EN

ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 27 February 2024 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/uADFE

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

JULIE HEDLUND: Good afternoon, good morning, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group Call taking place on Tuesday the 27th of February 2024. For today's call we have apologies from Osvaldo Navoa, GNSO Council Liaison Jody Kolker (RrSG), Sarah Wild (RrSG), and Steiner Grotterod (At-Large). They have formally assigned Christopher Patterson (RrSG), Rich Brown (RrSG), and Lutz Donnerhacke (At-Large) as their alternates for this call and for remaining days of absence.

As a reminder the alternate assignment form link can be found in all meeting invite emails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Please remember to state

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.

EN

your name before speaking for the transcription. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And with that, I will turn it over to Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Julie.   Welcome everyone to our last meeting before ICANN79. We have a pretty full meeting today, just a lot of prep and get some things closed up before we hit ICANN79. And we do have two sessions scheduled at ICANN79 on Saturday. So, we'll have a busy week of transfers here. So, I don't think I have anything else.   I did want to thank those that started on the rationale doc. We definitely need some more input there, but there's a start on it.

So, please, when you have the time, take a look at that and make some updates to it. I know everybody will be heading out shortly. So, whatever we can get done, great. So, I think I'll just call for any stakeholder groups that have anything they want to bring forward. Any comments, questions they want the working group to take a look at. Any stakeholder groups that want to come to the mic? Okay, I think I will move on from here, and we can jump into our agenda.   So, Christian, do you want to jump us into our agenda?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Sure thing.   So, we just want to start off by making sure everybody's aware of the agenda for ICANN79. So, there will be two sessions on Saturday. That's this Saturday at 1:15 and 3:00

o'clock local time. So, please, please be there. We're looking forward to seeing you and hearing from you as well. And this is the agenda. It will be a rolling agenda for both sessions.

So, you'll see that this is the agenda on both sessions. It's going to depend on how far we get with the first part and then part two, which we do want to make sure we do get to in 79. So, this is what it looks like for now. So, the first part of it is going to be regarding the preliminary recommendations for change of registrant data. So, it's going to look similar to how we did in DC going through the Group 2 and Group 1A Recs. So, we're going to be displaying what the preliminary recommendations are, and we'd like volunteers from the working group to present those, a lot like DC. And so, the speakers are going to basically be reading through the recommendations, giving some color, provide some rationale for how the group got there, which is the purpose of that Google Doc.

We will not be displaying the actual rationale language. It's more for discussion purposes for now. But it is really helpful, especially for those speakers and for in case to get any questions from the from the community. So, that is what this open mic section is going to be for. So, we'll be recapping the draft, the recommendations, opening up to the community for feedback. And then once we're through with those recommendations from change of registrant, then we'll be moving to kind of the part two, which will be revisiting the discussion of the transfer restrictions and if there are exemptions needed for that, mainly in regard to the established relationships discussion that was pinned last year.

So, we'll go over that a little bit today. And in the slides, and we'll also share the slides today.

So, I just dropped it in the chat. But we will also be sharing the slides on the list following this call too. So, please do look at those slides. Because that will be queuing up the discussion that we'll be having in the this mainly the second session of 79. And same thing, we'll have an open mic for the community to provide feedback on that because it is a discussion that we've kind of pinned following change of registrant. Now the change of registrants, we've had these discussions, we've got to loop it back in to see if there are any changes that need to be done with those transfer restrictions. Now that core is done and see if the established relationships is a direction that we want to go. So, that is the plan for 79.

Are there any questions from the group with regard that before we jump into our preliminary recommendations? I don't see any raised hands. Okay, then why don't we jump into the document? And I know Sarah is not here, but thank you, Sarah for and Steiner too for getting a start on the rationale in this document. So, everyone should already be familiar with this document. So, I'm not going to read through everything for the sake of time. But what we do want to do is make sure that the group is aligned on these preliminary recommendations before we share them to the community in 79.

So, just starting with preliminary recommendation one and these sections. So, the only change that's really been done since our previous meeting is this language down here. So, I'll just read it. Change of registrant data does not apply to the addition or

EN

removal of privacy proxy service provider data in RDDDS when such privacy proxy services are provided by the registrar or its affiliates. So, this was speaking to the fact that if the information is provided by the registrar, then they know that this is not the data that's presented in RDDS is not the actual true registrants data.

So, it doesn't apply to the additional removal of that information in RDDS when the registrar knows that it or its affiliates are providing these services. So, the problem was is earlier, with the earlier languages that it's often difficult for the registrar to know whether or not like a proxy is the registrant or not or the privacy service. It's difficult for them to know that. So, this language has been updated so that it's clear that it only applies when the registrar or its affiliates. Otherwise, if the registrar doesn't know, then it would they would have no idea to know whether it's a privacy service. It's just an updated registrant neighborhood or the registered name-holder's data. So, are there any questions with that? And thank you, Sarah, for providing rationale for this. The working group believes this ensures that the court process is followed, where relevant and appropriate. And I believe Mike had a question about this. Is Mike on the call? I do see Theo has a raised hand. Go ahead, Theo.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. Just a process question, I guess. But I'm looking at 1.2. I know we're not discussing that, but I'm sort of wondering how we got to that recommendation, because in my mind, that doesn't even work anymore now that we have moved on to a notification system. I'm sorry, my bad. It's been a long day. I'm on the complete wrong track. Apologies.

EN

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: No worries. Yeah. So, material change was really just referring to the fact that it's non-typographical error. And as I recall, the group didn't really have an issue with that classification, particularly with regard to smaller registrars if it is a more manual process. But otherwise, nothing precludes them from considering something of material change. So, if there are no issues with 1.3 as the revised language, then we'll move on to preliminary recommendation 2, which has been updated.

So, again, the ordering of some of these has been updated following the previous call. So, anything that's kind of been changed around is in red text. So, this was one that we didn't quite get to in the previous call but is one that we've heard. And so, we wanted to make sure that it was noted down prior to being presented in 79. So, it states that the working group recommends eliminating section 2 from the transfer policy. Instead, the working group recommends that a standalone change of registrant data policy must be established existing outside of the revised transfer policy.

