

---

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday, the 7<sup>th</sup> of July 2021 at 13:00 UTC. In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, all those in attendance will be noted from the Zoom Room as well as the audio bridge.

I would like, however, to note the apologies we have received from Priyatosh Jana, Eduardo Diaz, Judith Hellerstein, Alberto Soto, Claire Craig, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

From staff, we have Evin Erdoğan, Gisella Gruber and myself on call management.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and David and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Jacques. We also have real-time transcribing on today's call and I will put the link in the chat so you can follow along.

A friendly reminder for everyone to please state their name when taking the floor each and every time and to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. And try to keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you all very much and with this, I turn the call over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Devan. Welcome to this Consolidated Policy Working Group Call which is going to be an hour and a half as per usual. We will start a work group update with the transfer policy review policy

---

*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.*

---

development process first. Then we'll have an update for the intergovernmental organization curative right work tracks, otherwise known as the IGO work track. And then the expedited policy development process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data before known as the EPDP but there are also other EPDPs coming up. So, that's...

DEVAN REED: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, can you hear me?

DEVAN REED: I'm sorry. No, we can't...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You cannot [inaudible].

DEVAN REED: We can't hear you, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Like this. Hello? Hello?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yep. That's what you needed to do.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That seems to be a bit better, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very strange. I think, yeah, my mic might've just popped out. Sorry about this. So, starting again and apologies for this. We'll start our agenda with the work group updates with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, continuing on with the Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track, the IGO Work Track and then the expedited policy development process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data, what used to be known as the expedited PDP. Although now there are other expedited PDPs as well.

Then we'll have our policy comment updates immediately afterwards with some comments being received for three different drafts. Well, one of them at voting level but one is still at commenting level and we are reaching the end date for this as it's the 19<sup>th</sup> of July for the initial report of the Expedited Policy Development Process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data.

Any other business will follow and I therefore ask now whether there are additions or amendments to be made to this agenda. That was when testing things out that it works well and when it works afterwards, it doesn't work well. I'm glad the sound is back. I'm not seeing any hands up, let's therefore proceed forward with the agenda as it

---

currently is on your screen and move to the action items from our last week's call.

The only two items remaining being that Alan Greenberg noted the draft advice to the board on the EPDP phase 2 by next week. So, this is going to be addressed today. And then there's also a potential item for discussion regarding the pirate side blocking order against DNS resolver Quad9. And the question was whether we should invite Bill Woodcock to present on this. I'm not sure. I mean, there was a discussion between the co-chairs of this group and staff as to whether this really is something of interest to this group. So, if anybody wishes to speak to this and mention whether it would be a good idea to have Bill Woodcock speak to us, then now is the time for you to raise your voice.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I believe that was a small "yes please" from Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not seeing anyone being totally against it. Right. We'll work on this. Meanwhile, our concern is not directly in the realm of the At-Large and

---

the ALAC. The question is, what is the impact to end-users on this? But if we do have space, then we'll see what we can do. We won't spend too much time on it. That's all okay. Jonathan, any thoughts on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, the action items look good, let's move on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's get moving then. And thank you for putting the real-time transcription on the screen, the RTT link, always very helpful by the way. Let's move on then to our next agenda item and that's going to be the work group updates that we have for this week. And we'll start as per usual with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with TPR PDP, with the ALAC members, Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka and of course alternate and observers as well invited to speak. So, Steinar or Daniel, would like to take the field please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier. I did have my hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you did? I did not see your hand. Now I'm seeing it. Okay. Alan Greenberg. Apologies for that, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for your faith that even though the box was unticked, you believed I did it on the action item. Sadly, other things took precedence

---

over the last weekend and I do not have the draft ready. And I also noted in the chat I have to leave on the hour so if we could have the EPDP section happen before the end of the hour, I'd appreciate it. Thank you. EPDP RDDS.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yeah. Thanks for this, Alan. As you'll notice, my unicorn friend is deeply disappointed by your lack of action on this action item but we'll swiftly try and go then through the—to the first transfer policy review process within 15 minutes and then we'll go through the work group updates. Will go with the expedited PDP as number two in the work group updates. That's okay. Right. Let's then go to the Transfer Policy Review Process. Steinar Grøtterød, Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello. And I think I started this and hopefully the rest of the At-Large team can follow up. At the last call, the CPW call, we agreed upon that we should kind of having a discussion of essential questions that are being raised in the working group. And then it was distributed the following question. Can At-Large accept that the form of the authentication are not needed in the final new inter-registrar transfer policy? That is that the transfer authorization code, the TAC is sufficient.

