
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Thursday, 10 November 2022 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/allFDQ>

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 Thursday, the 10th of November 2022.

For today's call, we have apologies from Theo Geurts (RrSG), Catherine Merdinger (RrSG), Prudence Malinki (RrSG), and James Galvin (RySG). They have formally assigned Jothan Frakes (RrSG), Jody Kolker (RrSG), Rich Brown (RrSG), and Beth Bacon (RySG) as their alternates for this call and for remaining days of absence.

As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google Assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails. All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Alternates not replacing a

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.

member should not engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom Room functionalities. If you have not already done so, please change your chat selection from host and panelist to everyone in order for all participants to see your chat and so it's captured in the recording.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. Recordings will be posted to the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone, to our second meeting of the week. Just a reminder, we're trying to keep this pace going through the end of the year. With holidays and stuff, it actually doesn't work out quite that well. But just a reminder that we have 10 more, I think, meetings this year after today's meeting. Our goal is to complete our review of the public comments by that time. So that's about all I had, I think.

The one update we had talked Tuesday about, a proposal for Recommendation 2 that would pull back the losing FOA. So we're still working on that. Again, it's just a proposal to the working group. We should be able to provide that sometime soon, hopefully next week, so everybody can take a look at it and we

can get that discussion completed on Recommendation 2. But until then we'll go on to the other recommendations and make progress on those.

The only other thing is every meeting we try to give any of the stakeholder groups a chance to speak if they have anything from their teams on anything that they've talked about or discussed over the past weeks or days. I know that we're meeting more frequently now so it may be less of an intervention than it used to be. But if there's any stakeholder groups that want to mention anything that they've been talking about that they want to bring forward in the group to discuss or just didn't know, I'll open the floor up to anyone. Okay. I think that's about it. Then I think we can jump into our work and we can jump into where we left off on Recommendation 3 on Tuesday.

I think we were—yeah. Thank you. We talked about this just for a couple of minutes at the very end of the call last time. It's suggesting maybe some wording around—I think this is what this is getting at—if e-mail is used, not providing the TAC in that e-mail, but providing the link to a secure mechanism. I think a lot of registrars do this today. But I think the question is should this be mandatory where we're basically saying, "Don't send the TAC in an e-mail or an unsecured e-mail." Obviously, in a secure e-mail, it would be fine. But the question is do we add language that says if it's an unsecured e-mail, they'll provide the TAC and provide a link to a secure method. Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: If you are considering the last mile between the registrant and the resellers, there is no secure communication. The most of the communication is going via e-mail. Most of the registrants didn't check a website for domains every day. They get notified by e-mail by their company who is doing the work for them. So if we do it as a mandatory requirement, we will move out about 80% of the registrants.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Lutz. Other comments on that? To Lutz's intervention, but again, I think that a lot of registrars today are doing this. I think the question comes down to does it make sense to mandatory. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Obviously, the person's e-mail account would have a password on it. I'm still hesitant about making this change or requiring the TAC not to be provided by e-mail. We've been doing it by e-mail for years now. Do we have a lot of TAC stuff? I thought we haven't found evidence of a lot of problems around this. I mean, I guess there's issues around man-in-the-middle attacks, but this seems like a change that would be a real disruption to a user's experience and I'm not sure that it's balanced by the security that it provides. I'm just not sure. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. A good point on how does it really affect. Is it a solution looking for a problem? Obviously, it seems like, yes, it's more secure if it's done this way. But to your point, is that solving

an issue that doesn't actually exist today? Or if does it exist, it's a minimal impact. Thoughts, others on that? Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Roger. Rick Wilhelm, Registries, but primarily wearing that 9154 author hat here. So it's essentially a password for domain. The group needs to decide—it was there in the RFC because sending around passwords and letting this kind of data which we're saying is security information, having that rattling around and being in someone's e-mail and available for compromise is not good security practice any more than a registrar—I'm sure there's no registrars within earshot that would do an account reset by sending a new password through the e-mail to the registrar's account. None of the registrars I'm sure on the on the call do that sort of thing. So this is sort of in line with that kind of a situation. I mean, some of this also would go in concert with other things that might be done regarding other things related to security as well as rollback and things like that. But that's the reason why the language is in there because to have essentially a password for a domain be sitting in someone's e-mail and send around to an e-mail is not a good way to do that, again, as people here within earshot now. That's all. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. Thanks for that perspective on why it's in 9154. Again, I think it gets down to what Sarah was kind of bringing up is that balance. It provides a higher security level. And to what ends I think is the balancing act of trying to figure out mandatorily making this across the board on every transfer, every

TAC provision, or to the fact of is there a huge issue that we're solving here. To Sarah's point, we've never identified that this is a big problem, but even solving small problems is a good thing from that perspective. But are we creating more of a barrier from today's world to tomorrow's world, not just for registrars. It's more at the registrant's convenience. Again, you're balancing the convenience versus the security.

