
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 09 April 2024 at 16:00 UTC

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

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

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group Call taking place on Tuesday, April 9th, 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Osvaldo Nova (GNSO Council Liaison), Eric Rokobauer (RrSG). They have formally assigned Essie Musailov (RrSG) as their alternate for this call and for the remaining days of absence. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form link can be found in all meeting invite emails.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Please remember to state your name before speaking

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.

for the transcription. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Christian. Welcome, everyone. Not a whole lot of updates before we get into delving into our homework over the past couple of weeks. It looks like we got some really good feedback we can get through today so we can resolve any open issues and get any questions answered there. The only thing I would probably say to start is that for the contracted parties, we are a month away from summit starting. So I'm sure many of you have already started planning, but we'll be heading there in just a few weeks. So it's something to think about. Other than that, I think I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups that want to come forward with anything outside the homework, I suppose. We'll leave the homework stuff for our agenda, but anything outside the homework, any stakeholder groups that want to bring forward comment wise, anything, questions for the working group. So again, anything outside the homework, we'll cover the homework pieces in detail here soon.

Okay, great. I think we can probably jump in. We've got quite a bit to cover on the COR worksheet. So maybe I'll turn this over to Christian to kick us off here.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: So I'm going to jump into the document here and I'll post it in the chat as well. First of all, thank you all who contributed to the document already. I really appreciate this and this is going to be a really helpful exercise for continuing forward and figuring out what's finally going to go into the initial report with respect to changes of registrant data.

The first thing I want to do before jumping into those tables is I just kind of want to briefly go through those yellow highlights, which is something that we meant to do last time, but we just kind of ran out of time. It's not a lot that was changed from the meeting before last, but I just wanted to make sure that everyone was kind of aware of these updates. It included this section for Rec 3, which had subject to the opt out requirements described in Rec 4. This is referring to the to the notification that would be sent when a COR occurs that would not be sent if—or the current recommendation language that would have an opt out. So that's why we just wanted to clarify that. Same goes for Rec 3.4 subject to the opt out requirements described in Rec 4 for when there's a change of email address. So it's really just kind of a slight rephrasing of that language, just so that it's clear.

And then finally, this last updated item was 4.6. This is an addition before it was a footnote to Rec 4. So it was just turned into a Rec 4.6. So those are the only changes that were done from two weeks ago. But everyone should be kind of aware that already haven't done the assignment. So thank you very much again.

And with that, we will move into the first table, which is the most probably the most important piece. These are the ones that the group cannot live with. So we see we have several items here

from the business constituency. So what we would ask is if the representative, Zak, if you're here, if you wouldn't mind kind of walking us through some of these items and then rationale, and then we can have a discussion about what this means for the recommendations. So, Zak, over to you. Well, in that case, until Zak is able to join or if he's not here today, does Zak have an alternate today? I'm not sure. For the BC.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yeah. Hello, this is Arinola Akinyemi for the record and the alternate for the BC. However, Zak is on the attendee list. So you might need to promote Zak to panelist.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Zak, over to you.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay, so I want to just provide a number of caveats to this. First of all, cannot live with is a fairly strong term. But between this and the other one, the yellow one, it could have gone in either. I put it in this one. I see some other stakeholders took a different approach. I don't want to overemphasize that cannot live with it, because the way I see it is that it's a whole package of recommendations. So there's moving parts. So if one thing changes, maybe you could live with this thing, etc. So that's the first caveat.

The second caveat is that there was a very limited time for the BC to digest this and provide its instructions. And in particular, there

wasn't sufficient time to have a call about it, invite guest speakers to brief everyone on the context. As we all know, the context for these things is very important. That's the second caveat.

The third caveat is that as everyone here is aware, these things are done by committee. And so you have to take it in that context. The fourth caveat is that you'll see that the focus of recommendation 2.3 is the elimination of the change of registrant data policy that requires the registrar request to obtain confirmation from both prior registrant and new registrant prior to processing a change of registrant data.

And so the BC simply put, and it's clear in the text that was provided in the feedback form, believes that registrants should have an opportunity to kibosh a change of registrant and that if there is going to only be notification that it be affected prior rather than post the change of registrant data.

Last caveat is that do not intend to provide—that this is to sabotage recommendations or to convey that we're being obstinate, but we were asked to provide feedback about things that we liked and didn't like. And so we've done that. Thanks.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you, Zak. So would you like me to read through the recommendations that you have in the table? The first thing for 2.3 and then I believe the next is—

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: I mean, people can read it themselves. I'm sure. But whatever you prefer, Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Well, I mean, if you if you could possibly walk us through those recommendations.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: All of the ones in red?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes, we'll go in order of the recommendations, just so we can have a discussion about what you know what those mean.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay, so the rationale provided for 2.3 was that while the BC recognizes that the act of updating the domain name in the first place assumes agreement of the change of registrant data. However, if the notification is only to occur—if there's only going to be a notification [inaudible] notification must occur prior to the change for it have the intended effect of enabling a registrant to take action. Moreover, there should be an actual ability to stop the change, rather than only take remedial post transfer action. So that's 2.3.

2.4, the BC supports this reduction of the 60 day into register transfer locked to 30 days. But it should be subject to an opt out and the opt out should be mandatory and readily and clearly available to registrants and should not be a default setting. The

rationale is that this provides greater balance between security and transport ability for registrants. The current transfer policy does contain an opt out, but is not uniformly and consistently offered by registrars, thereby leading to confusion, frustration, complaints. Christian, I'll stop there. Am I doing what you you've asked, or should I be doing something different?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. Appreciate it. So if I understand correctly, and please correct me if I'm wrong, the idea behind updating or the kind of disagreeing with 2.3 is that rather than removing the requirements to, which is the current transfer policy, to require confirmation from the prior and the new registrant before a change of registrant is enabled, the BC would prefer that that actually remains in place that they're keeping the confirmation and also with 2.4.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: That's correct so far in 2.3, with the caveat that if there is only going to be notifications, then that should occur prior to the change of registrant data.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Okay, well, and I see we have some raised hands there. So I'll just pause there.

