EN

ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 26 March 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/wQDFE

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, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call, taking place on Tuesday, the 26th of March, 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Osvaldo Navoa, GNSO Council Liaison. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form link is available in all meeting invite emails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now. All right.
	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 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. Thank you. And over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

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.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. I don't think there is anything big to share on update, so I think I'll just go ahead and go into any calls for any of the stakeholder groups that have some questions or comments or discussions from last time that they want to bring forward to the group. I'll open up the floor to any stakeholder groups that have anything they want to bring.

Okay. With that, I think we can go ahead and jump into our agenda and get moving. So I think I will turn this over to Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you, Roger. Yes, and just a note for this agenda. So I posted the agenda in the chat, and the one in the chat is an updated agenda from what's on the screen right now. We've just added a third item just before AOB. If we have time, we'll go over a COR impact analysis doc that staff has prepared. But until then, we'll just continue on with the agenda as is.

So right now, we're going to provide an overview of the recommendations, and I'm going to drop in the chat right now the worksheet that you'll see that's on the screen right now. And if you're not able to see it or not able to access it, please let us know. It's in the shared drive, so everyone should have access to it. But this is what we're going to be talking about today and what the homework is going to be for all the working group members.

So with that, I'll just start with kind of providing an explanation of this document. So this document actually has all of the group 1B COR recommendations as they are. There are some that have

some highlights, which represent changes that have been made to the text following last week's discussion. So I'll go over those in a bit. But I really just kind of want to go over the format of this document and kind of what the expectations are.

So this document, I'll just kind of scroll through it just a little bit. So you'll see the recommendations are all kind of listed out. These include all of the recommendations from pertaining to change of registrant data. And then we also have a group 1A, REC 17 down here, because this was an item that was pinned following the COR discussions. And so we felt that it was relevant to include it here as part of the assignment.

So what this essentially is is that we're going to be asking you all to provide for each of the recommendations, put them into one of these categories. So on page 7, just below where all the recommendations are listed, and you can click on there, it'll take you right to it, we have four tables. The first table in red is for items that you cannot live with. So essentially, what you're going to do is you're going to go through, you're going to first read through all of the recommendations as they are. And you're going to put them in one of these four tables. And so everyone should have their group in here. So I'm sorry, let me just back up. Let me just go back to the top.

So as I said, there are four tables where if you read a recommendation, you see, yeah, I cannot live with this, then we want you to put it in the red table and provide text that you could support. If there's a recommendation that you can live with but would prefer a change, then indicate that in the yellow table and provide alternative text of that change that you'd prefer. If you see

a grammatical or typographical edit, something small that doesn't change it at all, it's just kind of a grammar thing, then you can drop that into the blue table. And if you can support the recommendation text as is, then indicate that in the green table. So now go to these tables, and you can see what we'd like you to do is to please put in your group consistency rather than you as an individual. So we really want you guys to take this back to your groups and get their feelings on these recommendations because this is now what we're going to be using to determine what really gets into the initial report. We're getting to that time now. Now is the time to make any changes that you see are necessary for these recommendations.

Ideally, we'd like to see everyone in the green table, just providing your group and just kind of listing the recommendation numbers that yes, we can support this as is. Hopefully, all of them should be in here. But if there are some items that you see a grammatical edit or maybe just want to change to some of the wording or you simply can't live with it, we need to know that now because this is what's going to be used for the initial report. And we we need to have those discussions of if there are still pending items that need to be discussed or changed.

So you'll put down your group. You'll put down the recommendation number, your proposed update to it. That's really helpful to us to say what exactly you would change and how you would change it, and your rationale for why you feel that is necessary. Again, this would be just really helpful for discussion, getting through all these, making sure that everyone can support these recommendations. So again, ideally, everything will be in

the green, but we want to know what changes need to be made, if any. Are there any questions? So I'll just kind of pause there before we kind of go into some of the highlighted, the changed text. Theo, I see a raised hand.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, when you talk about groups, then constituencies, you mean this, the members of the working group, right? Not full support from the IPC or BC or at the stakeholder group. We don't have to go back to them and go like, are you guys okay with this? We just want to have an inventory of what the groups in this working group are thinking, right?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Well, I mean, ideally, we would like to see that there are groups that can support this. I mean, we would ideally like you to be able to take this back to your groups and get their thoughts on these recommendations. Caitlin, is that right? Just want to make sure I'm clear on that, too.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Christian. And thanks for the question, Theo. I agree with what Christian just noted. So this is a representative working group. So we have members that represent their groups. So now that the recommendations are more crystallized, now is the time to go back to your full group. And while we're not expecting every, for example, with the registrars, every registrar to raise their hand and say we fully support this, it is incumbent upon the members of this group to ensure that their groups are aware of the status of where

this is, and that if there are registrars who might not be as familiar or might have a serious issue with the recommendations for them to speak up, but again, it doesn't have to be full consensus, everyone raise their hand and agree with every word in the recommendation. It's just now is the time to coordinate with your group and make sure that your group is okay with the way the recommendations are written for inclusion in the initial report. So yes, it's more of a going back to your full group to coordinate rather than just with maybe the two NCSG representatives or one IPC or however the breakdown is. It's to let others also opine on the status of the recommendations.

ROGER CARNEY: That was great, Caitlin. And I think it's important to recognize what we're trying to do here. And it's that, I think Caitlin said it perfect, we're not looking for different groups to go back and do a vote or anything. But it is an awareness so that the whole stakeholder group is aware of what the stance is and where it's heading so that if there are any issues, that we're learning about them now instead of 45 days after we publish our report. So I think that that's the key, is try to head off as many knowable issues before we get to that spot. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, you want to get more eyes on it. And it doesn't have to be a full support of the registered stakeholder group. They don't have to go through all the motions, setting up a motion and then get it approved by the entire membership. You just want to get more eyeballs on this.