Any other thoughts? Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN:

Hi. On this matter, registrars have been sending EPPs for years now and it has not been—or TAC's EPP. Sorry, I haven't been around a while. But that has never really been the source of a theft. Yes, attackers have accessed the e-mail accounts of people who had a TAC in their account. But that's a different vector than having the TAC sent to them directly. Also, in order to request the TAC, you have to have a secure connection to make that request. You have to log into your account at the registrar through your reseller or what have you. There's already a secure check at the beginning. Third, in order to make this change, it will require new systems at all registrars. Considering that this has never really been an issue until it was brought up recently, is this worth the change? I don't think it is. But that's my take on it. Back to you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rich. Again, I think that it does boil down to that. Are we solving a problem? I mean, as Rick mentioned, it's in 9154 and there's logical reasons and security reasons for it. But does

that override? Rich mentions, yes, there would have to be registrar system changes. But really, it's also a registrant change because they're used to that so you had to educate the registrant. If you were doing it that way, then you won't be doing that and they have to do something different. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Sure, Roger. Just real briefly. The document 9154 doesn't speak about the resellers. The thing said the registrar's interface for communicating with the registrant must be over an authenticated encrypted channel. So the document doesn't try it. The RFC doesn't try to address the reseller channel. While I see where Richard is coming from, I think it might be a little bit of an overstep to say that everybody's going to have to change their systems, because there's probably somebody that is not sending the Auth-Info Codes through e-mail right now. But the 9154, it doesn't make any requirements on resellers. It just says registrars, for what it's worth. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: On the text we are reading here is that the authorization information the registrant must be over. So we are not talking about the registrar. We are talking about the last mile of the communication. This includes the reseller and registrant. Up to the final point, we need to have this if we take these words seriously.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Lutz. Okay. Any other? Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. This is Emily from staff. I just wanted to clarify one thing about the text you're seeing in front of you so that it's absolutely clear. So the comment here in the first paragraph from the proposed edit is indeed a summary of what the ICANN Org comment stated and it does quote directly from the RFC here. The suggested text and the strawman revision are based on the ICANN Org comment. This does not mean that this is the edit that the working group would need to make if it wanted to incorporate the suggestion. So of course, the recommendation could be modified in any way that the group saw fit to incorporate the suggestion either. So here, this is the existing language with the suggested new language from Org in red. But of course, a different formulation based on the working group's assessment could also be used, certainly. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay, any other comments, suggestions, thoughts on the strawman? It sounds like the group is thinking that this should not be a mandatory requirement. That's at least what I'm getting. That the addition here, what's in red is red is ... Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Just briefly, to elaborate on something I put into the chat. What happens here is somewhat related to what happens with the action/mechanism currently known as the losing FOA. Because right now, if someone manages to lose control of their e-mail account and there is that mechanism for the losing FOA that might have something in there to put a pause after they lose control of the TAC. But if we consider things like the security, looking at them in isolation is extraordinarily difficult because you tend to make more local optimizations rather than sort of seeing how they all fit together. I think before we come back and come around to make conclusions on this, we should look at the security things as they all interlock. So I think that'd be worth doing. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN: I just wanted to mention and I think I've said it a couple of times now, customers' e-mail accounts are going to get compromised. It's just a universal fact. We can't solve for that. But I think we've ran into this multiple times. I personally feel we're going to make no progress if we keep coming back to the argument, "Well, if a customer's e-mail account is compromised, all bets are off." And thus, we have to change the policy XYZ to fit that. Unfortunately, it's just too big a variable to write policy on. Just a statement on that. So that's all I got to say on that point. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rich. Okay. If there's no other comments, I think that the group has—again, thanks to Rick for identifying what 9154, what the intent there was. But it sounds like the group does not think that this red language should be mandatory. So I think that we can move on from this one. Again, if people want to voice opinions, the mailing list is great to do it on. If something new comes up, we can bring it back up. But it sounds like the group does not want to head down that path and making it mandatory.

So let's go ahead to F. Okay. So this is a change from a "may" to a "must". I think our language already says that it can be sent. It may be sent in English as well. And the suggestion is that the "may" become a "must" in 3.1. Thoughts on that? I don't know specifically but I'm guessing this came from Compliance on this, just to make it easier so that they can work this without any need for translation. Again, I think it's simple may to a must. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I just wanted to clarify that this was not a comment from Org. I believe this was a comment from—I'll go back to the review tool and check it. But it was not an Org comment. I think the purpose of the comment was basically because the losing FOA and sort of other standard communications around the transfer process currently are communicated in English as a primary language as a standard. So the idea here is that it would be consistent with what already exists in the policy. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Yeah, Rich. Rich in chat. What I was kind of thinking. The important part, I think, is what we already captured in 3.1 and that it needs to go in whatever language the Registration Agreement is in. Making it may or must, as Sarah said, I don't know that I had either way on that. I think that it makes sense. As Emily described, some of the communications has to be in English. So, making the must here to me make sense. So I would support changing that to a must. Again, open up any comments, suggestions, disagreement. Okay. Your comment is purposeful and fairly easy, small change. So I think changing into a must make sense. So we can move on. Again, just like any other thing, if people disagree, please, please use the list and it can be brought back up. Emily is that a new hand?

