we will entertain those thoughts you know, makes perfect sense, I mean we can't avoid it. I just think with a little bit more time it might help us focus the discussion once we have it, once we're ready to have it.

(Mike O'Connor):   Yeah. I agree.

Man: That sounds reasonable.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Well then if we're going to wait until next week for some of these other issue one related discussions, we'd like to start talking about our second charter question that is the need for options for electronic authentication due to security concerns and use of e-mail addresses.

When we first kicked off the working group we had you know, talked about at a very high level, you know, there were questions about what registrars may be using any sort of security tokens for example or any

mechanism. We've made it very clear within the registrar constituency and the call for comments that you know, we're seeking examples, folks who are doing something like this to step forward, but we can go back and you know, sort of study what is the model, is it a good one? Is it something we might want to recommend?

To this point there's been, nobody's come forward so I'm not sure if that's just busy with other things or perhaps this question was attributing something that's not necessarily in existence. We'll have to wait to see.

But for the rest of us here today are there thoughts, any particular topics or issues we want to raise surrounding our issue number two?

The thundering silence.

Paul Diaz: You know for me, yeah, and that's perfectly fair. From a personal perspective I have a feeling that this particular issue I'm hoping we'll develop more discussion once we get the first round of comments in because right now it's me, almost a sort of yes or no and I'm not sure exactly how much more we can say at this point unless somebody has a particular thought and we want to tease it out. I'm perfectly content just sort of putting it on the back burner for now and waiting to see what other inputs we get from the community at large.

(James):   (Paul) this is (James). I think that's a very appropriate approach and I'm actually curious to see what we get back on this question. I don't really have anything to add to the discussion.

Paul Diaz: Thanks (James).

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mikey). I think the one that leaps out at me that we might want to at least put a placeholder in for...

(Rachel Ray):   Hey everybody, (Rachel Ray) here.

(Mike O'Connor):   Hello?

Paul Diaz: Got you (Mikey), it's okay. Just a little background noise.

(Mike O'Connor):   Oh, okay. Is there are lots of sort of out of band authentication systems available that kind of old granddaddy of the bunch is one called Secure ID in which basically people are given a credit card sized gizmo that has a number that changes every minute and when you log on to a system you have your password and then you type in the number on the Secure ID gadget and the responding system also knows what that number is and so it provides a very secure way to do password-based authentication with an out of band mechanism.

And those are available for automated systems as well. There's basically a whole huge body of literature on that. And I think that one of the sort of underlying themes of this question is whether or not we should recommend that some sort of system like that be embraced by the registrar/registry community in order to strengthen the authentication that's being done now. It would essentially give a three-way authentication because you'd have the auth info code, the e-mail address and then this out of band cycle.

And I haven't actually run off and done research on the current state of affairs. I bought one of these 20 years ago when we were procuring

the payroll system at the University of Minnesota and you know, I'm sure that the state of the art has advanced a lot, but it's extremely secure. I mean it's a wonderful gizmo for that sort of thing and it might be one that we at least want to put a place holder in for at this stage of the game and start doing a little research on if nothing else. Okay.

Paul Diaz: So (Mike) you're envisioning, and I realize that it may be...

(Mike O'Connor):   Pretty antique, I'll do my best but.

Paul Diaz: But you would envision that registrars would have this token or registrant?

(Mike O'Connor):   Oh no, registrars.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   I would expect you know, and I can't imagine that millions and millions of registrants would be interested in, no I was thinking more in terms of authenticating between registrars.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   So a, you know, a population of hundreds would be subscribed to this rather than a population of a million.

Paul Diaz: Okay. A couple thoughts there guys, (Mikey) I'm not sure if the way I read issue two the concern that's being addressed is, and this clearly is what the SSAC was writing about is that the registrants e-mail addresses get compromised, get hacked and then all sorts of bad

things happen to their domain names. I don't believe the focus or the concern was on the communications between losing and gaining registrars.

(Mike O'Connor):   Okay.

Paul Diaz: If anybody reads it differently please let me know but it also just stands to reason in terms of real world experience and that the you know, the focus is on the communications between the domain name registrant and the registrar of record, the losing registrar getting the auth info code and filling out the form of authorization to initiate the process. That those are very important processes, sensitive and critical processes and that the issue here is is there a way that we can beef up the security at that level. That being...

