
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 31 January 2023 at 16:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/l4w-DQ>

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

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, 31 January 2023.

For today's call, we have apologies from James Galvin (RySG). They have formally assigned Beth Bacon (RySG) as their alternates for this call and for the 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 you view access only to chat. Alternates not replacing a member should not engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom Room functionalities. If you have not already done so,

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.

please change your chat selection from hosts and panelists to everyone In order for all participants to see your chat and so it is 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 say your name before speaking for the transcription. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. Over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Devan. Welcome, everyone. Our final meeting of January here, I guess. Just a few things before we jump into our agenda. Just a quick timeline, I suppose, here. We're wrapping up all of our Phase 1A discussions, hopefully, today so we can move on to our Phase 2 discussions. A good chunk of this call will be spent also on a review of the 1B discussions that we've already had and some of the topics around that and what we've covered and everything, just a refresher, so that when we jump into Phase 2, we all are in that same level footing there.

Also, next week, we will not be meeting. ICANN will be having I think it's an annual one maybe, I don't know, staff meeting. So we will be skipping next weekend and starting back up on the week after. Again, we'll be starting back up on Phase 2 discussion. So there'll be new topics for everyone. So jump into the charter and

refresh yourself on all the Phase 2 topics so that we can get running on those as soon as we pick that up in the second week of February there.

Also, there's a Project Change Request. We've been talking about it for a few weeks now. The form is filled out, now we'll share it with the group shortly. We're providing it to Council I think next week so that they can prepare for their Council meeting in February.

I think the last thing is the redline, another redline of the initial recommendations. I think we've gone through all the topics so far, all the recommendations once, redlined them, looked for inputs, updated them. So I think that this is, hopefully, the last good look unless we make some changes, obviously, out of the Phase 2 discussions and the 1B discussions. But we should be pretty set on those. But that final redline should be coming out shortly as well. As we start into our Phase 2 discussions, just set that in the background and take a look at it and make sure that you're agreeing with them. If there's something that's questionable, please take to your stakeholder groups so that we can get those resolved. But that'll be kind of more of a homework assignment as we get into our Phase 2 discussions, just to make sure that everybody's comfortable with those Phase 1A recommendations.

I think that's the big ones here. I see Emily's hand now. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. Hi, everyone. This is Emily from staff. I just wanted to highlight that when we do send around that redline, it's going to include a few things that you haven't seen before. So it will be the revisions of the recommendations that we've been discussing, but staff also had homework item to go back and make sure that every recommendation has a rationale and provide some additional context to sort of bring some of the recommendations into more of a package, as well as mentioning certain things that were discussed during public comment, for example, topics that groups advocated to have included in the PDP deliberations that the group felt were either out of scope or not within the charter questions. So those sorts of things will be in the report as well. And because that is not recommendation text but is an important piece of the report as well, it is really important that everyone does look at that and think about whether that does reflect the work that the PDP has done. So we really appreciate your expert eyes on that text when it comes out. We'll provide some additional information when we send it in the e-mail as well to help you navigate through the document. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay. The last item is just our general call for any stakeholder groups that may have had some discussions that they want to bring forward to this group. If they're talking about anything specific or anything in general at their own stakeholder group meetings, if they want to bring anything forward, so that the group is aware or needs to address or anything. So any of the stakeholder groups need anything, you need/want some time here?

Okay. Anything from the threat vectors team? I know that they were working on a write-up of what they were working on from last year. Again, I know that that's the last ICANN meeting. They had a pretty good write-up at that point. I don't know if anything's been done or completed yet. So anything from the threat vectors team? Thanks, Rick. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Roger. So noting that we don't yet have a product on that one, I think what we're going to do is, based on some of the previous discussions about the security model that we've heard within the working group, we'll take a first stab at sort of summarizing that, knowing that indeed it will likely be replaced or revised by the product of that group. But at least that will help us tie the report together a little bit in the immediate term and provide at least a placeholder for that piece of it. So, hopefully, there are no objections to that approach. And please don't be offended if we don't get it quite right. We're not trying to replace the expertise on this group but just make sure that the report kind of moves along as we progress with the work. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay. I think that's all for the updates. I think we can go ahead and jump into our agenda with agenda item three there. Emily, do you want to take us through these updates that we made on these?

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Roger. Sure. So last week, we talked about three different areas and came to some, I think, preliminary convergence on a few things. So we're just going to go over that briefly. And if there aren't objections today on the call to the direction of this, then we'll incorporate those as well into the master redline.

The first one was a preliminary recommendation on record keeping. And this was one where ICANN Org had said in public comments on the initial report that it would be helpful from a compliance perspective for there to be a recommendation regarding record keeping. You'll recall that the working group asked for some suggestions on what would be helpful. And the Contractual Compliance team came back with a suggestion there. It seemed like on the last call that there was some support for going forward with that.

We placed this recommendation in charter question A5 that seemed to fit there. That was about the question of if the gaining FOA is no longer needed. Is there a sufficient paper trail with the Auth-Info Code for auditing and compliance purposes? Previously, we had sort of said the working group didn't come to any agreement on this topic. Here we have some new draft language, basically, just summarizing that, indeed, for auditing and compliance purposes, it's necessary to have records in place to assist with any investigations.

The only adjustments we've made here from the text look that everyone looked at last week is just to make the language consistent with our other recommendations. So MUST instead of SHALL. And there was a reference that made it sound like this was actually language in the policy. But since this is a policy

recommendation, we adjusted that slightly. There was preliminary agreement in the group last week. It sounded like to go with these 15 months.

I see Sarah saying, "No comment after period." One line down. Oh, thank you, Sarah. Okay, not a problem at all, Sara. Thank you. Just let me do that in suggestion mode, just so you can all see it.

So that's basically the adjustment. It's more or less what we looked at last week. And then we just added a rationale consistent with the response to the charter question that basically says that this additional 15-month data retention requirement is to enable compliance investigations and that the 15-month period is specified to be consistent with the registration data policy.