EMILY BARABAS: New hand. Thanks, Roger. I just want to speak to the next item before moving on. So the next comment was from the Registries and it's pointing to that area of confusion on this recommendation about the arrangement of some of the wording regarding what was the exact timing of the notice, so whether it's at the time of request or provision. And that language that we proposed up above with the implementation note, I believe addresses that issue. So essentially, just rearranging the words a little bit to make clear when this notification is actually being sent. So I welcome any input, whether that's not the case, but please take a look at that. Otherwise, I think that this comment is addressed. In which case, we can move on.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Maybe the red, anyone from the Registry, if they don't see that that handles it. Again, I think that when I read this the first time, I thought I saw it but it was pretty simple to agree with the comment and that I don't think the comment is about the time period as much as it is the words "provision" and "provide". But to Emily's point, I think that a few clarifications there can address that. Again, when I read it, I was like, "Oh, I understood it as fairly simple." But that's because we're all pretty deep in this. So it does come out that way. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Sure. Thanks. I'm not sure whether this is one that I find in Galvin's. Can you go back to that language? Yeah. The difference between provision and provide—provision is where it lives when it gets created at the registry at the TAC. And then provide would be—well, I'm not sure provide in reference to something else. But that was the meaning of the difference between provision, meaning where it's installed or the date that the registry database is updated, if that helps to kind of clarify the comment.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. I think that that's exactly right. I think provision being fairly more technical. I mean, we have a picture of what that looks like. And provide is being that actual distribution to the registrant or the requester outside of provision.

RICK WILHELM: Yes. Because there could be some difference between those two times for reasons that might locally make sense to the registrar.

ROGER CARNEY: Right, exactly. Thanks, Rick. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger, and thanks, Rick, for the clarification. I clearly did misunderstand the comments so I appreciate that you're on it. So does that mean that we should then rename the notification of TAC provision to be something else? And is there another word that can be used there that is more consistent with the concept? I believe that the point of reference here for this notice was about the moment that the registrar record is giving the TAC to the RNH or whoever receives the TAC. So is there another word we could use for that notification that would be more accurate and consistent with the intent? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. It's a good thing to catch because I guess I didn't even catch that part. I think, Rich, you have it right in chat there. So, Sarah, I think that obviously provision is the technical creating of it. As Rick mentioned, for some reason maybe there is a small delay or some kind of delay between when it's actually created and when it's actually provided to the registrant. Technically speaking, obviously, there's going to be some kind of delay but it can be fairly immediate. But I think that that's the point here. Should notification of TAC provision? I don't know. To me, it still sounds correct. I understand the confusion there. But it still sounds right. But open it up. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: What about the friendly amendment to notification of TAC issuance? Because provision is sort of one of those odd words in English that is both a verb and a noun, and to certain years, it might be difficult for something like that just get away. Just avoid the ambiguity by choosing a different word for after TAC, and so like notification of TAC issuance or something like that.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Thoughts on that? I see Sarah in chat there. Yeah, I see what you're getting at there, Sarah. I don't know if Rick's intervention there helps us. It sounds like it's better than the confusion of provision and provide. Come on, Sarah, you said every day. Okay, great suggestion, Rick. Let's use that. We'll say for that and see if that works out for everyone. And if not, again hit the list with concerns or suggestions of something better than provision and something better than issuance, if that's needed. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So I think what we're going to do is maybe also use the term issue then in this final part of the recommendation. So no later than 10 minutes after the registrar of record issues the TAC. I don't know if anyone has concerns about that. But we'll draft it up. That way, it'll all be consistent and in front of you. We're going to start putting those red lines directly into a version of the report so that people can see it in context as well. So thanks for that input.

Moving on to the last couple of comments under this section. There's a comment that is essentially about bulk transactions and trying to find ways to consolidate those. Recalling that the group has already talked quite a bit about bulk use cases and didn't ultimately come up with any recommendations, and did talk a little bit about consolidating notices and previously discovered that there's an opportunity to potentially consolidate notices of the transfer completion but that might be more challenging for the notification of TAC issuance. I think that this has pretty much been discussed and there's not something new being presented here. But obviously, please hop in if you think that that's incorrect. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. We did have some good discussion around this and what we came down to providing a TAC for each domain made sense. To me, I don't know. It's an interesting spin on Rick's 9154 intent. If a registrar sent an e-mail saying, "Hey, your TAC has been created, it points to one spot with 25 TACs." I don't know. It's kind of interesting to see that. Any comments on that? Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi. I think that we should be able to combine the notice if the notice recipient and contents of the message are the same but for multiple domain names. And indeed, 3.2 already has domain names with the optional plural. So that suggests to me that there's no reason why they can't be combined. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. Any other comments, questions on that? Again, I think it gets down to the mechanism of—what are we calling it? Issuance? As Sarah mentions here, it's interesting because it was already thought, obviously, by domain names, being plural here. So, to Sarah's point, I think we have wording in another recommendation that talks about consolidating. Maybe that's our next one, actually. That talks about that. Again, to Sarah's point, I don't know that we have to do that or add that language because we kind of already handled it in our recommendation.

Okay. Where are we at? H or something?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Roger. Before we move on, I just wanted to just confirm that it sounds like we're not going to modify the language of the recommendation because the fact that domain name has an optional plural there sort of indicates that there's a possibility of consolidating those notices where feasible. Is that correct?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, that is correct.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Thanks. The final recommendation on this topic is from the ICA and said that security best practices should be considered for inclusion in the Transfer Policy itself. So they become

requirements for registrars. And just recalling previous conversation about this, I think the group has previously discussed this idea to some extent. I think that previous discussions concluded with the fact that best practice protocols may not be an appropriate element of the Transfer Policy, but certainly there's an opportunity to discuss that further if folks want to do so. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Honestly, I think you hit it there. But I think that we did kind of go down this path. I think one of the things that pops into my mind was two-factor authentication. It's great for those registrars that do that but it's kind of the outside of the scope here. We changed the Auth-Info being whatever the registry wants to, something more standard. So, I think we did look at some of the—and I can't say best practices—but better security mechanisms and came to that conclusion. But just my thoughts. Emily, is that a new hand?

