
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 17 January 2023 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/H4w-DQ>

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:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 17th of January, 2023. For today's call, we have apologies from John Woodworth, ISPCP. As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite emails. All members and alternates are promoted to panelists.

Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Alternates not replacing a member should not engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom Room functionalities. If you have not already done so, please change your chat selection from host and panelist to everyone in order for all participants to see your chat and see what's captured in the recording. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

have any updates to share? Please raise your hand, or speak up now.

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.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Just a few quick comments before we get started. Just a reminder that the review in any redlining for recommendation 10 through 22, we extended it from the deadline yesterday to next week, the 23rd. So just for everybody to remind everybody to make sure that they've got everything looked at and marked up by next Monday, the 23rd.

Also I wanted to reach out and see if we had any update on recommendation 13, the rationale for the TTL. I know that the team was going to work on a revised, maybe shorter version of what we presented last week. And I wanted to see where the team was on the rec 13 rationale. Anyone from that team. Rick, please go ahead.

RICHARD WILHELM:

Roger. Rick Wilhelm. I don't have any news to report. I don't see Jothan on the call. We we're going to circulate, I think that he was going to circulate some stuff, but we don't have anything at this time. I think we'll make a run at it for next week. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Great. Thanks, Rick. Thanks, Jim. Jim, also, I don't know if the threat vectors team had finalized their write up on the threat vectors from ICANN75. Do you have any update on that? Is that InWorks, is that being reviewed? Any comment on that, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN: I think InWorks is about the best I can offer you. And yeah, Sorry. I'm just coming off a vacation as well as all the holidays, so I'm not caught up. Yeah, we're just behind on that. So sorry.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Great. Thanks. And just let us know as you progress on that so we can fit that in for attending discussions. Okay, I think that was it. I'll open the floor up to any of the stakeholder groups that have had some calculations or discussions or questions that they have been having behind the scenes or off this call that they want to address or at least bright up. So I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups that have any comments. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. This is Steinar for the record. As I informed on the last meeting, I had created a Google Doc where all the CPWG members and everybody with the link can actually add some comment to the 22 different questions. And so far, there is nothing new arrived into that Google Doc. But on, was it last week?

There was this proposal for recommendation 16 that was distributed by the small team four, and I was hoping that we could spend some time to clarify whether there is consensus to their proposal. Because that is actually one of the few things that CPWG or At-Large wanted to have some clarity about whether we should recommend a transfer lock immediately after the initial successful transfer between registers. So I was hoping to get some clarity about their proposal. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Steinar. And you're specifically talking about the 30 day locking period and the small team putting a recommendation forward to provide a way of breaking that lock, basically, unlocking it. And I think the small team I'd come to the conclusion on, I don't think Zack's on, but I think he talked about maybe Kieron can speak to it, not needing it for rec 16, which is the post registration creation. But after recommendation 17, which is post transfer.

Okay, great. And we'll talk a little more. And then it's highlighted on the screen. Talk a little more to that. Again, I think the recommendation came across as being focused on 17, the post transfer. Okay. Thanks, Steinar, for that. Zack, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thanks, Zak Muscovitch. So Steinar and all, in the last version of the small working group small team, rather review of 16 and 17, you're right, Roger, that the last version which I believe was distributed to the working group generally was that there wouldn't

be an ability for anyone to opt out or unlock post creation, but would post change of registrar. So we'll talk about that more in due course, but the general rationale was that there didn't seem to be much of a big enough reason to remove a lock 30 days post creation.

It didn't seem like there'd be much utility in that in the sense that most registrants who registered domain name at a particular registrar won't have a big reason or good enough reason or common reason to want to get out of that lock within 30 days post creation. But there were more compelling reasons in the context of a change of registrar under rule 17. So in other words, rule 16 has remained the same. As I believe it was in the initial report where 17 did undergo some proposed revisions by the small team.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Zak. And as Zak mentioned, we'll get into those. And Steinar, I think that there's no, I would say, consensus or even agreement. We're not doing consensus yet, but it's just still a new concept and the work small team has just presented it over the last, say, two weeks even. So I think that that is yet to be known if there's agreement to add that or not. The small team has put that forward for the larger team to review and see if there is support for it or not. So I think we're yet to get to that spot.

Okay. And, again, we'll touch on a little bit of that in the agenda item 4, I think it is, yeah. But first up, we'll Berry forward here and have him walk us through the updates to the swim lane that he graciously did over Christmas break, really spent a lot of this

Christmas time on this. So this is, I guess, Berry's Christmas present to the rest of us. So Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. Berry Cobb, for the record, and welcome, everyone. I don't know that I would call this a Christmas present, but hopefully, this is at least something that the working group does think it's useful in terms of testing the logic and flow of the proposed transfer process. A couple of things before I dive into this. This will never be perfect. It really is conceptual in nature. It's not intended to be a policy document. As I noted, it's really more about testing the logic behind the proposed recommendations or changes to the existing transfer process. In a perfect world, we would have one that is a current state, what the transfer process looks like today versus what we we're reviewing here, which is really the proposed version.

I find it interesting because way back, I guess, a good decade ago under the IRTTs, I had, as a community member at the time, had suggested we put together a swim lane to document current and proposed state at that time. It never really did get traction, but I do find it interesting to compare what we have now with what I tried to put down on paper beforehand.

The other part I'll say is that with respect to this not being perfect is I've already found a couple of small errors on the swim lanes compared to the version that we sent out with the agenda yesterday. An updated version is posted on the Wiki for you to review, and it's quite likely there will probably be one or two suggested changes coming out of today's call, which we'll update.

One other aspect to this is it's starting to get busy and complicated, which is probably one of the reasons why this didn't get traction from a decade ago. But there are already more wormholes or basically on page references than I would typically prefer in doing a swim lane diagram. And even when we get this to a stable version or as close to perfect as we think we can get it to, it's obviously also going to be subject to change depending on the groups deliberations with respect to Phase 1B and change of registrant as well as the Phase 2 items when we talk about the TDRP and a reversal of the transfer and those kinds of things.