ROGER CARNEY: So let's go ahead and go with Theo. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, thanks. And this is Theo for the record. And no worries, Zak. I mean, we are talking about 2.3 old policy. Always with ICANN when you try to walk back mistakes from the past that is very problematic within the ICANN community. And I want to note a couple of things. And you mentioned already the caveats that you already pointed out. This was also short notice.

Going into this process very, very deep would have been challenging going through all the operational issues and all that kind of stuff. So like you said, this could have been a red one or a yellow one. And this is just the BC, which we have now in the document, we are still missing on some of the other groups on what they are thinking.

And I'll bet, no, I'm not going to bet, probably illegal under the ICANN Code of Conduct. But anyways this process, what we are now going through today we are going to see the same exact thing when we are going to hit the comment period, because it's going to be a repeat. And that was sort of that I was trying to relay back, like when we started discussing this process. It's good to test the waters a little bit and I think we got a fair view on where people's minds are. But I think it's going to be amplified when we are going into the actual comment policy. That's it for me at this moment. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks. And that's a good point, Theo. And again, I think all these comments in here are great, because just exactly as Theo pointed out, we're probably going to see these same similar comments in public comments. So, if we're prepared, that's the

best part of this. So, I appreciate the BC taking the time to go through this. It's great. And recognizing the caveats, I think most people have those same caveats in their comments. And again, I think what we can use this for is really to help provide the different stakeholder groups the additional information. As Zak said, they didn't get to sit down and have a detailed discussion on this. So, I think that at that point in time when they can do that, the best thing is to provide the working group rationale as to why these things happened. And as Zak and Theo just had that little conversation there, obviously a lot of the context gets missed from what the working group spent years doing. So, I think that it's good to know.

And I think one of my first comments when I read this was, okay, as kind of Theo went down, maybe problematic how it started. And when you change things, it becomes a little more difficult. But one of the big changes we made here was that differentiation of the current policy is more toward a change of registrant, which implies an ownership or something similar to that, a change of ownership, where our recommendation has gotten away from that. And we're recommending things about change of registrant data, which is a slightly different topic. And that's what the first thing that came to my mind was we're no longer talking about a change of registrant here, per se. We're talking about data that's changing. And again when the stakeholder groups get back and get time to discuss those things, I'm hoping those items come up. But anyone else have any comments? I know Sarah had some and came back. And I think Theo must have hit on some of her stuff. So, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. And we've sort of got to recognize this is a test run for the bigger work that comes our way when we move further. But on 2.3, and Steinar sort of mentioned that already in the chat, and that triggers the question like how do you sort of convey, relay, communicate a very complex situation? When, as a registrar, we're looking at the operational issues there, we are dealing with registrants that are confused, you know. And again, how do you sort of communicate it in such a manner that everybody gets it within two minutes? Like, okay, we are not really giving up security, but we are actually sort of improving the usability, the registrant experience altogether. You know, that's the hard part, I guess. That's it. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, Theo. Yeah, and that's exactly right. And Steinar's question in chat is the one that should be answered. And I think you have to walk through all of our discussions on that. And I think that's the hard part. And especially when you, as Zak mentioned, not having enough time to go through that and have a detailed discussion and be able to say, okay, this is what the working group thought. You know, obviously in this instance here a change of registrant was opt outable today, you know. So if that happened, then there was no verification, or I shouldn't say verification, but an acknowledgment.

So, I think there's multiple reasons why we came to this. And those are the important things to get to and explain to the working group, to the other stakeholder group members that aren't participating in this three-year cycle. So, but I'll go to Sarah. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. Yeah, my hand is up mostly to support what Theo said and agree with Steinar's comment in the chat that we have to explain why we think this is sufficient. And I think Theo gave a whole bunch of really good reasons just now. So, maybe it's just a question of how we're formatting the report to include our rationale, which I'm sure the staff team is already thinking about. So, just hands up for supporting maintaining the change from instead of approval to notification, and hands up for explaining why it's a good idea, because I still think it is. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTROD: Yeah. Hi, this is Steinar for the record. I just want to say that the way I processed this with the Consolidated Policy Working Group is that I made my recommendation and distributed that in front of the meeting last week. And we had a half an hour session discussing this. And I also asked all the members to get feedback to my proposals for this exercise.

Unfortunately, I didn't receive any detailed update. But the essence of the discussion was that CCWG members were kind of afraid that what we are proposing is firing up the possibility for domain theft. I tried to explain to them that we don't have any data that really indicate that the volume of domain theft is that significant high and that we should put more security elements

into the core policy and try to make it more difficult—Difficult is not the best word, but more challenging for the registrant to actually do update the registrant data. But what I think is that we need to explain when we go in the public face here also the element of why we have ended up with this and also giving data and input that the volume of domain theft is not that high and we're not trying to create a policy that makes domain theft close to impossible. So that is also some action items we need to take care of. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Steinar. Yeah. And again, I think that's a big part. And again, I think I don't know that was the reason for going through this exercise here, but it actually does do a very good job of taking us through and making sure that we do have that rationale, and when the report gets put together, that we are addressing these items, because the three years all of us have spent together, it works out and we kind of can make sense out of those things. But when someone reads it as a plain statement that says, hey, we're not doing acknowledgements, we're doing notifications, no one who spent those three years together is going to raise their hand and say, okay, but why? And again, I think we've got a lot of reasons why we went that direction. And if we didn't have enough, this is the perfect time to make sure that we do. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thanks, Roger. So just having listened to everyone's remarks, I'm thinking that there's some things that ultimately there may be a

genuine difference of opinion on in terms of the recommendations and the transfer policy. But other things, initial concerns or disagreements could potentially be resolved with that fuller three-year training course we've been subjecting ourselves to. And so in light of that, there's no way we can put them through the three year training course, but it would seem to be useful if even prior to the comment period, stakeholders be given an opportunity to put their questions to the working group via webinar, so that to the extent that your explanations can satisfy the concerns, that you preempt the comments to some extent. Thank you.