ROGER CARNEY: Correct, exactly. And hopefully if anybody does raise a concern, we can fill in these appropriate tables here so that we can bring it back to the group and we can make any adjustments if needed. As Christian said, we hope everything falls into that green table. But we know that there's different buckets of different changes. So that's why there's the four table setup. And again, this is a fairly big undertaking because it's not like Theo described when he first got on, it's not the two or three or even four people in attendance today, it's more of sending it out to your stakeholder group and trying to get any feedback from that.

So, and Steinar, I think you put in chat, what's the deadline? I think we do have that to talk about. And I think I'd like to get from the working group some thoughts on it. We talked about it and we weren't sure a week was enough, but we don't want it to go too long. So we want action. So I think we're going to talk about it. And again, I think from each of the stakeholder groups here providing that need assessment of, okay, how much time is needed to do that. Again, there's four, and we'll say five recommendations here. But there are some sub points that expand out. So it's not a huge thing. So I don't want to take too long. But I do want to, again, as I just described, I want to be able to give enough time so that we can get the input now instead of later. So thanks. I'll turn it back to Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you, Roger. If there are no further questions about the assignment of this document, and Caitlin said it perfectly, so then I

EN

think we can go into the discussion about when do working group members think that they can reasonably complete this by. I mean, ideally, we don't want it to be too long because, yeah, the timeline is steadily whittling down. So would two weeks be enough setting the deadline for April 8th? Or I'll leave that open for discussion now if there are no further questions about the document itself. And I will just kind of note for the document in those tables, we would like to see at the end of it, each working group member and their group has noted all, has added each of the recommendations within those tables. Ideally, they're all on the green table, but if they're scattered around, then so be it. But we would like to hear from each working group member, from each group, and for each recommendation. Not just like not just recommendation one or something like that. We'd like to see it for all of them so that we can just be sure that there is wide support for these to move on into the initial report. So with that, I'll just leave it up to the group to discuss when should the deadline be. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Christian. Yeah, and to add on to Christian's point there, the homework, the expectation is that again, there's four recommendations in this part 1B here, but also a relook at recommendation 17. So what we're wanting to see is for the registry stakeholder group that they have a response to all five of those somewhere in one of those four tables. Again, hopefully they're all in the green table, but you know, changes are welcome, and discussion is needed now to complete them. So, but for every stakeholder group, we want every recommendation to fall in one

of those four tables, so. And to get back to, and I'll follow Rick here, get back to our time here. So Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Are we going to talk about in this discussion the content of the recommendations in this discussion today, Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Yeah, we'll go through these. Just on the updates, though, is all we were planning to do. Anything more than that, feel free to bring it up as we walk through those. But the goal was, yes, to talk through the updates as most of these are recommendations that have been put in place for a while. But yeah, if something big there is on one of those, bring it up, and we'll discuss it. So hopefully that helps, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, I think Zak was the first one to throw out a suggestion of two weeks, April 8th, being done by our, I believe we have a meeting April 9th. Jothan, maybe you can jump on and let us know. Are you thinking three weeks to that? Or are you thinking more than the one week that I suggested to start with?

JOTHAN FRAKES: So if I heard correctly, we want to get this out rather quickly. And I think that's important that we do. I'm just noting that right now we're in the midst of some holiday season where we may not have access to all of the people who might want to get the feedback, especially as we go out into what I would call the tributary registrars that might have some minority perspectives or things to provide input on this. And I was basically asking if we could extend the runway just a little bit. I was proposing a week, but longer might be easier. I don't have a prescriptive amount of time. Just I know that this week there's quite a lot of people that have religious holidays or other like spring break with kids and things of that nature. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks. Other thoughts? Again, when I first looked at it, I was like, yeah, I'd like it back in a week. But recognizing that the ask here is bigger, I think, than a week's time, it's definitely getting back to your groups to let them know what's being said. So I think that that does take some time. So two weeks, it seemed like it was reasonable. But again, I think if we're talking about three weeks, then that starts to get pushed on our deadlines and stuff. But again, it's important to do because we want to know now versus knowing later. Obviously, it's harder to change these once we've went out to public comment back than it is to change it now. So again, I think this is important. So I'd rather take the time. Again, not a ridiculous amount of time. I don't want to take until May to do this. I think that we need to make sure that we're pushing it forward. So but any other thoughts? Steinar, I think, is

agreeing with Jothan there on the extra week. Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. I did want to emphasize that currently we're concentrating on the group 1B recommendations. And we're looking at them together as a package because we're closing in on these. But I did want to emphasize to the group and hopefully provide some comfort that there are two things to keep in mind when we go through this. The first is this is not the last time to provide feedback. And it's not that if we were to conclude the review period in two weeks that you are agreeing and signing in blood that there will be no further changes. There is going to be the opportunity to review the initial report as a whole. And we'll want to provide adequate time to do that. And also, this is not a formal consensus call. It's just an opportunity to share with your group that these are in the process of being finalized. There will be another opportunity to provide feedback. But if there are any showstoppers or any -- like what we're really looking for or concerned about at this phase is that first category of you cannot live with this. And to explain why so that the group has adequate time to look at those concerns and consider them. So with that in mind, would the group be okay with a two-week turnaround time for reviewing these recommendations, keeping in mind that we want to have adequate time to review the entire report as a whole and do a consensus call without having too much slippage in the project timeline?

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks for that, Caitlin. That was a good reminder to all of us. So back to that then. With Caitlin's thoughts, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, so I'm having a little bit of a struggle with this. I mean, the goal is absolutely clear. I understand the proposal and what we are trying to achieve here. I do have somewhat of an -- well, an issue is not the right word. But I do think that if -- you know, okay, let me put it in a concrete example. You know, if we go back to the registrars, I think that we can easily explain why we have done what is in the recommendations. Most of the stuff for a registrar or operational level, if you have the technical background most of us have, this is not going to be an issue. What you're going to have an issue with is that when other groups go back, they need to explain this to their groups and the people within those groups who don't have a strong background or are not familiar with this work at all. You know, that is going to be -- I think those people are going to have the problem, like, how do I -- how am I going to present this in a fashion that everybody understands it? And I think that is quite complex, and that's quite a barrier to achieve. And then you're going to get feedback from people who sort of try to -- with their best intentions, of course, trying to give feedback. But that is going to be feedback that is not really, really great in the sense, like, we might be going back a couple of steps, which would be inevitable, I guess, when the public comment period is there. But I don't think that we are going to address any big issues that are new to us. I think a lot of this has already been discussed. So I think if you're going to widen the circle, so to speak, you've