Those aspects and it really depends on the outcome of the group deliberations will likely be what we term as sub-processes or basically a process that's on a completely separate page. And then we use these off page references to move back from one page to the next. But one way or another within this document we'll have to create a space for when it's likely or probable that the core, if it continues to exist or the TDRP and transfer disputes need to be listed up on this particular swim lane.

So let's get into a little bit of the details here. Let me make sure I can see hands in chat. All right. So this has changed somewhat since the previous version, which was implemented or created as part of our initial report. And there have been some fairly substantive changes to our proposed recommendation text that we're trying to account for in this version.

As I said, that this will evolve over time. What hasn't changed is literally all of this part that's beginning to end structure of the general use and expiration of a domain. That'll remain intact. So there is nothing to see there. But at some point, the domain has

to be registered, the registrar of choice from the RNH. There's an account created. The fees are paid. The domain gets provisioned.

And that takes us into our very first proposed recommendation or well, the first step of the swim lane diagram, not the first recommendation. And I want to say a couple of things here about the post creation transfer restriction. So first and foremost, the post transfer restriction when I was reconciling the latest recommendation text with the swim lane, I did notice probably a pretty potential gap in the proposed text or rationale for the language.

We'll talk about that as a separate agenda item in the upcoming calls. But I think the gap exists around the reasons for why we're implementing such a change versus what is actually occurring out in the marketplace today. And so we'll probably want to take a closer look at that text and update it accordingly.

The second item that I'm going to touch on here and for those with a keen eye have probably picked up on this. So many of our policy deliberations across various consensus policies involve time frames from one way to another, whether they're SLAs or technical time clocks, those kinds of things.

There's been a constant debate about hours, days, calendar days, business days, time zones, those kinds of things. What you're going to see in the swim lane is I'm actually producing both hours and calendar days. And essentially, the staff position here is we need to be consistent within the document. That's kind of the first

principle. And using hours and one recommendation or days and another recommendation removes our lessons, that consistency.

Secondly, the thing about the transfer policy is it's one of the consensus policies that is much more technical in nature. And whenever, assuming that all of these recommendations were to get adopted at some point in time, the development teams behind this will be coding in all of these different time frames, and ours seems to be more appropriate or put differently staff's preference in terms of what the final report is going to look like should be hours across the board and not really relying on days or calendar days or business days.

And the reason why I'm including both in which perhaps the compromise, is that we include both throughout the report is that the hours is much more useful from the development perspective whereas a conversion into calendar days is useful from a human reading perspective or non-techy people. So they don't have to convert 720 hours into 30 calendar days.

So I just wanted to draw your attention into that. You're going to see that through other parts of the swim lane except where there's a few of them that are listed in minutes. And then it would look a little bit confusing to try to say 0.01 calendar day for a 10-minute duration. The final thing I'm going to say here, and you're going to see this in two places, which is a topic that was just discussed in the preliminary or the opening remarks for the call, is this yellow sub-process here have done an established customer procedure.

These are just placeholders for now because we haven't had a chance to fully deliberate the proposal. And depending on the

outcomes and some sort of stability on the proposal, then we'll come back and update what these exceptions to the restriction procedure may look like. So, again, it's just kind of a visual placeholder.

So the point here from this part of the swim lane is the domain has been provisioned into the registry. The registrar of record will apply the 720-hour restriction to transfer. And then, of course, we get into the RNH using the domain. At some point in the time, they decide to transfer the domain. Is it expired or not? It goes through its own thing. Either way, they're choosing to transfer the domain, and they're essentially logging into their account panel to unlock the domain and to request the TACK, which really takes us into the core of our main deliberations.

Now here, there are a couple of substantial changes from the previous version starting with this first task. The initial report version kind of lumped together the requirement or the proposed requirement to reveal the TACK within five calendar within a hundred and 20 hours. And I had it originally over here when the TACK was going to be revealed by the registrar of record to the RNH. But when you'll recall in previous deliberations, we talked about the time frames of each portion of the transfer process, and this seemed disconnected here. So I dissected that task to illustrate that the essentially the moment the RNH requests the TACK, that's when the clock starts for the 120 hours for the TACK to be revealed.

The second task here is the registrar of record will review transfer request for frictions. Now this doesn't have a red text callout, which as a reminder, the CQ is the charter question and the

charter question number. And then the second row is the recommendation number attached to that particular charter question. This particular task, we're viewing the transfer request for frictions isn't a consent, a proposed recommendation, but there needs to be some kind of triggering event that really sets up this friction secure decision, which also is not a proposed recommendation.

But what we've realized is that when we think about the grand scheme of transfers, a majority of them can or will likely happen instantaneously because they don't have locks supplied. The registered name holder unlocked the domain at their registrar of record. There is no locks applied with respect to disputes. So on and so forth. Bills have been paid. There's literally no frictions at all that would allow the domain to be transferred within a course of 5 to 10 minutes once they receive or once the TACK is revealed to the registered name holder.

And so this friction to cure, if there are none, then we move into generating the TACK and provisioning it with the high entropy per recs 9.1 and recs 7, the TACK has to be sent to the registry and I'm going to continue on the frictionless path a little bit and we can come back to the friction or challenge path in a little bit. But by and large, the challenged part hasn't really changed a whole lot other than kind of reordering some of the wormholes here.

So the registrar of record generates the TACK, it's provisioned with high entropy. They're sending the TACK to the registry per recommendation 8. The registry will verify the TACK that it meets its syntax requirements. If it doesn't, then there needs to be a mechanism or a call to action back to the registrar of record that

the TACK isn't working, and the registrar of record needs to do what they need to do to make it work. Either they generate a new TACK or they figure out what's going on. One way or another, they're getting a fresh TACK that would be valid when the registry does review this.