As part of the implementation of the new standalone change of registrant data policy, the working group recommends the following changes from the existing policy language in section 2 of the transfer policy. So, this is basically clarifying that the group would like to see this outside of the transfer policy, keeping the transfer policy more in line with registrar transfers. Does anyone have any questions about that? I do see Zak has a raised hand. Go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Christian. And I'm in favor of this, and thank you. I just want a quick question for clarification. If the change of registrant portions of the transfer policy is being removed and will form a standalone separate policy, would it be more accurate to call the transfer policy a registrar transfer policy? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. This is Roger. And if you remember, actually, it used to be called the inter-registrar transfer policy. So, I don't know if we'll go back to naming or not, but it's definitely something to think about. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So, I don't have any major issues with this recommendation, except that I'm not for it, I'm against it. Okay. So, we went to the process that we sort of, we came to the determination, there was a use for the change of registrant policy in combination with transfers. That is a fact that we established a long time ago. Now, we came to the conclusion like, okay, that specific piece of the change of registrant data policy, where we tried to solve a problem back in a day, that is no longer there due to GDPR.

And so my reasoning would be like, okay, if that problem, if that solution, that piece of policy that had a solution for an issue a long time ago, if that is no longer being part of the transfer process due to GDPR, then I think it's tough call to go back to the ICANN community and to the council and go like, okay, set up an entire

EN

process for this, because we don't have an issue anymore. But we still want to have this process for reasons completely unknown to me. I mean, logically, if there was still a problem, in the sense that the solution of the change of registrant policy would solve that problem, yeah, then I would go like, okay, let's talk about it some more. But that is not a case anymore.

GDPR prevents that specific problem to be solved now. And basically, what we sort of established during the course of all of this, we don't have zero hard data that this policy was ever working at all. On the contrary, we only saw major problems coming out of it. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Sorry about that. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and actually, the working group kind of got to this, and we spent some time on it over the course of many sessions. And it got down to change of registrant data is not a transfer specific issue. And it wasn't necessarily, the current section two needs to stand on policy. It's the recognition that change of registrant data is not a transfer issue. It is somewhere else, though, we definitely don't want to lose the fact that between now and whenever that is occurring, but it's more based on change of registrant data. And is there a policy needed around that? And I think that's where all this recommendation is coming from. So, hopefully that helps, Theo. Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:	Thank you, Roger. Berry Cobb for the record, just a word of caution. When we're viewing these, this draft recommendation or preliminary recommendation text, they can't always be considered just in pure isolation. So, this top level or parent level recommendation text for recommendation two, we broke this out to try to be very targeted about the rationale. But when you're thinking about the rationale in the specific context of each one of these recommendations, we still got to think about it in the larger kind of package of all of these recommendations' kind of as a bundle, because this particularly is talking about, as Theo mentioned, yes, there are remnants that are going to still continue to exist. And I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.
ROGER CARNEY:	Great. Thanks, Berry. And great to bring up obviously, and not even our change of registrant recommendations aren't independent on themselves. They still definitely have a tie to our recommendations that we made earlier. So, yeah, and it does have to be taken as a whole. And it's obviously something that we run into when we do go to public comments. A lot of people do try to make an isolation out of each one and sometimes don't consider the other one. So, it is something we'll have to work on and continue to work on, especially through public comment. So, okay. Any other comments there? I'll turn this back to Christian. Okay. I think we can go ahead, Christian.
CHRISTIAN WHEELER:	Thank you. Okay. 2.1. This is one that Mike noted in the mailing list is maybe needing some shoring up. So, I'll just read it. The

working group recommends that the role and definition of designated agent is no longer fit for purpose. Accordingly, the working group recommends all references to designated agent must be eliminated from the future standalone change of registrant data policy. And Sarah noted that the working group found the designated agent is not used as expected and does not provide benefit moving forward. So, it should be eliminated. So, does anyone want to speak to this, if this recommendation language needs to be updated or as far as the rationale? Does the group still believe that designated agent shouldn't be noted in the change of registrant data policy?

ROGER CARNEY: Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: I agree, Christian. I mean, we went over this and there is no role anymore for that designated agent. That role has been eliminated completely due to the notification system in place. So, there is nothing to do for the designated agent. The designated agent can go home, in this case, never to return. So, yes, we can remove it from the policy. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and I know, correct me if I'm wrong, but Mike's interjection there was, it was based on the fact that we're losing that definition out of the transfer policy. And like Theo says, it doesn't seem like it applies there anymore. But designated agent existed before IRTP. And to me, it's going to

exist after registrars use something along those lines, even though it was defined here at one time, have used that throughout time.

And I don't see that's going to stop. So, I think it may be good to note, Mike's comment there that, yes, it's being removed from the transfer policy as this is not applicable to the transfer policy anymore. But that doesn't stop registrars from using, that fact elsewhere when they want to do that. The one big easy example is in the aftermarket when there's an auction or something, a lot of times the agent themselves take some control over that process and make decisions that were assigned to them by the original registrar. So, I think that it's good to note, yes, we're removing it from the transfer policy because it's not applicable to the transfer policy anymore, but that it could still exist elsewhere and things like that. So, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. So, I agree there. Maybe that term is going to be used somewhere else, maybe in the future, maybe in other places where it doesn't exist in the policy. So, yeah, I agree we can remove it from the policy. But yes, that term designated agent, maybe it pops up somewhere else and is still being used. We don't know that, but for this, for our work, for the Working Group on this specific piece on the transfer policy, we can remove it. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Okay, any other comments on that? Okay, great. Christian, go ahead and take us forward.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. And number 2.2. So, again, this is a new addition from last time, based on the discussion from last call, is that the Working Group recommends eliminating Section 2B, Availability of Change of Registrant from the Future Standalone Change of Registrant Data Policy. So, you may recall that Section 2B was stipulating the different circumstances where a registrar has to or may deny a change of registrant and the group felt that this was not really necessary.

There was a pointing to that a lot of these policies, like if it's related to the UDRP or TDRP, that the registrar should deny it, but that's duplicative because it already says it in those respective policies. So, it's not necessary to include here. So, the group recommends removing this section from the policy. Does anyone have any issues with that recommendation or revisions? Please go ahead and speak up. Otherwise, we'll move on.

