ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 07 September 2021 at 16:00 UTC

Note: 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/JAA_Cg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call, taking place on Tuesday, the 7th of September, 2021. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. For today's call, we have apologies from Keiron Tobin, RrSG; Tom Keller, RrSG; Sarah Wyld, RrSG; and Steve Crocker, SME. They have formally assigned Jothan Frakes, RrSG; Eric Rokobauer, RrSG; and Essie Musailov, RrSG as their alternates for this call and for the remaining days of absence. As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google Assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. Members and any alternates who are replacing members, when using the chat feature, please select either "panelists and attendees" or select "everyone," in order for all participants to see your chat and for it to be captured in the recording. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only.

Alternates not replacing members are not permitted to engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom Room functionalities. If you are an alternate not replacing a member, please rename your line by adding three Zs before your name and add, in parentheses, "alternate" after your name, which will move you to the bottom of the participant list. To rename yourself in Zoom, hover over your name and click "rename."

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing no hands and hearing nothing, if you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Just a few updates—just a couple, actually. I just wanted to give anyone a chance to talk that may have had some conversations with their respective groups on

any of the topics we've covered so far or anything else that they would like to bring up here, and again, anything that you maybe had talk on-list or something with your respective groups that it would be good to share here. I open it up for anyone—any of the groups to bring anything forward that they've discussed or maybe even made some decisions on their side. I'll let anybody come to the mic now if they have anything to share.

Okay. And again, we'll ask every week so if you guys do have some conversations with your groups that you think would benefit this group to share any of that information, just bring them forward each week and we'll discuss them and get them put in place.

The only other thing I have is planning for ICANN 72 is well in-place now. We will be having a session. I'm not sure that that's solidified when yet. But we'll have a session during 72 so we can plan on that as well, just so everybody knows. I think that was all for the updates. Any other questions or comments for anybody before we get started?

Okay. Let's go ahead and jump into our discussions for today then. Actually, if we could start on the transfer steps chart that Sarah did. Yes. Thank you. I want to thank Sarah. She's not able to make it today. Luckily, she's actually taking some vacation time so she wasn't able to make it so we'll go through this. A few people have put in comments already and we'll talk about those. But she actually left quite a few. Thanks, Caitlin, for putting that link in. She actually had a few open-ended questions that she left in here as well. So we can go through those as we step through this.

Again, her goal here was try to put in place more of a step-by-step view of how the transfer process would look going forward, within mind that she was trying to figure out when or if any communications or notifications should be looked at—if we should require them, or if we should make them optional, or if maybe they should be combined here or there. So I think that was her main goal, was really just to get down, step-by-step, the whole process and then where things fit in. And again, I've seen several people comment here. I know a few people have already taken a look at this.

And if you haven't looked at it, that's fine. We're going to go through each one of these so we'll open it up for discussions as we go through. I think her few steps that she did outline here … I can't remember. She put quite a few steps here. I'm trying to remember. Here we go. I think she has 10 good steps in there and then maybe a further discussion one. But we'll go through each one of these and then we'll talk about then, if anybody has questions. I even had some questions, line-wise—if it makes sense to move things forward, up, down, or something like that. But I think she covered most things. Again, thanks to her. And if you guys talk to her, thank her for doing this.

All right. So let's jump in, the first step being that the registrant or whoever has access actually makes the request for a transfer. So yeah. Line two. What she had for actions for this request was whoever makes this request may have access to remove certain locks that are on the domain itself. Basically, that's all they're doing, is removing any locks they may have access to and then requesting that they actually get the TAC.

Again, one of the things we've talked about previously is this may not necessarily be the registrant. It may be the account holder or however that works or it may be the registrant itself. So one of those people will be making that request. I think when we first started talking about notifications, this is where I thought that maybe there would be, naming-wise, a pre-notification, or a pre-transfer, or a transfer request notification that may be sent, the idea being, "Okay. Yes. There was a request."

Again, possibly sending that to the registrant, since maybe the registrant's not the one doing it. But maybe a communication goes out to the registrant saying, "Okay. This has been requested. Here's the next step that we'll take in how that happens." Again, I think there was some fairly good discussion and support for providing—when this request comes in, providing a five-day window the registrar to actually provide the TAC and do any unlocking that they need to do. But that will lead us into step two.

So I think the big question there … I'm not even sure there's really a question here besides the fact of should there, could there be a communication at this point—maybe from the losing registrar or sponsoring registrar outlining the process and maybe even providing, "Okay. This may take up to five days to receive this TAC." So I think that's probably the only big question here is does a notification make sense? Should it be required? Should it be optional? Or maybe we don't even mention it. So I'll open it up. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. I want to go back a step a little bit.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. You bet.