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

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, well, I think I agree with Zak. That is a good idea. You know, have a webinar and get some questions from the community, from the SOs, ACs and stakeholder groups. What my issue with that is, you will only capture a small part of the community. And if you can convince those people, excellent. And if they can bring the message into the entire community, that would be fantastic. But I don't think that's going to happen. I think we always will be sort of going back to the process that we need to defend ourselves over and over again till the recommendations are approved by the board. And then it's over. Again, I'm not dismissing it. I'm just laying out that there is if you want to do that, do a webinar. I think it should be sort of prepared very, very well, way ahead of time, and trying to get as many people field questions in advance so that we can actually discuss about it. And

I think that that is sort of, and this is also a lead that came up when I was looking at the document that was shared last week by Berry. That is definitely the document that we're going to put in all this information on why we were doing this. And we need to be well prepared for that document when it goes to the final report. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong, but when our group 1A recommendation came out, we did have a webinar, and it wasn't necessarily specifically tailored to receiving feedback. It was more of the first part of that of providing what we came up with and then the material that goes along with that of the discussion and rationale. You know, so I think we did a webinar, and again, it wasn't necessarily tailored to answering questions or anything like that. It was more to just provide the information up front prior to that initial report coming out on group 1A stuff. And it's something we can definitely do again. Again, that initial report provides hopefully at least the important pieces of this three-year training session, as Zak called it. But that's the goal, is the report does pull in the relevant information for each of those items that we've combed through over the time where everyone else doesn't get all that much or doesn't have to get to, whatever it is, get to spend that much time dealing with it. And hopefully we can summarize that hopefully in that two-minute read kind of thing. So when people are interested or have questions, it's available to them.

We haven't really talked about our ICANN 80 agenda yet. And maybe that feeds partly into that, presenting what we have.

Hopefully by ICANN 80, we're well into our initial report for all of our topics that we've covered. So it may be a good time. I'm not saying it is or not, because we're still a couple of months away from that. But that's an option as well. Okay.

Again, I think that as Zak said, one of his caveats, he put this in the red. And again, I'm not sure that matters here either. I think it's great that we're discussing it and that we can get these out in the open. And to me, it's always better to discuss it earlier than waiting till the report's written and then waiting for 45 days to get comments back and then finally getting to them. So it's much better. We can see the questions now and hopefully address them as best we can before, during that initial report. But any other comments on 2.3? I think we've gone through that pretty detailed. Maybe we can just move on to 2.4. And I think Zak already read this for us. So any comments on 2.4, BC's comments? Again, BC's supporting the 30-day. And I want to make sure that the mandatory opt-out, BC's not saying that it needs to be opt-out. They're saying that ability to opt out has to be there. So I don't know if Zak has any comments, but I'll go to Jody real quick. Jody, please go ahead.

JODY KOLKER:

Thanks, Roger. Zak, what I'm curious about on this is, does this opt-out happen after the domain has been transferred from another registrar to the new registrar? Or does it happen before the transfer actually happens? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jody. And I think this is talking about once it's moved and there's a 30-day lock on it, that opt-out ability. And again, I think this is what we're talking about. But I'll let Zak jump in.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah, so just thinking about this a little bit, Roger. So the 30-day lock, the BC believes that it should be by default. And so there would be, as Roger mentioned, the lock implemented notionally. And that would mean at the new registrar, after the first hop. So the first hop is fine. It's the second hop. Is that right? Am I following this?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. Yeah, I think that's right, Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Then there would be the lock at that point in time, but subject to an opt-out so that the registrant could say to the registrar, look I've got 10,000 names with you or we're IBM, we need to move this for a deal or, and there's no there's no reason to enforce that 30 days in the circumstances.

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

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. And I just wanted to clarify as well for, if not just for myself, this is referring to the 60-day, currently the 60-day lock

that would follow a change of registrant, correct? Not a change of registrar. So with the current policy and the transfer policy is a registrant may be able to opt out before updating their data. Some registrars don't offer that opt-out. So oftentimes what happens when you update your data, that lock gets placed and then you can't transfer to a registrar after you update your registrant information, like your email. So this recommendation is saying rather than making it 60-day lock, reducing it to 30-day lock, like the other inter-registrar, like after initial registration and after a registrar transfer, reducing that from 60 to 30 days, but making the opt-out something that is required across the registrar rather than something optional. Is that right? Is that the right interpretation of it?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: That sounds very good, Christian. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Okay, good. So far, the group had talked about getting rid of this 60-day lock entirely. And this is a suggestion to keeping the lock, but just making it 30 days. And then the following recommendations were that those notifications should be before, not after it occurs. So I'd be curious to think about, because I'm assuming here that the group still thinks that that 60-day lock should be removed. But if others think that it should be brought back, again, I think this exercise is really for making sure that we clarify the rationale behind it. So if the group thinks that, no, we want to keep that 60-day lock removed as it was more of a

frustration for registrants rather than actually preventing domain hijacking, which is the idea behind it, then let's make that clear.

The same goes for the notifications, the notifications being after a change already occurs. If the idea was that it's just so that it's easier for registrants to quickly update their data, they don't have to do something before, they don't have to wait a period or do some kind of confirmation, let's talk about that now so that we have that rationale documented about why the group believes that it should be after, not before, or there should be no lock versus a reduced lock. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Christian. And thanks for digging that out because I was actually confused as well then. I thought I knew what that was saying, but I guess I didn't. Yes, this 2.4 was specifically for change of registrant data, which today is the change of registrant has a 60-day opt-outable lock. And the working group went to just removing the 60-day. The change of registrant data does not have a lock. I think that I got this confused with tying this into Rec 17, and maybe others did too. This is not about that. This is about the change of registrant data. Today the change of registrant has an opt-outable 60-day lock. And the working group decided that we should remove the 60-day lock and the opt-outable part, obviously, because it's removed. And that there would be no lock on a change of registrant data. So I think that that's what we're discussing here. So hopefully that's what we're discussing, Christian and Zak. Maybe both confirm that.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah, that's right, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Okay. Because I was confused. So, okay. Thank you. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah. Hi, this is Steinar for the Record. I hope I'm not restarting the confusion here. But my reading of 2.4 is connected to what is previously known as the material change. That's when there is some element of registration data has been changed that triggered a lock to transfer a domain name. And if I recall correctly, and we have the same understanding, this is one of the elements that really created a huge number of problems/cases for ICANN compliance. My questions to Zak and BC is, I understand that you want to have some sort of time period where it is impossible to initiate a transfer when there is a, in bracket, material change of registrant. Why did you end it up on 30 days? Why didn't you put it on? You mentioned that 60 is too long, but lower than 30, if you want to have that kind of security element, if it is a security element. Thank you.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you, Steinar. So, Steinar, I recall the BC's deliberations on this. There are people in the BC who are perfectly happy with keeping a 60-day lock because they like things to stay put as much as possible to restrict DNS abusers, etc. However, given that there was an inclination to reduce onerous 60-day time periods, the BC's view was that, well, 60 days is great, but if we're