So please do take a look at that, and if you have any concerns, please respond on list. Any questions before I move on to the next item? Let me just share the link to this as well. It was in the agenda but it's good to have it on hand as you follow along. Okay?

Steinar has a question to everyone. This record tracking is doable for the registrars. I'll pause for a moment.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Emily. Thanks, Steinar. Thanks, Sarah, for responding. I think that generally most registrars provide this anyway, or do this. So I don't think it's a far stretch. But if any of the registrars want to come on, please do. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. My point in questioning this is that I really don't like to have a scenario where we agreed upon a voting and the requirement, and then in the next round saying, "No, this is impossible. We have to return back and change this." So it's just like having this sign-up if it's doable at this phase. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Steinar. Yeah. As Owen mentioned in chat, I think most registrars are doing it. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Roger. I just want to elaborate from what I put on chat there. I mean, these registrars are currently already retaining records regarding to Auth-Info Code provision, and I haven't really heard any concerns or issues from ICANN regarding what we're currently doing. So I think it's just a matter of readjusting and tweaking our systems to record this stuff as opposed to that. So those things looking in there don't seem to be a concern or problem for me. I see other registrars agreeing in the chat as well, too. So I don't think this would be a problem for us to do.

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

THEO GEURTS: Similar to what Owen is saying. I can't really imagine that they don't have those records or logs. I mean, it's going to be very hard

to maintain some level of customer support satisfaction if your answer is “We don’t know because we don’t log it.” Registrants don’t usually like it when you say “I don’t know” because that is not the answer they are looking for. They need clear answers and you need logs to answer the questions. And these questions pop up on a regular basis. I mean, there’s always somebody asking, “When was the domain name transferred? Because there is a dispute regarding it, etc.” So it’s also for your own liability avoidance. Thanks.

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

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, just a slight counterpoint here. There are registers out there and some of our portals work like that as well, where the Auth Code is visible in the registrant or the reseller interface for a domain name. So if a registrant clicks on the domain info page for a domain name that he has registered with a certain portal, then he will see the Auth Code as part of that in there. This will obviously have to change with it. But we do not log when a registrant clicks on that page or a reseller looks at the Auth Code to provide it with registrants. So in many cases, the Auth Code is part of the information, the general information that the customer currently has. This is obviously something that will change with the new policy, but I would not create it as a given that this is currently being logged by all registrars. This is clearly not the case. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Volker, for that. Okay. Emily, I think we can jump back into our next changes then.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. Hi, everyone. So next up was a preliminary Recommendation 16 and 17. So on last week's call, we did talk about the small group proposal. I think where we landed at the end of that call was that there was not at this time agreement to move forward with that. But there were a couple of additional adjustments that the group did seem to want to move forward with. And specifically, that was around clarifying that this new requirement for the 30-day prohibition on transfers would replace any existing requirements at the registry or registrar. For example, if there was currently a 60-day prohibition on transfers following either domain create or a transfer, that would be replaced by the 30-day requirement. So we've got some additional texts in the recommendations and a footnote here that attempts to clarify that. So please do take a close look at that and make sure that it's consistent with your understanding.

We've also just made a suggestion here to include the number of hours and the term "calendar" to be consistent with elsewhere in the recommendations where we're using the term calendar days as opposed to just days, and also including the hours as well. So if there are strong objections to that, please do flag that as well. But again, please take a close look at this language and just make sure that it's consistent with your understanding of where the group is headed. I'll pause for just a moment.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. And just to add on to what Emily said, I think the work of the small team didn't get good enough support to make the change here now. But what was talked about was talking about that proposal in context of the Phase 2 deliberations of any rollbacks or any dispute mechanisms that come up. Again, we're trying to solidify the language here, just so that we have agreement across the board, but not wanting to throw that work away. It's just that we're going to talk about it later. Thanks.

Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger. I was at the last call for the first hour but I did miss the last half hour. Was this something that was discussed in the last half hour by any chance? Because I don't recall such a solid determination on this that there wasn't any traction for it and for it to be deferred. My sense from what I did here was that there were people who were thinking about it, that it was still to be considered, that it was still to really be decided upon by the working group as a whole. But maybe I missed something or maybe I was optimistic. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. Again, I'm not sure. Maybe staff can help us out on the timing of that. But the feeling I got from the call last week was, yes, there's some support for it but not enough to put it in the recommendations right now, just because there was talk around how does the future discussions in Phase 2 about disputes

affect that and will it change the thought on it? So the idea was to document what is agreed upon now, which is on here, and then bring that back up in our discussions in Phase 2.

Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thanks. I think some people suggested this before, but this notion that there's a silver bullet awaiting us in Phase 2 with a rollback program was really optimistic. I mean, if we leave everything subject to figuring that out, I don't know how far it will get us.

Frankly, regarding these two proposals, Recommendation 16 didn't undergo any proposed changes by the small group. So the only changes that are there now are the additional green language, text in green. Regarding preliminary Recommendation 17, the small group did recommend a change to it. But frankly, I heard general concerns, but I don't recall it ever being put to the working group to make a decision on this. So I come back to the call today and I'm a little bit surprised. But then again, I did miss the last portion of last week's call, but I believe this was covered in the first hour. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Zak. Yeah. Actually, we've talked about it for the last couple of calls and actually the last three meetings. Last week, I purposely tried to get that general feeling from everyone if it was a positive thing to add in or not. To me, I didn't get that feeling that it was needed to be added now.

