

# Update on the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP

At-Large representatives:  
Steinar Grøtterød & Daniel Nanghaka

ALAC Alternates:  
Raymond Mamattah and Lutz Donnerhacke

ALAC Observers:  
Chokri Ben Romdhane, Hans Bathija, K Mohan Raidu, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy

# WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS TO CHARTER QUESTIONS CONNECTED TO AUTH-INFO CODES

## **B1) Is AuthInfo Code still a secure method for inter-registrar transfers? What evidence was used by the Working Group to make this determination?**

**Recommendation 1:** The Working Group recommends that the Transfer Policy and all related policies use the term “**Transfer Authorization Code (TAC)**” in place of the currently-used term “AuthInfo Code” and related terms. This recommendation is for an update to terminology only and does not imply any other changes to the substance of the policies.

**Recommendation 2:** The Working Group recommends that the Transfer Authorization Code be defined as follows: “*A Transfer Authorization Code (TAC) is a token created by the Registrar of Record and provided upon request to the RNH or their designated representative. The TAC is required for a domain name to be transferred from one Registrar to another Registrar and when presented authorizes the transfer.*”

**Recommendation 3:** The Working Group recommends that ICANN org establish minimum requirements for the composition of the TAC (for example, minimum length, syntax, or entropy value) based on current applicable technical security standards. ICANN org may change these requirements in response to new or updated standards, but any changes to the requirements must go in effect with sufficient notification and time for contracted parties to implement the necessary updates.

## **B1) Is AuthInfo Code still a secure method for inter-registrar transfers? What evidence was used by the Working Group to make this determination?**

**Recommendation 4:** The Working Group recommends that the Registry verify at the time that the TAC is stored in the Registry system that the TAC meets the requirements specified in Recommendation 3.

[Additional Candidate Recommendation xx: If a Gaining Registrar requests a transfer and an inter-registrar transfer lock is in place, the transfer must not proceed.]

## **B2) The registrar is currently the authoritative holder of the AuthInfo Code. Should this be maintained, or should the registry be the authoritative AuthInfo Code holder? Why?**

**Recommendation 6:** The Working Group recommends that:

6.1: The TAC MUST be only generated by the Registrar of Record upon request by the RNH or their designated representative.

6.2: When the Registrar of Record sets the TAC at the Registry, the Registry MUST securely store the TAC using a one-way hash that protects the TAC from disclosure.

6.3: When the Registrar of Record provides the TAC to the RNH or their designated representative, the Registrar of Record MUST also provide information about when the TAC will expire.]

**B2) The registrar is currently the authoritative holder of the AuthInfo Code. Should this be maintained, or should the registry be the authoritative AuthInfo Code holder? Why?**

***Recommendation 8:*** The Working Group confirms the following provision of Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy contained in the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data: “4. Registry Operator MUST verify that the "AuthInfo" code provided by the Gaining Registrar is valid in order to accept an inter-registrar transfer request,” with terminology updates in accordance with other relevant recommendations.

***Recommendation 9:*** The Working Group recommends that the TAC MUST be used no more than once per domain name. The Registry Operator MUST clear the TAC as part of completing the transfer request.

**B3) The Transfer Policy currently requires registrars to provide the AuthInfo Code to the registrant within five [calendar] days of a request. Is this an appropriate SLA for the registrar's provision of the AuthInfo Code, or does it need to be updated?**

***Recommendation 10:*** The Working Group confirms that the Transfer Policy should continue to require Registrars to provide the TAC to the RNH or their designated representative within five calendar days of a request, although the Working Group recommends that the policy state the requirement as 120 hours rather than 5 calendar days to reduce any risk of confusion. The Working Group further recommends that the policy make clear that 120 hours is the maximum and not the standard period in which the TAC is to be provided.

**B4) The Transfer Policy does not currently require a standard Time to Live (TTL) for the AuthInfo Code. Should there be a standard Time To Live (TTL) for the AuthInfo Code? In other words, should the AuthInfo Code expire after a certain amount of time (hours, calendar days, etc.)?**

**Recommendation 11:**The Working Group recommends that:

11. 1: A standard Time to Live (TTL) for the TAC be 14 calendar days], enforced by the Registries. [add footnote that Registries should set the TAC to null after transfer completes?]

11.2: The Registrar of Record MAY set the TAC to null:

- At any time in response to a request from the RNH.
- After a period of less than 14 days by agreement by the Registrar of Record and the RNH.

**B5) Should the ability for registrants to request AuthInfo Codes in bulk be streamlined and codified? If so, should additional security measures be considered?**

TBD

**B6) Does the CPH TechOps research provide a logical starting point for future policy work on AuthInfo Codes, or should other options be considered?**

The Working Group carefully reviewed the TechOps proposal and considered input from those involved in development of the proposal. The Working Group appreciated the expertise and relevant experience of those who developed the proposal and therefore considered it a logical starting point for discussion. The Working Group agreed, however, that it is important to consider (i) the range of views and interests that may not have been represented in the development of the proposal, and (ii) any new information or interests that have come to light since the development of the proposal. Therefore, in developing its recommendations, the Working Group deliberated on each of the charter questions taking into account both the relevant elements of the TechOps paper as well as all other available information and inputs.

**B7) Should required differentiated control panel access also be considered, i.e., the registered name holder is given greater access (including access to the auth code), and additional users, such as web developers would be given lower grade access in order to prevent domain name hijacking?**

The Working Group does not believe that there should be any new policy requirements in this regard.