

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona  
GNSO - CPH TechOps Meeting Session 2  
Sunday, 21 October 2018 at 10:30 CEST**

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.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Marc Anderson: All right. This is Marc Anderson. We're going to go ahead and pick back up with our next session and I see I think most people came back, so I think that's a good sign. I think maybe we even picked up a few faces so if you just arrived, welcome to the ICANN 63 Tech Ops Session.

Just a couple administrative reminders, when you're speaking please make sure you speak into the microphone, state your name for transcription purposes, and just a friendly reminder to not speak too quickly. Maybe that's a reminder for myself as well. We do have a number of people where English is not their first language. So please make sure you're keeping that in mind when speaking.

For this next session, actually for this entire session, we're going to focus it on the future of the gTLD transfer process. And for those of you who were with us for the GDD Summit, one of our major topics at the GDD Summit we had some breakout sessions and some really great ideas there. Previously to that, the Tech Ops group, you know, identified some challenges with transfers and GDPR compliance.

And we presented ICANN staff with a potential workaround, or I guess a temporary stopgap measure, which ICANN staff accepted and incorporated, largely incorporated into the temporary specification. And so that was something initiated by the Tech Ops group and, you know, probably a nice

win for the group. We were able to identify a problem, propose a solution and have that solution, you know, largely accepted and adopted.

So it was a very nice win for the group and sort of a, you know, good sort of justification for, you know, what we're doing. But we also recognizing that it - that was just a temporary solution and that there would be a need to develop more of a long-term solution, you know, (Tom) has, you know, has been on point for this and, you know, I'm greatly appreciative of him for stepping up and sort of shepherding this process along.

And with that sort of buildup, I'm going to turn it over him to talk about possible new gTLD transfer process and where we go from here. So over to you, (Tom).

(Tom): Thank you, Marc. Yes. Welcome back to the very fun topic of a new possible process. I think one thing we should point out is that we are living with a temp spec and we need to change the transfer process as it is written in policy today.

The exercise we're (unintelligible) is to come up with a process but none of us have any ideas of how that will ever get into policy. Nevertheless before we go into that process, we should have a very good picture in our minds of what we want, and that's why we had the meeting at the GDD in Vancouver earlier this year. And out of those two sessions, there was a picture formed, which we debated in various groups, and this is what I now came up with a written draft outline the thinking of the group at that time.

So though we don't have to go through the whole Google Doc, you're happily invited to do that but we're not going to do that now for the sake of staying on time and doing some work, what we're going to do now is I run you through the process very shortly.

You can ask the questions so in case there's something you didn't understand or you want to add, you can do that, and then we're going to split up into four groups and work on a couple of topics that came up during the review of the initial document. And then we will reconvene and then I think all those groups can report on what they - where they're at on this topic, and then I would basically put that on paper again and we go into the next iteration.

So as you can see, this is a very lively process. It lifts from what you put into the process and so please participate. That would be my ask. Okay, so how the process works is that we said at the GDD that it should always start with a domain owner and the losing registrar. So that'd be the domain owner saying, "Well, please give me a transfer token" and the losing registrar is setting the transfer token as a registry. And as we define it now, it's setting some kind of...

Marc Anderson: (Tom)?

(Tom): Yes?

Marc Anderson: Can you move the mic closer here?

(Tom): For me? Is that better? Okay. Cool. All right. So once the domain owner asks for the - goes to the losing registrar and asks for a transfer token, the losing registrar saying, "Yes, I'm going to give you one," and the new thing here is that he is going to attach a TTL. That means that token has only a certain lifetime. It's not set currently what that lifetime will look like and whether that will be hours, days or months or whatever, and it's not really set how the token will look like.

It could look exactly like today and we could use exactly the same process or not. That's for the sake of writing a very high level document. I even stayed away from calling it auth-code or whatever. We can go back to that, you

know, as part of the discussion we'll have later on but for the sake of keeping that fairly high level I took that name.

So then the losing registrar is setting the transfer token at the registry. The registry is doing exactly what they use currently. They say, "Yes, the token has been sent." At that instant the losing registrar can communicate the transfer token and the TTL to the domain owner. The domain owner takes the transfer owner, goes to the gaining registrar and says, "Well, here's my transfer token." The gaining registrar is taking the token. He's going to the registry and the registry is making a check whether this transfer token is correct or not.