And to your point about if we can actually get to a rollback. To me, as Sarah said, I'm not sure that—if there's a rollback or not, I think it may help people lean to if there's an opt out or not. Again, I don't know that they're tied together so much as being just another security layer that is useful. Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. Just kind of building on what I posted in the chat. It's not just what we uncover or deliberate on in Phase 2, but as Caitlin will go through as part of this agenda for an overview or recap of our Phase 1B, there was also a discussion around the change of registrant or the lock that is now 60 days. And there were preliminary general, not formal agreements around whether that continues on. And if it did, does it also match and/or leverage the post-transfer restriction as well. So I think there are multiple dependencies tied to this and not just Phase 2. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for the reminder there, Berry. Zak, go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thank you. Last shot at this, Roger. Thank you. Keiron and Owen were on that small group with me. So I'd like to hear from them if this was their understanding that there was not going to be any further consideration of the proposed revisions to Recommendation 17. I'd also like to hear from anyone in the group, whether they had strong hesitations or strong concerns about the proposed revisions. If that's the case, then I do genuinely understand the decision to not go ahead. But frankly,

my sense was that there wasn't such strong determination by members of the working group, they were still thinking about it. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Zak. I think that that's the thing is still thinking about it is I don't think enough for us to write it in here. Again, I'm not saying that it's over. I think what Berry just talked about and anything that we talk about in Phase 2, I think this is going to come up again. Again, I don't think the small team work is done. I think that we're going to revisit this again, but to get past where we need to get passed on Phase 1A, again, not that there wasn't objections like you said, Zak, I think that there just wasn't a lot of "Hey, yeah, this is a good idea." It was, like you said, we need to think about it more. I think that that's fair. Go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Sure. But, Roger, I had understood that the feedback was to come back before January 31. But it was an extended date to provide feedback on these things. Then given that, I thought that there would be actually discussion of these two proposals where perhaps there was even be a straw poll taken. But instead, what it seems to me that it's a fait accompli, the deadline came and passed, and there hasn't been a robust discussion on them. Last time we talked about these, we're waiting for more feedback, and we said we'd go back over them. And now we haven't, we're just moving on.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think that the moving on part, I'm not sure I agree with it, because I specifically made a call last week in support of it. Again, there was some support. It just wasn't widely supported or at least not vocally supported on the call or on the list. Again, that's why the decision was not to put it in here now and let people think about that and see if it fits in still later on.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: All right. Roger, I don't think that's the right approach with respect to this. Because I don't think it was ever put to the group to make a decision one way or the other. I think we were still mulling it over and there was going to be an anticipated dedicated time to discuss these two proposals. So to me, moving on from it on the basis of not having heard enough support from it really ignores that there hasn't been a defined opportunity to provide the support on an anticipated call following the close of the January 31st comment day. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. I think that it was specifically on the agenda item and we did pull it up. So again, we can debate on if there was enough time or not. I am not trying to stop this idea. I think that it's going to come back and we're going to discuss it. It's just now that we're finalizing the Phase 1A work, I want to get past that, and then we can talk about it as it pertains to, as Berry mentioned, the 1B stuff and then Phase 2.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Roger, it's on the agenda for today? I saw the agenda. I thought we'll be discussing it today.

ROGER CARNEY: What's on the agenda today is these topics here, the redlines that we're looking at here. Last week and the week before it was on the agenda for discussion of the proposals, not the updates.

Keiron, please go ahead.

KEIRON TOBIN: Thank you. Sorry, I was off last week. Zak, I think the best kind of way to describe this is the registrars are still internally with the different models and stuff like that. There is currently still some discussion going on. And there are some preliminaries in the second option, such as whole other things that may implement this. So as Roger mentioned, we will come back to this, it's not a closed session. It's just there are other pending factors in the second section that may kind of disrupt what we've already done if we were to finalize it now. I hope that helps some clarity. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Keiron. Okay. I think we can move on to the remaining updates.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Roger. So the next recommendation that we have some updates on is for preliminary Recommendation 2, which focuses

on what is now called the transfer confirmation, formerly called losing FOA. What we talked about last week was some specific items, some minor modifications and clarifications that folks had suggested in the past but hadn't yet been discussed by the group. The first one was the suggestion to use the term transfer confirmation instead of the standardized form of authorization. There did seem to be some support for that on the last call. So at least in the current redline, we have the term transfer confirmation used here.

The next item was about that the transfer confirmation must include the gaining registrar's IANA ID, a link to the ICANN maintain web page listing, accredited registrars and corresponding IANA IDs, and if available, the name of the gaining registrars.

The third item discussed was about requiring that the transfer confirmation include an opportunity to proactively accept, in addition to rejecting the transfer. It sounded on the call, I think, Roger, based on what you said that there was not sufficient agreement to require that. And so that is not included here.

The next one was about language. So this language is consistent with what we have in the two new notifications that are included in Recommendations 3 and 4, that the transfer confirmation must be provided in English and the language of the Registration Agreement and may also be provided in other languages. So that's a change from the current which just requires English. Any questions about those changes from last week's discussion? Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. A question, though. When the language says—no, never mind. I'm reading it wrong. My apologies. Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So if there are no questions or concerns about that, we can go into some additional items that are outstanding that we haven't talked about yet. Oh, sorry, Keiron? Theo?

THEO GEURTS: So these notifications, they can be sent through secure messaging systems. Does that include an API? And the reason I'm asking that, because a lot of these notifications that we currently now send, this has happened with the domain. And that has been done with the domain, and domain name has been updated, etc., etc. All of these are being sent through the API, and then our reseller translates that to a message that the registered name holder can understand and read. So I don't want to get into some discussion in a few years with Compliance over this, you didn't send a message. Yes, we did but through an API. And yes, that is not a messaging system per se. It's just a secure API. So that's why I'm asking for the question here. Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Understood. So you're actually one step ahead. I believe this is something we have not discussed previously. So this next item is something that we had captured in the notes that someone had raised as a suggestion. So this is a new item for discussion. It's in brackets only so that people see the language in front of them. But for Recommendations 3 and 4, so that's the notification of TAC

provision and the notification of transfer completion for both of those recommendations.

You know what, you're actually one step ahead. I'm going to go here and then we can come back to the timeframe because I think that's probably going to require less discussion. So those two notifications, there's a footnote that says, "The working group recognizes that this notification may be sent by e-mail, SMS, or other secure messaging system. These examples are not intended to be limiting and it is understood that additional methods of notification may be created that were not originally anticipated by the working group."

Somewhere along in the discussion suggested that that should also apply to the losing FOA, now called the transfer confirmation. So this is very much a question out to the group. Is that something that the group wanted to see and what are the implications of that? Or is that not the case and that the status quo should remain in terms of a method of sending?