ROGER CARNEY: Christian, this is Roger, and I don't have anything to say on this. I just noticed Berry's chat, and it would be helpful if somebody in the Working Group would respond to Mike's email on designated age. Again, we're just removing it from the transfer concept and again, it can live wherever it wants to after that or, wherever it is being used today. It's just the fact that it's being removed out of transfer because it's not a function of it anymore. So, it would be good to close that loop so that we could, at least Mike can see it, and he can share that as well. But sorry about that. Christian, please go ahead.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: No, all good, and thank you. Thank you, Berry. Okay, moving on. So, these red lines here are more just about clarifying because we added this two, that everything under two is pretty much what's going to be changing from the existing transfer policy as far as revising language and removing certain sections. So, this language, the future change of registrant data policy is just in line with that revision. So, the content of these hasn't been changed otherwise.

I do want to highlight 2.4, however, though, and because this is one we didn't quite get to last call, although the group has seen this before and has thought up language for this. So, this one is regarding the removal of the 60-day transfer lock. So, I'll just read it. The working group recommends eliminating from the future change of registrant data policy the requirement that the registrar impose a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock following a change of registrant. This requirement is detailed in section 2C2 of the transfer policy. Additionally, the working group recommends eliminating from the transfer policy the text regarding opting out of the 60-day lock as this text has been overtaken by the removal of the lock requirement from the transfer policy.

So, in other words, getting rid of that 60-day transfer lock that would otherwise follow a change of registrant, that lock is being done away with. Does the group still stand behind this recommendation? And part of the reason why I ask is that I see some rationale here from Steiner, which states that any transfer lock based on update of registrant data should be minimal in length, number of days, if any. The opt-out feature should be

mandatory and easy to understand for the R and H. For high-value domain names, other security features should be used to secure the domain names.

Metrics indicate more frustrations by R and H due to transfer lock based on updated registration data. So, it sounds like there might still be some support or some thinking that the lock should be minimized and the opt-out feature be made mandatory. However, what we've heard from the majority of the group is that they want to do away with this transfer lock. So, I just want to make sure that that is still what the working group wants to recommend, is removing this lock and the opt-out option in favor of a notification-based policy. Theo, I see you have raised hand.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. So, I'm not the entire voice of the working groups. If any of my colleagues have something to add to this, great, or else it's going to be a Roger and Theo Christian podcast here. That being said, of course, yes, it makes sense, the recommendation. I mean, a change of registrant or an update to the registrant data that sort of involves something like a punishment like, oh, you changed your data, now you can't move your domain name, removing functionality from the process, that's never a great idea. I mean, if that happens somewhere else, you're probably going to have a problem. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Theo. Yeah, and this one was probably the big one and we haven't had a lot of data supporting a whole lot of things,

but compliance did share that this 60-day lock was probably the most confusing and complaint-oriented issues around transfers and that's one of the reasons the group went that direction is, again, nothing huge, but I mean, it was one of the bigger things that we did have data on. Any other comments?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: I see a comment in the chat from Lutz. Lutz, would you like to speak to that?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Lutz Donnerhacke for the record. Sorry for interrupting you here. I'm in another meeting at the same time. So, I have to mute my audio. Can you hear me?

ROGER CARNEY: We can. Thanks very much.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Okay. I see that we removed all the locks, all the protections that we had, and that might be a problem if you are thinking when the very first meetings we had, there we said we need some protection because several of the registrants are not able to react in hours or days to change notice, and that's why we have a problem that we can't remove all the locks, and now we are going the way down to remove all the locks, remove them, make it easy, change anything within days, and I have a very bad feeling for the security of the domains for most of the registrants. I know that's

EN

the problem most of these people had, that they are saying, hmm, better I had to look every day for my domains, but, to be honest, most of the people are not doing this, and we are happy that they can read their email once a week. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Lutz. Yeah, and this lock is being removed, but it's not that locks are removed. The 30-day lock still exists when a transfer actually does occur. So, I think that that's the important part. Here, the lock is just being removed because of a change of data, not necessarily an actual transfer. If a transfer happens, the 30-day lock still exists, and so that, again, the lock is still there. So.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Theo has a raised hand. Is that an old hand?

THEO GEURTS: No, it's new, brand new. So, actually, I think the comment from Lutz is excellent because we're going to have this question, these feelings, these thoughts, we're going to have that during next Saturday. We're going to have them during the comment period because there is still the feeling like this works something, this gives protection. When you ask people, usually, what kind of protection does it really provide, there's no facts coming your way, there's nothing substantive really going on there, but it's still the perception that we have a problem with here, and I don't know how we can take that away because we keep hitting this issue.

It's not really an issue, but we're going in circles with this discussion here, because this is not the first time this question popped up. I mean, we had it throughout the entire deliberations that every two weeks, this would come up in some shape or form, and while we have some of the rationale there, I'm not sure if we have enough there, but again, I don't know the solution to this because there's a lot of feeling about this, and that is hard to neutralize in cold hard facts. So, you can probably move on to that fact and go like, yeah, okay it had no real function there, it wasn't part of the transfer process anymore. So, why did we, that's one of the reasons we took it out.

So, but it's still going to be pretty hard to sort of do this when more people are going to chime in on this, because not everybody has done 120 meetings on this, and went through all the facts and all the processes that we've laid out and were part of the discussions. So, Saturday there will be new people to this and they will come to the mic and go like, but now you're taking security away and that's going to be a real hard one to deal with, thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and you're right and it is today a current hurdle that we are removing, and to your point, that's the whole goal of the rationale, now can we document the rationale well enough that no one's going to ask that question anyway? No, I don't think so. As Theo points out, I think we're going to hear it Saturday night, we know we're going to hear it in public comment, but we can go back to our rationale and maybe they don't understand our rationale which is fine, but we can go back to that and if need be add to it so that we're there, but that's again as

Theo pointed out, that's what the rationale is for, it's not going to eliminate the question, it'll just help answer the question. So, Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN: Yes. Hi, Rich Brown for the record. I hope I'm coming through, is that good?

ROGER CARNEY: It sounds good. Thanks, Rich.

RICHARD BROWN: Great, thank you. So, I actually just want to address the question that was presented, yes, we are moving, this is a trigger for a lock, not a lock itself, okay, all we are doing is removing this one trigger. So, as far as the recommendation or defending this action, we should focus on the locks that are already in place that the registrant has full access to as well.

So, first when a domain is registered, it's locked for 30 days, read the policy, not going anywhere, there's also nothing that states that lock is removed after that 30 days, although registrars may differ, but the transfer lock should still be available to the registrant at that time, if their registrar removed it after the 30 days, they can still enable it, otherwise it's going to be locked until time they decide to transfer and remove it. So, the domain is already locked, this trigger adding a lock is kind of unnecessary in that thinking.