EMILY BARABAS: Old hand, sorry.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thank you. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger. So yeah, it's obviously been a while since the IC submitted this, but I can share some of the thinking that went into it just as a preliminary matter. I'm perfectly okay with not, of

course, including best practices in the Transfer Policy itself. But I guess the thinking that the time was that if the overall approach of the Transfer Policy in our work in this group is to leave room for registrars on an individual basis to implement security protocols that worked alongside the baseline requirements of the Transfer Policy. There is the potential room to include recommendations for registrars so that they can fill in these gaps or include additions to the baseline approach.

So just to give you one example, we all talked at length about how somebody gets into your registrar account, all bets are off, one on the record, and there's nothing we can do about that. But one of the recommendations outside of the four corners of the Transfer Policy, the best practices could be a recommendation to registrars to provide notification to a registrant when they're recorded e-mail address and their account has been changed or is about to be changed, something like that. There's many other examples of this.

So what I'm getting at here is that even if the working group properly doesn't mandate these things, it could be helpful for registrars to know. And I'm talking mainly in the smaller registrar about we're not requiring these things at the end of the Transfer Policy. But heck, you certainly should consider doing these things because the Transfer Policy itself doesn't address all security issues nor is it intended to. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Zak. I think that's the important thing. Obviously, the Transfer Policy is specifically scoped. The small team is kind

of working on that threat vector, what kind of falls into our realm and doesn't. And I think that getting into best practice or even suggestions is a great idea, just not for the transfer PDP itself. We need to stay focused here. Security at a whole level of best practices is a great idea and maybe something even the TechOps group can look at providing. To your point, Zak, maybe some smaller registrars don't even recognize or know some of the best better practices to use. But again, for the transfer PDP, I think that's out of scope for us, but definitely something that's community worthwhile.

Okay. Any other comments? Otherwise, I think we can move to Rec 4. I'll let Emily go through this real quick for us.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Roger. Let me just drop the link here for everyone into chat. This is the recommendation for the notification of transfer completion. I think we can zip through this pretty quickly because a lot of is similar to what we saw for Recommendation 3.

The first item is about the SLA that was proposed for the notification of transfer completion. Currently, the recommendation states a 24-hour SLA, so the notice must be sent within 24 hours of the transfer being completed. The proposal here is to make it much quicker, allowing the RNH to act more quickly if there's a problem. So here they suggested 10 minutes, consistent with the notification of TAC provision. That is, I think, not something that's specifically been discussed, making it quite a bit shorter, but perhaps something worth considering. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. To me, when we walked through these, it made sense that it was different and that the 10-minute is controlled by the registrar that process this. Once they have created the TAC and provided, they control that whole process where a completion actually goes through the registry as well. So to me, the SLA seemed appropriate and that the completion will be notified to the losing registrar via pull message. To me, the SLAs made sense. But obviously, the comment was written so we can see if anyone else has thoughts on that. Any comments along changing the completion SLA? Okay. I don't see a lot of support for it. Again, I think it makes sense because multiple parties are involved here. So I think that the difference seems logical to me. All right.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So our next comment is very similar to the one that was previously discussed about sending to additional contacts. So I think we can document the rationale here, and it seems like it's probably similar to the one for Recommendation 3 unless working group members think that there's something different about this use case that would require additional contacts to be provided with the notice. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. That does make sense. Does anybody have any issues with using that same logic from Rec 3 here? Okay, all right. Let's go on to C.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So similar to the feedback on the previous recommendation about the wording being structured in a way that's somewhat confusing. So we've created a strawman that essentially is a bit more clear in terms of the language and also suggested that consistent with the previous notice, it may be appropriate to also have some messaging around the use of privacy/proxy services. So we welcome feedback on whether that makes sense in this case as well. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I agree. I think this does help clarity-wise, the new language here. So any comments or questions on that, concerns about the strawman? Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I do not understand the reason for the deletion as listed in the registration data at the time of the transfer request. So that means that if somebody has attacking on transfer, he can change the data so that notifications can go to the intended attacker address.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Lutz. Emily, please go ahead. Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. Sorry about that. So the idea here is just that the structure of the recommendation as with the insertion was confusing and not that we're trying to change the intent of it, but to

include that phrase as an implementation note rather than in the sentence itself of the recommendation because it seems to be causing confusion from several readers. So the idea here is still that for the purposes of sending the notification, the registrar of record should use contact information as it was in the registration data at the time of the transfer request. So it's just moving the language into an implementation note instead of being in the first sentence of the recommendation itself. The intent is clarity and not to take away the requirement. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I think it was just readability that you get out of it. Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Moving the sentence make it from a must to a should. So it's optional.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Lutz. I see what you're saying. The must send the notification still is there. The should is still, when you look at it, it sounds optional but it's really not as optional as it sounds. You have to have reasons not to do it. I think that that's an important part of should. Should is not an optional thing. You have to provide reason why you're doing it. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I think it's more clear when it's in the actual recommendation. So I would rather undo the strikethrough and keep it as it was originally stated. I mean, the implementation note is not wrong, those things are the case. They can remain as is, or if we're undoing the strikethrough, could remove the first sentence of the red text also. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: So, Sarah, I think the issue is that the strikethrough's red, it's difficult to read. So are you suggesting maybe including the first sentence of the implementation note into the recommendation?