I will pause. Roger, this might require some discussion. Do you want to take over the queue? If it builds right now, just Keiron.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Keiron, please go ahead.

KEIRON TOBIN: Sorry. I don't know why my microphone wasn't working before. Just going back to the previous one about the language, I read it a couple of times just to kind of understand it in full. Would it not

make more sense for it to just state the transfer confirmation must be provided in English, full stop? It may also be provided under the same language as the Registration Agreement. It just reads a lot more comfortably. I think there's just a lot of languages in there.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Thanks, Keiron. Yeah, I was thinking the same thing. The MUST is in English and the MUST applies both the English and the Registration Agreement. So it has to be both.

KEIRON TOBIN: Okay. So the transfer confirmation must be provided in English and the language of the Registration Agreement, and may also be provided in other languages.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And the only optional part is that last part is other languages.

KEIRON TOBIN: Okay. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Keiron. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Roger. Rick Wilhelm, Registries. This is about the last sentence that's kind of in green text down there. The working group recognizes that this notification may be sent via e-mail, SMS, or other secure messaging system. The way that that last clause is phrased or other secure messaging system almost implies as if this text deems mail and SMS to be a secure messaging system. A lot of people would argue that e-mail is not and no one would argue that SMS is a secure messaging system.

So we might just want to, I think, tweak some wording in that last one. I'm not sure exactly what we want to say here. Maybe we have to drop the word secure and work in the concept of security somewhere else. In other words, to say may be sent by e-mail, SMS, or in other messaging system, recognizing certain security considerations may apply or something like that. But I think we want to avoid implying the way it is currently phrased, where we seem to be saying something about the security of the e-mail and SMS. Thanks.

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

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. That's a good point. Sarah just posted something in the chat, which I very much agree to. There needs to be a realization that for reseller registrars are also registrars, that e-mail is usually the only way that we can communicate to a registrant. Resellers have the option usually to get information from the API, and those who are not able to implement an API, that is where we have to

say, “Okay, you can’t implement our API, that means that we have to do some work for you to ensure that we are compliant with all these ICANN policies. Then we will have to do the work for you and our only option is then e-mail.” Not the most ideal method as a solution, but it’s the only viable one to make sure that we remain compliant. So that is why e-mail is vital for also the registrars to be compliant with all these policies. Thanks.

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

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Roger. I think going back to what Rick had said about that, I think the reason why we’re using that wording is because that secure mechanism is wording that is in the change of registrant process in Section 1.2 of C—I don’t recall which part under the Transfer Policy. So we’re just kind of parroting that wording that was in there. I know that note that in the existing Transfer Policy where it references secure mechanism, it says examples of secure mechanisms can be found in the implementation notes which follow the text of this policy. I don’t have those by me. Sorry, scrolling around here, to see it. So one of them is sending an e-mail requiring affirmative response, calling or sending an SMS, calling the registered name holder’s telephone number. So there are some examples there. So if we’re going to make the change here, we need to make sure we make the changes elsewhere, just so that we’re consistent throughout the Transfer Policy. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Owen. Thanks for bringing that forward. Okay. I think Sarah had some suggestions here. So I think that maybe some small wording changes here we can make. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: If I can just jump in, Roger, here. I see that we have the secure mechanism wording on the screen. I'm trying to recall when did this exactly come from? Or bring that up just a little so we can understand what secure and kind of how to date that because there are certainly some advancements that have been made since then. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Owen. Interestingly, the secure mechanism, as you said, Owen, things have changed to make that happen. I think that Rick's call out there is important. The interesting thing is obviously the degree of security that you're looking for. Is it secure or not? Obviously, you can have encrypted e-mail which is more secure, but that's not what we're talking about. Obviously, it's a degree of security. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Roger. I think the thing that Owen pointed out is correct. I think in that context, SMS is being used for an authentication mechanism not to be delivering payload. I think that here we're talking about delivering payload via the SMS in this context. So I think while there's a case to be made for consistency, I'm not so

sure that these are the same situations. On the page that we previously had on the screen, the SMS was being used for, essentially, a two-factor code. Here we're talking about notifying and sending payload about what's going on with the transfer.

So I think while it consistency is good, we need to be careful about just where if the situations are actually parallel. This probably just deserves a little bit of careful study. My point here in raising this was mostly that we don't get painted into a corner of having someone play gotcha with the group where they say that, "Oh well, SMS isn't secure. Why are you saying that it's secure and you're sending payload over that?" That's my main point in raising this. Thank you.

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

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I think maybe there's a new [inaudible] and I might suggest just kind of splitting them out a little bit. So it sounds like what Rick is speaking to now is some language that is currently in a footnote in Recommendations 3 and 4. So those are our new notices. And it sounds like potentially some folks want to go back and provide some feedback on the language in that footnote to potentially follow either the suggestion that was in the chat from Sarah not commenting on whether e-mail and SMS are specifically secure but perhaps referencing secure messaging systems in general. So there might be a fix there. And that's for the footnotes to Recommendations 3 and 4. So I really encourage

everyone to look at the text of that and think about whether that's appropriate.

The other question—and I think that's the question at hand here for today—is whether this group wants to comment on the method by which the losing FOA, now the transfer confirmation, is sent and make any adjustments to the status quo on that, or whether the group feels that the status quo is appropriate and therefore that nothing is needed to be included in this recommendation in terms of changes. So I hope that that clarifies a little bit the question that we're asking for this particular item. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Emily. Okay. Yeah, Sarah, if you want to go in there and make a comment, or Rick, either one of you, about possible language on that, I think that's good. I think what Emily is looking for is the status quo right or not here. If we need to update it, I think that's fine. We just need to come to an agreement on updating that.