Another thing to think of is after domain transfers, it's automatically locked for the policy, once again, see point A, there are many, many times the registrant has full ability to ensure their domain is locked, there are also many opportunities where the WHOIS is verified and whatnot via other means, like upon registration, you have to verify the registrant, etcetera. So, there are many areas where these locks are there and already being put in, all we're doing is removing a trigger that automatically locks the domain, not with 100% accuracy, where it's not really necessary in the process. So, I just want to point that out and remind everybody that's what we're doing, we're not removing the ability for a registrant to lock their domain. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Rich. Yeah and again that's another good rationale to add, there are other options for registrants to continue to add additional layers of protection and as you were describing it, the one that popped up that you didn't mention was registry lock and registrants have that option at some registries as well. But I'll move on, Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. Zak Muscovitch. I'm not going to repeat the, the BC's apprehensions about this that I've said numerous times throughout the months, but I want to actually focus on potential rationales for this change. So, my question is of a technical nature that the registrars might be able to answer, but could one possible rationale for this change be, for example, the elimination of the lock altogether, be that notwithstanding a change of

registrant's name, the domain name remains in the customer's account and therefore the customer still retains overall control of the domain name? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. That's an interesting thing you bring up and I'll let the registrars talk to that. Obviously, the account is something somewhat out of, everybody knows about it, but it is not necessarily a direct thing in policy. So, I don't know how to address that part, but I think that as you bring it up, it's still that fact is true, is that when someone changes a name, it hasn't necessarily moved an account or anything. So, again, I'll let the registrar speak to that as well. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So, I got some questions around the entire thinking there. So, I got a hard time to sort of explain or come up with an answer there, but when there is an update to the registrant data, be it a material change or not a material change, just an update altogether, regardless what that data is, that isn't tied to any changes into the overall account, at least from my perspective, I mean, that wouldn't be a very good idea, at least on the wholesale registrar model, I mean, if data would change on the domain name and would also change data on the account, then all of our resellers have a problem, because their account, the reseller account gets updated 20,000 times a day, because if you're talking about a large reseller, data of registrants gets updated all the time.

So, if that would be tied to changes to the account, which is the reseller account, then there would be a major problem. So, in our case, as a wholesale registrar, there will be no changes made as soon as the registrant data is being updated because that would cause a major avalanche of problems for us there. So, we're not going to do that, I can't speak for the retail registrars, but it wouldn't be very logical to me if there's a relation one-on-one. So, that's my take on this. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: All right. Thanks, Theo. Any other comments from other registrars on that, otherwise, okay, go ahead, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Right. So, just to follow up on that. Doesn't that mean that one solid rationale for eliminating the 60-day lock triggered upon a change of registrant is that even if the name is changed from John Smith to Bob Marley, even if the email address is completely changed, the fact is that the person who has control of the account can generally go back in to their account, look at their dashboard, and reverse or prevent any transfers of that domain name to someone else's account or to another registrar. So, in other words, the change of Registrant doesn't affect the control of the domain name.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. Any comments from anyone on that? Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: I'm trying to figure out what Zak is trying to solve here, or what problem he perceives here, because that's not clear to me. It's either one of the two, maybe both, I don't know, but I'm not 100% clear what we're trying to solve here. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, I don't think Zak's trying to solve anything, I think he's trying to document logic and rationale. Is that right, Zak?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah, I'm trying to help you all out. I'm against this proposal, but I'm trying to come up with a rationale that could help justify it, and maybe that would persuade me, because the concern here is that as Lutz alluded to, is that there's a perception amongst a sizable portion of the community, or at least it's anticipated, that removing this lock altogether would have security repercussions, and the security repercussions come down to loss of control of the domain name as a result of a change of email address, as a result of a change of Registrant, and so, what I'm suggesting, actually just putting it out there, really, as a question, is whether that concern is misplaced, because at the end of the day, notwithstanding any material change to the registered name, notwithstanding even a total change of the email address.

The original name holder still has that domain name in their account until such time as that domain name is somehow moved out of there, and how can it be moved out by somebody else, other than through I guess, a push, in that case it's still the same

registrar, or inter-registrar transfer, in that case the transfer policy has the 30-day lock which gets applied. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Zak. Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN: Hi, Rich Brown for the record. So, let's address that a little bit, answer some questions.   First of all, I'm having trouble remembering it all. It's still early for me. What's to stop somebody from logging into the old what if the end user's information is compromised debate?   One, I want to say this real clear, policy cannot handle individual security, and the transfer policy can only handle that so much. I mean, to go a step further.

So just want to say that. Two, in the current policy there's this thing known as the designated agent that many here have already stated, and there's another part called the opt-out.   If the registrant's data is compromised, one, if they log into an account and request a transfer, they can opt out of the policy right there because they have full control as the registrant, as the policy should give them, unless you're saying we remove all control from all registrants to protect them completely, and nobody's going that route.   So, one, it's kind of a null argument, but people keep bringing it up.

So, it needs to be answered. That one, an individual compromise of data won't prevent an unwanted transfer. It's happening today, okay?   So that's the number one answer when we get this hypothetical, I think is what really needs to go down there. So, I'm

going to leave it at that. That's one thing, and like I said, I'm having trouble keeping everything in order. I think you made some other points, but I'll leave you to mention them. I'm willing, want to work on this, but yeah, one piece at a time. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Rich. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. So, it seems my earlier comment on this sort of aligns with what Zak is trying to do, get more clarity on how we ended up here, and sort of come up with a more language sort of to diffuse that perception, like if you remove the 60-day lock, hell will be unleashed. We will have an avalanche never witnessed before, something that biblical, if you will, but, how do we go around that? Well, first, let's take into account there, before this policy was there, there was no policy. So, you could update your domain name, your registered data, correction there, two different things. You could update your registered data 100 times a day, and there would be no locks, because when this policy wasn't there, you could update the registered data. And we sort of always assumed back in the day, a decade ago, that was a bad thing, because now, there is no control in place there.

So, we assume that if data is being changed, that is bad, and we must place a lock in it. And back during the deliberations, a long time ago, we sort of assumed that, but we had zero, we didn't have a shred of evidence if that was the actual case. So, we are actually reverting back to the situation before the policy, where we

had no hard facts that a change of registered data would sort of be bad and would be tied to domain name theft. So, we needed to have locks there, because we needed to prevent all kinds of bad stuff, sometimes imaginary bad stuff, because again, we didn't have any evidence there that this was the case. So, you have that situation, and I think we should reflect a little bit on that.