got to risk, and that is something you've got to factor in or not. That's not up to me. But I think you're going to get a moment, several moments, where old stuff is going to be rehashed. And I'm not sure if that is really great. But I assume, Roger, you talked this through, you discussed this with the rest of ICANN staff. And what I just said, you already factored that in, and you made a different decision there. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and again, you bring up some good points that maybe we didn't drill in as deep early on. Obviously, to your point that registrars and registries may be a little advantaged just because they deal with -- and again, all registrars and all registries deal with transfers, and the other stakeholder groups don't deal with it on as big a scale as the registries and registrars. So yeah, I think it's definitely an educational thing going out to all the groups. But to your point, the contracted parties maybe have a little hands up, so the other parties may be a little more challenged at trying to get that education across. So I think what we'll do is we'll shoot for the two weeks, and if the parties need more time, probably more toward the end of the first week, letting us know and seeing if we can extend that or not. But let's shoot for that two weeks in early April there and try for that. And again, it is important. What we're trying to achieve here is going to help us in the long run. Okay. Maybe I'll turn this back to Christian then.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you, Roger. I just updated the date to two weeks from now, 9 April. And, yeah, if groups say that they need more time, let us

know maybe next week. But we should really try to shoot for this just so that we have enough time to finalize everything and get stuff into the initial report and get that in front of you all.

Okay. So the next part of our agenda, I'm going to go through the updated text following our -- from last week's meeting. So I'm just going to scroll down. And Rick, if there's a recommendation that you want to talk about that's not -- or anyone, really. If there's any recommendations that aren't highlighted that haven't changed that you want to talk about please just raise your hand and we'll go through that. But just for the sake of time for now, I'll just be going through the -- what has changed since last time.

Okay. So a lot of what we talked about last time was regarding recommendation 3.4. So the highlighted is new text, or what's been changed. So this reads, unless the registered name holder previously opted out of receiving COR notifications, when a change to the registered name holder's email address occurs, the registrar must send the COR notification to the RNH's prior email address, the email address that was on file with the registrar immediately prior to the change. The registrar may send the COR notification to the RNH's new email address. And C, the registrar may additionally send the COR notification to the RNH via SMS or other secure messaging system. So this was in regard to the -- making sure that 3.4 still was compliant with 3.3, which said that they must send it via email, SMS, or other secure messaging system. We heard that a lot of folks wanted to keep it sent to the prior email address, but to keep it combined with 3.3, they may also send it via -- may additionally send it via other methods, like through their account or via SMS or the application. So we want to

RICK WILHELM: So the registries don't really have a dog in this fight, but I'm raising this point as a former registrar when I was doing engineering out of registrar. From a complexity standpoint, one of the things that the registrars may want to consider is oddly eliminating the opt-out options on this. I know that that might sound odd, but from an operational standpoint, having the ability to opt out of some of these notifications is a very big operational complexity. That might be -- oh, we rolled through that last week. Sorry, I wasn't here. Okay. Then I'll shut up.

ROGER CARNEY: No, Rick, this is Roger. That's perfect, because we did walk through that exact same thing you're talking about. And the big thought here was to make it flexible for the registrars. And as you just described, the complexity part is what we ran into last week as well, and maybe the last couple weeks. But it was making it optional for registrars to support this or not. But if they do, they have obviously certain requirements. But, Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Just considering -- it seems to me that 3.3 and 3.4 are slightly contradictory, and I think it's because 3.4 is trying to limit 3.3. So we've got that we must send it by email or

EN

SMS or other secure messaging system, not limiting. And then specifically when it's a change to an email, it has to be sent by email. And I just -- it seems contradictory, and so I think I'm flagging it as a thing to think about how to clean up that language. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, and again we kind of talked about that. And I think this 3.4c was meant to hopefully address any issues between the two. But, yeah, if we can come up with wording that is clear, maybe that's good. But, yeah, it definitely is just when this one specific change of registrant data element is being affected, that applies. And the hopes was c would be tied back and make 3.3 and 3.4 work together. But if we can improve it, for sure. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, this is one that we kind of blew past it. But in Rec 1.1, this wasn't highlighted, but I think that the definition of material change to a registered name holder's name or organization -- so I agree that it should be listed as any change to the email address, but change of registrant data is a material change to the registered name holder's name. That doesn't really jive with the DMV definition, Department of Motor Vehicles, sorry, or like a legal definition of if you're changing someone's name, you're changing someone's name. And as from an attorney, and I'm not an attorney, but from a legal definition, when you're changing the name on someone's thing, like that doesn't jive with what I consider like the driver's license or DMV definition. And I'm

surprised that that is that loose, that any change to the name does not count as a change of name. So it's surprising to me that that's that loose. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Yeah, and again, the DMV has maybe a lot of rules that we all agree or disagree with. And I think that here, you're right, it's looser than that definition would be. But I think that's on purpose, just so that we're not being that rigid about things. And again, I think this gets back to the registrar's and registrant's responsibilities of keeping this data as accurate as possible. To your point, DMV, it's still required to change, for me, that everyone puts a D in the middle of my name when there's no D. And I would have to have that corrected. But I think that this gets back to that it is a looser definition and on purpose. So -- but I'll go to Jim. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, thanks, Roger, Jim Galvin, registries. But this is not a registry comment. This is a security comment. I'm going to go back to -- way back to when we were doing all the TAC development and the processes and procedures that go with that. And the security profile that we were creating and what exists. I've been sitting here, and although I have missed the last few meetings, and I was not part of the discussions, but I have caught up on the transcripts, and I'm looking at this, and I'm thinking about it. And I have to say that I don't like this at all from a security point of view. And I think that this notion that you can opt out of receiving notifications when your email address changes is, in my

mind, I view this as a fundamental violation of the overall security profile. Right? The security profile is based on a point of control being the email address. We kind of had this discussion way back when, when we did the first version, the first set of recommendations. And the first set of stuff. I'm going to bring this whole issue up again later on with one of these later recommendations.