Emily, do you have any other thing you need on this? Thanks, Sarah.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Sarah. So it sounds like if there's not momentum at this stage to change the status quo in terms of the losing FOA's format or any commentary on that, we maybe just leave the text as it is for now. That means that in the recommendation itself, we don't include this. This adjustment that Sarah is suggesting would be applied only to Recommendations 3 and 4 about the new

notifications, that this language would actually go away and not be included. Let me just put a line through it because we won't add anything specific here in this recommendation about the losing FOA. Then I think we can move on unless there are objections. Hopefully, that makes sense in terms of what's being requested here. Sarah is confirming. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: That sounds great. Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So the last item on the list for the losing FOA is again an item about consistency. So here currently the timeframe for the losing FOA, so the failure of the registrar of record to respond within five calendar days to the notification from the registry regarding a transfer request will result in a default approval of the transfer. The question here is whether the group wants to say five calendar days/120 hours consistent with the use of hours instead of just days elsewhere in the recommendations.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. I think that, again, the consistency thing is good if we state it this way. We should be consistent about saying it this way. Any thoughts from the group? Concerns about specifically here, five and 120? Thanks, Theo. Okay. What do we have next, Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So we just have one additional item to discuss regarding the losing FOA. This was an item that was raised previously by Jim. He asked whether there needed to be further discussion about when and by whom the pending transfer status is set and completed, or whether that's a purely operational consideration and does not need to be included in the policy recommendations. So we wanted to make sure that there was time and space for the group to think about and discuss that before we move on from this recommendation. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Any comments on that? I see that Jim's not here today. So maybe I'll just flag that for Jim later and bring it up with him. But I don't see any comments or concerns on it. So I think we're good with that, Emily, not having to add anything.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So that's it for our edits from last week and the remaining items on the transfer confirmation. So I think we can head back to the agenda. The next item is the Recommendation 13 small group work. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Perfect. Thanks, Emily. Recommendation 13. I think what we were doing is trying to get the rationale nailed down. The small team I think sent a few e-mails last week, maybe earlier this week even, on this. It seemed like they got to some language they were good with. Anyone from the small team went to talk about that? Thanks, Emily for that.

Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure, I can. Thanks. We went in and actually took the pen and redid the rationale. I'm guessing it will show up on the screen here in a second. Emily put the link into the thing. The new rationale is there in purple. At least on my screen, your mileage may vary. Towards the bottom there, we kind of went over it.

One of the things that in so going through this, the bottom two bullets are things that people have seen before, points that they've seen before. The first purple bullet is actually a new point that—I'll own it in case someone doesn't like it—I came up with when I was thinking about this is I realized that if the registrar was in charge of the expiry, then there was a chance that when that timer fired at the registrar to make it effective, they really need to provision it up, they need to send a null TAC, they need to null the TAC at the registry. And there's a chance that when that timer fired on the wall clock that the registrar systems could be down, the registry systems could be down, or the link between them could be down. Or they could all be up and the transaction could fail for some reason. Then the registrar would have to have retry logic in place. And then the same set of circumstances could happen at that point.

I won't sort of go down to the rainy day path and all of that, but what this means is that, essentially, having the timeout happen at the registries has fewer points of failure and statistically will be more likely to be accurate. So therefore, it is actually a really logical thing. And I'm actually kind of surprised that the collective

we didn't come up with it sooner, because it certainly would have come up in implementation as when this would have gotten turned into code. Wearing my former hat as a registrar, I could have seen this error situation coming up. So that's sort of where we are on that.

Let me stop on the rationale. But then I do want to bring up a related point about 13.1. But let me see if there's any questions or comments about the rationale first.

ROGER CARNEY: All right. Thanks, Rick. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. I like the rationale. Actually, these were problem points that I thought I envisioned a couple of months ago. We were talking about this. Clearly, it's purely my mistake, I guess, that I'm not able to communicate those operational issues way in advance because this actually nails a lot of my concerns back then. So thank you, Rick.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo.

RICK WILHELM: Sounds good. Thanks, Theo. Don't worry about it. I'm not sure. Maybe I had an extra cup of coffee on Friday as I was trying to do this. I'm not sure.

Any other questions—I don't see any hands—on the rationale? Okay. Feel free, Sarah, to go in there and tune up any the language that literally kind of came off of my pen. Jim had a look at it, I know, and some other folks in the small team had to look at it, but I'm sure that there's some tune-ups that could happen. Thanks, Jothan. Jothan had weighed in on e-mail on this also.

One thing, if we could go, scroll up then to—and yes, this is as support from the RySG, Keiron, from both of Jim and I. One of the things that we realized when we were looking at this thing also during the discussion about the rationale is that there's a little bit of situation with regard to the language of this thing. Right now it says, "The TAC must be valid for 14 calendar days from the time it is set at the registry, enforced by the registry." This is the current language there in 13.1 that you see.

Now, the phrasing of "must be valid for" seems to certainly force a minimum but it does not clearly specify a maximum. So it's sort of like, "Hey, Roger, you need to take a nap for an hour. If I tell Roger to do that, he could sleep for eight hours," and it's like, "Well, you told me that I had to nap for an hour. So I decided to nap for eight hours." I think that our intent was with this 13.1 was to prevent long lived TACs, right, because that's the thing. So maybe we need to tweak the wording here a little bit just to hone in on that exactly.

The other thing that's a little bit weird is that this doesn't seem to allow a registry to have a standard that's less than 14 days, if it so chooses, as long as it formally declares that. Now, that's something that we hadn't really discussed that if a registry wants to say like, "Our transfer window is 10 days," one of my favorite

examples is .bank, maybe the .bank folks want to have their standard transfer window to be only five days for some reason. So it doesn't appear to allow the .bank registry to have a smaller transfer window.