If you look at a more of a higher level when we are being watched as a group when we started talking about the tech, that it should have a TTL, there were definitely a couple of registries who said to me, that's a good idea. We might want to copy that, because that's not bad. But this piece, no, there are not a lot of ccTLD registries that truly believe that this policy with a 60-day lock is a really good idea. I mean, back when it was released, there were people shaking their heads on the ccTLD side and going like, okay, you want to really have a bigger support staff at your company, because this doesn't make a lot of sense. And that is what keeps up. We don't have strong evidence. And as Rich explained it, and as I have done many times, if you have account compromise, there is a precursor to that, and you have much bigger problems. Because when an attacker can bypass your login name, your strong password, because we don't do weak passwords anymore, because that is most likely forbidden by many laws already. Plus, your 2FA can be overtaken. You got major problems there. I mean, everything, all bets are off now. If an attacker can do that, you're in serious problems. And basically, if that happens, you're already in such a bad place. The 60-day lock won't be a barrier anymore. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Roger. Zak. So, listening to Rich and Theo, I think I've identified what the answer is to my question about whether the control of the account controls the domain name. I think the way to look at this is that, if there was an unauthorized change of registrant or unauthorized change of email address in respect of the domain name, that must really mean that the account was penetrated. That's the only way that would happen.

So, maintaining, I don't think it's an argument then to say, well, the account holder still has overall control of the domain name because they have the login to the account. Well, the fact is that the account was penetrated. That's the only way the unauthorized change of registrant data was affected. So, I think that's a dead end in terms of rationale. But the other two rationales are also as a result of listening to Rich and Theo. One is that there's commercial solutions above and beyond what's available in the transfer policy to protect registrants. That's somewhat controversial because some registrants will say, why do we have to pay for this? This should be part of the policy. And the second one, I think, well, let me leave it at one for now. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. And when you hit the unauthorized, I think you're probably right. Obviously, there can be mistakes made and I wouldn't consider those unauthorized even if it was by somebody different. But I think you hit that and you used the right term there

because that path does. Yeah. And to your point, who has control is kind of in question if it's unauthorized.

And again, at the point it happens, no one really knows that it'd be an after the fact kind of thing. But again, obviously, it's just a mistake and someone that does control the account made that change. It could just be a simple mistake. And hopefully the notifications are enough to address that. And again, it's not like it's left that account. So, it's not changing anything in that where if it does leave that account, then there is a process if it's going to another registrar, there is a process and a lock that happens. So, I'll leave that there. Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN: Hi, Rich Brown for the record. Yeah, I just want to sum up something. So, outside of a compromised data issue, which I think we can agree at that point, they have the keys to the kingdom. But say there was an unauthorized change to the registrant. First thing that happens when that change is made, the registrant is notified, meaning the prior registrant and the new registrant on how they're notified. So, they are notified of the change. You also have to remember, there's a lot of steps to go through to get to the point first where like you need access to the account or there's a lot of stuff to get to the point where you first make that change.

So, say the change is made, it's unauthorized. Then they request an authorization key to transfer. Then there's the five-day approval period. Remember the FOA we wanted to get rid of, we put in because there's a security reason behind it and we see that.

That's why we left it. Then, if all of that is avoided, meaning we've sent notifications, we send another notification, be a part of the transfer process, and effectively five days ago, I would silence, which I will say this just as a note in my 15 years' experience doing transfer disputes, I've rarely had somebody contact me a month later going, where's my domain? Normally, it's very quick and very scared situation. But even then, to go a step further with our actions on the transfer policy, it is now required that, that domain be locked at the end point.

So, if we've walked through all of this stuff, they somehow figured out how to change their registrant. Then the registrant, the true registrant never responded to anything. Domain got transferred. There's still a 30-day period for dispute, minimum. So, I just want to point that out so everybody understands there's a lot more than just these minutiae. Maybe kind of what Barry was getting onto that you also got to remember the bigger picture involved when looking at these minutiae. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. Thanks, Rich. Yeah. And again, I think all those things feed nicely into rationale and how this working group got there and how it sees this is actually a better solution. And I think that I'll use Theo's voice here because I know he's mentioned this several times in our discussions. And back in the IRTP days, there was this bigger concern of domain theft.

And as Theo has pointed out, registrar systems have changed dramatically since the 10, 12 years ago of when this issue was brought up. Again, even then, it wasn't necessarily known how to

solve that problem because as everybody said here, if an account truly is compromised, there's really nothing to do except for cleaning up after the fact, hopefully. But to voice Theo again, the registrar systems are dramatically different and better security-wise, not excluding any policy things that we come up with, just on their own, registrars have done a much better job of securing their own systems and making it more user-friendly for them. So, just extra thought there.

So, I think we can move on from here, a good discussion on it. And thanks for trying to get some more rationale in here. And I think just even talking through it, those things are the rationale and we need to get that in the document so we can say those things and so people can see the logic that we use to get there. So, but I'll turn this over to you, Christian, to continue on.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you, Roger. Yeah. So, just moving on, the recommendation three, this is what all has to be in that notification. And I will just kind of add that the group is adding that they have to provide instructions for how the registrar can take action. Previously, it was just you have to provide contact information. So, this is also a kind of an element of added security that the working group has added. And so, no changes have made here except for this piece, which based off of the previous call, we said that the registrar may send the change of registrant data notification to the new email address. So, whereas before it was its saying that the registrar must.

So, if there's a change of email, let me just read it actually. When a material change to the registered name holder's email address occurs, the registrar must send the code notification to the RNH's prior email address, which was the email address that was on file with the registrar merely prior to the change, and may send the code notification to the registered name holder's new email address unless they opted out of these notifications. So, saying that it's required for the prior registrant and then the registrar may send it to the new email address as well. So, it's up to the registrar.

So, just wanted to kind of clarify this change rather than saying that it must be sent to the prior and the new. It's saying it must be sent to the prior since that would hypothetically be the person who would be the prior registrant, quote unquote. So, that they're notified of it and saying that there wasn't really a lot of need to send it to the new email address to what they're changing it to unless the registrar wants to do that. So, just making sure that the group is aware of that change. Otherwise, there are no further changes to the notification elements for under Section Preliminary Recommendation three. Zak, go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Christian. My question is going to be about 3.4, but can you scroll up? I think it's 3.1. So, my question is, there's a requirement upon a material change to the email address to send a notification to both the prior and current email addresses. Correct so far, Christian?