SARAH WYLD: No. Sorry, Roger. That was not what I was suggesting. I personally do not find the phrase that is crossed out to be difficult to read. I think it's fine. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Sarah. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. One more suggestion. Could we keep the struck out text, take this first sentence from the implementation note, make it a must and move it to the recommendation so make it a second sentence of the recommendation and make it a must? Would that address both Sarah's concern and Lutz's concern? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Yeah. That's what I was trying to suggest as well. I think that, Sarah, like you, it's not all that hard for me to read it but obviously it was for others. I'm wondering if it's easier just to say the same thing in another sentence inside the recommendation. Okay. Let's go ahead and do that, Emily, separate those. Again, I think all of us that are used to this language, it reads clean and clear. But to those others that are having a stumble through there, two sentences will help out. Okay. Let's move on to D.

EMILY BARABAS: So this item is also from ICANN Org. You'll recall that for Recommendation 3, ICANN Org suggested some additional elements to include in the notification. And here again, specifically the items that were suggested were a deadline for taking action, an element explaining the TAC, which wouldn't be applicable here, and required actions that registrars must take. So, potentially, for this notification of transfer completion, the group could, for example, suggest including the amount of time that the registrant has to initiate a TDRP. And to the extent that in phase two, there's some sort of reversal process. The timeline for that could also be included in this notice. I think that those are the elements that would specifically be applicable to this notice, but I encourage ICANN Org colleagues who are on this call and more involved in the comment to let me know if I'm misunderstanding. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. You highlighted the two that probably makes the most sense to discuss the timeline around TDRP and

the quick reversal if there's a timeline, obviously. Should those be included in here? Should we make that a mandatory inclusion in here, or maybe even an optional inclusion? Thoughts from the group on that?

Good ask there, Sarah. Maybe if we can get some text put together for that and so people can see what it actually looks like. Maybe that'll help us. Okay. Let's plan to do that. Thanks, Emily. Let's move on to E.

EMILY BARABAS:

The next item is similar to in the previous notice, this request to also include English as a language for the notification. It sounds like the group is in support of doing that. So unless there are comments on that, we can add that here as well.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. That makes sense. Anyone have any comments specifically about making it "must" in English? Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi. Thank you. I think we should make sure that our language requirements are ideally are the same for all required messages. I would rather see all the messages should be sent in the language of the agreement and English maybe, or maybe English as an option, but definitely they should all be the same. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks. Yeah, I think if we can keep them consistent, that makes sense. So I think that's good for E will be the same as what we have for Rec 3 as well. Okay. Move on to F.

EMILY BARABAS: So the final two comments are I think to be saved potentially for phase two and discussion about a fast undo or rollback procedure, and there are considerations to take into account there. So I assume that everyone has read those comments and is aware of them in the context of the discussions now but we're happy to pull those forward for when the time comes and make sure that they're raised again when rollback is discussed in phase two. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Obviously, we should be saving these and moving them forward because then we can talk about those. Okay. Anyone else? Thanks, Sarah. Thanks, Eric. Okay. So I think we completed 4, let's move on to the question. Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So the next item is the question for community input that was put forward with respect to Recommendation 4, and the question was about whether the gaining registrar's IANA ID should be provided by the registry operator to the losing registrar for the purpose of including it in the notification of transfer completion and possibly the losing FOA should that be brought back into the recommendations. I'm not going to regurgitate all of the comments but there were a number of comments supporting that. We've also captured here, Roger, what you relayed from the

TechOps discussion as well, which seemed generally supportive of this concept. There were also a few comments that were not supportive of including it or felt that it wasn't necessary. But this is kind of the moment to wrap this discussion and kind of bring it into the Rec 4 and also ultimately losing FOA should we go forward with that. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. I think when this group originally talked about it, it had fairly good support of including it. It was more of an operational question mark of obviously there has to be work done between the registry and registrars to make this happen. So I think the idea of it was well supported. Does it balance out with the cost of making it happen? As Emily just mentioned, TechOps talked about this last week. And the general feeling was, yes, it made sense to provide and not an extraordinary lift. At least that was my feeling from the discussions last week. So I think that providing it makes sense and we should include that in the recommendations. But I'll open it up to any comments, suggestions, changes. Okay. I think we can move forward and put that in the recommendations then. All right, on to Rec 5, Emily. Emily's getting a lot of airtime today.

EMILY BARABAS:

Lucky me.

ROGER CARNEY:

I like it.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Recommendation 5 is about terminology. So this is specifically about using the term Transfer Authorization Code or TAC in place of Auth-Info Code. Oh, Sarah, do have your hand up for about the previous item?