Then per recommendation, assuming that the TACK does meet syntax requirements, the registry will set the TTL for maximum of 336 hours. Per recommendation 13.1, per recommendation 9.2, the TACK will be hashed. And it's also securely stored per part of recommendation 9.2 as well as recommendation 12. That then enables the registrar of record to reveal the TACK to the RNH, and they must communicate that the TACK will have an expiry date. And there's three sets of recommendations that touch on this particular task, 12, 3.2, and 9.3. And an additional requirement per recommendation three is that there is a notification of TACK issuance that is sent to the RNH within 10 minutes of it being revealed at the account panel or whatever method that will reveal is.

So moving on, the register name holder now the TACK. They've received the notice and they're deciding to initiate the transfer. They're going to go to their gaining registrar of choice, create an account, pay the fees for the transfer of the domain. They're going to enter in the TACK into that control panel there at the gaining registrar. And then there's basically, this is a new part because we're starting to get into A, we're compensating from a deficiency of the swim lane from the initial report, but then based on further deliberations, it's made this more clear that the previous version didn't really account for what's really happening here, or at

least what I'm trying to document, what we think is really happening here.

So the reason for the decision box being in the gaining registrar is, I guess, it's conceivable that the RNH will enter a TACK at the gaining registrar and maybe they chose to type it in and they miss a character or something. There's some kind of check that's going on whether that TACK is valid before it's even being sent to the registry. Whether it is or it isn't, I needed the logic to start here in the gaining registrar swim lane for when it is when the TACK is actually sent to the registry. Because the very next step at the registry is the registry will be confirming according to recommendation 10 that the TACK is valid to the domain name that is requesting the transfer and if for any reason the TACK is not valid as compared to the domain name, then there's a no.

The initial report version actually had this going to the registrar of record to reconcile, but in reality, the registrar of record is not going to know that there's an issue at this point. So we had to change this to better illustrate that in this particular scenario, it's going to be the gaining registrar that's going to be notified that the TACK is not valid. So this is where we start in our wormhole here. The domain is not valid. We jump into the delta wormhole, and we pop out of the delta wormhole. Is there an issue with the TACK? Yes, there is. And the gaining registrar will inform the RNH of the invalid TACK and that they need to go acquire a new one from the registrar of record.

Now, the wormhole for this part really starts all the way back to the beginning. Now that's technically not what's happening in this particular instance. But the idea is that in essence, the process

really in effect starts over. I could probably put the in or the out of the wormhole somewhere in here that there's something that needs to be done, but for the purposes of the swim lane itself, it just made it easier that the RNH will still continue to be using the domain name and they're going to really be restarting the process on trying to get to a valid TACK with the domain name.

So then assuming that the domain in TACK is valid, this is a parallel process by the way for these three decision boxes. But the registry will be about doing another validation. Is the domain locked such as a registry locked or maybe somehow there's still a dispute resolution issue against the domain name. One way or another they're going to be looking to make sure there are no locks or restrictions preventing the domain from being transferred.

If there is, and that then if it's locked, then in this case, they go through the wormhole and they need to work or the registrar of record takes on the work to figure out why the domain is still locked to continue with the transfer. This is also another change from the initial report. Originally we had coming out of the wormhole on frictions to cure, but it didn't really make sense. And so we moved the out of the wormhole into this part of the logic process.

Assuming that the domain is not locked and then per the small group about TTL enforcement, that the registry will be in the position to enforce this and this really kind of is connected to the transfer confirmation or what used to be known as the losing FOA, which we'll get into in a minute. But assuming that everything is cleared, the registry will be doing this check that if the TTL has expired, what happens when it does? Now, if the TTL is expired,

it's not going to be the losing registrar that may be the first to be notified of this issue. So this is a new part of the process where the gaining registrar will need to send a notification of TTL expired to the RNH.

And I'll note that there isn't necessarily a recommendation or proposed recommendation around this. It's really more operational in nature in terms of closing the transaction down. But kind of the same logic applies as the TTL has expired, it's no longer valid. In essence, it's really almost set to know the transfer can't go through. The registered name holder needs to take some sort of action to figure out if they still wanted to do the transfer, if they don't. But it's connecting into the wormhole to really kind of reset the process for getting a new TACK through its registrar of record so that it can reissue it through the gaining registrar.

So let's assume that the TTL has not expired. The registry will set the domain to pending transfer. They're going to reset the TACK to null, per the one recommendation that a TTL can, I mean, the TACK can only be used once, and they're going to terminate the TTL because of the shorthand, the losing FOA, that could mean a collision in terms of managing the TTL.

So once they do those particular actions, the registry, then they're going to send an EPP transfer command to the registrar of record and provide the gaining registrar IANA ID. These are really encapsulated in this TACK or in this task with the registrar of record recommendation number 2, that there will be a transfer confirmation and that it must include the IANA ID at the registered name holder.

This is where what we currently refer to as the losing FOA starts. So when that happens, the registered name holder receives the transfer confirmation, and then we get into some logic about how this works. And to be honest, I have no operational knowledge of how the existing losing FOA works. So I'm almost near confident that I've probably got some of this wrong.

But again, this is really conceptual and not necessarily a technical diagram. But based on the existing requirements, that if no action is taken against the losing FOA, it will automatically transfer at the end of a 120 hours or five calendar days, which is the existing requirement. So if the RNH takes no action against the transfer confirmation, then the registry at the end of the five calendar days or a 120 hours, the registry will start to initiate the actual transfer.

However, based on also what is redlined in recommendation 2, is the RNH will have the ability to accept the transfer, to help expedite the transfer completion, or in some cases where warranted, they'll also have the ability to cancel or reject the transfer. If they choose to cancel it, then I'm assuming that the call to action and the transfer confirmation will be an action that the registrar of record will be first involved in by which here the registrar of record will invoke the cancellation procedure, and yet there's another wormhole which is echo, which takes us back to the challenge section of the losing registrar. Essentially, registrar of record would set the TACK to null. There are deny transfer reasons. And, essentially, the process stops going into the wormhole to basically reset the process.