EN

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes. So, it would be similar to a change of registrant is today. It changed the registrar name holder's name, organization, or email address.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay, because the way I read it was that it's only when it's a change of email address under 3.4, no?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Well. So, under 3.4, yes, it's just a change of email address, and that's because if, say, someone changed their name but kept the same email, it wouldn't really make sense to send two notifications to the quote-unquote prior and new because the only thing that's been changed is the name. So, you would still only be sending one notification to that email address that's on file, or I suppose to the text or SMS message. So, really, the only times where there would be a change of contact information where they could send two notifications would really be that email address.

And then 3.5 kind of goes into that they're not prevented from sending additional notifications if they want to. So, if there's a change of phone number or address, for instance, but really, it's just to say that if there's only a change of name, for instance, the registrar doesn't need to send two notifications. They just need to send it to the one.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: And that one is the same person. Well, that one only has one email address, right? So, logically, I think what the point is,

EN

Christian, is that if there's a change of registrant name, even if one would like to receive notification, they're not going to receive notification unless there's a change of email as well. Is that what you're saying?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: No. So, there would be any time that there's a material change to the name, organization or email address, the registrar must send this notification to the registrant, but they're only going to be able to send that to the information that they have on file. So, that would be via email, SMS or other secure messaging system. So, since the email address is really the only item that would be kind of contact ability, that would be something that the registrar would need to send it to the prior email address. So, for instance, it wouldn't make sense to send it to the new email. Then the prior registrant, if there is a prior registrant, wouldn't be notified of that.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: No, I totally get you. I think that's a good explanation to include is that the reason there's going to be no notification to the new registered name holder or the updated name is because it's the same person, it's the same controller, unless the email has changed, essentially, if that makes any sense. And I get what you're saying.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Thanks, Zak. And really 3.4 is just calling it out because that is obviously a noted communication method. So, when that does change, it does trigger a possible different solution. Again,

an organization or name change doesn't change a communication method. So, it is just that streamlined version of it. It's just going to whatever that communication method was, and still is. So, Theo, please go ahead. Yeah. Thanks.

THEO GEURTS: So, not to put Zak on the spot here, but since he's flagging this I think that's important, but I think what we are really are discussing here is when it comes to the terms of the rationale, there is not much there yet that addresses sex points.

So, what I would suggest is because it is a good question because more people will be tripping over this that we sort of either park that in our minds like this will come up again that's what I'm saying and I think it's good to know or to point it out that we will have some questions around this, because it's a little bit complex language and I'm not sure that everybody will go into the nitty-gritty of all of this but there could be somebody going like, but wait a minute, why is this here and then you sort of get the entire explanation that Christian did, going like this, this, this, this, this, oh now you're giving me all that information and you present and you tie it together, and you present it to me, now I get it and I think that should be the rationale that Christian just explained and I think you will be good then on Saturday.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and you're right and again any of these questions that come up are perfect, because we're going to hear those on Saturday, we're going to hear those in public

EN

comment and if we can address them, hopefully, at least they'll see that and use it or not, but at least we have that to provide back. So, that is a great thing. So, okay yeah and again as Theo mentioned, it's pretty nuanced when you read through those and as he said, 120 meetings in most of us can do it, some of us still can't and that's the whole issue is answering those that cannot or forget it or hasn't attended 120 meetings and just seeing it for the first time and that's where you have to be detailed in your rationale response so that point can come across. Okay, go ahead, Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you so I think that that is that is pretty much it we'll just note that in in the primary recommendation for which this goes into the opt-out option, where the registrars must provide an opt-out to receiving the change of registrant data notifications. We've just kind of moved the language around, so the content of this is the same, but just wanted to note for everybody that it says that, registrars must enable the change of registrant data notifications by default, when a domain name is initially registered and registrars may disable change of registrant data notifications, if the registered name holder elects to opt out of these notifications. So, it's really just a kind of a rephrasing of the current language otherwise it is the same from what it was before. Zak go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Christian. I'm only speaking because I see we have 25 minutes left. The question is that, if there's an opt-out for change of registrant data and that's all registrant, a change of registrant

data so whether it's email address registered name holder etcetera. A registrant can opt out of that in the methods that you've outlined elsewhere etcetera. My question is, shouldn't there be a distinction between opting out of change of registrant data generally such as the name or address etcetera. And the email address, shouldn't the email address not be opt-out of opt-out-able. If that's changed, shouldn't the registrant have to receive a notification as a security measure. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Zak. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: So, we are back on is it a security feature? And of course, we can agree to disagree here but, personally when I register domain name for myself personally, I don't even bother to put them on a lock anymore and if I have the choice to not get any notifications, if somebody is meddling with the data I would have at least the choice to get that opt out.

I mean, if that is going to be my Hollywood movie type of savior, some sort of last resort I'm not going to count on that, I mean that, that's not if you want to have real security you got to be really secure yourself, you got to make sure that you got the right registrar there, but at least as much security features as possible on the account because that is your biggest problem and when we are talking about domain name theft and how you would usually go about it, if I would want to steal a domain name I would go definitely for reverse for social engineering because that is a low

tech and it is extremely effective there, but again that opt out I really want to sort of approach this from a data protection perspective.

Why shouldn't I have the option to opt out from such notifications it's my data. I mean my data is being processed over that email address regardless what I'm doing. Still, I don't have any control there, so I would go from there and if it's really any additional protection, I would argue hard against it. I mean this policy will be public. So, that is not something that's going to be any barrier for somebody who wants to steal domain names. Thanks.

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

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger. So, look there's the argument that Theo outlined, which is a compelling argument that none of this is really going to prevent thieves, but there's the other argument that, just because when the alarm goes off, the police never arrive in time anyhow, thieves are going to get away. People still get these alarms every day for their homes and offices I've got one totally useless but, for this it's still desirable because it gives you or it provides peace of mind or fake security instead of real security.