going to reduce it, then let's reduce it to 30 days rather than eliminate it altogether.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay. Thanks, Zak. Yeah. And again, I think what Steinar brought up, the big reason, the one thing that we did seem to have some good data on was this 60-day lock and the opt-out ability of this 60-day lock very much drove compliance issues. So, transfer issues to compliance. So, it was one of those where, okay, we all agreed that registrants should have the ability to change their data and all that, but as soon as they change, and as Steinar mentioned material change, as soon as they made a change to one of those things, a lock pops up. And it's generally a lot of changes come in when they're actually going to be moving. So, it became that chicken-egg kind of thing where, and again, the opt-out was available, it was confusing. So, I think that that's where this working group got to is registrants should be able to change their data and not affect the processes later on.

We put in place a lot of Group 1A recommendations for the security of moving a name from one registrar to another, and we had that discussion of if that's the issue, that's where we need to address it, not in a different policy aspect. The registrants should have the ability to change their names, and if that dictates something later, that something later has to handle it, not the change itself is where the working group got to. But I'll go to Owen. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thank you, Roger. I appreciate the feedback from the BC. However, I think we had spent quite a bit of time discussing this and a lot of the rationale and the reasons. And as Steinar mentioned, this is a source of headache for registrants in a number of compliance cases. I recall from when I was working at compliance and this became an obligation, registrants were beyond aggravated, and I'm being nice with the wording, because quite often they would want to change the data when they wanted to change registrars. So they want to move their domain name, they have to make a change for whatever reason, and then they're blocked for 60 days. That's really aggravating for a registrant. And I appreciate the desire to have a, and I'm using air quotes, security issue here, but I don't think that a 30, 60, whatever day lock from changing data is causing any security. We don't have any data showing that it prevents unauthorized transfers. We don't have any data showing that. And the only data we have is registrants who have these domain names are significantly aggravated by this. So I think that it's a very narrow, narrow scope thing to bring us back in because it's not going to stop with this concern. And if the BC would like to come back with some other, their proposal, I'd like to see some information, data, evidence to undo what we've discussed together as a team here. And there are times to change the data, to block a transfer if there's any concerns. We have the FOA period when a registrant emails change, they're made aware of it. And so they have days to undo a transfer. There's a 30 day transfer lock if there's a domain going to another registrar. So I mean, there's other things built in there that are security devices that I think are a lot better than just freezing a domain name for 30 days because you have to update your email

address or something like that. Again, having seen dozens and upon dozens of these cases myself personally at ICANN Compliance, registrants hate this thing. And I don't think it's really securing anything by keeping this lock. And so I advocate for removing it as we've originally done. Thank the BC for the feedback. But I think if they look at more of the rationale, the reasons, as opposed to this, oh, no, please don't change the current policy, which is what this kind of appears to me, as opposed to understanding all of the rationale and reasons that we've discussed for many months on this. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Owen. Yeah, and hopefully Owen added to what I was saying because, I mean, there was one meeting that we purposely made clear delineation between change of registrant data and registrar transfer. And we purposely made sure to make those discussions of, yes, if there's security issues, we need to address those within the Group 1A recommendations because we think we've got them covered there. And the change of registrant data should not have that lock that just is confusing and, to be honest, can be overridden. So it was not really a lock.

But again, we made that conscious decision to separate them and make sure that our security measures on a transfer were there. And on a change of data, we didn't need it as it was just more of a hindrance than a true security item. But Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, and always an interesting discussion when we talk about this particular lock. I mean, I remember back 10 years ago in the IRT, when discussing this I wasn't very thrilled with the entire lock option. It didn't make any sense back then to me. I mean, we didn't have that lock prior to the policy, never noticed any issues with it. So I was already wondering within the IRT, well, why should we have a lock? So when the option became there to opt out from it, I ran with that. I was a heavy supporter back then because I was happy about it. And the first thing when that policy came out, I told our development team, we're going to make that available to every reseller registrant because I don't want to have a gigantic mess there. And we have offering the opt out for since the policy is out, which is almost eight years now and never had any issues. And I think if you go ask every registrar who offers that opt out, they will tell you that there are not many issues there, if any, because if there were any issues, then they would most likely change the entire opt out system. But I suspect registrar who do use it, yeah, I can't really guess what they're thinking is there. I don't see it much all over the place, but that could be me.

But going back to all the comments that we just received from Owen, very, very well laid out and from Steinar. Okay, we are discussing this. The BC has some issue with it. We already laid out all these reasons. So in my mind, the question starts to form, what is missing here that we can convince everybody like this is a good move? I understand that the BC has been discussing this and I don't want to put the BC in the hot seat here, but I find it a very great example of a stakeholder group who comes up with their reasoning on why they come up with 2.4 on why they sort of cannot live with. But I do wonder, like, how do we get in the

position that everybody can live with it? Is that even possible?
Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Yes, it's definitely possible. So we'll get there. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah, thanks. Those are excellent comments and responses. I mean, just in terms of this particular issue there, Theo, there's an interest within the BC that is sympathetic to Owen's concerns about registrants being frustrated with the locks that are in place. And so there's that element. There's also the element that is concerned about enforcement of IP rights and stuff like that, that would be happier with more locks. And so that's where the kind of balancing comes into play. But yeah, Roger, I hope you're right that everything is possible. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: We'll get there for sure. Okay. Any other comments on this 2.4? A good discussion, and I appreciate it, because I was confused when we started, so I appreciate it for myself. Okay. Maybe, Zak, you can take us through the three.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: So three, I don't want to revisit the notifications issue, which we've covered, but really, if you look to the rationale, the BC suggests that, listen, there's going to be some registrars, and we've

discussed this at great length in this working group, who have a business model where the notifications of changes just aren't wanted by the registrants, so they opt out. There's a recommendation for an opt-out by them.