And if it is correct, the process is processed immediately. Currently it's not processed immediately. Currently the losing registrar has five days' time to actually (Ack) it and if it's not act, it's auto (Ack). So that one of the biggest asks in the room at the GDD. That is very complicated to tell customers to wait another five days or not wait five days or go to their old registrar and make him do something.

So everybody thought that's not very customer friendly and domain names are complicated enough, so there was a general feeling in the room that we definitely need to improve this aspect of the transfer process. So the transfer is processed immediately and the gaining registrar is informed and the gaining registrar can then inform the domain owner everything is done. There are already a couple of ccTLDs registries out there that do it that way so it's nothing new. It's just new to the gTLD process.

Another thing that's very important here is if the transfer the processed, there's no owner data copied. So currently the process as it stands, the domain object is basically passed on with the owner object to the registrar and the registrar an update it. We believe that since the gaining registrar is already having the data of the new domain owner, it doesn't make any sense

and the transfer of the data is not GDPR compliant. That's why we can't do it anyway. So the process as we have is not working.

So I want to get a bit more into the topic of the TTL because that's new. All the other stuff is fairly standard. The TTL is the concept where we would leave it with a losing registrar to manage that. So it's not managed at the registry level. There are a couple of ccTLDs that do it at the registry level but this is new to gTLD registrars, and to ease the burden of potential implementation, we said, "Well, we'll do it at the registrar. Registrar is easy." But that has the caveat that's not transparent.

So it is on behalf of the registrar to say, "I set a TTL," and the idea is that if the TTL expires, the registrar is basically setting a new token, which he may or not pass on to the domain owner. So there're always, as a standard of describing it, there must always be an auth-code and if you use auth-codes they can be a situation where there's none. So once a TTL expires, he should actually talk to the customer and say, "Oh, the TTL is expired. Do you want to have a new transfer?" And then he can reinitiate it.

And what happens if the TTL expires and the token is overwritten, the domain owner cannot use the old token. This is a security feature and I think it's very good because just relying on a password is a bit weak and here we're really, really, really improving the process. We just have to make sure that it cannot be gamed.

Another slight issue we're going to talk about later is whether how a losing registrar how we can actually - whether he should, to start with, or can, if he can, to verify the transfer request. So in the old process, that happens after the transfer has been initiated. So it comes to the registrar and the - he can issue an FOA2.

Here we could think about the FOA2 in the very beginning, or something in that style. That would have the benefit of not changing a lot of the policy

language around. The question is more whether it should be mandatory for the registrar to do it, so he needs to send out emails communication in whatever kind, shape or form, or not. That's another point of discussion we will go through later on.

Okay. So that's the process. Too fast? More questions?

(Roger): This is (Roger). One thing I'll bring up is I think the TTL being registrar controlled is great. I'm guessing policy's not going to like that. I don't think many of the non-contracted parties constituency groups will like that, and mostly just because of consistency. A thousand registrars could have for a .com a thousand different TTLs, and that'll be hard to explain to a customer that's registering at two different registrars, "Okay, you get 30 seconds with this one or three months with this one."

So I'm guessing when we take this to the next level and try to push this to try to get it into policy, we'll get pushback there. And for the registries in the room, I'm guessing that they're going to be asked to take this on so that it's consistent. So. Thanks.

(Shari): (Shari) from MarkMonitor. We'd just like to echo that. We think it should be controlled by the registries and not the registrars.

(Tom): Yes. This is one of the points of discussion for later on. I have absolutely no hard feelings around that. You know, if you ask me personally I would rather cede to the registries out of consistency reasons. If it comes to TTL having different times, I think we need to define a certain setting anyway, you know? So even here if you leave with the registrars then we can say, "Okay, it is in the minimum of a day and a maximum of 15." That's what the document is stating currently, but that was just put out for discussion. So I don't personally care.

Any other questions or comments?