THEO GUERTS: I understand the logic here. Unlock the domain name, request TAC. That sounds very logical. But I would make the unlocking of the domain name optional. That does not depend on if you can request the TAC or not. You can also request the TAC when the domain name is still locked because there could be business models or security settings—added security settings based on if, for example, a TAC is validated or not. You could say as soon as it's validated, then the registrar unlocks the domain name. So you can put some different logic around the entire process for many good reasons. So I wouldn't make the TAC request dependent if the domain name is locked or unlocked.

ROGER CARNEY: That's a really good point, Theo. It's actually something to even bring up when the registrar does its work. But that's a really good point in that even owning—having the TAC in your hand—doesn't necessarily mean that it has to be completely unlocked. Maybe they're just going to unlock it once they give it or whatever—however that works. So that's a good point to note, that that lock or some locks may come off at a later time. So thanks, Theo. Any other comments on that?

Okay. And again, the messaging or communications notifications, I think, think about should there be one? Is it possible? Is it

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. My understanding that today, the status of a domain name—the EPP status transfer lock—update prohibited, etc.—is not a part of the transfer policy. I'm just wondering if we should add that into the policy on the next round. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Steinar. I think that's something to look at for sure is which one of those locks should be controlled by this policy and which ones shouldn't be controlled by the policy. So I think all those different locks, we need to look at and say, "Okay. Yes. This policy should dictate at least removing or setting at certain times these certain locks." So thanks, Steinar. Okay.

And I think that, to me, when I was looking at all these steps, this is where I was thinking … Obviously, all this is pre-transfer or all that early work that has to be done before a transfer is even in any kind of pending state or anything.

Okay. Let's go to line three, step two here. Prepare the domain for transfer. So this is going to be mostly done by the losing registrar or the current sponsoring registrar. Some of the actions taken—and maybe this isn't all of them. Maybe there's more we should add—is to verify the validity of the request, however that registrar is going to do that. That might be just by their login, or their two-factor, or whatever.

And then, remove any of the other locks as appropriate. And again, maybe this is just the locks that the registrar puts on it itself. Maybe there's still other locks there. Create the TAC in the registry system. If it's approved, the registrar creates that TAC and the registry hashes that in their side. And lastly, set the TTL on the TAC. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. Just to make sure that we don't accidentally end up with policy language which becomes final—so this is just me reminding myself when I was reading this—when I look at the verify validity of request, that should be optional.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And again, I think that that's a loose comment there because that may just be they logged in, or they've already preapproved it, or whatever it is. You're right. It's optional. But even more than optional, it's a broad statement that that validity maybe be different things for different, even, types of registrars.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. But it could also end up in the final policy and then you have to verify it due to your contractual obligations with ICANN. With resellers, we have no way to do that.

ROGER CARNEY: And that makes perfect sense. Even if "verify request" makes it in there, it's got to be somewhat optional language because, like you

said, that could come in a different mechanism. So it may be just automatic for certain domains or even certain models. Okay. All right. And again, all this is being done, mostly by the losing registrar. Obviously, interaction with the registry system plays into here a little bit as well.

And again, I think Sarah put in some notes about what—again, in quotes here— "verify validity." And again, all the different things. I think this goes to there's probably many other things that some registrars do. As Theo mentioned, some may not even do this much or do any because that transfer may come in from a different source.

So here's the first five-day window mention here. I think that I'm one that had … When Sarah first wrote this, I commented back to her that she had the five-day window in the next step. And it was like, "Okay. Does it make sense to mention it here or there?" I don't know that it really matters as long as people are comfortable having that five-day window. It obviously comes post-request and pre-TAC, is what we're talking about. So it comes as soon as the request has come in and up to five days until that TAC has to be provided back to the registry or again …

This document is—I won't say a happy path but a complete transfer, not necessarily branching off into denial aspects of whether the transfer may fail or not as well. So this is more along the lines of, "Okay. This transfer is going to go through and we can talk about the reasons for denial that can come up here." And again, that should be done within that first five-day window. And again, there's certain spots here that the transfer may fail, which we'll have to branch of as well.

But any comments on that? Again, I think the group has settled on allowing a five-day window from request to TAC, which is what it is currently, so I don't know if we're settling on it or just agreeing with the current policy. Any comments or questions on that step—I guess the second step of Sarah's line here? Okay. Thanks, Kristian, in the chat, on the five-day window.