So I don't have any suggested text. And when we had this small group discussion about this, we didn't come around to setting it. But we sort of knew that this 13.1 was to prevent long live TACs. But I don't think that we were trying to set a minimum with this, at least not explicitly so. So I want to bring that to the group to discuss because it's more of a group discussion, because the small group was more about the rationale right now and about the enforcement, not about changing the TTL or about changing that 14 days. I'll stop there because my point is clearly gotten—it resonated with Sarah so I'll let her go here.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. Yeah. We've went back on wording and I think that we've changed the wording here—standard, minimum, maximum. I think we've had just about everything in here and this is what we ended up with. Just one comment I'll throw out is obviously we need to update our 14 calendar days to be consistent with our days in our statement. But I think staff can take care of that for us. As far as the meaning here, I'll throw this back to Sarah and see what she has to say. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thanks. Hi. Thanks, Rick and the small team, for putting all that together. I definitely agree with the outcome as it is with the

registry to enforce. I think we probably all agree with the 14 days of the concept. So some wording suggestions to help me get clear. What if we say the TAC must normally be valid for 14 calendar days? I don't typically use the word normally in that way but I know that that's a way that some people use it. I think it makes sense grammatically. Because we can't say the TAC must standardly be valid. That just doesn't go as a sentence. Yeah. I mean, we could talk. We're going back and saying the standard TTL for the TAC must be 14 calendar days. But we took that out. I'm not sure why. I think standard is good there. So that's my wording change suggestion there.

Then, Rick, you are correct. It does not allow a registry to define a shorter period. I think I'm okay with that. But I guess I am open to further consideration. But I do want to standardize this. Yeah. Thank you.

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

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. I'm in total agreement with the maximum time. But the minimum time, the thing that should be equal to the maximum time, I don't think you should leave that up to the registrar to shorten that period. I suspect it's going to be a mess. And I understand the reasons the .bank example is actually a very good one and basically we see that happening at the moment now with the current Transfer Policy.

For instance, just an example here, a payment processor, very important domain name. The domain name has always been on a registry lock. So there's always this manual engagement to move such domain name or do an update. So there's always very careful planning in advance to make any changes or updates or transfers happening to such a domain name. And usually that is carried out in a very short window like in one day, everything needs to be done and set.

I understand that some registrars would like a shorter limit. But I think if you look at it from a operational point of view and you start planning with the registrant or the company or whoever wants to transfer domain name fast, you can do that. There's nothing in this policy or the one that we're discussing that limits such operational planning in advance. But again, if we're going to allow different minimum timelines, I suspect it's going to be a mess. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Theo. I think that, as Sarah pointed out here, the standard time to live wording was changed. I can't remember exactly why. There's always been this discussion of minimum and maximum. And really, to Rick's point, the goal here was to stop long lived Auth Codes, TACs. And the goal was that. We're not trying to stop the minimum and we had discussions around that. We're trying to make sure that a TAC doesn't live forever.

Again, the concern here, does it read that way for people? I don't know. I think that's what he's asking. When I read this, it always assumed to me that it was 14 days, and that's what it was going to be set. To me, it was a min, max. It was both of those values. I

didn't mind the standard and I don't remember why that went away. But to me, it was just that one number it was set. Obviously, 13.2 allows that to be set to null. Again, we've gone through several different language changes here. I guess the question from Rick is, is it an issue the way it's written? To me, it's not, but I'll let Rick go. Thanks, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Roger. I think that, to the point that I was raising, my perception of that there's a loophole in the current language that I was trying to close, to that extent, Steinar's suggestion is, I think, hits that spot on. Because his suggestion, which Sarah has rephrased in chat, the TAC TTL must not exceed 14 calendar days from the time it is set at the registry, enforced by the registry. That closes off long running TACs. I think that handles the point that I was raising. I think that Steinar's suggestion is a great upgrade that addresses that issue.

There's another issue which we're talking about here is should the registry be allowed by policy to have a standard minimum that's less than the 14, where they consistently enforce it less than 14, which would theoretically be a 13.3 or a 13.1.1, hypothetically, because the registrar has the ability to shorten it on their discretion on a domain by domain basis. So going into that for parity, it seems like the registry, especially concerning the kinds of special purpose registries that we have, should be able to have at least the ability to do a standard, where they set a standard that's less than 15 days, presuming it's consistently enforced. That seems reasonable. If they don't do it gratuitously and spaciouly in a name by name basis, that sort of thing.

I know that from a registry standpoint, representing the registry constituency as a whole, I know there are enough registries that have specialized policies that they would want the ability to do shorter for security reasons, for the reasons that was mentioned previously about certain names, having a very short transfer window, just like the registrars have the ability to do that in 13.2. So that's my point. And yes, I understand. Sarah has a great point there in chat that she just made, last thing there. Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. I think one of the concerns, just top of my head, is if I had rick.net and rick.org, the TTL on those can be different, and it doesn't seem like there's reasons for that to be different. Maybe there is, I don't know. But as a registrant, I wouldn't see that. Now, if I had a one or two-letter domain versus a 30-letter domain, they're both com, I would want possibly protected. But I can understand it as well. It's just I don't think we ever talked about it to begin with so I don't know. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thanks. Hi. Going back to the suggested language, Jothan raised a really good point, which is saying that the TTL must not exceed 14 days. It doesn't mean it has to be 14 days. It just means it can't be longer than that. So I guess I'm no longer as supportive of that text as I thought that I was. Thanks to Jothan for pointing that out. So I think I want to suggest instead that we should go back to saying the standard TTL must be 14 days. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. Okay. I've called Rick here because I think he's the one that initiated this and was making sure that it was clear. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. I'll be brief. It's not fair that the registrar gets the ability to have its reasons to have it be less than 14 days, and the registry, specifically, a high security situation or for registry policy can't have the ability to have a standardized registry policy, which is well-known and well understood that all transfers involving .highsecurity, which of course doesn't exist, it's hypothetical. It's unfair that the registrar gets the ability to, for security or other reasons, have shortened it. And the registry doesn't have the ability to set that policy. I'm completely supportive, for various reasons I've been on the record for, to have the ability for the registrars to have 13.2, but it doesn't it all seem fair that the registry couldn't have that registry policy to do it this way. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Again, I'll say that this is obviously a new concept. I know we didn't talk about allowing the registry to change that. Obviously, the working group will need to think about that because it's brand new topic that we've never talked about. Keiron, please go ahead.