The BC suggests instead that registrants who don't want to receive these notifications use an email filter to direct them to their junk. To put it simply. Thanks.

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

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, no, I'm not really great on that idea, Zak, that our support teams are going to instruct registrants to apply mail filters in all these email clients, whatever they use. I mean, there's a whole range there, which can be very problematic. But I understand the reasoning but again, as we discussed, and this is a repeat of a repeat, I guess, but for the business models that are out there, it's a great option. For the rest of us, not such a great option. You know, again, for most retail and I suspect wholesale registrars, it's not something they are going to do. And of course if you think about it logically, I can understand it for a brand registrar. But if you—in my perspective, looking from a wholesale registrar perspective, sending those notifications just makes sense because if you have a dispute, like, why did my data change? Well, we sent you a notification, right? I mean, then you can go back and go like, yeah, this shouldn't be a surprise because we emailed you. It's that always every time there's a discussion about

this and this happened it's great to have sent an email. It's great to have logs and go back to register or resell like, yeah, but this shouldn't be new because on this and this date, we did send X and X and X. So you can't complain five years later that you're surprised that your data has been changed or whatever your domain name has been renewed or whatever the reason is. So these notifications for most business models will make a lot of sense to keep sending notifications because it's going to help you as a registrar, your support team, is going to give them ammunition when there is a dispute. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Theo. Any other comments on this? My only other comment at a higher level is, and maybe Zak can use this with the BC and other stakeholders can, I just want to make sure that we talk about these things—And I don't know if Zak, maybe it was just a wording thing, but it talks about change of registrant. Now, we're not making that determination here. We're not saying it's a change of registrant. We're just saying it's a change of registrant data, which obviously could be a change of registrant or it could not be, or it may be the same person. So I think that one of the big things, again, I think is when we made that decision a while back that we're talking about change of registrant data, not change of ownership, etc. So, and again, just something to keep teasing out through. So, Ken, please go ahead.

KEN HERMAN:

Okay. Thanks, Rogers. Ken Herman for the record. Just to reiterate my question from last week, my stakeholder group was—

in this issue, they weren't concerned about the notifications. They're happy with the notifications so far in the input that I received. They were just concerned that monitoring that they're produced in a timely manner. So if you recall, the question was what mechanisms are in place to ensure that registrars comply with this? Frankly, I don't really think it's an issue. Most of the registrars that I've worked with have automated these procedures and they just get sent, but I suspect that there might be some others where there's some issue. So anything that—it doesn't have to be here, but anything that I can share with my stakeholder group about how these things get monitored.

I know last week we talked about how we just wait—basically it's complaint-based and if people complain, well, then compliance might follow up. And of course in reflecting on that, it might be, well if I don't get it, how do I know that things have happened? So just anything we can be sure about compliance would be—with the 24 hour aspect of it would be really helpful. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

All right. Thanks, Ken. Yeah. And as you mentioned, I think that the 24 hours is a nice window and I'm assuming some registrars that are more manual can use that time. But as you said, I think most registrars, this is probably within seconds or whatever, is relatively quickly there. It's going to happen because they automate that. So it's just happening. So, but yeah, it's a fair question, Ken. And I think that anything that compliance can add in there would be useful as well. So, but I'll go to Theo. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. And not to put Jothan on the spot, but he always says he's the smallest registrar out there. I would love to know if he sends notification, if it's automated, or if he just grabs a phone and tells registrants through the phone that a change has happened. I would love to have that information.

Going back to Ken, he already mentioned like, yeah, if there are complaints, yeah, then ICANN compliance is going to do something. And I'm pretty sure while I'm not working for ICANN compliance, but being on the receiving end from registrar audits, this is clearly something you want to audit as ICANN compliance. It's easy to do. And you already know, like, okay, now we can check if that is being done.

Same goes for, I mean, these notifications are not the only ones being audited now and then. I mean, we're talking about renewal audits, notifications, we have in the past have to explain how that works and again, renewal, deletion, it just is all there and is part of most registrar systems and is done automatically and is being audited from time to time. And that's always a lot of fun. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Yes, and it is done in audits. Thanks for bringing that up. And Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, Theo said my name three times. So I'm going to bite the worm and get the hook in my mouth here. So I have it all

automated in compliance with the requirements. But I do, in fact, pick up the phone in a lot of cases and talk to the agent or the artist. Sometimes it's a great opportunity to have that touch with the customer. But that doesn't scale for registrars that are even 10 times my size, much less millions times my size. So I think what I do isn't, I think it's not a norm. But I do at least what's necessarily, I'm compelled to do to remain in compliance. And then I go above and beyond with some of my customers as sort of like a concierge service. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. Okay. Any other comments on that? Again, good discussion and good teasing out of the particulars there. Okay. Maybe I'll have Zak jump into 3.4, which I think is—

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Yeah, we could deal with 3.4 really quickly. If we could just put 3.4 on the screen really briefly. So as you can see, the focus of 3.4 is the means of notification ABC here. It's premised on opt-out requirements and it's premised upon notifications. But the focus is on the A, B and C. Now if we can go back to the feedback form.