Okay. Let's move on to the third step here that Sarah has. It's fulfilling the request to prepare the domain for transfer. This gets to probably the biggest action step that we've hit so far— obviously, providing the TAC back to the requestor/registrant. I think that that's one of the things that she's got a question here. Does this need to be communicated to certain specific people? Again, I think that we probably … And she has in here e-mail in the messaging but we probably need to extract that a little bit to just a messaging because it may not just be e-mail. But Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. When I provide the TAC to the domain name owner, that makes sense to me. Then, send a separate notification saying the TAC has been provided. I find that redundant. That is just unnecessary communication with the registrant. Everybody gets way too much e-mail anyway so let's keep down the notifications and e-mail conversations.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. I think that she was trying to—and I think maybe some wording tripped up here—but she was trying to recognize

there may be a difference. The requestor may be not the registrant. So that communication of the TAC may be just in the portal. So technically, whoever's requesting it may get it. And then, should it also be sent to the registrant in some form? I think that's what she was trying to separate here. But I agree. Let's not overburden with communication because then people will just start ignoring it.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. But if you provide the TAC to the domain name owner with the description that the domain name is ready for transfer, that should be enough.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think that makes sense. And I think that she answers that, maybe even later on, where maybe a lot of the communications can be put together, combined. So thanks, Theo. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. I think it's important to acknowledge that step one through five should only be one e-mail. So if the registrar chooses to e-mail the TAC to the registrant, then they don't need to send another mail because they already sent the TAC to the registrant. So they don't need to notify of a TAC request since they got the TAC so they know there is a TAC.

I think it's also important that we note that it doesn't have to be an e-mail. I think we should word it somewhere around that the TAC

needs to be provided from the registrar to the account holder or registrant in a secure manner. That will be different from registrar to registrar and it will be different, probably also based on the registrant agreement—the registration agreement that the registrant or account holder have with the registrar. Right now, in this, it says, "'Here's your TAC' e-mail." And I hope that we do not put in the policy that it should be an e-mail. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Kristian. I completely agree. I think that the mechanism of the communication she be left open. And again, we'll find the right wording at some point. But yeah. We have to support newer and future technology. And you're getting a lot of plus-ones, too. Great.

I think if we jump over to some of her questions. Do we still want the five-day window? I think most people have … Again, I think we've got a consensus that there should be a five-day window to provide the TAC. Again, I think one of the big questions here that she wrote down is do we need to dictate who the TAC is provided to? Again, thinking of the requestor may not be the registrant. So is it supplied to the requestor and the registrant? If it is the registrant, then obviously just to the registrant. Thoughts on that? Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Assuming that the account holder is doing stuff for the registrant and is preparing the domain name for transfer, in the reseller model, we must assume that the reseller is working on behalf of

the registrant. So to me, it sounds redundant to send an e-mail to the reseller or account holder, "The TAC has been provided." They are fully aware what they are doing.

The registrant receives … Again, I already mentioned that it doesn't … If the registrant already received the TAC, then it's redundant to send that message again. So I think this is a little bit redundant if you talk in terms of—if we need to dictate who the TAC is provided to. The registrant already got the TAC so you already covered that basis. So I think that nullifies the question.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Great, Theo. Thanks. Okay. Any other comments, questions on this? And again, I'm sure Sarah put e-mail in just as a mechanism. But I know that she's always talked about providing multiple mechanisms, more generically. So that's good.

Okay. Let's move on to the next one of notifying … I guess one other question I had is when the TAC … And thinking today, we have a state called "pending transfer" but that is when the registry accepts the request of the transfer.

Do we, should we change that pending transfer definition to when the TAC is provided, meaning that this is the only … We've got the five-day window, which the transfer hasn't been even started yet, theoretically. But then, when the TAC is provided, up until it is given to the registry through the gaining registrar, that transfer is in a different state where it is known to be allowed to be transferred, at least by the sponsoring registrar. So is this the new

pending state compared to today's—I guess the NACK/[AC] section of today's transfer? Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. Technically, it is not. First of all, you could have the situation if somebody creates a TAC by mistake. There's buttons to click in the registrar interface in the control panel. People are bound to do things that weren't supposed to happen. These things happen. People want to renew domain name and accidentally click on "delete." It happens. So you cannot make the assumption, at least in my mind, that if the TAC has been created, that we now have a pending transfer going on. That only applies when the transfer is actually requested by the gaining registrar. I think that's when you actually can say, "Okay. Now something is being transferred. Registry is aware." Then it's pending.

ROGER CARNEY: So in the immediate transfer scenario that we've been talking about, is there a pending state? Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I agree with Theo here because if we put the pending transfer status at this phase, we actually have to make policies for the registrar or at least the registrar to remove all other EPP statuses because we might end up a domain name having a pending transfer and a transfer prohibited status and that doesn't make sense at all. So I'm not in favor of putting the pending transfer before the registry has received a valid TAC and then a request for transfer.

ROGER CARNEY: And again, I'll leave my question open as to … Are we just eliminating the pending state, then, when we're thinking about immediate transfers? Again, just something to think about. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. And interested question. If the transfer is instant, then there is actually no use for the pending transfer status. You're not going to wait five days anymore—at least not within that scenario. So yeah. I think this requires a little bit more work.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Theo. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. I just want to recap what I said last time. I think we should skip the whole pending transfer state unless we decide to do a losing FOA thing. There is no pending transfer when the transfer is immediate.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Great. Thanks, Kristian. Okay. Any other comments, questions? Okay. Let's jump into the next step, then, of … She's got this marked as notify the domain owner pre-transfer. So I think that we've talked through this with the last one, in that maybe these steps are combined. And especially, even if the steps aren't,

the communication is. This just gets into her point of possibly being different parties doing the requesting versus the owner.