(Dave McBane): Yes. This is (Dave McBane). I was just wondering could you outline I guess the use case we're trying to solve with the TTL, kind of like why we're implementing that I guess. I mean I understand for the good housekeeping perspective but like is there - has there been a string of problems that has led to this?

(Tom): Do you want to answer that or...?

Jody Kolker: I could answer that, sure. This is Jody. I mean the reason that we wanted to have a TTL is because customers will do things that are not good, like they'll leave their password in their email account for three years and suddenly someone breaks into their account, email account, finds a password, goes to the domain and then transfers the domain away. That's really what we're trying to get rid of. I mean the auth-token is given in plain text and email. Emails get hacked and then suddenly they're losing a domain. That's why we wanted to put a definite you've got this long to transfer this domain away. If you don't do it during that time, you can get a new one, I mean.

(Dave McBane): I guess from that -- and I'm sorry, this is (Dave McBane) again -- I guess from that perspective I mean just as easily we could re-lock the domain like after a certain time period or something like that. And I guess, I don't know, I'm just trying to kind of understand like kind of what's led us to implementing this specific feature.

But if we're saying it's from a security standpoint and we need to have like, you know, a rigid structure in place, I do agree that imposing that at the registrar definitely is going to be a better protection, if that's what we're looking to do. But I'm - you know, in just speaking with I guess our compliance department, we haven't seen any cases where this would have prevented like a domain hijacking. So I guess I do want to, you know, make sure that as a group we're agreeing that this is actually necessary and actually going to solve some problems.

(Roger): This is (Roger). Yes and I think that, again, a nice security feature, like you said. It's a great additional security feature. And one of the things that there was discussion around is the old transfer process before GDPR included some FOAs, both from the gaining and losing registrars, that basically got confirmation from the registrant or admin contact that, yes, we want to transfer it. With GDPR that disappeared. We couldn't do those things anymore.

And again, I think it's been proven that it makes sense to - it's not needed. Transfers can still happen. And to you point, I don't know that we've seen anything like that either. It's just one additional layer that would help out if something did happen.

(Tom): Yes, and adding to that is that it is a very great feature for communication towards the customer. So if you can tell them you have to do that now in the next five days or you have a window of five hours, whatever, you know, if you're talking about very important domain names, you don't want to set something and leave it stand there forever.

You know, if you have a high profile name, maybe you as a customer wish to only have a window of two hours to execute it. And it's very good for that purpose. Whether we will realize that with a lock or any other means, you know, is still up for discussion, you know. We can do that. We don't need to reinvent the wheel. So this is more the basic concept.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson. I'll just, you know, sort of piggyback a little bit on what (Roger) said with the changes that went in for the temporary specification, I think maybe there was some criticism or some concern within the community that the transfer process is now somehow less secure. And so I think, you know, it's just something, you know, I think, you know, to your point, you know, has there been an actual problem?



I don't know that we're aware of any problems, at least not within this group, but sort of something to be aware of is maybe the perception that the transfer process is less secure. And something we need to keep in mind as we're developing recommendations for a future policy is make sure we address what sort of concerns that the transfer process is somehow less concern. Make sure there's a comfort level that it is secure movement forward.

(Roger): This is (Roger). And we'll get in - this will be one of the topics we break out into but I would just - whoever's going to discuss that, I would think about the lock situation and that seems to reuse some other feature, where this is more specific to actually a transfer was requested and it expired.

If you lock it, then you have to go through and say, okay, why was it locked and, you know, why was it unlocked and why was it locked, because you're going to do those for different reasons, where this auth-code, this password, whatever we're going to call it, is only for a transfer. So it's more specific. Just - and again, whoever talks about that in the group, it's just something to think about.

(Tom): Any other questions before we move forward? Yes?

(Chris): (Chris), .news. From a customer, meaning domain name owner perspective, I don't like the ID to go to the losing registrar to get my token because he will not be the one that I will deal with afterwards anymore. As a registry we always see issues with that point because he's losing the contract, he's losing his customer so he's not really willing to help the domain name holder. How are you going to deal with that?

(Tom): This is another point of discussion we're having but just to make that very clear, this is already the case. So you have to get your auth-code from your old registrar. So it's not changing anything in that process, just that we cut out all those FOA process in the very beginning, which you can't do out of GDPR reasons anymore. But you could try to think that problem.