KEIRON TOBIN: Thank you. I would just push back on Rick on saying what makes a .bank any more important than a .com or a .xxx, a domain in its entirety is important to the individual who owns it just because of the terminology at the end doesn't make it any more important. Thank you.

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

THEO GEURTS: The reasons from Rick are well understood. Except my problem with it is that if the registries are going to set their own expiry on a TTL, then it's going to be problematic when you want to implement it. I mean, you have to look up, basically, for every registry that's out there and there's many nowadays, that you have to look, "It's five for you guys. It's six with those guys." You're going to have to make so many exceptions in the code again. That is going to be annoying. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. What I suggest here is maybe Rick can post something to list so the discussion can move to the list and we can talk about it again. It's a new concept and I think the working group should have the time to spend on it, not just trying to fit it in here. Again, I think, when we look at this, the goal here from the start, I believe, was to kill long lived codes. I think that this achieves that. And I think that Rick's bringing up another thing that is a possibility, which is fine, I think that it can be discussed, but I'd

like to move it to list so that we can move on. Rick, your last word, please.

RICK WILHELM: I'll be very brief. This is another one of the reasons why way back when I was not really in favor of the registries enforcing this, but we'll move it to the list. Thank you.

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

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I just want to recap where I think we landed before we move on from this item, if you don't mind.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. It sounds like for now, for the purposes of the next redline, we're going to use the existing language from the small group here in the report, but we're going to add the hours in addition to calendar days consistent with what we're doing with all the other recommendations. And we're going to adopt, for the purposes of the next redline, this new rationale provided by the small group and include that as well. Does that sound correct? And that some discussion may continue on the list regarding a potential additional provision regarding a different TTL set by the registry, but that that

won't be included for the moment in the next redline. Did I get that right?

ROGER CARNEY: Great, Emily. That's how I heard it. If others did not hear it that way, please jump on in and let us know. But that's how I heard it. Let's accept this, take Rick's new concept of registry flexibility there to the list and have a good discussion there. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Roger. I appreciate your forbearance. There still needs to be an edit to disallow long live TACs. The Steinar edit which was there until it wasn't got rid of the ability for long live TACs because of the example I gave of napping. But now, a curiously flexible reading of this would still allow long live TACs of 13.1. So I think we still need to have some sort of an edit there to disallow long live TACs explicitly. Thank you.

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

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I think, to the extent that there are clarifications, that everyone agrees are appropriate and can be supported, maybe that's also discussion that can continue on the list in terms of suggestions that can be palatable for all. And also noting that the recommendation text will be read in conjunction with the

rationale, which currently at least states in the TAC should be no more than 14 calendar days as well. I'm wondering if perhaps we can—I see another suggestion from Sarah here. It looks like there's a few alternatives. It's, at least to me, not yet clear if we have enough support to pick one of these. You let us know how you want to proceed, Roger. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. Thanks, Emily. I think we're going to proceed with what we have. I suggest, to Rick's point, making sure that we don't allow any long live TACs. If people have wording choices on that specifically, let's get them added in here. But I do invite Rick to throw into list the idea that he was bringing up on the registry flexibility as well as possibly a new provision, as Emily mentioned. I think what we have here, let's go with this. And then we will have any suggestions on making sure that the 14 days is the stopping point for any long live TACs. Okay. Emily, I think we're good on this.

Kerion, one more thing. Please, go ahead.

KEIRON TOBIN: Sorry. Just go back to that document. We're also getting rid of the "no more than" so must be 14 calendar days?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, correct.

KEIRON TOBIN: Perfect. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. I think we can jump to our next agenda item. Go ahead, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: I apologize. Our next agenda item is the recap of Phase 1B deliberations. Caitlin is going to take us through at least the first segment of it and see how far we get. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Caitlin, you have the floor.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Emily, and thank you, Roger. Emily is currently putting a document on the screen that staff has been working on to recap where we were prior to reviewing the public comments for Phase 1A. The purpose of this is to assist everyone in going back in their memory bank about where we left off with this discussion and also explain why we pivoted our approach to the phasing of the work in terms of how there were several points that touched on items in Phase 2 that the team thought were dependencies. So before finishing up the work here, we decided that it would be helpful to start those Phase 2 discussions earlier than planned. In short, this document aims to provide a summary of where we were. I'll give the typical disclaimer that the working group has editing rights. So

if anything was captured in a way that you don't agree with, you're welcome to propose edits to the document.

The first section of the document should be fairly non-controversial. That's just a recap of what a change of registrant is in terms of the current policy language. What appears in that light yellow box is the definition per the Transfer Policy. As a reminder, it's just that there are certain requirements when changes are made to registrant fields. There's the prior registrant name, registrant organization, registrant e-mail address, and administrative contact e-mail address if there is no prior registrant e-mail address. If there are any of those changes, certain requirements are in place, including the controversial 60-day post change of registrant into a registered transfer lock. But that is opt-outable as we all know and have discussed.

The last sentence provides a hyperlink to the Transfer Policy where you can reread that section of the policy if anyone needs to refamiliarize yourselves with that. So if you can scroll down.

You may remember that at the beginning of Phase 1B, we started with some polling questions to gauge the group's initial thoughts of the current state of change of registrant. We captured the general sentiment of that, which is that the majority of the working group believes that significant changes are needed to the change of registrant. That's 73% of the group. Then we had asked if the security principles that were touched on in Phase 1A should continue in Phase 1B. Approximately 82% of the group answered yes.

Moving on, we tried to capture the initial high level themes observed by the working group and we discussed the change of registrant. In terms of where these items and bullet points came from, many of them came from that decisions matrix and triggers matrix that the group worked on, as well as points made during working group calls. As I just noted previously from the poll that got sent out to the working group, one of the big themes that were touched on by many folks in the group is that the security principles developed in Phase 1A should continue to Phase 1B. Specifically, if the group chooses to depart from those Phase 1A security principles, there should be a documented reason why instead of why not proceed with the same types of security since the goal is to make the Transfer Policy more secure for registrants.