And then conversely, if the RNH does accept the transfer, the losing registrar will send the pull message to initiate the transfer

process. The registry will move the domain to the gaining registrar credentials, add one year registration, then the registry will send a pull request to the gaining registrar, and or in parallel also send a pull message to the registrar of record. Before I continue on, one ask that I would have for the more technical oriented representatives we have on the call. I really have no idea what the difference is between a pull message, or transfer command, or a pull request, or a pull message, so on and so forth.

This isn't meant to be a technical document, and part of me almost doesn't even want to include these, but I have to. There needs to be some kind of trigger mechanism action for a task to transcend swim lanes from one role to another. So that's really the only reason why these things are in here. So kind of the mini homework assignment is for the more technical oriented people to help us better adjust this text if needed, if it's necessary, to make it more clear about exactly what's happening within EPP as these triggering events.

So the send pull request to the gaining registrar. The gaining registrar will apply the post transfer restriction for 720 hours or 30 calendar days per recommendation 17. I've got this placeholder about the established customer procedure until we've considered the small team proposal around this. Setting that aside for the moment, though, then it's likely, but not a recommendation in the draft report, but it's most likely that the registrar, or the gaining registrar will send a notification to the RNH that the transfer is complete. And in this context, for this part, the RNH starts to use the domain at their new registrar, which starts the process over.

In parallel, there's a pull message sent to the registrar of record because there is an action by the registrar to send a notification of transfer completion within 24 hours or one calendar day with the gaining registrar ID to the RNH per recommendations 4 and 4.3. And that the RNH receives the transfer notification complete. And then they start to use the domain from the beginning. The final thing I'll conclude here, again, this challenged part at the gaining registrar is very likely not representative of what happens in reality. And you'll notice most of these don't have a call out of a charter question or a recommendation.

I'm not saying or suggesting that any of this any changes to recommendations would be warranted here. These are business operating procedures by the registrars, and most of them probably not even necessarily were within the picket fence. But based on the high level components on why a transfer may not proceed, is why a lot of this logic is in here to kind of help facilitate how we're using the wormholes in and out.

So I think that's pretty much it from a high level overview of the transfer process per our recommendations. I look forward to feedback. As I noted, there's a slightly updated version on the wiki that will also include in the meeting minutes. And I definitely invite working group members to scrutinize this so that we may get better than where it's at. And I'll turn it back to you, Roger. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Berry. And again, thanks for all your work on getting this updated. Looks like there's a few questions. So I'll start with Jim. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Roger. Jim Galvin, Registry Stakeholder Group, Identity Digital for the record. First of all, Berry, awesome. Just plain awesome. This swim lane is great. I'm sure you're going to hear that a lot from people as we go along here. So I just want to take an opportunity to speak for all of us in having put that out there. So I do have two points of clarity, which are not directed to you. This is really for the group here, to focus on. So no criticism whatsoever of your set of swim lanes.

There is a comment about setting domain to pending transfer, and that comes right after the question, TTL expired. And I think you're almost there right about in the center, at the bottom there is the TTL expired question. I just want to call out and make sure that we do all understand here that there is no response from a registry that would say TTL expired. When a registry gets a transfer request from a gaining registrar, the only two things that it can do are it can either-- well, maybe I'll say it is three things. It can either accept it, which means it then continues to move forward, it can say that the TUCK it received is invalid, right, which means it simply doesn't match the one that's there, or it can simply reject and say there's no transfer permitted.

Because from a registry's point of view, once the TTL expires, that TACK field is going to be null. And the registry is not going to have any information around about whether or not a transfer is

currently in progress or not. And I don't think that it wants to. I mean, I'll speak without having checked with anyone, but I think it's fair to say operationally we don't want to keep track of transfers that started, and it might have expired, and how long we going to wait to issue an expired response message. Operationally, that's just not going to work.

So there's no such thing as the registry checking for an expired TACK. It's either valid or it's not. And the only thing that gaining registrar is going to hear is that it was either valid, it was invalid, or transfer is not valid. And I hope that that made sense. I do have a second item, but let me just pause on that for a moment and see if there's any discussion to be had. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Jim. So Jim, you're saying that as we're looking at this swim line here, those three gray boxes are kind of one decision point for the registry.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes. But, I mean, operationally, it's how it would be implemented. I don't have an issue with there being independent decision boxes. Because I think it's fair for people to know that those decisions have to be made. And in that respect, all I'm saying is, TTL expired, there's no such question that a registry would ask. And so there's no way for it to respond to that issue. That makes sense?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. One of your comments, I'll have to say is probably a registry operational decision. I think you said that the TTL would be null if it's expired. And I think that that is probably a registry decision. I don't know if all registries will know it as soon as it expires or if they will keep track of the time. And maybe they just do a batch job nightly that expires or weekly or whatever it is. But the TACK may still be at the registry even though it's TTL has expired. And other registries may note that out as soon as it's expired, I think. Is that what you're saying, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN: No. I'm trying not to speak at all about implementation choices on the part of a registry. And, actually, Sarah's question, I just want to call out in the chat, is actually the second issue I was going to bring up. But let me try to say this again a little more slowly and carefully. The issue here is that the TTL expires.

Conceptually from the point of view of requirements, that means that the TACK is no longer present. Now whether or not it's physically present in a database or not and how a registry goes about actually making it not present is not the issue. The issue here is that once it expires, it's not present anymore, and it should not be treated as present. And so when a registry gets a TACK, when something is not there, all it can do is say no transfer allowed.

If you want a registry to be able to say TTL expired, now we get into all kinds of issues. I not only have to know that a TACK was there, there has to be a window during which I might reply, TACK expired. I mean, do you want me to remember for six months that

there was a TACK there at one time so I can say expire when you try to submit it, or something like that? I mean, operationally, that's not the concept here. Right? A registry doesn't have that knowledge of whether or not a transfer is in progress or expired. It's only at the registrar of record. All the registry knows is whether or not the TACK is present.

ROGER CARNEY: So let me try to, at least, in my mind, make that more clear. When you say present, you mean valid or invalid?