So I don't know if we have a lot. Let's see here. Two templates. I think, again, maybe we start avoiding the pending transfer until someone comes up with a good spot for that. We could probably nix the idea of pending transfer in the scenario of immediate transfer.

So I think that we're starting to combine a couple of these, especially the communication. We won't be notifying them three times here. This is one communication, I think is what everybody's saying. So unless anybody else has comments on that … Okay. Let's go on to the next step, then.

So initiate the transfer. Again, this is actually, maybe the most variable pieces. Once the TAC has been given, that the registrant or requestor actually has … It's up to them to start this work going forward. But this is when they actually submit it to the gaining registrar. Again, Sarah noted that the domain owner, or account holder, or whoever has the TAC, technically … That's some or the security aspects. Anybody that has the TAC at this point can take that to a registrar and initiate this transfer. So Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. It looks like a pretty good logic there. The only thing … I agree with her. No gaining FOA. But, "is likely to send a welcome message," I think that's completely up to the registrar—or reseller, actually. We send just a message that a transfer has been

completed to the reseller and they do whatever they do on their end to welcome the customer. Sometimes one customer is transferring multiple domain names. So that would be several welcome messages or payment received messages.

So I think that's completely up to the registrar or reseller. All these things are automated. There are poll messages, where the registrar can do stuff on or a reseller. So I think that is completely up to the registrar and reseller, that last part.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. When I read it, I was thinking the same thing. It's like, yeah. It'd probably be nice for certain people to get that. But I can see some registrars not sending that notification until maybe even it was complete. Hopefully they'll send something once the process is done. But they may not do it here.

Something Steinar mentioned in chat here that I'll bring up. Combining the notifications, we still need to have a way for the registrant or requestor to stop the transfer. I think that that's one thing. Maybe that's why I was throwing out the idea of pending. We can not talk about that that way. But once the registrant receives the TAC or the requestor receives the TAC, they should have an ability to … It's not stopping the transfer because the transfer is not occurring but be able to basically invalidate that TAC so that it can't be used to transfer something.

So I think that part of that notification of the TAC has to say— something communicated in there, "If this is not valid, or if you've changed your mind, or whatever—" something like that— "take

these steps so that the domain can't be transferred. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. It was actually to call out that, in the chat, Daniel says, "I think the transfer status is important." I really would like to ask Daniel to speak to this so I can understand what he means. I hope that's okay.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thanks, Kristian. Can I go ahead and speak?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah. I'm basing on once the transfer has been initiated, assuming that the transfer has not be authorized by the registrant or the registry who is making the transfer, then there is need for the registrant to be able to updated on why the transfer is taking place. And in case the registrant has not authorized a transfer of the domain, then they can be able to invalidate the transfer.

That is why I suggest that the transfer process is very important—the transfer status is important. In case the transfer is in a pending state and has been authorized by the registrant, then the definitely, since they're the owners of the domain, they can [be worked with]. That's why the five-day window is appropriate in this manner. Hope that answers your question.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Daniel. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. Then I understood it correct. But if the transfer is immediately, then when the gaining registrar starts the transfer, it will go through directly, meaning that the transfer will never be pending and there is never a transfer status. It will just change from registrar A to registrar B in the registry. It won't be pending or anything. So maybe it will go from "unlocked," to after it's transferred, it could be "locked." But that depends if the registrar locks it. But it would de facto be locked, since there wouldn't be an active TAC anymore. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Kristian. And Jothan mentions it here, too. I think the important thing here is that—I think Sarah's mentioned it in a couple calls before—is that the NACK has kind of gone away. There is no such thing as a NACK in this new model. As Kristian described, once the gaining registrar has the TAC, for all purposes, the transfer is done unless something goes wrong. But for all purposes, the transfer is done.

So really, the window of time is between when the registrant or requestor receives the TAC and when it's supplied to the gaining registrar. That's the only time that a transfer request could be stopped. And again, the request happens. There's maybe a five-day window and then they get the TAC. And then, between when they get the TAC to when they give it to the gaining registrar is

really the only window to invalidate that TAC so it can't transfer. So Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. Just a quick follow-up on that. The notification of TAC request directly to the registrant and nothing else is to tell the registrant there is something going on. And this would include information on how to invalidate the TAC. And in basis, that is like NACKing a transfer before it happens because you invalidate the TAC and then the transfer cannot happen anymore. That's a mechanism that is … At least, we talk about that as a mechanism to prevent unauthorized transfers of the domain. Yeah. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Kristian. The, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Thanks. When you talk about prevention of unauthorized transfers, there's a lot to unpack there. First of all, the amount of unauthorized transfers happening right now, over the years, is low. So in terms of being an issue, it is not a big one. And I understand notifications where people can invalidate a TAC or validate a TAC. I understand that some people in this group think that it's a good practice—some sort of last line of defense, so to speak.