Yes, but there was a discussion and general feeling around that that we don't want to involve registries into the process of communication between us and the customer. So there are a couple registries that say every transfer is going through us and we talk to the customer. This is something we had on our list and was debated and the feeling of the room was that we should stay away from that.

(Roger): This is (Roger). And I think that's a very valid point and I think it needs to be talked about is that still has to be solved, because it will happen and some registrar is not going to be playing fairly. Then there has to be a mechanism around that. What that is I don't know. And again, I would caution registries taking on that responsibility, as they don't have a contract with any registrant. So they don't - and again, how it happens if a rogue registrar is not compliant, that's going to be an issue, and I think that's one of the big things to talk about is how do you get around that when that happens, because it will.

(Tom): There are standard solutions for that already. (Zoe), can you go to the next slide, please? So because it is a conversation we should have been but I would love to actually have a couple more people than the usual suspects on that and what you can see here, you know, is that I think that's number three, you know, what happens if the losing registrar's not responding, you know? That is definitely a point we need to solve and, yes, we definitely should make a better job than any under the old regime. So that's up for discussion.

And if we don't have any more process questions or how it works, if that is clear, what I would like to use the time and, okay, jump into these questions. So I would say like five more questions if there are any and then we would do the breakout sessions. (Christian)?

(Christian): This is (Christian). Just one question to the other slide that was not involving TTL, just the gaining registrar shouldn't they send a registrant contact to the registry as well since you say no data transfer is sent back?

(Tom): Yes, so what...

(Christian): Because we need to know who the registrant is.

(Tom): Right. So if the - that's what we have to do already with the current process that we tell the registry this will be the domain object and the owner object for that domain name. It will not transfer the old one because then we would transfer data between two parties who don't necessarily need that data, and this is exactly what is prevented by GDPR. But yes, the gaining registrar needs to tell the registry who owns the domain name after the transfer.

And there is a rule that with any new domain registration, if the owner is new that you have to go through the regular process of sending them an email and making sure that email is working. No, it's a verification process. It's a new one.

All right. So there are the four questions. We have found a couple of people to help me actually run these breakout sessions. So number one, who's responsible for the transfer token and TTL handling processing? Is it a registry, is it registrar? Could be a shared burden? I don't know. It's very interesting. I personally believe that we will see pushback from the greater community if we leave it at the registrar level but on the other hand it would be the easiest way how to implement it.

So there we have Jody. So who's interested in talking about that topic, you know, please group around Jody. Can you say who you are, Jody, so people know? Yes, that's Jody. Okay.

And then the second point of discussion we will have: should the transfer check of the losing registrar be mandatory or optional? So this is trying to solve the FOA2 situation where we say, okay, does the registrar need to go through any process or can he say, well, no my customer he gets the auth-

code right away or do we need to send him an email and document something? We don't know yet but (Sarah) really wants to go after that. So if anyone has strong feelings, please go with (Sarah).

Then the third one is do we need a process in case the losing registrar is not responding? This is something with me. That's my point. So if you want to talk about that, come to me.

And then the fourth one is a lot of things about the possible values of the TTL, whether we need to come up with a policy or best practice to define it a bit more, and then that should be some discussion around the term, the terminology, whether we should stick with transfer token, which would be very specific to the very specific process, or whether we should call it the auth info or whatever. If you're interested in that topic, (Cheryl) - (Shari), sorry, will lead that discussion.

And there is a fifth topic that came up and that is whether we can have something like an expedited transfer reversal process. I love that but I think that will be very difficult. It's not in the policy currently and if we want to do something, it's a more topic for policymaking than for this group. It has no - it has technical implications but before we talk about that, I think we need to have a policy discussion around that, whether this is something we really want and then we have to put it in the policy and then enact it. So this is not a current topic.

Okay. So we have now another hour. I would like to dedicate like 40 minutes and, say, to 11:40 for the group sessions and then we reconvene and let's see -- yes, maybe 11:45 -- and then reconvene and we - every group can talk about the outcome. Let's do it.

No, we don't have any whiteboards or something, so we have to kind of do it manually.