SARAH WYLD: I do. I'm so sorry. If we could go back to that one second. It seems to me this is more work for the registry, right, because they're going to need to make the updates to include that messaging possibly. I noticed that both Rick and Beth had to drop the call. Are there Registry people on this call that can weigh in on this? Or should we make sure that somebody from that team is available for this decision? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great input, Sarah. I'll note that Rick was part of the TechOps discussion last week if this was a heavy lift or not. But it's a good point to bring in and make sure that they do weigh in on our call here. I don't know, Sarah, if it's more of a lift for them than for registrars, because registrars will have to intake that and then use it into the notices. From my understanding it was going to be a fairly—not simple, for sure, but a smaller lift for registries. But we should probably get their direct input on our call. So if there's no registries on, we can just bring it up in the next call and confirm it. Thanks, Sarah.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay, back to Rec 5.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I will note that the Registry Stakeholder Group did provide a comment in response to this question and I've dropped that into chat as well. That expressed that they were they were supportive of this change. So certainly it doesn't hurt to reconfirm that with the representatives from the Registries. But that does seem to be the direction of the comment.

Recommendation 5, as I mentioned, was about terminology. There's not a lot of commentary about the terminology itself. There's one comment that refers back to previous comments discussed under Recommendation 1 that probably don't need to be addressed separately here unless anyone disagrees. It's about the pitted proposal that was discussed in previous weeks. There was one proposed update or a question from ICANN Org that it may be useful to include an implementation note in this recommendation that not only policies but also, for example, ICANN publications and web pages should also be updated to reflect this update with the terminology change, which seems like a fairly straightforward edit. We've proposed some text here if folks agree that that's appropriate. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I'm glad we didn't get a whole lot of disagreement with this recommendation. Yeah, I don't see an issue with the implementation. I don't know if anyone has any comments on that, on the implementation note, to kind of broaden

where the TAC is being referenced. Okay. I think that the implementation note makes sense and we can move forward with that. On to Rec 6, making progress.

EMILY BARABAS:

Okay, Recommendations 6. I'll drop the working document here. Recommendations 6 is about the definition of the TAC. The first comment is from ICANN Org, and it's revisiting a suggestion that was previously made in some of the early input about this issue of including language that the RNH's authority supersedes that of the representative. The working group had previously said that that sort of language should not be included in the recommendations because it may conflict with agreements between the RNH and a third party which the RNH has given authority. ICANN Org provided some additional clarification that indeed that that sort of language would be consistent with the current Transfer Policy, which indicates that the RNH and the administrative contact are the only parties that have authority to approve or deny a transfer request to the gaining registrar. In the event of a dispute, the registered name holder's authority supersedes that of the administrative contact. So it's sort of tracking with some of the language that already exists in the Transfer Policy.

Again, here I'm not going to read the details of the comment but I can invite Hilda or Isabelle certainly if you have any additional clarifications on that. The idea here is just to provide some additional flesh around why that was suggested. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. It seems to make sense in that, the current one. But the fact that the registry name holder supersedes the representative ... I guess I'll open the floor up to see if anyone disagrees with that. It seems to make sense. It seems like it would be a fairly easy addition to the recommendation. But again, I'll open up the floor. Maybe someone else sees something here that I don't, for sure. Anyone have any comments, concerns about adding some language that talks about the authority superseding others? Thanks, Sarah. Okay. I think we could say that's a good comment and we can update that. So, on to B.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So this is another sort of reiteration of some of the concerns that were discussed under Recommendation 1 about the value of the TAC and concerns about it being targeted for theft. I don't think that there's anything new that hasn't been discussed. This comment, it's primarily a reiteration of some of those previous points. So if there's something to discuss here, please let me know, but otherwise, I can move on.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I agree. If anyone has any disagreement that maybe we need to touch on this again, but we've definitely talked about this and talked in detail on this. Okay. Let's go ahead and move on to C.

EMILY BARABAS: The next one is also from ICANN Org, and it's a suggestion to include in the definition of the designated representative both the

word “request” as well as the word “obtain”. So it would read “The designated representative means an individual or entity that the registered name holder explicitly authorizes to request and obtain the TAC on their behalf.” And the justification of that is that it makes more clear that if there’s a case where someone requests the TAC and it’s not authorized, that that’s obviously not something that’s within the scope of this. So it’s I think primarily a clarification element. But if folks have concerns about that, please speak up.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. Thinking about our discussions around this, it seems like that was our intent. I think that it makes sense to add it. Sarah? No, Sarah. We didn’t say that they could do a request, which I don’t think that was our intent. Our intent was a designated representative could make the request for. Any comments? Okay. Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, I think it does help. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Roger. I don’t know if this is going to make it less confusing. But my understanding is consistent with yours that the idea here is just clarifying that indeed the idea is that a designated representative is someone who can not only get the TAC but also make the request for the TAC. I guess it wouldn’t make sense otherwise and perhaps it’s implied, but this just makes it more explicit that that in fact that representative is being authorized. If someone has this title of designated representative, their authorization is not only to obtain but also to request that TAC. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay. I think we'll go with that text. Again, if anyone disagrees, please hit the list and let us know, and we can talk about it. On to D.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So D it's just noting that currently the designated representative is defined in a footnote and that it's potentially stronger and better for that to be included as a recommendation itself, which seems fairly reasonable and gets us out of the risk of footnote being deleted somewhere and people not getting the full gist of the recommendation. So the idea here is that we could simply make this its own recommendation rather than including a footnote with the definition. I think eventually in the final report, we'll also have a glossary, but we're not there yet. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I guess my only concern about defining designated representative in a section on its own is I don't know that we've really defined what the designated representative is only in the context of—we only have in the context of TAC. So I don't think we've fully defined what designated representative means. We've only defined it as it pertains to the TAC request. So I don't know. That's just my thoughts off the top of my head here. Eric, please go ahead.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Thanks, Roger. I agree with your comments too. Another concern I thought at the top of my head, is designated representative been defined in other ICANN policies, like if we confirmed that it's not used elsewhere? Otherwise, I don't think I'm that hung up to using this and moving out a footnote. I just want to make sure we've done other considerations as well.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Eric. That's a good point to reference. Make sure we're not stepping over a definition on that. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Sorry, I forgot my hand is up and I don't have anything. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. Okay. Any other comments on this? I'll note that Emily put in chat designated agent is defined but designated representative is not or we'll make sure that it's not. Okay. Any other comments on D? Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN: Hi. Yeah, I'm still confused on this point. I think a couple of people are. I'm reading through this. I'm kind of running with two definitions of designated agent right now. Because as I recall, when we were writing where the TAC goes to, we were also discussing there were going to be future changes to the WHOIS