But in reality, when you are talking about unauthorized transfers where somebody is trying to steal a domain name, that last line of defense—the registrant receiving an e-mail and can do like in the

movies—stop it at the last minute. Those kind of scenarios, those are so far-fetched, that is not going to happen. If somebody or if a hacker wants to steal a domain name, they're going to be in full control of all communications sent to the registrant. That includes hacking. Your e-mail box will get hacked. There will be a rule set in the settings of the e-mail box or all the communications get nicely filtered out. The amount of things that can happen here are numerous.

So you will not stop it. If you are really the target of domain name theft, you can be pretty, pretty sure that the e-mail that is going to save you, you'll never see it. So that is the reality. If you want to up the security of the registrant here, I think we should introduce some language here that says something on the line like, "Registrars and resellers should provide multifactor authentication within x days of the publication of this policy." Then you are creating good security controls to registrants to protect domain names and unauthorized transfers on a large level. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Just a couple comments on that. I think that that's maybe why I suggested earlier. That …. I think you're right. I think that that window is small if they have control. I think that's why I recommended or proposed a notification at the request time, when some registrars will be spending time validating or verifying the request, that the registrant received the notification at the request time. And then, they have several days to react to that, if they've received a notification, before the registrar actually submits or presents the TAC. Again, maybe that doesn't help at all either because, as you point out, obviously they've gotten a hold of

some other communications channel. Again, that's the only reason I proposed it.

The other thing I wanted to comment on real quickly was the frequency of these transfers that we're trying to stop, yes. You're right. It's pretty low. But I would say in that whole risk nine box or whatever people do with it, the frequency is low but the impact can be pretty high. So I think it's still somewhat of a concern that needs to be addressed. And again, I agree. The frequency is low but sometimes that impact is fairly high. So, Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: The way Kristian explains a potential way to NACK a transfer is good, in my opinion, but as long as we take into part the different roles that the registrant, the account holder, the reseller models, and all the other business models within the registrars have—as long as this method and technique will be able and doable for all these kinds of roles, and persons, and entities. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Steinar. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. I think we need to keep in mind that no matter what we do, we are actually not going to prevent—not authorize transfers. That will always happen. And that's why there's also a policy needed to take unauthorized transfers back. What we need to do is review the current transfer policy. One of the things we have a

problem with today is that the policy cannot be followed—for example, the gaining FOA. So there is basically no way around not changing the policy as it is today.

When we change the policy, we need to be able to tell the community that the new policy we have is as secure as the old one. So the new policy, we make sure to at least not create more unauthorized transfers than before. We're not going to prevent all of them. That can't happen.

For most domain transfers, or for most attacks that are created, it will be given out directly at the request. I think it will be very, very few registrars that use the five-day window. But it's a good security to have for some domains that you have the five days to do the validation. That's why I think we should keep it.

I think we could maybe—the text around the notification of TAC request, we could say that it can be sent, at earliest, at the request and, at latest, at the giving out of the TAC request. So it will be up to the registrar if you give it out directly at the request or if you until you send or provide the TAC, if you are a registrar that uses the five days to do the validation. By doing that, that flexibility, I think you at least get some of what you're looking for in your suggestion of doing it at the request. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Kristian. I think that's important, what you said. It's interesting because I think that what was said … And I think we've said it fairly all along, even when we were looking at numbers. We're not looking at making the current process any more secure.

We're making sure that the current policy is current and accurate. But the security wasn't the biggest issue of the current policy. It was just out-of-date. But the points people are making on—I don't know what we call it—the dispute piece of it probably is a bigger process to clean up than the policy itself. So just thoughts I've had as people are talking. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. I agree, actually with what you said when you talked about a policy, when it comes to reversal, that is going to need, indeed, a lot of cleanup. But I did want to point out that regardless of what security measurements you put in a policy, it will be a framework for people who want to steal domain names as a guide on how to steal it. That is part of the biggest issues I have with the change of registrant policy, which had one of the main tasks was to prevent domain name theft. If you look at the policy, you just look at the FAQ at the registrar on how they have implemented that policy and you already see where the holes are.

None of these policies that we will create will create a super secure system. That is just simply impossible. You can't do that on a policy level. So you need to make sure that if unauthorized transfers will happen, that you have a good policy to make a reversal there and as quick a possible because that is something you can control within the policy in case an unauthorized transfer happens. Unauthorized transfers will always happen when there is the opportunity for it, be it either the domain name is valuable, or highly-critical or whatever reasons. If somebody wants to steal it, they will steal it, regardless of what we are doing here in this working group. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Just to add onto that, a lot of the abuse and compliance people I've heard from say almost the exact same thing that you're saying, Theo. The policy is the policy. And today, even fraudulent transfers follow the transfer policy. If the dispute mechanism is, "You didn't follow the transfer policy," It's hard because they did but they just did something different that wasn't part of it. So it's one of those where you're right. You're creating a map for how to do it—get around it. So it still has to be secure enough to make sense.