JAMES GALVIN: Correct.

ROGER CARNEY: And again, to me present implies that it exists somewhere, but you're saying when the TTL expires, it becomes invalid. So the TACK is no longer valid as soon as it expires.

JAMES GALVIN: Not quite. I want to use careful terminology. If the TTL expires, the TACK is no longer present. The field is null. It should be treated as null. Now, whether a registry actually knows it or simply checks the date, okay, it's going to treat it as null if the TTL has expired. An invalid TACK is you hand me a TACK that you want me to look at and I will check and see there's a TACK present and is the one that you gave me match what's there. If it doesn't, it's an invalid TACK. If you gave me a TACK and I don't

have one, then I reject it as with a message of transfer not valid as opposed to TACK not valid.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks for that clarity, Jim.

BERRY COBB: This is Berry. Sorry to interrupt. Jim, just if I understand the logic here, you're almost suggesting that essentially, this decision box would go away. And because if it was expired, the TTL doesn't even exist. And then I should probably find a different route to explain what happens if the TTL expires which is separate from terminating the TTL on a valid TACK in preparation for the losing FOA. Is that it?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. A concrete suggestion, instead of the TTL expired decision box where you have it, put a decision box in front of domain and TACK valid. And the first thing you're going to ask is, is there a TACK present? And if not, you're going to reject the transfer request. If it is present, now you check to see if it's valid or not. And then you can check to see if it's locked or not and then move on just as you have. Did that make sense?

BERRY COBB: Yes, sir. And maybe I know that the staff team is picking notes here and maybe that is, like, some rationale fodder to better

support the recommendation text. But, yes, that makes sense.
Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: And, Berry, something else I think Jim is trying to make a point of as well as the TTL expired. Yes, I'll put there, that can't exist. Because that's not a known thing.

BERRY COBB: Right. Yeah. So all of this part goes away.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes.

BERRY COBB: Because the TACK doesn't exist at that point. So I'm happy with that because that's less things to clutter this up. Thank you for the feedback.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Great. Jim, you said you had one other thing that you wanted to cover?

JAMES GALVIN: I did. But Rick's hand also went up in the middle there. So you might want to, if you want to stay on topic here.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. Rick, please go ahead.

RICHARD WILHELM: Hey. Thanks, Roger. Rick Wilhelm, Home Registries. Yes, this is on topic of that. The thing I was going to add to hopefully move this thing forward. The error messages that come back from the registry are going to probably be rather generic with respect to the difference between TACK expired versus TACK incorrect. For the same reason that when if you log in to something, you typically don't get back error message that says your login was wrong or your password was wrong in a similar sort of way.

Because remember, this is a happy path that assumes that the request is coming from a legitimate gaining registrar that the registered name holder is actually behind that legitimate gaining registrar, but it could just as easily be coming from someone attempting to hijack. And so the registries error messages, I shouldn't say error, responses on a failed TACK are going to be just like, nope, that didn't work. And it's going to be purposefully oblique in some version. So we should keep that in mind that we don't try and over-specify some of these error messages just for security reasons. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, perfect. Thanks, Rick. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. So back to this issue of the other thing here, and to Sarah's question in the chat, I think if I got the right question here, Sarah.

After that TTL expired box, you have this note there about set domain to pending transfer. And I just want to clarify what that means and make sure that we're all in agreement here. A TACK is considered used at the moment that a valid one is received. So conceptually, we've been having this discussion that a TACK is valid until the transfer is complete. And I want to be careful here because from a registry point of view, the TACK can only be used once. I mean, that's actually in the large, that's a requirement.

And so although the transfer is not complete per se. Once a valid TACK is received, the TACK as it sits here, is reset to null, the TTL is terminated. I mean, those are just conceptual requirements, not implementation prescriptions. And what that means is the transfer may not be complete at this point, but it can't be tried again with that TACK. Okay? That is the net result of all of that. So this notion of a pending transfer status, I just want to make sure we do all agree and understand a registry has no concept of that. That's not a state the registry is going to understand. It takes into TACK. If it's used, then it nulls it out. And then it completes the process with the registrar of record. Okay?

And again, if something fails in that remaining step there, in that remaining transfer confirmation step with a registrant, and then they still want to transfer it, they have to be provisioned a new TACK. They don't get to continue to use that one again. Yeah, so that's my comment. That's really more for this group. I want to make sure we all understand that that's how that is actually going to work operationally. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jim. Just for clarity. When the registry accepts a transfer command from the gaining registrar, the transfer actually goes to a pending state. Correct?

JAMES GALVIN: Wait, from which registrar do they accept TACK?

ROGER CARNEY: From the gaining registrar. When the registry accepts a transfer from a gaining registrar, the transfer goes to a pending state. It doesn't get executed completely. It doesn't get moved. It goes to a pending state.

JAMES GALVIN: Well, I just want to make sure I understand. There's no action that a registry takes for that to be true. Is that correct?

ROGER CARNEY: I don't know what the registry does. They accept the command from the registrar or the gaining registrar and sets it and then tells the losing registrar that a request was [00:55:57 - audio cuts out].

JAMES GALVIN: That much is correct. Those are the actions. See, I guess this is really my point of clarity. There's this notion that you said the domain dependent transfer, that's not an action that the registry executes. I'm not aware of what a registry would do in that case

or what you want the registry to do. So that's just a conceptual statement about the current status.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, in today's world, a transfer doesn't occur until the registrar of record confirms it, or five dates expires.

JAMES GALVIN: Right.

ROGER CARNEY: So at that point, the registry is doing something. But prior to that point, the registry is also telling the registrar of record that there's a transfer request. So there is a pending state between when the gaining registrar requested, and when the registry actually does an action of moving it?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. I agree that that conceptually that is the current status. The registry as an action will set the TACK to null. And then as an action, it will send the pull message to the registrar saying transfer request received. And it will look for the transfer confirmation from the registrar of record. Once those two things have happened, I agree with you, there's this concept of a pending transfer status existing, but there's no action that makes that visible, if that makes sense. There's nothing tangible that happens in that state. There's no real status to set.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. Right. So when we're looking at this, that pending transfer in the box to the right is all once one action.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. And I see the comments in the chat room. So that's why I'm saying, I guess, for the point of clarity if we're expecting the registry to actually set that, that needs to be called out. I didn't think that's called out anywhere.

