Priority: T3

Issue: Implementation: Communication Protocols

Description: Protocol-level changes may be required to support specific clearinghouse models and functionality. For example:

- Querying TM Claimant Contact Information
- Receiving Domain Name Registrant Contact Information
- Receiving Notice Event Information
- Receiving Trademark Validation Status
- Receiving Registration Status Information

While it is expected that registrar-registry communications will continue to use EPP, this may require extensions to convey the additional information needed for Sunrise and Trademark Claims processes. The protocol(s) used to implement these data exchanges between the clearinghouse and registries or registrars are also a necessary decision point in designing the architecture.

Requirements:

(1) Minimize the cost and impact of implementation on the existing framework and infrastructure of the domain name registration system wherever possible.

Approach	Advantages	Disadvantages
(1) Use EPP	 EPP is already used in registrars and registries EPP is designed for the "provisioning and management of objects stored in a shared central repository" – such as a trademark database The protocol definition already includes guidelines for extending EPP, which would help to shape the technical discussions 	 Once the protocol is extended, each registry or registrar that requires these extensions still must implement them. The use of EPP may not necessarily be more cost effective to implement than the development and implementation of a different protocol
(2) Use EPP and other Protocol(s)	 Some required clearinghouse exchanges may fall neatly within other protocols and thus could leverage prior public implementation work in those protocols 	Some of the problems EPP has already addressed may include issues that will need to be solved for other protocols. This may result in some "re- inventing the wheel" in terms of protocol design and implementation effort