And again, what I've heard from everybody saying is today's policy is fairly secure. Practice is fairly sure. That's not the part we need to be focusing on. Obviously, cleaning up the policy so that it's current and future-proof. But we need to really work on that dispute side—probably more so. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. Just a quick follow-up from before. I think when we present the policy recommendations, people are going to say, "It's less secure because you removed gaining and losing FOA." And then, we need to be able to explain that it is at least as secure as before because we have these and these things instead. I'm just completely sure we are going to get those questions and we need to be able to answer them in a good way. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Kristian. I agree. I think that's important to keep in mind as we go through it. Okay. Any other comments? Okay.

Let's go ahead and move on to the next one, request the transfer at the registry. So now, the gaining registrar has the TAC and is going to make the transfer request. And again, our current thinking is the transfer request is going to be as immediate as possible so it should be fairly quick, time-wise, from this point on. So they submit the TAC to the registry and request it to be moved to the new registrar. Again, this is just done by the gaining registry through the current registry—gaining registrar through the current registry. Sorry about that. Okay. I don't think there's much to talk about there.

Let's move on to move the domain. So now, we get into the registry work. They've had a little contact—a little work so far, early on, in hashing and any unlocking that has to happen. But here, it gets into the bulk of the registry work. Obviously, a lot of this has to be detailed out. Confirm the domain is okay to transfer and TAC is valid. Move the domain to the new registrar credentials. Send poll messages to the losing and gaining of the transfer completion.

One good question for Sarah here is the, "add one year from the registration term." And again, she asks, obviously, "Is this actually done by the registrar?" But I think one of the big things of her question is, is this where we discuss that one-year transfer? Is it automated? Is it automatic that that happens? Again, I think that, obviously, Sarah's being a registrar hat here and there is a lot that the registry is doing here. So I think that it's important to hear from the registries here as well because there's a lot that has to happen.

I think one time we had mentioned if the TAC is not valid and they try six TACs in 30 seconds, and they're all invalid on the transfer, should the registry respond somehow to that? Okay. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. I just wanted to respond to the adding one year—if we should consider that. I will tell why I like it. A lot of registrants are transferring their domains close to expire date of different reasons. It could be that it's connecting to a hosting package as well and then it makes sense of them or many other reasons. But for example, if they transfer a domain three days before expire date, then domain will then be transferred to the new registrar. And if this domain is not renewed in transfer, then it will still expire in three days.

For the current policy around renewal notices to the registrant, if I remember correct, we need to send three notices. Please correct me if I'm wrong. I think it's one month before, one week before, and then after expire, within three days or something like that. Could be a bit off but something like that.

So if the domain was three days to expire, it was just transferred, then the new registrar would not send out a notice because that was already four days ago. That notice should have been out. The domain is going to expire after three days and the domain would be inactive. And they would be like, "Why didn't you notice me?"

The one-year renewal at transfer is pretty good in that sense—in other senses also, that it stops the registrant from changing

registrar every day or whenever they can because that's what we do see happen in some TLDs, that they transfer a crazy amount of times. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Kristian. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GUERTS: Yeah. I can only echo what Kristian just said there. It is my experience also that if we would lose the one-year term to the transfer process, yeah. That could potentially be very chaotic. Some of our resellers do not turn on auto-renew on the domain names for dozens of reasons—too much to cover on this call. So that would result in domain names going offline. And I don't think that this group—a least myself, I don't want to go there.

So I just want to keep the current setting, as we do it now. With .NL, the Dutch registry, you actually do not gain a year upon transferring a domain name and that always leads to issues. So I've already seen the issues and I think the current setup, as we have it now, is one of the better solutions—not the only one but let's keep it the way it is. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. And again, I haven't heard anybody come up with a reason not to do the one-year. So I think that moving forward, we'll just assume that until someone does present something that may be a better idea on that. But I think that we move forward. The default is that one-year add-on period.

Again, maybe some of the registries can come talk to this. There are a few things here that's getting matted into registry workload. So I don't know if anybody wants to talk about that. Again, I think that sending the poll messages to both the losing and gaining at the same time … And maybe there's some information in there that's getting passed back and forth, like who the gaining and losing registrars are and this and that.

Again, the gaining registrar probably knows who the losing registrar is or could find it out fairly easy. But the losing registrar doesn't know who the gaining registrar is until after the fact. So maybe that comes in the poll message or maybe it's just something that the losing registrars have to do on their own is to look for those things. But again. Some ideas that I've heard thrown out there.