And I'm just sitting here thinking that if I'm a registrant or if I'm a bad guy, I can get into a registrar. I can opt out of receiving notifications. I can then change the email address. And I've now got control, and I can do all kinds of stuff. And it just feels to me like the central point of control in this whole system is the email address. We've eliminated the FOAs and those things. They were all based on being able to send notifications or interacting with the registrant. They're all based on that email address being a point of control.

To my mind, from a security point of view, it is simply a bad idea to say that I can opt out of changes to that email address, to notifications. There should be a requirement to send it in all cases for the email address at all times. There's just too many ways for things to go wrong if that's not true. So I just offer that up for registrars to be thinking about here. And so from a security point of view, I think that initial highlighted phrase there is, I mean, I would object to that. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Jim. And actually, we did talk about that, how recently, I'm not sure, if that should be the one anchor, we'll say.

And I think the discussion around that was that that is a security item. And that's a business model that can be followed if the registrar wants to or doesn't want to. And that's why the prior conversation started to occur in that it's a decision by the registrar to even provide this functionality or not. And to Jim's point there, and again, I think we talked about this on a call. That is a security thing that the registrar can promote or not. You know, so I think that that's where that came in that. So, but I'll go to Jothan, please.

JOTHAN FRAKES: So I think here, Jim, you're pointing out some great and very important security consequences and considerations. And one of the things that we leaned in when we talked about it last week, and I know you were probably in Australia for the IETF, when we discussed this, we were looking at the making sure this was a very, very well-informed consent. That the registrant in the case that they were kind of delegating this responsibility to their registrar or some agent, that they were doing that in a very, very informed manner. And perhaps that that would be something that would help, I think, provide a bit of guarding against or guardrails against some of the things that might trigger those security concerns. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. Jim, please go ahead.

EN

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, thanks, Roger. And thanks, Jothan. Jim Galvin for the record. I think the comment, the two-finger comment I would like to add to what you said in particular, Roger, is in my mind, this is not a business practice question. This is not a security service to be added optionally. This is a baseline system positioning, this issue of the email address changing and the fact that it exists as an anchor. It's a baseline. It should be true for everybody. This is not just an extra. And that's what I mean when I say that this is a kind of an essential security element and an anchor. So I just draw that distinction up. We can move on for now. We'll see what happens as we go forward. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: No, Jim, it's great that you bring it up. And I'll just add on because I think someone brought it up when we did talk about it that there's a reminder that this policy does not happen in a vacuum and that the registrars are contractually obligated to verify if an email changes. And they have to go through a process to do that. So this is one of those things that's layered on top of an already existing requirement in our contracts that we have to verify if an email changes or not. So, again, just something else to think about. So, again, I appreciate you bringing it up so that we can have the discussion. Just want everybody to have all the talking points as well. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I have a comment on a different topic. But relating to what's on screen, one of the things that I have found confusing throughout this discussion is the opt out and like,

is there an opt out? Can they opt out? When can they opt out? Can the registrar control that? I keep forgetting that recommendation four is lower down on the page, but it's going to modify recommendation three. And so we might be able to do something around instead of where it says, like, unless they previously opted out, maybe something like subject to the opt out requirements in recommendation for this has to happen. So I'm going to think about suggesting along those lines and hopefully that will help add clarity. That's thought one.

Thought two specific to what's on screen. I think 3.4 confuses me just because the trigger is that the email itself has changed if we're keeping that. And so I would want to put that first as the, so we would say, like, when the change to the email occurs subject to the opt out requirements in rec 4, these things have to happen. Right? So, that's the line I'm thinking along for clarity. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks. Yeah. Good input there. So, anyone else on this? Okay, I will turn it back to Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you and thank you Sarah for those recommendations. I think that makes sense to me. And yeah, it is confusing, the fact that the opt out recommendations are later. But hopefully this should add some clarity as well, especially with the conversation that we just had. So let me just note this.

So the group has decided to change from must provide the opt out to May. So that allows the registrars to determine whether or not

they want to offer an opt out or not. So, I'll just read it. The working group recommends that registrars may provide registered name holders with the option to opt out of receiving change of registrant data notifications. If the registrar chooses to provide the COR notification opt out option to the registered name holder, then the following recommendations apply.

And there's an asterisk here that I want to—I'll just read this now as well. So, this is regarding that they may offer the opt out, is note, registrars have the flexibility to offer an opt out at the data field level. For example, a registrar may choose to offer an opt out for material changes to the registrant name or registrant organization, but not allow an opt out for a change up to the registered name holder's email address. That's sort of kind of what you're speaking to, Jim, about keeping the email address as something that's required, so it is still here as an option. The registrar can choose to do it that way. But as the group discussed last week that they think that keeping the option, keeping the flexibility for registrars, not only to provide the opt out or not, but also what information they feel should not be opt outable. I see Sarah has a raise hand.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I have a question. Why is it a note and not a recommendation? Thank you.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Well, I mean, we can certainly make it a recommendation. We just thought it was a part of a bit of clarification in there, but we can

certainly make that a recommendation. Would anyone else like to see that as a recommendation?

SARAH WYLD: Can I just clarify? I was not necessarily taking an opinion on this question. I am asking, like, what's the difference. The difference I think is that a recommendation will be required to be implemented a certain way while a note I imagine does not bear the same weight. And so maybe we're doing that on purpose. I just, I'm not sure, thank you.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: I think it was a more of a point for clarification, but it would still be like, for instance, providing this example without providing the example in the recommendation, but I don't think it has to necessarily be a footnote, for instance, especially if that feels less binding, so to speak. So the intention was more just for, as a point of clarification, but still part of Rec 4. Okay, if there are no further questions. And yes, we can certainly make that a Rec. Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: No, if you want to continue, go ahead. I just have a thought on recommendation 4.4 though.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Okay, yeah, I'll read through them and then we can open up for discussion just so everyone has a chance to know what it is. So

we've split 4.4 and 4.2, just for clarity's sake, to make it a little bit clearer. The registrar, we updated, when you say it's the registrar, it was because it was previously registrars, plural. We just kind of updated it to be consistent language with the other recommendations, keeping it in the singular. So it says, "The registrar must enable "change of registrar data notifications by default when a domain name is initially registered and when a domain name is transferred in from another registrar." So if a domain name is transferred to another registrar, they would need to reset any kind of opt-out option that may have been selected by, you know, within the previous registrar.