This was the question that hopefully everybody has kind of prepared to have their opinion about but let's go back a little bit and see that if we could have the slide that I was discussing with Evin up in the screen. It might be more easy to get the picture of it. Perfect. Coming up, slide number three.

---

Before the Temp Spec, there was the policy work that both the losing and the gaining registrar should inform the registrant with notification when a transfer was initiated. This was some sort of a security mechanism that both party has to—they're both the gaining and the losing registrar—they're the gaining and losing registrant should have the confirmation that this was a valid and legitimate transfer.

With the Temp Spec and the lack of visible registrant data in the WHOIS RDDS, it was impossible for the gaining registrar, it was impossible to identify who was the present registrant of a certain domain name, hence this requirement was deleted—was removed. In the PDP working group for the inter-registrar transfer, there has been a discussion and I'm not saying it's consensus but there is some sort of at least the registrars advocate that there is no need to have the form of authentication. It doesn't matter. As long as there is a valid TAC, transfer authorization code, the transfer should succeed.

But this is one of the fundamentals because if At-Large think that we still, at some point, either the losing or the gaining registrar needs some sort of additional security measures, confirmation notices to the registrant that this is a valid transfer, then we have to voice our opinion when we come into that discussion. So, I'll leave the floor open for discussion. I would like to mention that for the ccTLDs, there are several ccTLDs that have totally removed all the (papers work) similar to the form of authentication and totally trust the authorization code for initiating and succeed a transfer. So, let's go. The floor is open.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Steinar. Trying to see, yes, there are quite a few hands so let's start with Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Steinar. I guess I'm asking you as part of the discussion. In I think it was the next slide that you showed, it would mean that the registrant has no confirmation that something has—that there's been a change. And for the situations where in fact they may not have requested the change but it may have come from another source, how would they be notified of the change such that there's some backup to make sure that the registrant agrees?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Holly, what do you mean by change? The transfer process is actually purely a change of registrar. All other elements in the data connected to the registrant, whether it's the personal data or the technical data, it's actually not included in the policy—could be seen as not included in the policy.

HOLLY RAICHE: But the change I'm referring to is, it is the change of registrar. I would think that'd be something that the registrant would want to know and have not only the knowledge but the power to stop that if it's happening without their knowledge or consent. Because I'm looking at this slide and what you've got on this slide is in red. What happens right now in green, I don't see any notification to the registrant at all. Now, is that my correct reading of this slide?



---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That might be the correct reading of this slide, but my experience so far with all the transfers is that the gaining registrar will always send confirmation to the person that initiated the transfer because the transfer is always initiated to the gaining registrar. Could be also a chicken-egg problem because if there is a request with a valid AuthCode that has been sent from the gaining registrar to the registry and confirmed by the registry, then there is actually someone has grabbed an AuthCode that they shouldn't have grabbed if that was the correct registrant. Was that badly explained?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly, since you asked the question.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Did that answer your question, Holly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think Holly has gone on mute. Let's move on. And so, the next person in the queue is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi. Thanks, Steinar, for your presentation and for bringing this question to the CPWG. I think what might help is if you're able to describe a scenario in which this change from the Temp Spec is a material importance to the end-user. In other words, I think trying to get to

---

Holly's question is, what does the process now look like that's different? It's just a lack of a notification from the gaining registrar but in this instance, the transfer is initiated by the registrant, is that correct? Because it's just a registrar transfer and it doesn't include change of a registrant, right?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: This is purely about the change of a registrar for existing domain name. The change of registrant is another process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So, the registrant is the one that makes this request generally?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Let's assume that this is a legit transfer request. And if so, the registrant in one way or another have got the correct AuthCode for the connecting their domain name, initiate the transfer to the gaining registrar. And the gaining registrar sent it to the registry. The registry change the [inaudible] registrar for that actual domain name and notify back to the registrant.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So, I guess talk us through what the stakes are here because if the registrant is the one initiating the transfer, then the gaining registrar should have the means to communicate with that registrant. So, the stakes are, the wrong registrant, someone else somehow initiating this transfer between registrars. And under the new Temp Spec, the