ROGER CARNEY: I'm sorry. Was it? I'm just trying to make sure that we all agree that these two blue boxes here next to each other, you're saying, is one action by the registry?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. But I'm not aware that the registry is required to set the pending transfer.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. Right. As you said, that's just a concept. That's not something that actually happens. That is just a concept. That the gaining register requested it. And now if it's accepted by the registry, now there's a five day wait period, up to a five day wait period to actually make an action. And that's what these two boxes are indicating.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. I believe I'm in agreement. I'm also trying to watch chat here too.

ROGER CARNEY: That's okay. I was going to take that one step further. If the domain is locked or for whatever we just talked about, a registry is going to provide back an error or a message saying, hey, this didn't happen. At that point, the TACK is still in the registry system and still valid technically. If the domain was locked or whatever, the TACK is still at the registry, still valid. It's just the fact is that something went wrong prior to the registry accepting it. Right?

So as these gray boxes progress and whatever they are, the TACK is still valid. It's not nulled here. It's when the registry actually accepts the command so there won't be an error code going back. It'll be a success code going back. That's when the TACK will get nulled.

JAMES GALVIN: So I think I agree with all of that. I guess my concern, let me be very specific, I think about my question here is I don't recall in the current recommendations, and it may just be an oversight on my part. I see Emily's got her hand up, so she may know the answer here, and maybe Berry does too. And I apologize if I'm dismissing this. I don't remember in our recommendations and the details where we actually speak to this pending transfer status code that one sets on a domain.

The observation in the discussion going on in the chat is that registries do set this now. And I'm just wanting to make sure that there is clarity in our existing recommendations that a registry is supposed to do that. Because I don't remember that existing even though I appreciate that, as Emily said, it's out there today in the documentation. It says that that's what happens. I hope that helps.

ROGER CARNEY:

No. No. And I think you're helping it actually, Jim. I think this is getting to the clarity points that Berry was asking for. And again, this pending state is a concept. It's not an action. The action is a registry accepted the transfer command from the gaining registrar. And that's the action that's taking place. And the process is that there's now a five day window that someone can act and knock it. And again, I think these two blue boxes are a combination process.

And, again, there's nothing that the registry does to set it to a pending state. They're just accepting the transfer and issuing a successful command back to the gaining registrar. And then the process takes over that there's a five-day window. But at that time, when they accept the transfer, they set the TACK to null.

JAMES GALVIN:

All true.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. And again, Jim, I think that you're really helping. And Berry can jump on, if not, and give these pieces together to make sense. Okay, Jim, I will jump to Emily to see if she has a comment and then come back. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger, and thanks, Jim. I was just going back to the report to confirm, Jim, your understanding about that obligation to set the pending status. And I don't believe that there is anything in the recommendations that goes into that level of detail. So I think that that's a question for the group as to whether there needs to be any additional clarity. I'm just looking back at the losing FOA recommendation. So we are going to be looping back to the losing FOA recommendation, and so it may be that that's the place that it fits in when we do discuss that. And, sorry, I think that's right. I think we just don't go into the level of specificity currently on the recommendations about exactly the steps involved in that. So I think we need to take a closer look at that.

And then looking at the recommendation regarding this concept of resetting the TACK to null, as Sarah noted, it seems like there's opportunity for confusion here. The term at the end of the final sentences, that the registry operator must reset the TACK to null as part of completing a successful transfer request. And I think what the discussion is indicating here is that that may be misleading and that we need to be more precise about it really being the moment that the TACK is reset to null is when the registry essentially accepts it.

So I don't know if folks have suggestions for the exact language that would be technically accurate. But I really welcome that in the chat and we can certainly fill that in because it would be good to have that in there. And then I think when we circle back to the losing FOA, we can come back to that point of clarity around the pending status. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. And just to follow-up on a couple of those items. And I think Sarah said something in chat. Yes, the pending state is because of the losing FOA. The reason is there. Otherwise, this blue box would have been if the registry accepts this the command, it would be transferred. So it would have stopped there. So the whole thing is the losing FOA process that comes in here. Emily to your question. When the registry accepts the request, the request comes from the gaining registrar. And, again, this first blue box is basically stating the registry is accepting the request. And that's when it gets nulled. Is at that point.

And this gets back to when we were trying to we had the discussion on when does a TTL truly expire? And again, this is that point of when does the expiration no longer matter? Because now a five day window opens and the TTL may expire after that. So the reason we're trying to make this clear is this is when the TTL is being used, gets nulled and it no longer exists there, but it was valid at the time it was accepted.

And I think that that's the key is, it can't move past this because then you start to question, okay, but three days after it was

requested, it expired, and four days after it was accepted. And it's like, okay, now he's trying to get into timing problems. So this is where it gets nulled, and this is when it was accepted. And again, this pending state is exactly that, is for the losing the FOA. So Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. Just let me ask a question before I ask my question. Are we now done with the transfer pending status discussion?

ROGER CARNEY: That's a good question. Rick, anything on that?

RICHARD WILHELM: Mine is not on transfer pending. It's on resetting the TACK. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Perfect. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Okay. So I can go back a little bit in the discussion, like, 10 minutes ago, I guess. I'm not sure who said it on the registry side, but it is about the suggestion that the registry will not provide a detailed message why a transfer has failed, but more of generic message that this doesn't work. And I got a little bit of a problem with that, not with the comment itself, but I would hate to lose

some of the functionality that we have now, but registries pings back like, okay, this authorization code is not valid.