And then REC 4.2, if the registered name holder elects to opt out of change of registrar data notifications, the registrar may disable change of registrar data notifications provided the opt-out occurs after initial domain name registration or following the completion of an inter-registrar transfer. So that's just to kind of help clarify 4.1, just saying that these only apply if the registrar offers an opt-out. If they don't offer an opt-out, then resetting it by default when it's registered or transferred, it's not really applicable because they don't offer the opt-out. They would always receive the notification.

4.3, we just updated it to the singular rather than registrar is plural. And then REC 4.4, this was out of discussion from last week, which is that the registrar must maintain a record demonstrating that the registrar validated that the opt-out was requested by the registered name holder. So this was an intent to, an intention to try to make it a little bit more secure to keep it, making sure that there's a record that they ensured that the opt-out was from the registered name holder. The word verified was thrown out there,

validated. So we know, not sure what should be the proper terminology of this, I can leave that up to the group, but this is kind of what we heard coming out of last week's meeting. And you've already seen the note. So I'll just stop right there. Go ahead, Theo.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, so what I'm going to say is not a big one, but recommendation 4.4, those registrars who are going to do this, for the wholesale business model, that's going to be pretty hard to get that sort of record. It's not impossible, but it's going to be pretty hard. And that's what made me back last week after call. And I was sort of thinking about this entire opt-out system. And Rick already mentioned it at the beginning of the call. And I completely agree with him because the next day I was going like, oh my God, this entire opt-out system is only feasible for a few registrars, which will suit that business model very well. So we just need to keep it. I'm really glad that we have it. But folks like us, and I suspect other registrars, creating this system is going to be a development nightmare. I mean, it is so complex. If you start just going through like, okay, I need to keep track of this, this, this, old records, new records, who did what on what time, the logging alone is going to be extensive. But just throwing it out there for the people who are sort of worried about security, I don't think there is any security issues with the opt-out because the registrars are going to do this while they really take care of their registrants already through lots of different measures to keep them and those domain names safe. Great for them. And again, we just need to keep this, but it is a operational and development nightmare. Thanks.

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

RICK WILHELM: So yeah, just to thank Rick Wilhelm, registries. So just echoing what Theo, just to sort of build on what Theo said. Yeah, if the registrar elects to offer the opt-out and they go ahead and implement it, then they will have to do it flawlessly because when you're doing these kinds of opt-out things, the lack of notifications does introduce the opportunity for security holes to open up because things can happen without then the registrant knowing about them. So it does open up security holes because things will happen by the registrant's choice. Things will happen without the registrant finding out about them because they have said, "I don't want to know about them." So security holes are therefore opened up by the registrant's own choosing, right? So there's a security hole that's opened. And then what will happen is that if something bad happens to the registrant for some reason, the registrar's record-keeping on this C option Rec 4.4 that's there towards the bottom of the screen, that record-keeping had better be airtight, not watertight, but airtight, vacuum proof because if there's legal action, then the registrant's going to be on the hook for those, they're going to be liable for those security things, I would predict. And so because the registrant's going to be saying, "Well, there was a problem and I didn't hear about it," and the registrar's going to say, "Well, you opted out," and the registrar's going to be on the hook to prove that sort of thing. So I'm smiling when I say this. So what I'm saying that the registrars that endeavor to do this opt-out notification thing and therefore allow the registrant to open up

these security holes in their security profile, as Jim was rightfully articulating previously, caveat emptor isn't the right, exactly right way to say it. There's probably better Latin, but I didn't go to a proper school, so I didn't really take Latin, but yeah, danger lurks here. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Yeah, and just a reminder, and I think Sarah hits on it a few times here and there. Again, this is going to be an option for registrars, but also how they implement it is optional because we're not dictating operationally how they handle all this. Now, obviously, there's some policy wording that they have to go by, but just off the top of my head, a registrar may only enable this for the point in time that the change is being made, so it may be a one-time opt-out kind of thing, or it doesn't state in here, but every time they change, they have an opt-out box that they can check saying, well, I know I'm making the changes, so I don't ... And again, obviously, still security holes because if that account's been hacked, it's not going to be that person, but if the account's hacked, there's other problems that we have than just this notification. But Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, thanks, Roger, Jim Galvin for the record. I think the way that I'm listening to all of this and trying to take this on board, and it's a shame that I've kind of missed some of these COR discussions, but let me boil it down to one particular principle here in the way that I'm thinking about this from a security point of view.

Again, this is not a registry position, although I'm here representing registries, but from a security point of view.

A key part, a very key principle in the overall security profile of the transfer system is about notifications, and that really is it. That's the bottom line. Notifications and their presence and the fact that they happen is an essential part of the quality of the overall security profile of the system. All of these, and with that in mind, I've been looking at these recommendations and reading this and going back over some of the discussions, but I think what bothers me in all of this is all of these options, all of these exceptions, all of these opportunities for different business practices. As Theo was suggesting, this is not about whether or not a registrar is going to take care of their registrants. I mean, let's take at face value that all registrars are good guys. They're going to take care of their registrants. But what happens if you do a transfer to a registrar that's not exactly doing the right thing? And you're setting up policies that allows that particular registrar that you might move things to, if you get hacked and other bad things are going on, you're creating the opportunity for holes. This bailing on notifications and even allowing for them not to be present just sets up all kinds of problems that I thought we went to great pains to try to establish a quality security profile. I've got to put that out there and make—The notifications are a key security principle. These exceptions and options and stuff like that, they tear away at that, they break that down. And I believe from a security point of view that you're creating more harm than good with all of that. So thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks for that, Jim. That's really appreciated. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I do wonder, I agree with Rick and Jim here in principle, but when we are looking at this here, this opens up for a small group of registrars to accommodate their clients better and make sure that they don't receive certain notifications because they have very good reasons for that. Now, there is of course the risk that there might be registrars who are not into the business of making sure that those domain names are already locked up through any other means. There are several registrars out there that that's their business model. They make sure that the domain names are as safe as possible. And they take all kinds of precautions to make sure that those domain names never ever get stolen. But they do that through means outside of the policy and such notifications can actually create confusion for those clients. Those are high risk clients, clients that have a huge threat for many reasons, because they are essential parts of the internet. So they've already taken good care that their domain name is not going to get hacked.