Also, you might remember that after the polls were taken, it seemed that the group was coalescing around retaining the change of registrant policy in some form. Be it significant changes were recommended by the group. We'll discuss some of those proposed changes shortly.

Lastly, the group had mentioned that intra-registrar hijacking or where a name is taken within the same registrar portal is different from inter-registrar hijacking. Because if the compromise happens within a registrar, it's easier for the registrar to restore the name to the rightful owner. And most registrars already have some sort of internal process of how to handle an ownership dispute of a domain name.

Moving along to Section 4. Here we have some high level bullets about issues that the working group members observed with the

current policy. Again, a lot of these items came from that triggers matrix that the group went over because several of you provided really comprehensive feedback to the different triggers for change of registrant. The first overarching theme is that change of registrant, as it currently exists if not fit for purpose, oftentimes registrants will update their contact details and it doesn't necessarily correspond with the inter-registrar transfer. But they're frustrated to find out that the name is locked for 60 days as it does hinder their ability to rightfully transfer a name. A couple of you had mentioned that this is a particular issue when the name is on the brink of expiration. Folks will get expiration reminder notices which registrars are required to send, and the registrant will go into their account, update information, and then potentially try to move their name but they're locked from doing so, and that's confusing.

The second point is that the way that the policy was implemented negated the original policy purpose, which was to prevent hijacking. As an example of that, the term designated agent was a term defined in the Transfer Policy. But a lot of registrars have incorporated themselves as the designated agent and opted out of that 60-day lock. That's allowable under the current policy but obviously that negates the purpose. Because if the lock is opt-outable or inconsistently applied, it's confusing for the customer, and many have noted it's a nuisance for a lot of customers, which goes to the third bullet point. It's too long and it's confusing to registrants. Some of the Registrar Working Group members noted that there was a huge increase in customer service queries for registrars once this policy was implemented and continues to be a headache.

Lastly, an important point is that because that 60-day post change of registrant lock is optional or can be opt-outable, it really provides no added security.

Moving on. This next section tries to capture some of the suggestions that working group members made to the current policy. The first one being that the current way the change of registering as defined is, again, not fit for purpose. It might be that someone makes a typographical change to their name and then they're locked from transferring their name for 60 days. What a lot of group members seem to coalesce around is rather than have the change of registrant defined as it currently is, to look at a change to the anchor contact method or the primary contact method that the registrar uses to communicate with the registrant, and in the event that that anchor contact method changes, that could trigger additional security methods. But in terms of how it's defined now, it's really not fit for purpose.

Some of the other proposed changes is many of you noted that in the event there is a change to that primary contact method, that a notification to the prior registrant would be sufficient instead of requiring an ACK or active confirmation. Many working group members suggested that the 60-day post change of registrant lock should be eliminated entirely. At least one or two working group members noted that the 60-day period for the lock should be reduced to 30 days. Because 60 days is too long and also 30 days is the period that we're using for Phase 1A or NACKing.

Another point is that following the change of that primary contact method, that some working group members noted that the added securities to the TAC and the post 30-day lock should continue for

a change of primary contact method, just like an inter-registrar transfer or a TAC request.

Then here, importantly, the fifth bullet point notes that a lot of the current change of registrant methods or security mechanisms should be eliminated. The notification alone is sufficient and that really what the group should focus on is enhancing the dispute resolution mechanisms in Phase 2. That is precisely why we've updated our working plan.

So if you go to Section 6—thank you, Emily—these are the related topics from Phase 2 that touch on change of registrant and necessitated the change in the group's work plan. Shortly, what I just noted was multiple working group members noted that we could remove certain change of registrant security features such as the 60-day lock and the acknowledgement from a prior registrant, but that in lieu of removing those particular features, the working group should consider enhancing the dispute resolution mechanisms in Phase 2. The group noted that those are inextricably intertwined. That topics like the transfer emergency action contact and the transfer dispute resolution policy, as well as this fast undo or clawback were topics that should be talked on in a more holistic manner in terms of change of registrant as well as Phase 2, which is why the group will be moving on to discuss those topics to see if that informs the discussion on the change of registrant or change of primary access method.

The last page is just a brainstorming table that the group can use when we go back to this topic. It talks about what's currently are required, should that continue to be required? Why or why not? That's a similar method that we've been using in our Phase 1A

discussions about documenting the group's thinking and then why or why not certain current security mechanisms or future security mechanisms should be included.

I was talking about a mile a minute to try to get through the document. But hopefully that helps everyone as a refresher. But obviously, this is something that the group can review and is recommended that it does review, in part because we tried to summarize opinions from you all that were mentioned in previous calls, but also just as a refresher to remember where we were because it's been a while, several months to be exact. With that, we're happy to answer any questions about the document or any improvements you think could be made to it. I'll turn it back over to Roger because I notice we have one minute left in the call. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Impressive that you were able to squeeze that in. Berry, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. Just real quick. The point of doing this is it's still going to be a while before we return back to deliberations on change of registrant. But, really, as part of your homework, while we're on break next week, you should review this in detail to keep it front and center of mind as we pivot into the Phase 2 topics, as noted by Caitlin and some of the dependencies that were identified here. But the main takeaway is with review of this briefing document or the summary document as where we've

landed with the Phase 1A recommendations where they sit now, everything is brought up to the same point in time or line, if you will, in terms of where the group is at with all current deliberations. Those should remain front of mind while we do pivot to the Phase 2 topics that we'll be discussing for quite a while. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Berry. Exactly. Again, thanks, Caitlin, for running through this to get everybody adjusted to this. I think, as Berry mentioned, this is important. I think everybody needs to take the time to read through this in more detail, especially since we have the week off. But just to level set everybody to get into our Phase 2 discussions. I'm amazed actually how much we actually talked about changing registrant now that we go back and look at how much we talked about it in a short period that we had last summer to go over that. But we are over time. I want to thank everybody for today. We're not meeting next week so it'll be two weeks before we see everybody. So I'll talk to everybody in two weeks. Thanks.

DEVAN REED:

Thank you all so much for joining. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]