

Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



GNSO Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process Working Group Request for Early Input

Date statement submitted: **3 August 2021**

GNSO Project Page - [Transfer Policy Review PDP](#)

Direct link: [Transfer Policy Review PDP - Request for Early Input](#) (.pdf)

I. RySG Overarching Comments

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to provide early input to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process Working Group. The RySG appreciates that the Transfer Policy Review PDP working group is examining various user scenarios, both as a result of changes due to the Temporary Specification and looking for opportunities to improve the experience of registrants. We look forward to reviewing the details that come from this analysis.

The RySG looks forward to continuing to engage in the ongoing work of the PDP to discuss these topics further.

II. RySG Feedback on the Request for Early Input questions

Phase 1(a)

b) Auth-Info Code Management

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?

RySG comment:

The RySG believes the current process provides registrars with the greatest flexibility. We understand that no later than at the time of the transfer the incumbent registrar would ensure the registry has the authInfo code available to compare to the value offered by the gaining registrar. This allows the registry

to validate the transfer request and, upon validation, to complete the transfer. We believe this minimal registry role supports the greatest opportunity for registrars to create services that are most beneficial to their registrant community.

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.)?

RySG comment:

The RySG is supportive of the concept of carefully managing the period of time during which a registrant may transfer their domain. We acknowledge that this is a beneficial security service to a registrant. Similar to our response to question b2, we believe that registrars should have the flexibility to manage the TTL according to the needs of their registrants.

** Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) Comment - In the interest of time, we did not conduct a vote on these comments. We did discuss them on our mailing list and during a biweekly conference call, and no member opposed their submission.*