Will there be a registrar that will go through this opt out scenario? Again, I think that's only a few with that select business model. The rest of us, we're not going to do this because it is, again, as I mentioned, this is complex to create and you don't benefit much from it. At least I as a wholesale registrar, I wouldn't see what I would get out of it or the registrants we serve that they would even have any benefit for this opt out system. It is super hard to create. It is super expensive to create. So why even bother to give the registrants the option there? But again, in principle, Rick and Jim

are right. And that is something for the group. Well, maybe we get some more input in two weeks and see where we land here. Maybe that's the best wrap up here. Thanks.

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

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks Roger. This is Owen Smigelski for the transcript. And Jim, Rick, I just want to let you know that before our last call, I completely 100% agreed with you guys. I thought that there should be a notification anytime that the email address was changed. But then hearing from some of my other registrar colleagues, I realized that it may not work in all scenarios for them. So if there is a corporate registrar where there is a law firm managing 50,000 domain names on behalf of a client, and they have to change the registrant email address on behalf of them, are there going to be 50,000 email notifications? Or is this something that the client even cares about because the law firm's taking care of it for them? What if there happens to be a dormant domain portfolio who has similar 10, 15, 20,000 domain names and they want to change their email address, do they need to receive all those notifications or can they just opt out?

There can be some outlying scenarios where there may be an area where there does not want to be that COR notification going out because it would be repetitive or confusing to somebody who may not necessarily need such a notification or want such a notification. And while my registrar personally will keep those

notifications there and having heard from some of the other registrars on our calls, we're not going to provide these opt-outs because it would be an engineering headache and nightmare and also a good security practice. There may be some registrars with different business models than my own that might want to have this opportunity for an opt-out. And I see Prudence jumping in there because I don't want to name her or her registrar, but that's a registrar that might want to have this opt-out because of its business model. So I don't want to preclude and require them to do something that might actually make their, confuse their customers more there. But understanding security risks, we're well aware of it, but I think that most registrars will do this because the operational nightmares of doing the opt-out. But again, I don't want to preclude another registrar from doing that. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Owen. Any other comments on this section? Again, to Theo's point, obviously this is not the end of the discussion. This really is just to update everyone on what the terms are. And this homework assignment is this exact thing. Okay, now we know and we can put in there and say, okay, this is a security issue concerned by whatever group. So I think that that's, again, a good thing. Today we are just getting through these updates so everybody understands them and everybody understands the background to them so that they can make some informed updates to our homework so we can get that moving. So Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:	Thank you, this is Sarah. I just want to pause for a second, think about something that James said in the chat. The concern being that the registrant has no recourse and cannot resort to help even from ICANN compliance if they lose the domain. And yes, that does seem like it would be bad. So maybe we should think for a minute as a group of what happens, like I feel like this has to have been answered and I've just lost track, but clearly I'm not the only person thinking about it.
	So if there is a change of registrant data that the registrant prior to the change believes was invalid and they discover that change at some point after it happens because they did not receive a notification, then what is the expected recourse? Is there? Is that within our remit? Thank you.
ROGER CARNEY:	Great, thanks Sarah. Any thoughts, anyone? Okay, maybe I'll turn this back over to Christian so he can finish any of the updates we have so that we can at least touch on each one of these. Christian, please go ahead.
CHRISTIAN WHEELER:	Thank you. And to Sarah's point, and this may not necessarily answer your question, but the group did discuss as far as what kind of remedial actions or whether it should be stipulated here. And I believe the group was more in favor of keeping it up to the registrars, how exactly they must take action or how to initiate reversal rather than maintaining a specific system for them to do that, because that may not fit all registrars.

And there was also a recommendation from group 1A, I believe, requesting the GNSO to do, I believe, an issue report for a possible dispute resolution procedure in cases of improper change of registrant, I believe. Let me just double check that. I think that it's here from a previous recommendation. Let me see that real quick. Sorry, I just wanted to refresh that. There it is. Here it is.

The group recommends the GNSO request an issues report or other suitable mechanism to further research and explore the pros and cons of expanding the TDRP to registrant filers and creating a new standalone dispute resolution mechanism for registrants who wish to and challenge improper transfers, including compromised and stolen domain names. So there is a recommendation from this group to further explore that idea as far as a dispute resolution mechanism that may apply in this case. But for now, the actual recommendation as far as part of the notifications goes a step further than what is currently required, which is just contact information for the registrar. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Does the text on screen apply to both inter-registrar transfers and change of registrant data? Because we're also recommending the pull change of registrant data out from the transfer policy. And so I just wonder if maybe it won't be considered a transfer anymore. And so this dispute mechanism that's being considered won't apply to it.

EN

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. This is Roger and I'm just going to jump in real quick. I think that, you know, this has been left open, this recommendation left more open than that. And that will be more the scoping of that issues report. My thought was that it, you know, would cover more than just, you know, a registrar transfer. It would cover any of the registrant incidents that they hit today, you know, whatever it is, and, you know, they lose control, whatever, however you want to say it. But it's any registrar initiated is to me what this issue report would be looking at. So just my thoughts. Thanks.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: And if I just might add to that too, I mean, this is the current text of it right now, but how I personally see it, this including compromised and stolen domain names, I think that that speaks more to the issue that might be, that the registrant would be complaining about if someone say hacked into their system and, you know, compromise stole their domain name to affect essentially versus, oh, I mistakenly, you did a typo in my change of data. So it is still a change of registrant data and notifications instructed them how to correct that. I think that by the fact that this recommendation includes compromised and stolen domain names, I think that in the circumstance where it's beyond just a mistaken update of one item of data, if they feel like their domain actually has been stolen, that this might cover that. But that's, again, that's just my interpretation.