Woman: We're trying to get whiteboards.

(Tom): Cool. Thank you. Happy work.

Marc Anderson: So can we get session leaders to remind everybody again? So, (Sarah), you're doing transfer check.

(Sarah): Yes.

Marc Anderson: Jody, you have TTL?

Jody Kolker: TTL.

Marc Anderson: (Tom), you have process if losing, you know, number three. And (Cheryl)? (Shari). It's (Tom)'s fault. Possible values, right? So I don't know if we just want to go to the four corners I guess and pick your group.

Man: Go to your corners.

Marc Anderson: Go to your corners. I guess I'll just pick - if anybody's on the phone, we're going to breakout sessions for the next 45 minutes. So I think if you're on the phone, it won't be - we'll - you won't be able to follow but we'll come back for summaries and recaps in 45 minutes. Thank you.

Hey everyone, this is Marc. This is just a ten-minute time check. So you have ten minutes until we circle back to the full group.

Well this is Marc again. This is two-minute warning.

This is Marc again. I hate to break up group four over there but we have 20 minutes until we have a hard stop for lunch, so if we could bring it back for...

Man: We're solving world problems.

Marc Anderson: Okay. Hello everyone. This is Marc Anderson again. And if anybody's listening on the line we are coming back from our breakout sessions and I'm going to turn it over to (Tom), who I believe we're going to walk through reports from each of the breakout sessions. So, (Tom), I'll turn it over to you again.

(Tom): Thank you, Marc. Yes. And without any further ado, we'll just jump into the reporting of breakout sessions. So, Jody, if you are prepared, it would be beautiful if you would share your thoughts.

Jody Kolker: Sure. Can you guys hear me? This is Jody. And we had three registrars and one registry so I think you can tell where our conversation went to on who's responsible for the TTL. But actually we talked through this a lot and it seems like this is a security policy and, you know, if it's going to be a security policy, it should probably be stored at the registry - for the registry to do and then it could become more of a standardized.

Now the problem with doing that, we talked through a couple of things like then EPP would have to change because you have to send a TTL and what (Dave) brought up was well why not have it be a standard, similar to what we have with the (Ack) and the auto-(Ack). It's a five-day period, right?

So the TTL shouldn't have to be sent to the registry. It would be a policy basically that, you know, it gets changed every five days - or not, I'm sorry. I didn't say that right. Once a transfer code is requested or changed I should say, when the password is changed by the registrar, then five days later, or X number of days, have it automatically updated at the registry.

One of the things we also talked about then was would a request - would registrars want a pull request or a pullback to say that the registrar or that the auth-code had changed? I think that's up for debate too on whether one is needed or not. But one of the problems that we came with is that in order for

the registry to do this, or for all registries to update this, they're going to want this to be a policy. And in order for it to be a policy, it's going to have to go through a PDP development, an IRT, and this is going to take years to have this done, it seems, because the registries will want ICANN's blessing on that.

So in light of that, we talked in the short term maybe the best thing that we could do is to have a document of best practices of how to deal with or what registrars should actually implement. And (Tobias) left us, so I can talk about him all day long. What (Tobias) had mentioned is that they've generally implemented some of these already and if registrars would be willing to do that, you know, we should put out best practices, for instance, if an auth-code is requested, put a TTL on it yourself as the registrar to have it expire in five, fifteen, or ten days.

But one of the problems with that is, you know, we can put the best practices out there, but there are 1,000 registrars and every registrar will - may implement it differently and some may not implement it at all. I don't know if I got that right, (Dave). Okay.

(Tom): Thank you, Jody. So the question is what do we do with that input now, so we can in some way put it into writing. And I think at some point we need to - because all these points are very crucial to the process. I think we need to go through a process of saying, okay, this is feasible. We need policy. If we go down that way, it will look like this. So we can define things and make it - I mean this will end up in policy anyway so we need to go through some kind of policy process.

So we could define things like registrar can follow the best practice and we can even say we will form policy around the best practices, not expect anybody to say, okay, you have to have that. The easiest way would definitely be the five days for the registries, where we say, okay, after five

days, you know, we have that check and so we don't need to set anything. And at that point it's up to the registry.