The objection here is not with the A, B and C, but it's the premises, the opt-outs and the notifications which we've already covered. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. And again, as Zak mentioned a couple of these are tied together that notification and the BC recognizing

better before. And in the before, just from an operational aspects, a little hard. Obviously, if it's an acknowledgement, then that works. But on a notification, it's the trigger is the change itself. But yeah, any other comments? Okay, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, you just mentioned it yourself. We are not psychics, so we can't predict the future. So the trigger is the change. The data has changed. That's the trigger to send a notification. Because if the data hasn't changed, well, there is no API call. Nothing is happening. I mean, the data is not being altered. So that is sort of a technical impossibility in my, from my point of view. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah. And it gets back to, I think, Zak's comment earlier of the BC saying acknowledgement versus notification, because that's the only operational way to do that. But with a notification, it would be post that change where I suppose a registrar could delay an update on a time period or something. But that seems to be getting into more of an issue than anything. Okay. Any other comments on that?

Again, this is continuing the BC's comments on that notification being important for the registrar. Okay. Zak, if you want to take us to number four.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Roger. So we could bring up number four again. So once again, it's not the specifics of Recommendation 4, but rather the premise that the BC has concerns with. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. Yeah. And again, this completely details and as we've changed some of the language that Kristen even went over today the notifications are

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Zak. Yeah, and again, this completely details, and as we've changed some of the language that Christian even went over today, the notifications are dependent on this number four, because if they do opt out, then the notifications of the prior recommendations don't exist. So, any other comments on here? Again, I think this is consistent from the BC standpoint of the notification being important for the registrant.

Okay, I think that takes us to the end of this first chart, and again, I think it's important here that working through this, not just getting responses from everyone, but taking the time to look at the possible responses we're getting and addressing those to make sure that we do have the rationale, and again, at least documented well enough for someone to quickly dig into that. As I said earlier, and Zak pointed out, the background that we have is great, and we all went through this, but everyone else is going through it for the first time or not as in-depth. So, we do need to have those pointed rationale and deliberations documented in our

initial report and our final report as well, so. Okay, I think we can go ahead and move on. Yep, Christian, please go ahead.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yeah, no, if you don't mind, I think that what might make most sense for this table, since we do have some overlap among different groups, is maybe if we went chronologically with the recommendations first, and that way we can kind of have a discussion between the groups that had some overlap. So, if you don't mind, I think I'd like to skip to 1.3, which is also, Zak, if you don't mind just talking for one more item, and then we can move on to 4.3 and then finally 17.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay, let me bring it back up on my screen. The BC is concerned with the second part of the sentence. Now, I had highlighted this in the original feedback. Oh, there it is, okay. The BC is concerned with the second part of the sentence, the draft reclamation, and believes that it should be admitted, or alternatively, that there should be a way to conclusively identify those privacy proxy services which are affiliated by the registrar by way of disclosure, possibly via the registration agreement itself, or directly reporting it to ICANN.

And so, let's look at the highlight portion that the BC recommends be admitted. The change of registrant data does not apply to the addition or removal of privacy proxy service provider data. Okay. But how are you supposed to tell which ones are affiliated with the registrar, provided by the registrar? When we last discussed this, I

think we found one non-affiliated privacy proxy provider, but in theory, there could be more. And so, the rationale provided by the BC for their concern about that highlighted portion is that it's not always readily possible to identify which one really is affiliated with a registrar, or provided by the registrar. And so, from an enforcement perspective, how are you supposed to enforce that recommendation? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Zak. And I'll just add on just some information before I go to Catherine. The affiliated does seem like it's an easier reach, but to the point of non-affiliated, the problem with non-affiliated is the unknown. And you probably have many non-affiliated privacy proxy registrations that you just don't know of. Technically, somebody that's a web developer that registers a domain for a client, their proxy service, an attorney that registers it is a proxy or a privacy. A friend doing it even is technically a privacy or proxy. So, I think that there's many registrations that fall under a privacy proxy.

Now, this is specifically talking about those affiliated flips that are known when a registrar makes a flip of, today it shows a privacy. And when it comes to an agreement, or for whatever reason, with the underlying customer to display their information, that's when this kicks in. And that's not really a change of registrant, is what this is saying. Again, just trying to set that groundwork there, and backwards as well. So, Catherine, please go ahead.

CATHERINE PALETTA: Thanks, Roger. I was going to say a lot of what you said, but I also want to ask Zak, is the concern that when compliance is enforcing this, you didn't follow the change of registrant data process, that the registrar is not obligated to tell ICANN that this is an affiliated privacy or proxy service? I'm thinking through that. Sorry, I'll let you answer that question first.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Give it to me one more time, Catherine.

CATHERINE PALETTA: So, you're saying the removal of this seems to be because registrars won't necessarily have to tell ICANN that this is an affiliated privacy or proxy provider, when ICANN is checking compliance with this policy. Is that right?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: That's right. So

CATHERINE PALETTA: I don't think there's a risk of that, because either the registrar followed all of the notification requirements and the steps from the change of registrant data process, or they didn't. And if they didn't, they have to justify to ICANN why they didn't. And so, they'll have to explain to ICANN that this was an affiliated privacy or proxy service, so I didn't follow all the steps. And so, while they may not be required to disclose, if they don't tell ICANN that it's an affiliated privacy proxy, then ICANN doesn't know it falls under this

exemption, and then you've not followed the policy. In my... That's my understanding of... That's what I think ICANN compliance's approach would be to that, I guess.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks, Catherine. That's a good point. So I think what you're suggesting, thinking this through, is that if there were to be a complaint by a registrant that they didn't receive the notification, for example, then the ICANN compliance would then say to the registrar what's going on? And the registrar would say, well, it wasn't really a change of registering data here. It was our affiliate or our arm's length privacy protection service. And it's at that point that it would be revealed and disclosed to ICANN, rather than just somebody observing the WHOIS, for example. Okay, Catherine's put into chat, yes. Okay. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: I saw Catherine shaking her head, even though she wasn't on camera. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So, I would go back, why did we even come up with this? And the reason for that is pretty simple, because back then when we created the policy, well, not much later, it turned out no developer on earth was able to code this. And we had to go to the board to get a deferral for that specific section. So, what we are doing here as a working group is get rid of that technical impossibility by creating this language. And the entire distinction between affiliated or non-affiliated, that is, in my opinion, a