etc., etc. But as far as designated representative, I thought that was falling under the privacy/proxy provisions that we have. So like the domain is under a proxy service, obviously, they are the registrant and the notice will go to them, meaning they're a designated agent. This wording opens it up to a myriad of third parties, which I think is the confusion here. Once again, maybe I'm totally wrong, but I think we need to define this a little bit better. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rich. It's definitely not trying to change or duplicate or anything of the designated agent. This was the idea of the account holder having access to initiate transfers or a professional web developer that manages something for a registrant, them having the ability. So it was, at least that was my recollection, purposely made fairly broad to handle those few things. And the designated representative was that kind of person, not a designated agent, so to say.

Any other comments on this? Hopefully that clarified it. Again, designate representative wasn't meant to replace or update agent at all. It was a separate concept of account holder or WebPro or anything under the thing of having multiple people have access to allow that. Rich, please, go ahead.

RICHARD BROWN:

I understand the designated agent in the area where they are authorized to manage the WHOIS for the domain. But I didn't think that we are extending that designated agent to now they also

control the TAC, which is effectively what this is doing. Honestly, I'm afraid we're removing the RNH from this equation by keeping a designated rep. Not rep, agent. Now, mind you, that designated agent, if they have the ability and right to change the WHOIS, of course, they could change it to something that belongs to them, making them the RNH, which would be the legal way to go about it, in my opinion. But just opening up that we send the actual TACs to anybody seems, honestly, like a big hole to me. And I'm worried about that. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rich. Again, sending it to anybody I think is a little broad. But an account holder is not the same thing as a registrant. And I think that the contact was to be able to handle that without explicitly saying account holder, because it could be, again, a WebPro that manages a domain for somebody. I think that with this idea, that's why we explicitly call out in our notifications that the notifications have to go to the registered name holder. So they can't be eliminated from the actual events that are occurring.

RICHARD BROWN:

But at the same time, we're saying the designation agent—I get that they're allowed to request. I have no problem with the request. It's the "and obtain"—that's the part I have issue with. I represent you, Roger, right? And I go to the registrar saying, "I'm the designated agent. You know this. Send me the TAC for the domain." By this update, the registrar now has to send it to you. To me, not to you, Roger. I'm sorry, if I'm allowed to ask, I would say, "Hey, we need the TAC. Can you send it?" And it gets sent to

you, Roger. And then I go, "Hey, Roger, did you get the TAC?" That's it. Otherwise, I think it's a big loophole that's going to cause serious headaches. I think I've made my point there and that's just about all I'm going to say on that.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rich. Again, I think the important part here is the concept of the designated representative was to facilitate the current and real account holder concept. I think the important part is our other recommendations don't allow the designated representative to be the only one to have access to that, and the notices go specifically to the RNH for that reason. So that even if the WebPro is doing this because they think it's right, the registered name holder is the one that receives the notifications and can stop it. I think that that's the important part. Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

I have difficulty to understand this. It seems that the text was written with different kinds of registrants in mind. If you have a large company which has another company doing the domain business for them, I do understand several of these points. If I see private persons or small companies with no IT knowledge at all, they completely rely on a reseller. Everything domain-related goes through this company and they even run their e-mail accounts, and if they have problem with an e-mail, they call the same person. All these distinctions do not make any sense for small and private persons. It makes only sense for larger companies with some departments or other companies they are working in larger

conglomerate for. I really have a problem to understand what's the difference between a designated representative and a designated agent.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Lutz. I don't want to get into the designated agent talk yet because that's something we're going to talk about starting next year or early next year. The point here is—maybe I can help Rich here—the TAC is not sent to the designated representative. But in most registrars, they will have access to it. According to Recommendation 3, the TAC is sent to the RNH. But because the account holder or the WebPro or whatever it is has access to the account, they will most likely be able to see the TAC in the Registrar portal. Hopefully that helps clarify. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Just to what Rich said in the chat, that it stays in there and obtain the TAC. I'm still stuck on did our original recommendation allow for the designated representative to obtain the TAC? I had read it that it does. So it's a token created and provided upon request to the RNH or their designated rep. So they're going to get it, right? They are provided upon request, means it is provisioned. So I don't think it's adding the—and obtain language that changes whether the representative can get the TAC, but also it feels like, as a group, we're not really clear on whether we think they should be able to. So maybe we can just put a pin in this. As a Registrar group, maybe we need to talk

about whether we think it should be because I feel like we don't have agreement as a team. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Sarah. Again, I'll just remind everybody of our discussions. I mean, I think this came up because of the account holder concept. The account holder may be different than the registrant, and almost all registrar portals, an account holder can see the TAC. That means obtain the TAC. So if they can see it, they can obtain it. I think that that was why the designated representative was "created," in air quotes there because we're not creating them but being defined.