(Mike O'Connor):   Well and it may be that there are newer cheaper versions. The one I was describing would be way too expensive...

Paul Diaz: Okay.

(Mike O'Connor):   ...for registrants but there may be, and this may be the way this question is phrased, is to go off and research what out of band options are available that could scale to a bunch of people like...

Paul Diaz: Okay. And again we're, the second observation that's going to have is that all right, so that if we're not talking communications between registrars but rather the registrar of record and their customers, you're necessarily talking about a one to a very many kind of model and I feel pretty strongly that ICANN, and this is ultimately a policy development process working group, ICANN should be very, very slow to ever get

in, put itself in a position where it starts recommending technologies because as we've already said, technologies change very quickly.

I personally think that this is something that is probably better left to market forces, registrars who feel very strongly about this can come out with solutions for the customers and can then you know, promote, advertise that as a competitive differentiator, but you know, my personal view is the network solutions route that said I do not feel comfortable with the working group coming back saying we've recognized or identified, researched, your three different security solutions that could be put in place. We recommend ICANN, you know, tell registrars to adopt one of these.

I just think that that's a very, very problematic course of action to take and again, I'm speaking as network solutions as the chair, I'm willing to entertain the discussions, whatever the group things but would also ask to think about the precedent setting value should the group do this, what's to you know, have folks down the road looking back and saying well, you know that transfer working group said it was okay to recommend technologies in some cases and all of the sudden it morphs into completely unimaginable things for future groups recommending technologies, just really think that may be a problematic....

((Crosstalk))

(Mike O'Connor):   I think we can take our lead from the way that question is framed. It doesn't ask what the technologies are it says whether there's a need and I think we could stay within our purview and take a crack at that. I

agree I don't want to get into recommending technologies, that's way outside the bounds of policymaking group.

But I think the question leaves open the avenue of discussing whether there's an in for that, and I think that what that might wind up with at a minimum is some sort of recommendation that says well, before we know what the need is we need to know how often the problem occurs. How often does the purely e-mail based authentication cycle get broken into? The answer is not very often then the need is low.

But if the answer is, oh it happens a fair amount, then the need is high. And then the recommendation simply acknowledges the need. So a recommendation that I think we could make is ask for a study of that to determine how bad the problem is. I don't think we're, this is a lot like the (fast flex) discussion, not a real good group to actually conduct that research but I think we could recommend that the research get done.

Paul Diaz: Good points. How do the others feel?

(James):   (Paul) this is (James).

Paul Diaz: (James).

(James):   I just want to echo some of your sentiments that wouldn't be very comfortable with any kind of a policy that mandates very specific particular technology adoption and from a security standpoint I think it's probably desirable that we don't have a monolithic approach just because then that would make it easier to, you know, you break one method you've broken them all and if registrars are implementing and

maintaining confidentially their internal security procedures I think that's, there's some benefit to that.

I wouldn't have too much of an issue with a very generic statement such as you know, ICANN recommends that there be a communication method other than e-mail or in addition to e-mail but stopping right there and not specifying what that other alternative communication channel would be or how it should be implemented. But beyond that I think that you're absolutely right, that it would be an area that would be fraught with precedent.

(Mike O'Connor): Yeah. I stand duly corrected on that. I like the idea though of going as far as you just said (James). And again, I'm not even sure that that's justified because it's difficult to know how often this happens. If it turns out that in however millions of domains there are out there this only happens ten times then the need is probably not very high.

If on the other hand it happens a hundred thousand times then I think there is a need and you know, absence of that kind of information it's really hard to answer that question.

(James): (Paul) was what I mentioned, was that, do you feel that was compatible with your concerns or is that still beyond or outside of something you would be comfortable for recommendation or some hypothetical policy?

Paul Diaz: I, you know (James) until we reach the point where we're ready to start clacking away at our keyboard and writing up our report I'm completely open-minded about it. I think what you were saying is going to be fine. The devil will be in the details. How do we actually phrase that for the

written record? And we just need to be sensitive that we don't go beyond the mandate and I don't think that's a problem, I think everybody's sensitive about the boundaries.