discussion that is outside of this issue. I mean, if the privacy provider isn't affiliated, it's just a regular data for us. And we treat it just like any other data. So, if somebody starts messing with that data and triggers whatever notifications, yeah, that's what's going to happen. If that service is not affiliated, because we don't know that. It's just data. It's just bytes from that perspective. But as soon as the service is affiliated with us, yeah, then we have a hard-coded few parameters in our system going like, okay, this is a change of registrant, has nothing to do with the change of a privacy provider. This registrant isn't turning it on or off or changing anything on the privacy level. That's all hard-coded. So, we're talking more about a technical impossibility created 10 years ago, which was deferred by the board since today and for the future till this policy change. So, I think that is why we have this discussion and not a discussion about affiliated or non-affiliated. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah. And I think as Katherine and Zak walked down those examples, it does show that I think that we have all those scenarios covered. So, either, as Theo just mentioned if you don't know, then you're following one, two, three, and you're sending notifications to the attorney or to whoever, but there's notifications being set. And if it is the privacy proxy part of this, then you know specifically, okay, there was nothing sent and didn't need to be because it was that one affiliated or as Zak said, arm's length, the privacy proxy service that did know and the registrar and did know that process. So, I think that we've got it all

covered. So, I think that's the good part. Okay. Christian, I think you can take us to whatever one's next.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you. I believe the next one is for the At-Large three. So, Steinar, would you like to speak to this?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah. Hi, and this is Steinar for the reason. And as I said, what I distributed to the Consolidated Policy Working Group was my recommendation to respond to this homework. And what—I kind of touched this in the last meeting also was Jim said about security concerns when opting out of the notification.

So, this is the base of why I propose—trying to be on the behalf of At-Large that we should not have any, the registrar should not have the possibility for the name holder to opt out of notification. Even though, and it was also said in the last meeting that the majority of the registrar will not enable this opt-out notification, but there are some business models. But I believe or my proposal or maybe hopefully At-Large believe that the recommendation 3.6 can be used for these categories of registrars that kind of tailor this into one notification for multiple domain names with the same information, etc. So, that's the rationale for why I put this directory into the yellow stuff.

And I also like to emphasize if the wording and the recommendation will be as it is written without the concerns or the input from At-Large, I also think that is something we can live with. So, that's my feedback on the first one. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Steinar. Any other comments from anyone? Again, I mean, we're kind of talking about similar things, but it's good to talk about this. Prudence, please go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hi. Prudence for the record. All I'm going to say is just optional opt-out. That's all I'm saying. I'm just going to say that once. Optional opt-out. Not all registrars need it, not all registrars will use it, but those who can will and those who can will do. And that's all I'm going to say about that. So, just optional opt-out. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Prudence. And again, I think as Theo mentioned earlier, I think there's going to be a large number of registrars that don't provide this, as Prudence just said, optional part of it. And I think that it does add a lot of complications that some registrars just aren't going to worry about it and others can actually use this feature fully in their business model. So, Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah. Thank you. I'm probably overstood on this. I need this at my registrar for my model. And I think there are other registrars that may need this flexibility. However, Steinar, if you would be kind enough to communicate that one of the things that I'm leaning on here is that there is an incredible informed consent that we want to make sure that the registrant, it's very clear to them what the consequences and action and reactions are going to be based off

of their opting out of this notification. And that way hopefully that reinforces a little bit more comfort in these circumstances. And I'm grateful to you for taking that to the At-Large that there was a, I guess, we can live with it aspect to this. So, thank you, Steinar, for that.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Jothan. And thanks for, as Sarah mentioned in chat, thanks for bringing up the informed consent because we did talk about that quite a bit is making sure that the person opting out was well informed of what that meant before they actually took that level. So, Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, this is Steinar for the Record. And I, of course, Jothan and Prudence, I will revert back to At-Large with the comment. And I do believe that, and it's very, very important that if there is an opt-out, it has to be informed consent.

But I just have a question because the way I read the recommendation—Why can't Rec 3.6 be used? I just need to have some background information, some examples. Then the 3.6 is that you can actually point this into one single notification for multiple domains. Doesn't that make it easy for you?

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Steinar. Prudence, please go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hi, Prudence again. So, it's not about the, because I know we conflated quite a few different kind of scenarios talking about why, but it's down to business models. So, the corporate registrar model that we have, our clients work with us under the proviso that they do not want correspondence in certain circumstances. They don't want to receive anything. They don't want to receive notifications. And that's what they pay us for. They don't want to have correspondence to do with ownership changes. And there are certain circumstances whereby it's not about the volume of correspondence all of the time. It's the idea of it being sent and then receiving it at all. So, for example, where it is an agreed internal migration where the change is happening from one entity that's to another related entity, they don't want the notification. They already know they're doing it. And also the audit trail that they have is in correspondence that they have. And also sometimes they'll even have legal documentation to do with a sale or an acquisition. So, they don't want this email. It's not going to give them what they need. And we have systems on our side with regards to tracking and providing reports of the actual consent. We can track it in our systems. Or we can track the change in our systems. And we have logs to support the changes in our systems. So, we can always provide verification should there be subsequent requests for information to do with, oh, how did this happen? When did this happen? We can always provide evidence that way. But the model that we have, we have a number of clients who do not want to receive anything at all to do with these things. And it's not about having one email that has 50 billion domain names at all. It's about not wanting to receive the email. And they reserve the right to do that. And they find these things incredibly

frustrating when they do receive them. I hope that provides a little bit of clarification. Thanks.