There's an argument for that too and in terms of there's a-- And Theo also raises a compelling argument that ultimately, the individual should decide what level protection they want. And protection shouldn't be foisted on them or notifications, if you don't even look at like protection notification foisted upon them, if they

don't want it. But the other argument is that we're dealing with hundreds of millions of registrants and they may think they understand the clear language that the IRT comes up with that's a caution about the opt-out, but as the working group entrusted with ensuring that there's baseline protections.

The extent that any protections are possible for the entire registrant world maybe a registrant should be forced to take a notification, when there's something as serious as a change of email address to be notified of that and there was an initial concern which at the time I thought was a valid concern that, there's people don't want to get overrun with notifications and there's this fatigue that comes with them but, what but one of the proposals that we have is that, there can be one notification for a thousand changes and that largely eliminates that concern I think so. On balance, I'm kind of tempted to take the view that if there's a change of name that's one thing, if there's a change of address, that's another thing but, the crucial key is the email address and that's something that arguably shouldn't be able to be opted out of in terms of notifications. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. Christian, please go ahead.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. I just wanted to note too that, this does have some overlap with the RDDS accuracy program specification. So, when there is a change of email address, the registrar does send a notification asking them to verify this email, that this is correct.

EN

So, there is some overlap here and we have a thing that says that you can combine these, but the opt-out doesn't opt you out of this verification notice.

So, the registrant I would say is still notified, if there is a material change to an email address that the registrar hasn't verified with this domain name before, because that is not a time, where they don't have to verify is, if it's already been verified, but I think that, if it's already been verified, I think that you could probably assume that it is legitimate. I just wanted to note that, that there is still that extra kind of security process in place.

THEO GEURTS: Christian, why don't you just say so that's a huge point. So, what that's the rationale for why we feel comfortable for not requiring, why we feel comfortable allowing an opt-out of any of this because, the WHOIS verifications is going to give you a notice and require verification no matter what. Like it or not, can't opt out of that

ROGER CARNEY: Great call out, Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. And since we are running low on time, I do just want to make sure that we first get some volunteers to speak to these during the first session. So, we have four preliminary recommendations with different sub points. So, it'd be great if we

could get four volunteers that could speak to for instance one and 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 for example.

ROGER CARNEY: And Christian, maybe give a little overview of what they're going to be doing, they're going to read through the recommendation and go through that.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes. So, the idea is that similar to what we did in D. C. We'll have slides that will show what are these recommendations and the volunteer would essentially be reading these out and ideally, providing some color to those with regard to rationale, why the group came to this recommendation, which is kind of what the purpose of the rationale homework is. If the group has questions, anyone can obviously answer those questions in the room or online.

So, the idea is really just to have working group members that came up with these recommendations they're familiar with having been through these meetings, are the ones presenting it to the community rather than having staff essentially reading this out to everyone and taking the questions. So, could we have maybe four volunteers to read these out and we'll obviously have slides prepared that you can read from prior to the meeting. Could we get some volunteers, please? Just by raise of hands.

ROGER CARNEY: Volunteer for each one. Anybody volunteer to read number one out for us? Anyone have a favorite one they want to volunteer for? Prudence. Prudence, do you want to do one or a different one? Thank you, prudence. How about number two? Anyone? Theo is going to do one too. Theo, which one do you like?

THEO GEURTS: So, first of all, I still need to check when you guys are having that meeting because I won't be there, but if it's at a reasonable time around this time that I'm in now, yeah, I'm not going to say sign me up for all of it. I'm not going to do that but, I don't have any problems going through some sticky ones here. Why did we remove the 60-day locks? That one easily answers there, and there's a couple others, if that needs some color, no problem, I will be giving some color at some point anyways because I barely can shut up here. Yeah, check on myself but, I sort of think I'm going to be there for the first hour. I mean, I'm not sure how long this is going to take in my time zone but after nine o'clock, I'm done and I'm going home.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Theo for that sorry you won't be there. We'll miss you, but okay that sounds great and it looks like going is a possibility as well.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: This will be the first to Jothan's question in the chat. These will be at 1:15 and at 3:00 o'clock local time Puerto Rico time.

EN

ROGER CARNEY: And Puerto Rico time is one hour earlier than east coast on Saturday Jothan. Okay, thanks Jothan and I know Sarah told me that she could volunteer for one. So, maybe Sarah and Owen can figure out which ones they like best and maybe Theo can walk us through the 60 day one. It should be available for that because I'll go early, so.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: That would be yeah Rec 2.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: I'll see.

ROGER CARNEY: So, maybe Owen take number three and I'll ping Sarah and let her know she's on the hook for four.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Okay.

ROGER CARNEY: Excellent.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you all. And yes, and in the meantime, please do continue to in light of this conversation, add rationale to this document as it's going to be really helpful to those volunteers when going through the document as to and when we get questions from the community, which inevitably we will, including on some of the ones we talked about today. So, hopefully, should be keep fresh in your mind.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And as Theo said, obviously, we're just looking for someone to initiate if everybody can participate especially when the questions come in or if there are any questions as Theo said, providing a little additional color, so.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: And I will note again too that, for the actual sessions, we'll have slides up that show these columns. Essentially, these recommendations. We won't have the rationale language up for everyone to see. So, when you're adding record rationale document, don't worry about it being public to everyone it really is for now it's still kind of internal to this team to this working group. So, just getting in thoughts to paper. Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: So, now the rationale is of course work in progress and is subject to many changes and with that legal disclaimer there. Why don't we mention the rationale? It definitely shows what the thinking is and where the group is going. So, why do we want to keep that

well not don't want to use the word hidden but, why don't we disclose that information there's a reason for that. Thanks.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Well, I would just say that, to be able to get through the sessions in 79, because we also want to get to the second session, which I want to get to know as well in preparation for the established relationships conversation, I think just for time, it would be best to focus mostly on the recommendations and getting feedback from the community and that the rationale is not necessarily that it's hidden, but that this is more of a discussion points rather than text that we want. We don't want to confuse the community. If this text is still kind of a work in progress as opposed to these preliminary recommendations, which is on a little bit firmer ground, but the explanation and the rationale is still very important for that conversation that we have in the first session.

THEO GEURTS: Okay, sounds reasonable.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: And Roger, with your permission, I'd like to move on to the second session, so that the group has some familiarity with it before--

ROGER CARNEY: Please, yeah let's do. Thanks.

EN

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. So, we're going to share these slides. I added it in the chat but definitely, review these slides before 79. So, we've prepared some here. Let me just open this up. So, for the first session, we have some prep, some materials that are related to it. The first one being the google doc. So, again, this we're not going to be sharing this google doc in the actual session, but these are just to kind of help prepare for the conversation.