---

registrant only receives one notification that that's taking place instead of two, is that right?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. That's the way I see it because with the present policy connected to the Temp Spec, there's no requirement for the losing registrar to send out notifications to the registrant that the transfer is being initiated and it's going to another registrant.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There's no requirement that the losing registrar send a notification?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, then that sounds like the question, right? The registrant receives no notification, then you're saying?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No. The registrant receives notification from the gaining registrar that the transfer has been succeeded. But it doesn't necessarily receive any confirmation from the losing registrar. Lutz has made an excellent presentation and he has his hands up and he's a better spokesman for this than me, maybe. So, let's listen to what Lutz is saying.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Could someone explain what the red lines and what the green lines are? Because there's no legends. So, I'm a little bit confused if the diagram we're seeing is the current one or the one before the Temp Spec?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: To answer this question, the green ones are the completion notice that are sent after everything has changed and the red ones are the messages sent before the change is made. And all the message shown here are only for the existing situation, not for the proposed one. So, what we see here is the current existing policy. All the red ones have to be done in order to get the green ones after the change is done.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be useful to see what it was before the Temp spec so we know what we're comparing it to.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: This is the old one. The slide is showing the old situation before the Temp spec. It's not a new one.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could we see the next one then, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: But let's say, if this is the old one, then why are there two notifications to the registrant, or did we [inaudible]?

---

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: There's only one to the registrant.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Even before the Temp Spec?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then we misunderstood what Steinar said.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: You see step four, FOA confirmed. It's the only message the registrant is getting and he has to respond to it in order to make progress in this transfer.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, what changed with the Temp Spec?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Step four and step three. No. Step four and step five are gone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, there's no notification?

---

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yeah. Because the idea behind the Temp Spec is to assume that an AuthInfo code is sufficient in order to know that the registrant is knowing what he's doing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And the registrant has gone to their current registrar to get that code and give it to the gaining registrar?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so the risk here is that a third party has gotten an AuthCode somehow and is initiating this transfer without the registrant being aware?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yep. Let me present an example for this because in the DE domain, we do have the situation that we do not have any FOA at all. It's a paperless run ccTLD. So, it's running on the proposed theme. Two years ago, ebay.de was gone. Was stolen, simply because somebody was able to get access to the AuthInfo code and asking different registrar to transfer the domain. And it succeeded because there was no interaction with eBay who is the original domain holder.

---

eBay, of course, note that they lost the domain and especially because it was a fraudulent one. So, they set up a fake domain in order to phish for credentials. So, they ask directly to the registry if they can change it and they managed to change this within an hour. But as a non-registrant, you are not in the power of asking the registry to make a change.

So, the question we have here is, we at At-large can agree that missing information of the registrant is okay because in most cases, in almost all cases, the registrant domain will be transferred in the good faith and not in a fraudulent one. So, the question we ask here is, can we assume that in almost all cases, the Internet and the transfer policies are handled in a good faith so we do not have any crime in this area so that no registrant has to fear about anything because the AuthInfo code is secure enough? And we have to answer this question. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Lutz. I note Holly, Jonathan and Alan still have their hands up. Do you still wish to contribute to this discussion?

ALAN GREENBERG: You bet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, go ahead, Alan. You have the floor. I think we'll start with Alan because he hasn't spoken so much and then we'll go back to Holly.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Okay. So, if I understand it, what we're talking about now, the diagram that is showing, is the situation prior to the Temp Spec. The current situation is steps four and five have disappeared and therefore the registrant is presumed to have sent the request to the gaining registrar and is never notified necessarily that anything has happened.

Now, my experience in this world is, eBay is in a strong position to say, "I am eBay and you know I am and stop playing games with me" and talk to the registry. I am not in a similar position to get back control of whether it's alangreenberg.org or whatever it is. I just don't have the same kind of clout and I can't prove I'm the only Alan Greenberg in the world and therefore you know I'm the right one.

So, a situation with eBay is an interesting anecdote but completely irrelevant to this. So, what we're really saying is, if the registrar, for instance, gets hacked or I've used a bad password and therefore it was easy to guess my password with my registrar of record which is, of course, public information, that I could have my domain—have a transfer requested and it'd be done and I not even be notified by anyone unless the registrar, the gaining registrar happens to send me a message and I happen to not treat it as spam.

I'll note, I get messages from registrars regularly saying, you really want to transfer your domain to me or it's expiring or something, and I ignore those messages because it's from someone I have no idea with and no business relationship with. So, yes, I have a problem if four and five disappears and nothing has replaced the change. Thank you. I have stopped speaking.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank God. Go ahead, Olivier. I don't know what's happened to Olivier, so I'll just speak [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm here. Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, since no one else wants to speak, I don't believe it is sufficient for the registrar to send a notice that it's already a fait accompli, the transfer has been done and surprise. So, even if there is a required message to send it and even if it's by the sending registrar, I still believe that you need some level of acknowledgement from the registrant that indeed they requested this transfer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Alan. And I think that part of the question is really, I guess, what is the reason for taking those messages out of the process for some reason? And I think...