ROGER CARNEY: Nope, that's a good point, Christian. And your chat before I jumped to Volker here, Jim, yeah, we'll be back to that. We just wanted to take this here. So we'll go back to our updates here shortly. So, but Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, I'm on the same persuasion here. I don't think we really need a recourse because as long as the domain name still stays with the original registrar, then obviously there is no damage and the registrar can change it back. Whereas the real issue occurs, arises when there's a transfer. And therefore I think the transfer policy will have to look into the circumstances under which the transfer occurred, which includes any owner changes that happened before that. But I don't think that we need to open up a can of worms here by introducing something where actually no damage has yet occurred.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Volker. Okay, I think I will turn this to Christian to finish us up here.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yeah, so we've gone through all of the changes that have been made. I just kind of wanted to pause on the group A Rec 17 just to see if the group had any thoughts on this language as is. So I'll just pause there because we kind of discussed there were some perceived risks and advantages to that last week and at the very, very end of our call. So just wanted to see if anyone had anything to say or note thinking about this since last week.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Christian. And again, this is around Rec 17 we published, but we purposely flagged it to come back and visit it after we did our complete look at change of registrar. At one point we had a small team built to talk about this and if there's ways to allow a transfer in this prohibited window, is there a mechanism that can be approached on that? And again, the small team came back with this established relationship discussion and at our ICANN meeting, we went through this and there seemed to be pretty good support, but we didn't have everyone there. So I think that this is why we keep hitting this, but it is that a relook at the way we look at it just because of the conversations we've had and we knew we were going to, we had flagged it when we left it. But I think I'll open it up to the floor then on that. Anyone have any comments on this Rec 17? And again, obviously is updated from what we published, adding in the established relationship. But any comments, Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks Roger, Jim Galvin, registries, but this is not a registry position. Just again, going back to security discussions, I think there are two things to say here. One is back when, again, having created the whole TAC profile, TAC processes, procedures, inventing the TAC and everything that went with it, that 30-day lock was a critical part of the overall security profile. And I think that any kind of exception that eliminates that is simply a violation of that. And again, this is not about the registrar on the leading edge of these kinds of transfers, it's about the next registrar in line and what they do. I mean, bad things happen to happen at the

leading edge registrar, and then it goes to the next registrar and you've got a rule that lets them just go do things. Then you have not provided a minimum level of protection for the registrant. That 30-day post change lock was a critical part of a minimum level of protection for a registrant.

The second thing that I'll offer is, for me again, this just falls into the overall category of, I'm sorry, I'm losing my train of thought here. All right, let me just leave it at that for the moment and see if it comes back to me. I'll raise my hand again, thanks.

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

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks very much, Roger, Zak Muscovitch. So I was following closely Jim's comments on the COR notifications and the security issues that arise from that. And that's a point that I've made myself in a similar fashion previously. So I appreciate his point from a security perspective in principle there. Then I find myself in the position of, well, I like recommendation 17, despite the security concerns, which are similar that Jim has raised. I'm trying to reconcile the two approaches I'm not sure if that's possible. But my question is this really for Jim is that, given your security concerns on recommendation 17, are you able to come up with any ideas or possible approaches to consider that could provide the innocent registrant who needs to change registrars, despite that restriction on the 30-day change of registrar? Any ideas that you might have to enable that registrant to switch registrars that

wouldn't give rise to security concerns, given that there's a competing interest here? On one hand it's security, on the other hand, it's transportability. And so it's reasonable to come down in favor of security over transportability in some circumstances and other circumstances, it's maybe more reasonable or feasible to come down on the side of transportability when the security risks are relatively minimal. So, question is Jim, without disputing your characterization of security concerns, you have any ideas or suggestions that could give effect to the intent of recommendation 17 here? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Zak. Before I get to Jim, I'll let him percolate on that for a little bit. I'll go to Theo, Theo please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So, I'm actually wondering how this is actually going to work because as an attacker, you need to do a little bit more work than usual if you want to get that lock removed for whatever reason. I mean, the registered name holder must have received registrar services for a period of at least 30 days, which is in line with a 30 days lock. So, till then, so when you move the transfer, when you create the account at the new registrar, you move the domain name in, that's when you start receiving registrar services. Not before, but after you move the domain. That's when the clock starts ticking, you still have that 30 day lock because you didn't receive 30 days of services yet. I mean, you are on day one after the transfer. So, you got 29 days more to go, which is still in line with the lock. Unless you are a long-standing customer with that

EN

registrar. Not sure how that works, but maybe we could think of a domain name investor who has several accounts with different registrars. And then we sort of touch upon what Zak is saying. So, there's your trade off there. I think there's a split here. So, I think for really, for a hijacker, well, you need to set up a little bit more. You can still do it, but I don't really see why you would go through that process. You already have to do more than what is required. I don't, I can't sort of wrap my head around that. So, I don't think that scenario is extremely valid where an attacker would do such a thing. Could happen, but it's highly irregular. So, I think this recommendation sort of strikes at the heart of, that there is still your security, but if you have a really good customer who has accounts all over the place with different registrars, you can still accommodate that customer. So, that's where I'm going to land now. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Theo. And I love it when Theo puts on his bad guy hat and tries to think of how to break it. It's always good to go through that process. So, Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, Jim Galvin for the record. But just making a security comment, not a registry comment. I too, Roger, the first thing I was going to say, and thank you for saying it first, I like the way that Theo is thinking about all of this. You kind of have to walk through these things and imagine what can happen and how things work. Theo, as part of his walking through it, was bringing in a little bit of external context, but that's the observation that I

would make in doing this. We look at each of these recommendations and to a large extent, we mostly tend to look at them as individual recommendations and not as part of the total system. Although Theo was doing a little bit of that in his characterization as he's walking through it. So, I just want to assert that I just think there's a lot more conversation to be had from a security point of view.