Lutz, yes. There's a notice sent to the registered name holders. That notice is not sent to a designated representative. The policy states it has to be sent to the registered name holder. Now, we're also saying that in certain circumstances, a designated representative exists. Not that we're creating them, they do exist today and they do have the authorization to request a transfer and obtain, not to be sent but obtain the TAC. So hopefully that makes sense.

To your point, Sarah, let's plan to revisit this so that the Registrars can get a discussion going and understand it. Okay. We've got two minutes. So let's go ahead and continue.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Roger. That's the end of our Recommendation 6 working document. For Recommendation 7, this isn't something that was sent out for homework, but maybe we can use the very end of this

call to just preview what's in here so folks can begin to think about it and work with their groups. We can hit the ground running on our next call.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Here's the recommendation working document. This is a recommendation about the composition of the TAC and specifies requirements consistent with RFC 9154. The first comment is, again, about looking at this question of the TAC complexity addresses one type of threat but it doesn't necessarily address circumstances where the TAC is compromised once it's been generated. And again, this is an advocacy point for the pitted proposal.

The second comment, it looks like it's actually a comment that's taking issue with the RFC itself which mentions printable ASCII characters and also case insensitive characters, and suggests that the group of permitted characters should be reduced further to reduce potential confusion.

The next comment is in line with what we were seeing previously from the Org comment but this was from a different commenter about the suggestion to use a secure channel for the provision of the TAC, not for example, SMS or an e-mail that is not encrypted. The next comment also refers to 9154 and notes that there's a weakness in that. There's not an audit trail capability. So this is

the first cluster of concerns. I'm just going to run through these last few.

The second set of comments or proposed revisions. There's a suggestion from a few comments about embedding additional information in the TAC. For example, the TTL or the gaining registrar's IANA ID. And also a comment that is not supportive of that embedding. We've very briefly captured some of the points that came up in the TechOps discussion that were related at a high level to this group. So folks should review that and make sure that that's accurate and should review as well if you are not familiar with those conversations and just get a sense of it. But that's something that can be discussed further.

Part C is a comment from ICANN Org, noting that in Section 4.1 of RFC 9154, it says that in accordance with current best practices and noting that the authorization information is not a machine-generated value, the implementation should use at least 128-bits of entropy of the value. The suggestion here is that the working group should consider including language that makes the implementation of using 128 entropy as the requirements are a must rather than a should even though the standard uses a should. There's some proposed language around that if the group wanted to go in that direction.

Then the final comment here states that RFC 9154 and BCP 106 requires reference for further clarifications regarding the difference between current and previous RFC/BCP. Perhaps the language can be reviewed by those who are intimately familiar with the RFC and make sure that it's correctly citing the necessary information.

That's our next round of comments. I don't know if anyone has questions about that. But otherwise, I think we can pause there and come back to these on the next call. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay. Any other questions or comments on Rec 7? Again, we'll start next week on those. Any other general comments? We had some really good discussions. We've covered a lot today. Any other comments? Again, if anything that was said today or directions we took, people disagree with or have questions about mailing lists, hit it up. And if someone brings something up on the mailing list, we can bring it forward in a discussion within the whole group. Okay. Lutz, please go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Just to rephrase the question from the chat, there's a raised condition in transfer, in the final notification. If the contact e-mail is bound to the domain which is transferred, it's unclear to which of the mail servers the e-mail will be sent to, the new one or the old one.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. That's interesting. I think that may be outside the scope because we're not dealing with DNS records there. But the specific part that we are responsible for—and I think it's highlighted in our recommendations—is the contact data. Again, it doesn't get down to what mail server it's going to go through because that's not in our control. But it will be sent to the e-mail

address or the contact, I should say, not necessarily e-mail address, of the registrant at the time of request.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I'm sorry to interrupt. On this place, the language we are using is it's sent to the same contact, which was on time where the transfer started. If you take it literally, you have to send it to the old contact even if the domain has changed in the domain system.

ROGER CARNEY: Again, you're talking about a different level, I think, that then we can control. It is sent to the old or the current at the time of request. But if the DNS has changed by the time it has been requested and been sent, that's something that the Transfer Policy does not control. That will be sent to that contact specifically and the DNS will do what it does. Again, I don't think that we can control it. Maybe I'm wrong. That's just my thought on it.

Okay. Again, thanks, everyone for the great discussion and progress today. Let's give everyone two minutes back, which is a rarity for us lately. I guess one minute now. Thanks, everyone, and we'll see everyone Tuesday, hopefully. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]