So I think we - what we should do is boil it down to a couple of options we have and then put them in the document, and that at some point in time decide on how to move forward with it. That's the only idea I have for how to get out of this issue. What do you think? That's...?

Jody Kolker: Yes, I agree. I think it would be best to have this documented somewhere on what we believe it should run and, you know, I think that a best practices document would be great. And, you know, I think if registrars are in agreement that, you know, I don't think there would be any harm in that at all. I think it'd be good, and to be able to have it listed somewhere. I don't know whether that would be on the ICANN website somewhere or how we would do that. IETF, you know, a best practices doc.

(Tom): I wouldn't know. Okay. Anyone, any comments, any questions? We're not having a lot of time and we still need to go through three other groups. So I will definitely document all that input and put it into the document so we can read it and debate it from there on. It will be - now the easy stuff is basically done, it's now the hard stuff comes.

Okay, number two, should the transfer check of the losing registrar be mandatory or optional? (Sarah)?

(Sarah): Yes. Hello. This is (Sarah). I'm just working with (Zoe) to see how I can get our work up on this screen. Okay. Just give me one sec to share the Google sheets with her. There are two.

Marc Anderson: Do we want to - (Tom), could we go out of order while (Sarah) gets that to (Zoe)?



(Tom): Is it working now? So number three - (Zoe), how much more time do you need? Okay. So jumping to number three until we can resolve the number two thingy. So do we need a processing in case the losing registrar is not responding? Should there be a ccTLD-like registry involvement? Initial thinking of the group was oh, God, no.

And we talked about it should be a compliance process because it already is a compliance process and it's more or less an edge case anyway. Then we talked about, well, if compliance - are we really trusting compliance to do a good job on that? And so we went back to the registry just to figure out if registries very often don't even the data so they couldn't even do the job. So VeriSign currently as it stands is not having the data so how would they ever verify anything? And with GDPR they would have an issue as well of actually getting data. So there's no good reason for them to actually get it.

So we circled back to the compliance team and there we said, well, if everyone can file a random request, we can run into an issue as to someone who is behaving bad can file all sorts of requests and bombard a registrar and he never heard of that and he's producing a lot of work.

So there should be a complaint about transfer not getting the token that should be initiated through the gaining registrar and there should be certain documentation the registrar should get, and then there should be the rule that registrars should try to sort it out first with the losing registrar because there are transfer contacts in the whatever ICANN (unintelligible) thing is called. Yes, thank you.

And if he has proved that he can't sort it out then we believe the losing registrar's already in compliance in some way and then compliance has to step in and look after it. We don't know how that process would look like or should look like, and it could be very complicated, but we think this is the only way how we can fix it, because bringing the registry into the thing will just not work out of many, many, many reasons.

So our thinking is that we're going to write our discussion down basically and all the things we kind of looked into so we don't have to have the same conversation twice, and then we're going to attach it to the main document and then we can basically, at some stage, vote on it or something to see whether this idea to attach it to compliance as a small specific process is working or not.

Okay. Number four, (Shari)?

(Shari): Thank you. So we had a large group over here that consisted of registries and registrars and a variety of client base too, so I think we had good representation. With regard to the first item, possible values, we came up with no more than 14 days. So this would give everyone what they needed within that timeframe. And then with that, we also wanted that to be done in a number of hours of days as the integer. So it'd be the number of hours within the days.

Then on the second one, we definitely need a best policy practice around transfer tokens. We don't want to set these requirements so that they are too rigid but some of the things that we discussed was uniqueness. We need to add in there which characters can be included but we didn't want to get too limited to where we were requiring people to have - we just want to be careful with our requirements.

And then with the third, we do need the definition and we kind of had two different views on this. We really think in discussions internally we need to use auth-info, because that's the EPP term so it translates well. And then the other discussion around that was using transfer key because the word key we feel translates to different languages more so than code or token.

(Tom): Thank you. (Sarah), are you ready?

(Sarah): We are. Thank you. So I worked with a small group that represents both registry and registrars and we actually modified the section of the policy that we were looking at. Thank you, (Zoe), for putting it up on screen. So we have suggested text changes, which I think if you're in the Adobe Connect on your laptop you'll be able to embiggen it so that you can actually read the copy. We want the other one first though.