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

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. Going back to Steinar's question about the language of 3.6, which deals about notifications. It's great that we can sort of bundle all these notifications when we are dealing with multiple domains. But when you're talking about an opt-out, that is a different mechanism there. I mean, that is not just about notifications anymore. When you are talking about opt-out, there is somebody doing something. It's either opting in or opting out. That all needs to be recorded. But there is input required from a user or a registrant or whoever when you're dealing with an opt-out. So 3.6 is not going to help us there in terms of getting consent or not getting consent. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Okay. Any other comments there? Okay. I think we'll turn this back to Christian on to the next one.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thank you very much. And I think this 3.4 from At-Large, I think we've kind of just discussed that as part of the three, if you agree, Steinar. Otherwise, I think we can move to 4.4 from RrSG. There's a question from, I believe, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: We do have a question. 4.4 talks about records that the registrar must maintain. And the question is, for how long must they be maintained or where does the retention period come from? I myself had assumed that it would be the standard retention period that exists in the registration data policy that is currently being implemented. But that was indeed just an assumption. And perhaps not everybody has the same assumption. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Did the registries mention something about this as well? I think the registries said something about record keeping on this as well. Is that what ...? Anyway, I believe so. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, we had a thing there about... Well, actually, Christian just found it. It's right there on the screen. We wanted to beef something up around Rec 17. This is a suggested change. And then the thing about record keeping was just to make the record keeping consistent with that. But it had to do with Rec 17. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Okay. Any thoughts on Sarah's question here? And my thought, Sarah, was yes, it follows the retention policy. But that was just my thought. I didn't know if others had different thoughts on that. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Please remind me, what is the retention policy again?

ROGER CARNEY: Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. It's the lifetime of the domain name plus a period of time. Right now in the current ICANN requirements, I believe it's lifetime of the domain plus two years. And then under the new registration data policy, the actual retention requirement is very limited. And so maybe even this is not appropriate for our use. What it says is that the registrar has to keep data needed for the transfer dispute resolution policy. And so maybe we should consider whether this update would also fall under the TDRP or not. Or maybe we should just define in the recommendation how long the retention period should be. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Sarah. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, just to follow up on that. Thanks for reminding me, Sarah. Yes, we did indeed set a period there during the IRT about how long that transfer dispute should be maintained, those locks. And when we're talking about transfers, well, I would normally suggest logically perhaps follow that policy so that our policy, which is a

transfer policy, is in line with the transfer thingy that is in the other policy. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Any other comments there? Okay. And I think we can touch back on this when we hit 17.2. Just in general, the retention here, because as Sarah said, I thought it would follow, or suggested, Sarah suggested, I thought it would follow normal retention policy. Okay. We have about five minutes left. Christian, do you want to take us to our next one?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes. The final element of this table is Rec 17, and we have a comment from At-Large, RySG and RrSG. So we've heard about the recordkeeping aspect, but I think we can open it up to the three groups if they want to talk about their recommendations or concerns with regard to Rec 17 from Group 1A.

ROGER CARNEY: Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I'll be quick. I just wanted to share that there is some disagreement or differences of opinion among the registrars with regards to Rec 17. So the registrars are generally aligned with the idea that registrars must apply a 30-day post change of registrar block or restriction. That part's fine, but some registrars are satisfied with the three-point established relationship

test, and others really feel like this actually is much too narrow, and it excludes sort of the bulk of situations where this actually comes up. So if what we're trying to achieve is when we're in a situation where there's a really good reason that the registrar can lift the lock, they need to be able to do so, then having these limitations don't actually get us where we need to be. And so some registrars would very much like to just see that text that's highlighted on screen, or actually the left side column, where you'll notice it just takes out the established relationship part. Yeah, thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, any comments? Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTOROD: Yeah, I just also posted in the chat, and again, what Jim said last meeting is there is, he as a security expert, he considered this as some sort of a breach of security, and the overall security elements that we're trying to implement here. But if that has not been seen as a concern from the registrars, I'm just interested to hear the argument, if it's not been seen as security, based on what Jim said last meeting. It's just for having some feedback back to the discussion at the Consulted Policy Working Group. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks Steinar. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. So, and I'm noticing on screen the suggestion that established relationship is confusing, which I kind of agree with. When we think about security, right, so there's a protection that would perhaps be reduced, I think is the concern. And the protection in this context is the lock. I think the protection that we would be removing is the inability to remove a lock. So what is that protecting? Who is that protecting? And are there circumstances where having that flexibility would better protect a domain owner? I think it's possible. So, I hope that helps. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, and I think that the interesting thing is how you get there. I think everybody seems to agree there's scenarios where the ability to remove the lock could make sense. And if that's true, then what are the mechanisms that we need to have around it in order to do that? And as Sarah said, some registrars think that that's a discretionary call and others are fine with a level of mechanism to document and everything like that. So, I think it gets back to the discussion we've had as we went through this is establish a relationship as defined thorough enough. And as Sarah just mentioned, [registrar stance] was some didn't even think that that was needed. So, again, I think that that's where the line gets drawn. But Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, just really quickly there, and maybe it's just me, but when I read the relationship requirements, I don't see how any registrant who is new to a registrar who just transferred their domain name

will be able to remove that lock, because that's not going to happen within those 30 days, the way it's worded now. The way it's worded now is just a fancy way of saying like, this and this and this must happen. And basically, it says that can never happen, the lock cannot be removed. If you follow that through as a new customer at a registrar, he just started to get his services from. I think those 30 days start clicking when the domain name is transferred in. That's when the clock starts ticking. So, within those 30 days, he cannot do nothing, because he's just a client for two days, 29 days, doesn't really matter. The transfer happens, and that's where the clock starts ticking, because then we started servicing him, not before that. So, I think it's, yeah, that language. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. And we are at time, so I'm going to let Jothan go last, and we'll close up here.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Oh, then I will go really quick. I put it into the chat that this is all going to depend on if it's the registrar's client transfer prohibited that's mechanically how we will do this, or if it's something that is set at the registry. So, I think it's worth talking a bit more, as the wise Rick Wilhelm has mentioned, I think we'll get our opportunity to arm wrestle between registries or registrars holding this requirement and fulfilling it. Thank you. That was my point.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, and just real quick on that, and again, how it happens is important and everything, but obviously, the auditing or a complaint or something driven, and then that happening with ICANN and the registrar explaining it will also follow through. But yes, okay, we are at time, so I am going to push this to our next meeting, and thanks everyone for participating and Zak for holding most of the call for us, and we'll talk to everyone next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]