What I worry about is we have a group of recommendations and we look at each one here. And the problem is we're not really sitting down and looking at this total system, doing what security professionals would call a threat analysis and a real investigation of how all the elements fit together. You've got all these little exceptions and little options in all kinds of recommendations. And the truth is they just do not give any security professional a warm, fuzzy feeling. They just don't. They might individually look just fine, but ultimately, you start putting the pieces together and there's just always something. And I worry, I mean, that's really the point that I'm putting on the table.

And the second thing that I'll say, getting back to Zak's comment, thank you, Zak, for the question, because you reminded me what the second point is that I wanted to make earlier. I actually don't have a suggestion here on the table for how I would fix these things. I think the larger comment that I would make in all of this is I feel like what's happened here in the set of recommendations, as compared to what we did in the initial report, okay, is we have fallen into the trap of trying to allow for facilitating a relatively small market, or at least what I perceive to be the smaller part of the market. They might be the high value part of the market for

registrars, they still feel like me to be a smaller part of the market. And we're creating options and exceptions. And my worry is that these are creating problems for the largest part of the market, for the largest number of registrants. And my answer to, is there a different way to do all of this is, yeah, surely there must be. I think that, you know, I'm certainly willing to sit down and walk through some stuff with folks who really are part of that smaller market and are looking for solutions. You know, you need to deal with a solution for that market, not create a solution that puts greater risk on the larger part of the market. That's my fear. That's what I'm bringing to the table. I certainly want to serve that smaller market. I'm willing to bet that that's the high margin part of the market for registrars who deal with that. And so they really want to have that. I don't want to take that away from you, but there has to be a better way to solve your problem than doing this stuff, which creates greater risk in my mind. That's just where I'm coming from. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Jim. And I think that, you know, one of the things to think about, and hopefully we do and we say it enough, that yes, Jim's point is, most of the time, especially even in this group, we work a recommendation sort of in isolation with—not with blinders on for sure, but as Jim points out, once you get to the end, you're not really at the end, you're at the beginning of that process of making sure that, you know, recommendation 17 and recommendation 6 and recommendation 2 work together correctly and aren't creating a bigger problem than what we're trying to solve. And I think specifically to this Rec 17, the reasons we did

30 days and made them consistent and all that, we've got a lot of logic behind that.

And actually one of the only supporting datum driven things, we knew the 60 day was pretty rough for registrants. So I think, you know, when we made that first step in group 1A, great. And to Jim's point, you know, are we making a step here that adds, are we creating a step that, you know, subtracts and maybe there are different solutions. So, but I'll turn it to Theo. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:　　　　　Yeah, thanks. I was actually going to, was on the same track as you there, Roger. I mean, we came to this because that 60-day lock was really annoying for several reasons. It just generated more support than it was, in our opinions, at least from my side, it was worth it. But I do agree with Jim in the sense like, does a security professional get a warm fuzzy feeling from all of this? No. The answer there is simply no. You know, and when I go through this and trying to figure out like, how can I attack this? You know, probably give me till next week and I'll probably give you the answer. But regardless of this, because when Jim mentioned, you know, this is a little bit horrible or horrifying maybe my words for security professionals. You know, my biggest issue with all of this is this is a public policy which people can read up upon, you know, and when I'm going through my head and this is probably not popular when I'm going to say this, but when I look at all of this, you know, and we've been doing this for, this is meeting 123, I think. And what goes through my head constantly, especially the last couple of months, I'm like, okay, if I'm going to steal a domain

name, I'm definitely going to resort to social engineering because that is going to be the easiest way to avoid all of this, including all the barriers that registars already set up with two-factor authentication, God knows what, IP whitelisting, whatever they have in place there. And this policy will never ever be able to solve that issue. But if we're going to have new domain name hijacks after this policy, I'll bet you it will be through social engineering. Thanks.

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

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger, Zak. Maybe we should schedule the social engineering call for two weeks from now, come up with a policy there, oh my gosh. But good point, thank you, and great points as well, Jim. Listen, I don't want to open up recommendation 17 at all, but seeing that it is being seriously reconsidered here, I want to raise one thought to see what this group thought of the possible solution that would kind of reemphasize the security model that Jim has been speaking of. And also I see Berry made some comments about tightening up or redefining the language there, and that's also a good possibility.

What I was going to raise, and I don't have a technical background from Registrar operations to know if this is feasible or even a good idea or not, is that if a registrant who needs to request the removal of the 30-day second hop registrar to registrar lock, the one that we're talking about in recommendation 17, if a registrant needs to

make that request for whatever business reasons, could part and parcel of that request be an undertaking to have that domain name moved back to that first registrar as part and parcel of the request so that the registrant on that case-by-case basis with the established relationship may get the agreement of the registrar? But that registrar will have undertaken along with that requesting registrant to revert the domain name in the case of a dispute or something like that. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Zak. Okay, I think we're down to our last minute. I think we are probably going to close the call on this issue here. But I think our last half an hour, at least, of discussion, it is exactly perfectly leading us into this homework assignment, because I think that the points everybody's bringing up is that homework assignment, going through each one of these and putting in one of the tables the issues, concerns or acceptance, all those things.

And again, we have four recommendations plus the update to 17, so I would say five. And then, again, every stakeholder group needs to make a comment on each of those five. Again, maybe it's, hey, we accept it as is, or no, we want this little tweak here or anything like that. But the goal is to get each stakeholder group to bucket these recommendations into one of those tables so that we can have a good fruitful discussion and get everything closed up. So with that, I'll maybe ask Christian if there's any closing remarks we need to make before we end the call.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Nope. Just as a reminder, though, to try to get this in by our April 9th meeting so that we can discuss it. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Christian. Thanks, everybody, great discussion. And again, take a serious look at this homework and get it in as soon as possible, and we can start the discussions as soon as possible as well. So thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]