And (Mikey) I probably you know, was putting words in your mouth. You did not carry it as far as I was saying, I just wanted to kind of set an end zone there, you know, and marking the field of play that we don't go beyond. Just speaking, having spoken to my colleagues in customer service that handle transfer issues, one thing that, their concern with issue two when they first, you know, I first raised it with them is that they said, too often this fundamentally becomes a compliance issue because too often some registrars are not collecting or cannot produce a form of authorization, right.

When there's a controversy about a transfer, oh yeah, we forgot; or you know, there's any number of excuses. That's just a basic fundamental ICANN compliance issue, doesn't even get into electronic authorization and all the rest, authentication I should say. So I think this is an excellent discussion, definitely open minded about you know, seeking more information and whatnot, but kind of go back to my first thought, let's you know, see, keep an eye on the public comments list and very importantly we'll see what you know, constituency positions have to say about this, it will help guide our discussion. How far do we need to reach? How far do we need to go?

To your point (Mikey), everybody may go, this really isn't a big enough problem, there are bigger fish to fry, we move on. But if it is an often enough occurrence okay, then what is going on, merely compliance issues or fundamental problems with the system in which case what can we do to you know, help correct that or address that.

Any other thoughts, (Mike Rodenbaugh) or (Kevin)? Anybody else have any input on issue two?

(Michael Collins):   This is (Michael Collins), I have a question as much as input I suppose. I don't really have an answer about how often it occurs but let me ask you if using an e-mail address from you know, from the acquired domain name (unintelligible) re-acquired by a new domain owner or is just acquiring like a hotmail or you know, Yahoo e-mail address that was informally used by and in contact you know, is that (passing). I was thinking really more sophisticated?

I guess, I don't know whether these methods of electronic authentication would function, I'm not technically savvy enough to know whether if I acquire (unintelligible) directories registering a domain name (unintelligible) previously used as an admin contact and was still listed and who is this inanimate contact for you know, domain name or (unintelligible) or domain names. Is that hacking?

Paul Diaz: Fair question (Michael). Anybody?

(Michael Collins):   Within electronic authentication prevent, I mean someone from using an e-mail address that they had so they were, they had the right to use that they were the registrant for, would that work?

Because I, well I don't know how often it still occurs, as well I do know is that people that have been interested in hijacking domain names one technique that is fairly commonly known is that people who look, shop for domain names that are expiring, that are dropping, that are used as admin contact in other domain names and they also do the

same thing with Yahoo and Hotmail addressed they'll just attempt to register, acquire a domain name, because I think if you don't use the Hotmail or Yahoo account after X period of time that it'll just expire, it'll become available again to a new user.

And I think there's people that do look for opportunities to acquire these e-mail addresses in an effort to acquire the information that they'd need to get the auth code, etc., to be able to acquire, hijack domain names. And some valuable domain names have been taken in that manner. I don't know how often this occurs.

(Mike Rodenbaugh):   It's (Mike Rodenbaugh), a thought on that. It's my understanding that (Nominet) in the UK has implemented some sort of electronic authorization process. In other words e-mail's not enough to do a transfer there I think. I'd like to reach out to them and ask them you know, what kind of information they had to lead them to that decision.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Be very interesting to know what they're doing so that we can understand if it's applicable to a GTLD environment. (Mike) are you, do you have a contact, do you, or who were you thinking to reach out to?

(Mike Rodenbaugh):   I know that the CTO of Nominet is on the SSAC so there's at least one contact we talk to.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Can you reach out? Are you willing to take the lead on that?

(Mike Rodenbaugh):   Yes I am.

Paul Diaz: Excellent.

(Mark): This is (Mark).

Paul Diaz: Yes.

(Mark): I think it might be useful to reach out to Nominet. I don't know how helpful they'll be in our situation because they have a significantly different transfer process which is partially owned by the registry itself. So don't know how much.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Talk about it a little bit. What's the difference?

(Mark): Well I mean they have a transfer process which can be initiated through (unintelligible) which is a lot more complex than the GTLD transfer process, then they have a process where you can go directly through the registry themselves and it's literally a paper-based process for where you fill out a long application and have both parties sign and document various pieces of information.

(Mike Rodenbaugh): Okay. Well I'm sure that's not the standard way that they're doing things. I think it's still via electronic authorization but I think that they use (unintelligible) or something like that. I'm not certain, I'll have to look into it a little bit. I'll get back to the group on this.