So we've got suggested text and then those are the notes on the suggested text. That's the other one though. We - the first - there were two documents and we want the first one first. Yes. My goodness. I'm sorry.

All right. So let's go through the notes first. We think it's important to allow that other parties besides the registrant can also request and receive the code. There are many valid use cases for that scenario; however, it must be verified appropriately because that's a significant security risk. Also in order to help ensure that if another person does request the code, the registrant it not surprised by the transfer, we want to see that the registrant is notified of the transfer and has the option to cancel it.

So that's similar to current process but it become a may rather than a must. We do see a necessity that they must verify the request, the registrar must do that. Now it could be as simple as something where they log into the account and just by logging in that counts as verification or it could be something more complex, but something has to happen to make sure that the request is valid. And we should keep in mind that this may be audited in the future as FOAs were in the past. So that's not a new burden.

We changed from - in the text we've changed from an FOA2 style request to notification just so that we know the FOA's really not required. It doesn't need to be that template. The notification could be even a text message or something. (Zoe), do you need the link again? Okay. Thank you.

Now we don't want that the policy should require registrars to notify their registrants of their transfer policy at the time of registration, similar to how they must notify about the renewal policy, the redemption process. That should be something customers understand upfront.

We do have this point of uncertainty. We're not fully comfortable with providing the code to a verified requester other than the registrant. But as we said, it is a use case that happens and we need to recognize, you know, different types of registrants. So we're okay with this as long as it goes hand in hand with an expedited reversal process. I know that's sort of an open question right now. I think that's important.

If we don't have this expedited reversal process than our group would go back to only providing the token to the registrant, which is - I mean that's the point of view I came in with and then now I'm a bit more leaning towards other parties options as well. But we do need that reversal process.

And then finally we'd like to see, or at least discuss, requirements for a notification to the registrant at the time when the request is made. So that is a new requirement, but I think it's important to make sure that the registrant knows the transfer is going to happen because of that third party option, and we could see removing this if only the registrant can request the code. So those are our notes, and we'll just look at the changed policy now.

(Tom): Thank you, (Sarah). Very interesting thoughts, all of them. So my suggestion would be that I collect all that input. I put into the document and then we, well, publish it again and go from there. So I think the next time we talk about it in our Tech Ops group calls and the, well, certainly the next GDD. I personally still have not even an idea how we can ever transform that into a living process but following the EPD they don't even know how to go forward with a regular process.

(Sarah): If they can do it, we can do it.

(Tom): So we still have a bit of time. Sorry?

(Sarah): If they can do it, we can do it.

(Tom): Oh yes, definitely. I'm not too sure whether they can do it. Okay, so that brings us to the end of the session. Thank you for joining. Thanks for participating and as soon as I have time I'll draft a new document and, yes, we go from there. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, (Tom). Thank you - sorry. Go ahead.

(Roger): Yes. This is (Roger). I'd make a suggestion that we take the current transfer policy and change it to what we want it to see. And I would say that that's the document we should really work from. Just go out to the ICANN website, take the transfer policy and mark it up the way we want it. I think that's something that we can use, plus it'll communicate well.

(Tom): Yes. But before we do that we need to work on figuring out what we want. And for that, this ICANN policy document isn't very handy. So I agree that would be very good - is a very good methodology to actually move forward once we want to put it in front of ICANN but before that most people will be scared away looking at this policy. We all do it, I know, you know, but it will be very complicated. So let's still with the regular document until we figure out what we want and have consensus around it, and then we can do exactly that. That's a very good suggestion. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: Okay. Great. Thank you. Again, thank you, (Tom), for, you know, taking the lead on this one. Thank you to all our session leaders and everybody who participated. We do have our lunch break now. It'll be an hour and a half, so we'll be picking this back up at 1:30 local time and we're going with - what's our next topic?

Man: (Unintelligible) transition.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. So picking up at 1:30. We have registry transition and registry mapping, and so we'll pick back up with that topic at 1:30. Hope to see you all then. Thank you very much.

END