We've also included the primer, calling back to those group 1a recommendations to also kind of it relates to the rationale as well as the transfer complaint metrics. So, these just to have it all in one place. Session two though. This is, once we're done with the preliminary recommendations in session one, we're going to move on to the conversation that we pinned last year about established relationships and I believe this is something that the small group which included Zak and I believe Steiner as well and possibly others that, calling out that there could be an exception to the 30-day post transfer lock. So, this is a conversation that we still need to have and we think it would be really good to make use of the face-to-face time in 79 and also a good opportunity to get some feedback from the community.

So, you see in the email sent yesterday, we sent some of these links. They are provided here as well on this slide and these are also kind of covered and with the exception of the transcript from the 17th of January call, which kind of explains the swim lane and also the established relationship document that the small group provided. These slides that I'm just kind of going to zoom through, are really for you guys to look at and prepare, just as far as preparation for the conversation that we're going to have.

So, this will look familiar once we get to 79, the session two. This is really just setting up the conversation about established relationships. So, I'm not going to go into it a lot. We may not even go into for instance, we're not going to go into this whole swim lane during 79, but we do just want to highlight it because it has aspects that we're going to need to talk about with regard to established relationships. So, just flagging for people, so it's not a complete surprise.

This is the latest swim lane that we have that refers to the registrar transfer process and there are two little boxes here in yellow, which are spots that have kind of been pinned in the process for the established relationship procedure that still need to talk about. So, this first little box over here, is if there is something that upon a registration or sorry, yeah, upon initial registration of a domain, there could be something of an element of established relationship procedure and same thing back over here on the far right, after there is an actual transfer. So, we're not going to go through all of the group 1a recommendations.

What we are going to focus on is how the established relationship procedure affects what recs we already have. So, currently, recommendation 16 from group 1a says that there must be a transfer restriction for 30 days, after the initial registration of a domain name. So, the group should be familiar with that and similarly with rec 17, the registrar must restrict the registered name holder from transferring a domain within 30 days of a completion of a transfer. So, this is that mandatory post 30-day transfer lock. Now, this rec 17, there might be an exception to and if there is an exception for customers with an established

relationship, how does that affect the security measures that the group has come up with for change of registrant data? So, we will again, recommend that the group read through these slides. They're basically just taken from the actual document that the small group wrote. So, this is the document that they have that we have linked. We've just provided it in slides for your convenience.

It's all here in one place but essentially, the small group had written a redlined preliminary recommendation 17, which states that registrars must apply a 30-day post change of registrar lock by default for any domain names transferred into a registrar. However, on a case-by-case basis and where an established relationship exists, the registrar may unlock the domain name in less than 30 days for the purpose of an inter-registrar transfer on a case-by-case basis. And clarifying that an established relationship means that a registered name holder who has (a) received registrar services for a period of at least 30 days and (b) a history of regular interactions with the registrar who has demonstrated a willingness to continue receiving registrar services from registrar in the future.

So, this is really where it's established, what an established relationship is, what it entails and how it affects an exemption, possible exemption on case-by-case basis to that 30-day lock. That for now, the group has said should be mandatory. So, this is going to be what we're discussing in section two. This is what the conversation is going to be about, should there be an established relationship, what does that look like and how does that affect the change of registrant recommendations. So, we've provided in the

slides, the small group's rationale. So, forsake of time, I'm not going to go and read through it all, but please do read this. Is this what the group the small group had come up with as far as their rationale for having an established relationship?

So, we will go into this in more detail in 79 in session two, but in the meantime, please prepare for that so you're familiar with what their rationale is and be prepared to speak for or against it with regards to how the transfer policy should be updated. And these are going to be some questions that we will pose to the group. So, first of all does the working group believe that an established relationship role or procedure should be created does the group stand behind that. And if so, is 30 days a sufficient threshold for being considered an established relationship? Does it need to be more, does it need to be 30 days at all? And if so, what is the operational procedure for a registrar to designate an established relationship?

That's kind of where it falls into. That swim lane, where does it belong, how does that affect the process if we do want to move forward with an established relationship? Question two will be going into, what are those exemptions? If the group does want to go forward with an established relationship. Is it an exemption to the post transfer restriction, does it apply to the post initial registration restriction, others?

And then finally number three, would be, how does this affect the group's 1b, change of registrant data recommendations. The group said that they want to eliminate that 60-day lock because there's already going to be a 30-day lock after transfer, but if there's an exemption to that, is that a problem? Does the group

EN

still kind of stand behind these core recommendations if there's an established relationship that's allows for an out of that. So, this is what we're going to be talking about in section two of ICANN79, that 3:00 o'clock session, assuming we are able to get through all of those preliminary recommendations from code. But we do want to have this conversation because we feel like it would be a good one to make use of the face-to-face time in 79.

So, again we would recommend the group looking through these slides which we'll provide an email along following this call and if you want to get into more detail we have these links like the 17th call. So, do does anyone have any questions before we kind of send you all off and we meet you in 79. And again, please feel free to use the list, continue updating with rationale but this is the idea for the second session, is to have this conversation and hopefully tie it up with a nice big bow. So, I'll just stop there and open up the floor for the three minutes we have left. I'm not seeing any.

ROGER CARNEY: All right. Great thanks, Christian for going through that real quick. It's good to definitely have some knowledge going into Saturday, so. Okay any other questions, comments, anything last, Christian that we need to cover before we—

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: I don't think so. But thank you to those who have volunteered to speak during 79. We will follow up with those slides that we'll be presenting as well with the preliminary recommendation language.

Thank you all for going through that today and kind of confirming what we have and great conversation on the rationale. Again, please do continue to add to that rationale document. It will be really helpful to those volunteers and to the whole working group as well once we start drafting up the reports as well. So, thank you all again and please do take a look at some of these slides and check out these documents as well as it'll just really help. Add some more flavor and familiarity once we get to that second session in 79.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Christian. Thanks everyone for the great conversation today, a great lead-in to our work at the meeting so look forward to seeing everyone, some in person, some virtual on Saturday so we can continue to make progress on moving this forward. Okay I think we can go ahead and call it the day. Thanks everyone, safe travels if you're traveling.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, everyone; have a good rest of your day. Safe travels. This call has concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]