Paul Diaz: Okay (Mike) thanks. And (Mark), yeah I agree and that's why I raised the issue you know, what would the applicability be in a GTLD environment. Many CC's will have essentially their own way of doing things but at least at this point within the working group, as long as it's not an onerous amount of effort to research it, it's probably worth

looking at because there may be some opportunities there, some best practices that we can identify and put forward.

And if not, we can always say that we did make a full faith effort, good faith effort and it was just too different and then we're back to square one.

(Mark): No definitely. I agree.

Paul Diaz: Very good. Yeah I realize from the SSAC report in our (tent) that we note in the final bullet that in the report both the .UK (Nominet) registry as well as the Swedish dot .SE registry have methods and I don't know for .SE who we might talk to you know, or perhaps it's the same point of contact if we, the Nominet fellow is part of SSAC (Mike) you might ask him hey, did you also speak to your .SE colleague and...

(Mike Rodenbaugh): They might have - (Olaf) may have a contact over there as well.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Yeah, anybody that might be able to just give us a you know, a quick background, again recognizing if it's so unique though very different and something that is honestly just not applicable to a GTLD environment, so be it, you know we'll note it but if there's you know, some general best practices that could be adopted great, let's figure out what they are and bring it to the group for further discussion.

Marika: This is Marika. I'll check with (Olaf) when he's back from his holidays whether he has a contact at .SE.

Paul Diaz: Very good. Thank you Marika.

(Mike O'Connor):   This is (Mikey). SSAC might just have some more generic thoughts about this too. Have they ever explored this?

Man: They have done a paper on domain hijacking.

(Mike O'Connor):   That would probably be another one Marika to dig out of the archive and send us the link, they might have some ideas in there.

Paul Diaz: The link is there if we're on the (wiki) side, issue two it's in the, the external link is in the first bullet so we can't see that report, granted it was written in July of '05 so you know, the information they're going on a lot has happened in the interim but, and even the processes that those other CCTLD registries may be in point may have changed in the interim.

                   But the link's there so we can get to it, it's a fairly long report, 48, 40 odd pages, 48 pages. But it gives us you know, some insights and you'll recognize some of the case studies they used, they were certainly high profile cases in their time.

Man: I'm sorry (Paul) but at our main Web page?

Paul Diaz: Yeah. If you look, I'm sorry I'm not clear, if, look at the template for constituency statements.

Man: Constituency statements.

Paul Diaz: Sorry. And then there in issue two, the color is not blue on my screen it comes up purple so it's a little harder to see...

Man: Oh yeah. Yeah.

Paul Diaz: ...but you ended up, first sentence says see link and that'll take you to the report.

Marika: This is Marika again. I can check as well with Dave Piscitello was a staff member serving on that, on the SSAC to see if there's any more recent information in relation to this issue that he might be able to share.

Paul Diaz: All right. Thank you.

(Mike O'Connor):   There's actually quite a lot on (unintelligible). Okay.

Paul Diaz: Yeah. And any more current thoughts would be most helpful, Marika and (Mike) and when you're talking to the other colleagues referring this back to the old reports, there's certainly some value there but again, something that was written three years plus ago that's kind of dated information, would love to hear, know what is being done currently.

                        All right everyone, by my watch we have about six or seven minutes left. I'm thinking that it might be easier to draw this one to a close a few minutes early today rather than trying to dive into issue three. I'm sorry I didn't mean to cut off, were there other thoughts on issue two or if anybody had additional thoughts on issue one?

                        Okay. If not then why don't we give ourselves a break, we'll get out of here a few minutes early this week. Some of us have action items for

next Tuesday's meeting, we'll bring those to the table, start with those, have further discussion then on issue one as it relates. Please I encourage everybody just you know, bookmark the page for the public comments list just to you know, be sensitive to anything folks are saying. Hopefully there will be some more feedback as the deadline gets closer, there'll be more inputs there.

And you know, with that I thank everyone for their time and we'll look forward to seeing you all again this same time next Tuesday.

Man: Thanks (Paul).

Paul Diaz: Very good. You all have a good day now.

Man: Thanks (Paul).

Woman: Thanks, bye.

Coordinator: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. You may now disconnect.

END