In addition—and it kind of goes to the next step—there was discussion early on—maybe it was in the TechOps group—about the TAC being reset on transfer so when the registry completes the transfer, the TAC is wiped out so that that domain does not have a TAC any longer. I think Sarah actually asked this question in the next line. But it's an idea. Is that the registrar's responsibility? Which seems a little odd because then the gaining registrar, what's their motive for it. The losing registrar doesn't have access anymore so maybe it has to be done by the registry. Just things to think about there. Okay. Any other comments on this?

Okay. Let's go ahead and move to the next one, the post-transfer updates. Again, the gaining registrar has to update the contacts to be the current contacts which may be, obviously, different than the

old ones, as there's no sharing of that information available. And here, Sarah put in the question of resetting the TAC, and invalidating the TTL, and whatever that process actually includes. Again, I think that the TechOps … I don't know if it was the paper or not but the discussions around that were that the registries would clear that on a successful transfer. But again, open for discussion. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Earlier on in the discussion, we talked about a one-time password or a one-time TAC. And I understood it you use the TAC for a transfer and when it's successful, and then you want to transfer again, you will need to create a new TAC. So that in my mind answers the question if the TAC had to be reset or invalidated.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, but who does that?

THEO GEURTS: Oh. Okay.

ROGER CARNEY: To me, it seems logical that the registry [would do it.] Again, I'm not a registry and never been one, but the gaining registrar, to me, wouldn't have as much ...

THEO GEURTS: That makes sense.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay.

THEO GEURTS: It needs to be invalidated or reset at the registry level also. It's present there also, so it makes sense. I'm not a registry also, but logically speaking, you would assume, okay, if a TAC is present in multiple systems, then you want to have an authoritative, logical way of working here, and then the most logical way is the registry to reset it.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. And again, I think that to me, it just seems that way. And maybe we can make that statement now until someone comes up with a better or different solution, but it seems like basically, to your point of the one-time password, that one-time password enforcer is the registry. The registry is going to enforce the fact that that TAC is no longer valid for that domain.

THEO GEURTS: Okay.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Kristian. And just to note, Jonathan chatted that the Tech Ops never came to a conclusion on that. There was discussion, but never came to a specific conclusion of what that mechanism looked like. But I think until someone comes up with it, it seems logical that the registries would do it, and we'll stay with

BARBARA KNIGHT: Thank you. I think that we probably want to obviously consider that as the Registries Stakeholder Group, and to the extent that we determine that there are any concerns on our end, we will circle back.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Barbara. So let's go on to our last transfer step that Sarah noted, is notifying the transfer of notifying the registrant or requestor of the transfer of completion. And she has this coming form the losing registrar, and we've kind of talked about it before as well, that maybe even the gaining registrar has some communication between when the TAC is provided to them to this point. Maybe they're communicating on [well, welcome] and things like that. But here is also a possible notification spot for the losing registrar. Once they get that pull message from the registry that says the transfer is complete, should the losing registrar send a communication or should they have the option to send a communication?

Which may also include links about the dispute mechanism or the way to get this back if it was invalid and what those steps are. So, thoughts on losing registrar requirements here? Is it optional that the losing registrar send this? Should it be required that they send it with certain language, like the procedures to get it back or certain language saying, okay, this was transferred and this was

the date it was transferred to this registrar? Thoughts? Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: I think just the simple message that the domain name has been transferred should be enough. And please no requirements on language, etc., but just keep it simple. If there is an issue, if it 's an unauthorized transfer, you will hear it one way or another. So that doesn't really matter to set up a complete procedure if there is an issue. How that procedure will go depends on the current policies that we have now. Also, within the Registrar Stakeholder Group, there are several registrars who operate amongst themselves really quickly to reverse transfers. How those procedures are set is completely different on a case-by-case basis, so you don't know. So I think just keep it simple, just inform of the actual status, what has happened, the domain name has transferred, if there's an issue, your support team or the gaining registrar's support team will hear it quick enough anyways.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And that's a good point, Theo, that each dispute may be slightly different or even the way it comes back may be slightly different.

THEO GEURTS: And I like the suggestion of Kristian, include the IANA ID. Every registry includes that. They don't always include a registrar name, so IANA ID would make sense. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Theo. And are we thinking that this should be required for the losing registrar, or maybe it's just optional that they send it? I think that's one of the decisions we have to make as well. I think people think it's a good idea to send, but are we going to require it? And again, the mechanism, we're not going to say require an e-mail or anything, but make it required or optional. I think required is what we're leaning toward.

Okay. I think we cleaned this up and got a lot of answers here. Thanks, everybody, for [inaudible]. On the transfer itself—and Sarah added this last step in here of the fast undo transfer or basically the dispute process here, how do you do this. We haven't really gotten into this. And again, we keep touching on it and we know this is scheduled for discussion later. I think we just have to keep all these notes as we move forward so that we can address them when we get to that spot.