Or no, you cannot transfer domain name because it's currently being transferred. There's already a transfer process going on. I mean, those kind of messages are important to know why a transfer is not working. I mean, if a registry system gives back, this does not work, that's going to be flying blind here because we have absolutely no idea what's going on. Is there a transfer pending? Is the authorization code not valid? You have no idea. So I wanted to make sure that we do not end up in that situation. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Theo. Rick, please go ahead.

RICHARD WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Roger. First just coming further on Theo's thing. I wasn't implying in that comment that the existing error messages, the error message detail or, I guess, it's EPP minor codes. I think they are that would give back the fact that the Auth-Info code is invalid. Those would go away. It's just the difference between an Auth-Info code being incorrect versus an Auth-Info expiring that don't expect that difference to be split out.

But certainly, if a transfer is attempted and the difference between the domain being restricted slash locked depending on what terminology gets used and the difference between that and an Auth-Info code failing are obviously too reasonable ones to do. It was about the details between the types of Auth-Info issues.

The one thing that I would offer here is that given that we talk about resetting the Auth-Info code and things like that, given that now we've got that the direction is that we're going to have hard enforcement at the registry, resetting the Auth-Info code to null and exactly what the timing of that is, is a lot less important than it once was when there was more where the registrar was being responsible for doing that.

So we whether or not an Auth-Info code or TACK is existing as expired, but still set in the registry database versus null is really an equivalent state and it really doesn't matter that much because if the stale Auth-Info code is submitted, it will get rejected as per the previous discussion that we were just having about expired things. So whether or not it's null or not, it's existing in the databases, null is a lot less important than it used to be. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Okay. Any other questions, comments? Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. This is Emily from staff. So just in case folks are not fully following the chat, we've made a suggestion in the chat for a revision to a preliminary recommendation 11. I'm speaking to the point about being more specific around when the TACK is set to null. So if others have feedback on that, please share it in the chat. We'll put it in the next round of redlines, and there will be an opportunity to react as well. But early feedback is always welcome. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Any other comments or questions. And even from Berry, if he needs any clarity to start working. I know he's going to review what's being said and everything. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks. Jim Galvin for the record again. I just don't want to lose track of Theo's question. And I'm wondering what your position is and moving forward on the question of whether or not we still need pending transfer.

ROGER CARNEY: I guess, I don't know why we would look to get rid of the pending transfer. I mean, that's what the losing FOA has functioned on.

JAMES GALVIN: But we're not actually doing a losing FOA per se. I mean, maybe this is why we need to have the conversation, right? So when a TACK comes in, the registry issues-- because now we have to talk about when we're going to eliminate the pending transfer status. And we got to deal with that. But if we're not actually doing a physical losing FOA anymore, a valid TACK is received, a transfer confirmation request is sent to the registrar of record.

So that would be the only time period when that status is set. It would be set upon receipt of a valid TACK, and then it would be unset at the end of the transfer confirmation request message.

Whether it gets act or knack, it gets unset at the moment that that response is received. I mean, I just think that we should be clear about that. If we're going to keep it, then let's be clear about when it's set and unset. But it feels like we may not operationally need it anymore. And I'm curious about the value that registrars get from it if it's present so we can understand.

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah. And, Jim, you're right. To me, that's a technical solution, not a policy thing. To me when the registry accepts the request from the gaining registrar, they start a five-day window where it will auto act after five days, or it may be stopped or accepted early. And again, if there's physically a pending transfer, I think most registrants would prefer to see the pending transfer.

But if not, again, to me, that's not a policy decision, that's a technical decision. The simple fact is when the request is received by the registry, the registry does not execute that for five days or receives another command to stop it or accept it immediately. Does that make sense, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN:

It does. I mean, I'm actually neutral as to whether it's present or not. I just think that we should be clear, and I'm asking for that more than anything. And it is helpful to understand what value registrars get from having the status set. I think that's what struck me about Theo's questions. It's like, yes. Maybe this isn't valuable anymore. That's all. Thanks.

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

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. Thanks, Roger. And I agree with you. It's not a policy thing. It is just a technical reality. I mean, if there's already a transfer going on, and the second attempt is being made from whatever point of view, could be the same registrar, could be a different registrar. A registry has to give back, like, yeah, you can't do that because there's already one going on and we can't just do this. So that's more of a technical reality there, which is already exists today. I mean, we get those messages from most registries, I think. I can't remember there's one that doesn't do it. So it makes common technical sense. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. And that's a good point, Jim. I think that keeping it makes sense, but to your point of specifically where it gets removed is something to call out as well. So we see where it's set, and that's when the registry is accepting it. And then we should call out as well when it gets set or completed, basically. So Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Hi. And this is Steinar from record. I do understand in one way that this is not the policy issue when discussing the pending transfer. But on the flip side here, we make policy that prevent transfers from succeed like the recommendation 16 and 17, and that is being displayed in the previous RDDS system. So I from

an endpoint user, I actually think this has a value, the pending transfer status. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Steinar. Yeah. And I think that a lot of people see the benefit of that step or stage or whatever status that you want to call it. But to Jim's point, we should be clear on when that gets removed as well. And I don't think that'll be hard to put on here.

Okay. Any other questions or comments on this? Okay. Again, we'll give Berry some more time on this so he can listen through the conversation probably multiple times to try to get it all worked out. But thanks for everybody. And especially berry, for putting this together. Again, I always say editing is a lot easier than trading, and I appreciate Berry creating this so that we can punch holes through it. So I appreciate that, Berry. And we'll get an update coming. Okay. We've got 10 minutes. I think we'll jump into our next agenda item. Which I think is on small groups. Is that right?

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Roger. This is Emily from staff. So that's correct. I think our next agenda item and I can bring it up here is the small group proposal on recommendations 17, which you can all find on the agenda page on the wiki, and I'll just share that in a moment. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. And I'll turn this over to the small team to discuss. And, again I think they posted this to the list and came up with this, but I'll turn it over to the small team to walk through the recommended changes to 17 that they're proposing. And again, we can talk about it. So I think that we've got a whole 10 minutes here. So maybe we just can introduce it and people can start thinking about it, and we'll get into more discussion on it. But anyone from the small team want to talk about the updates here that are being proposed? Karen, please go ahead.