But we will go through these items. And again, just think about them and we will discuss this in our transfer dispute topics later. Not that we have to solve all of it here. I don't know if there's anything ... The one thing Sarah brings up in her notes is the reverse transfer, but I'm not sure that's what we're talking about here. Reverse transfer, at least in today's nomenclature, is different than getting a fraudulent transfer back. So I think we can try to avoid the reverse transfer idea or terminology.

Okay. So again, I think when we started this, I kind of touched on the fact that this is when a transfer goes well or at least processes correctly. I think that the pieces that we're missing here is what

happens and for what reasons does the transfer not go through. And again, I think early on in the process where a registrar is verifying the request, in today's policy there is a set of reasons for denial, and we need to take a look at those and make sure those are still valid reasons for denial and also take a look if the list is complete or needs to be added to or not.

So I think that maybe on our next call, maybe that's a little homework, is for everybody to take a look at reasons for denial in the current policy. I don't remember what section, but it's in the current policy, and do we need to update that or add to it at all? And we can discuss that on our next call next week.

The other part here where a transfer could go bad I think is when the gaining registrar is providing the TAC to the registry, there's some systematic things occurring there that may cause a transfer to be stopped. The TAC is invalid or invalid syntax or TAC, or it just doesn't match or there is no TAC, any of those reasons, the registry can respond back saying okay, this is an invalid request, the TAC is wrong. And I think that we need to show and detail in that item as well where that can fail or transfer and make sure we have those items covered.

Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, max renewal term, going over the ten-year or whatever that max term is for that registry, which I think all gTLDs are ten or supposed to be ten. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. About creating invalid TACs, I'm not sure if that is an issue or maybe I'm just looking at it too simplistic, but with several

EN

registries, including a very large one, if I don't abide by their syntax, how they want authorization code to be generated, if I don't do it correctly as a registrar, I will get a message that it will fail. It's just not going to happen. What I want to do, if it is not up to the specification set by the registry, it just won't happen and I will get an error message in return.

So I think that those hardcoded requirements set on a registry level should sort of guide us forward when it comes to the generation of a TAC:

ROGER CARNEY: That's interesting, Theo. I guess I didn't think about that breaking point of when the registrar goes to create the TAC that it may not get a positive response back from the registry and that's a failure point. I was thinking at the end when the gaining registrar is providing it, that maybe they didn't key it in correctly or whatever reason why they provided the TAC differently is when I was thinking about it. But you're right. Up front when the losing registrar goes to create the TAC, they could potentially not get the TAC created at the registry.

THEO GEURTS: That makes the most sense. There have been cases—I was in a situation that I had to create a really simple authorization code because for whatever reason, because the registrant didn't paste or copy the authorization code or didn't know how to and always kept typing in the wrong one, or due to HTML formatting it would totally ruin the authorization code, and every time I would try a

very simple one like 12345 and it didn't go through, that didn't happen at the registry, I always would get back, "No, you need to do it like this and this," which always would include a symbol or whatever or at least a capital letter, uppercase, etc.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Yes. Good to keep in mind as we do that. Okay, any other comments, questions? Thanks, Jothan, for adding that. And again, we can keep adding to this document as we go. So if people come up with ideas of, again, the homework being to look at where it can break down, we can add into this document—feel free to add lines into it if it makes more sense or add it into the comments where we need to look at, does this denial request still make sense or should we add this one? And to Theo's point, obviously, it can break at multiple points here, so we need to add those in.

And I would say we don't have to wait and talk about them all. if you find some, put them in the document if you want. Otherwise, we can discuss them next week as well. Yeah, I encourage people to use this document for sure so that we can keep it streamlined and everybody has the same starting point and everything.

Good. Okay. Anything else? Okay. I think that was really all we had on schedule for today's call, so maybe we'll give everybody back a few minutes. But again, I want to make sure we're looking at this. [I want to] kind of find a stopping point for the losing FOA so we can move on to the gaining FOA soon. I don't want to stop this premature, but I want to get to a good stopping point where we're all comfortable with the losing FOA and what that means

and what those notifications possibly are. And again, maybe we'll clean this up a little so that we can combine a couple of these steps that we talked about today and look at it that way.

And hopefully, if we don't finish this next week—which I'm hoping we do—it'll be shortly after that so that we can move on to the gaining FOA. And staff did provide a link to the gaining FOA working document and we'll send that out again as well so that we can prepare to talk about that.

We'll go through this really quickly next week, any additions to this document here, and then we'll jump into the gaining FOA once we complete that. Any other comments, questions? Otherwise, I'll give everybody ten minutes of their day back.

Okay, great. Anything from staff that we need to know before we ...? No. Okay. Well, everybody have a good day, good week, and we'll see you next Tuesday. Thanks everybody.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Roger. Thanks, everyone. You can disconnect your lines. This meeting is adjourned. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]