KEIRON TOBIN: Thank you. Yeah. So just to go back to rec 16, when we reviewed that we did decide that, as was mentioned at the beginning by Zak, that we wouldn't touch that just because legacy registries currently have a 60 day period on, which has been brought down to a 30 day, whereas some of the new registries don't have anything on any locks. So meeting in the middle there would give that 30 days for both positive registrars and the registrars who don't currently have locks. So we felt that was kind of a happy medium. Then going on to preliminary recommendation 17, we changed it from what was initially, I forget the name of it. We called it--

ROGER CARNEY: Established relationship.

KEIRON TOBIN: Yeah, but now we've changed it to established relationship because we felt we didn't want to confuse anything with the

established customers or an established relationship. I think Owen mentioned that terminology for an established customer is already reused elsewhere. So an established relationship seemed more appropriate, and it clarifies exactly what we are looking for when you want to opt out of that kind of criteria.

So essentially, the information that we came up with was that you've got to have been with the register, again keeping hold of the 30 days. You've got to show proof that you have an established relationship. So for example, aftermarket customers will probably have people who may look after their portfolios or things like that so that they would be in regular contact with the registrar. Again, showing an established relationship. This can be done on a case-by-case basis.

We've also added a bit more rationale in terms of why we believe that this is a more positive approach. We don't really want to disrupt any form of aftermarket or anything like that. And we believe that this is a medium ground for everyone to hit on and make sure that we are being fair to all representations of the groups out there.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Keiron. Hopefully, everybody's had a chance to review this. I know the small team had posted this to list a while back. Obviously, the wording here on the screen here into the actual recommendation. Staff put in here for us and updated. And Zak actually did most of the work here.

So I think that, again, the idea here is to keep the 30 day lock on both post create, post transfer, but with giving an option to in the 30 day lock pushed transfer early if there's a request to do so and that there's an established relationship between the registrar, and the registered name holder, and the registrar. And again, obviously, there has to be a request to make it happen as well. And again, here, some of the logic of why that's needed and why the change here. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: This is Steinar for the record. Just a question, maybe more technical stuff. Will it be possible for the registered name holder to opt out within the period of 30 days after a successful transfer, or do this option has to be approved or accepted by the registered name holder at the time it was transferred in? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Steinar. So when it gets transferred in, the idea is that the lock gets put on it. Again, I think that the wording here is on a case by case basis. If the register name holder request the lock to be removed, the registrar has that option to remove that lock if there's an established relationship and the registrar agrees with that. So I think that once it's transferred, the lock goes on, and then it's an option after the transfer lock is put on that someone can remove the lock or work through that process to get the lock removed within that 30 days. Does that make sense, Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, thank you. This is Steinar for the record. Yeah, it makes sense. But what I've seen so far, and my day job is actually doing a significant number of transfer, is that some registrars do have this option per today. But is there something that you have to select on immediately. I can't recall seeing an option to remove the transfer lock, let's say, 15 days after the transfer has been completed or 30 days or whatever. Today is 60 days lock, for today. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And I think today that opt out is part of the change of registrant. We discussed a little bit, but we'll get into a little bit later as well. But this is the thought of and this is new, I would say, not necessarily a new concept, but a new use of it. I saw a bunch of hands, but they went down. So maybe I answered those.

And Sarah, I don't know if there's manual work besides request and the registrar does it, agrees to it. And what's that that, yes, there is a relationship there. Yeah, so the person has to do that. So the lock is mandatory. So getting back to our original Phase 1, there was always a 30 day lock, mandatory lock. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yes. This is Zak Muscovitch. Just in regard to Sarah's comment that there would seem to be a need for manual intervention upon the registered name holder making a request to permit the transfer based on a claimed established relationship. I think that's

probably correct. In most cases, I think that probably could be seen as a feature of the proposal in the sense that to balance out the concern that some might have that a request to allow a transfer within the 30 days post registrar change would be something that's automatic will happen in every case.

The manual intervention based upon the assessment of the established relationship by the registrar upon a request really is the counterbalance to that concern. Your sense that it is going to probably take some additional efforts or a registrar to respond to these requests by customers who believe they have an established relationship with the registrar. And that's probably to deter the removal of the lock as an almost a default position.

The lock is in place and then it can be automatically removed nearly upon request. No. The proposal kind of envisioned this additional step and it could be somewhat onerous, depending on the situation. But I think that might be a benefit of the proposal. Also, now I'm just thinking it through. I imagine that if there's a fixed criteria that could constitute an established relationship, perhaps it could lead to automation of that decision making. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Zak. Okay. I think that that's a good idea if there is something that we could do that. But again, and probably some keys here is the registrar may unlock this. Again, just because a registrant wants to do it, doesn't mean it's going to happen. It's still an agreement between the registrar and the registrants. But we are at time. And again, I wanted to introduce this so

everybody could think about it. And, obviously, it seems like Sarah's got some thinking she's already started doing. So great. But again, think about this.

And to Steinar's point, this is the small team bringing this forward. And you can see, Zak said it, what it was and what it is now. And again, I want everybody to look at it and see it's now in front of the full group. And if this is something that's supported, if this is supported, but may need some changes, great. But take a look at this. And again, we'll keep visiting this until we get an agreement of, do we keep the old language? Does this make sense to move forward with? Does this move sense with some modifications?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Roger, this is Zak. Just really quickly. Though I appreciate you giving me credit for this, really, I was just the secretary for Owen here. Thank you, though.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. Yes. And thanks to the small team for working on this and putting in a lot of extra time on this. Okay. Sorry to keep everybody an extra minute here, but thank you for the great discussion today. Thanks, Berry, for the swim lane and we'll get working on updating that. But thanks everybody, and we'll talk to everyone next week.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Roger. Thanks everyone for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]