ALAN GREENBERG: The reason was that they couldn't be done anymore under the Temp Spec.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Okay. Yeah, couldn't be done anymore. Steinar, let Steinar respond to this and then we'll go through our queue.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: For the sake of simplicity, it was impossible because the registrant data, the email address was removed in the Temp Spec. So, the gaining registrar can actually not check towards the WHOIS RDDS, whether it's the same email address that was listed in WHOIS as the one that it gets the request for a transfer by.

So, but I think the key question here is that—well, let me add to this also. If there is a legit transfer, the registrant contacts the new registrar and asks for a transfer. And with that communication, there is some document change hands etc. because there is always a payment included in the transfers and so on. So, the gaining registrar do have some sort of confirmation that the person that is contacting and ask for a transfer of a domain name is some sort of a valid person.

If the registrant also in addition have a valid AuthCode that he—the only way to find a valid AuthCode is from the losing registrar. And let's assume it's not been hacked and so on because there's a special situation. And the transfer been initiated and the AuthCode is being accepted by the registry, then it's some sort of a combination that if the registrant support the gaining registrar with a passcode or that was valid and then it was also a valid transfer. So, my key thing here is that, do we reduce the risk for the end-user, for the registrant by removing the form of authentication? Do we gain more with having some sort of

---

authentication even though it's a purely notification stuff that is going by e-mail?

And maybe we could have also when the PDP Work Group have finalized the discussion about the transfer AuthCode parameters, the maintenance of the transfer AuthCode at that time when we see what is being kind of agreed upon or consensus within the working group, what sort of management should be with the AuthCode? Maybe this key question should then be rediscussed. But there's a lot of hands here, so go on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for that, Steinar. Let's go to Holly and then we'll have Justine and then Christopher and then we'll come back to you. So, Justine Chew. Sorry, Holly Raiche first. And Holly has put her hand down. Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just getting ready. I totally agree with what Alan has said. He said exactly what I was going to say and he said it probably better than I would have said. Amrita's note in the chat about what happened in India is a very interesting example which ought to be replied to but I'd

---

also like to hear from Steinar about what's in the chat in terms of a pre-transfer notification and if that addresses the issue. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. And Steinar, please take notes and then we'll go to Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely. Go ahead, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Great. Thank you. I suppose I have a comment and a question at the same time, so, but I don't necessarily expect an answer straight away so it is probably something that Steinar and his colleagues might want to take note of. The first point is, what happens—this goes back to what Amrita is saying, what happens if the registrar of record fails? And when I say fail, I mean fails to complete its obligations with regards to the AuthCode or completely fails as a business in the case of Net4India in which case the registrant doesn't have access to the AuthCode, what happens then?

The second point is if you want to remove the messaging for four and five which I can understand is a result of the Temp Spec, then where does the registry stand in replacement of the registrar of record? In a

---

sense that, can the registry take over a notification to the registrant whether it's pre-transfer or post transfer? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine. I'll go to Steinar first because you've had two pretty interesting questions here and then we'll go to Christopher Wilkinson after that. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: And maybe I need some help with this. But so far as I know, the registry can't take over and if there is—with the case of the India situation, that could not be solved with FOAs either. That was a complete mess. If the registrant can't get the transfer authorization code, it can't initiate a transfer. The whole system also before Temp Spec and as it is today, totally depends on that handshake with the transfer authorization code between the gaining registrar and the registry. When it comes to pre-notification, I'm not sure about what that means so I was trying to find it in the chat but it's a lot of words here so I need some heads up on that one. Who asked that in the chat can maybe speak up? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was Jonathan. And I guess what I was saying, the losing registrar does have the contact information prior to the transfer taking place. They just no longer have it after the transfer has taken place. So, I mean, the missing contact information is a function of the WHOIS data no longer being public but the losing registrar should have the contact information prior to the transfer taking place. So, rather than a post

---

transfer notification, that notification could take place before or concurrent with the confirmation to the registry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Well, the losing registrar do have their contact data. The good idea is that you shouldn't change the contact data in the transfer process. It's purely a matter of change of sponsoring registrar. But there is the challenge about matching that—the gaining registrar could actually match the data from the losing registrar. Maybe Lutz has some more details about that. And I also see Daniel with his hands up so please assist me with this one.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Hope you can hear me. Apologies that I joined the call late but just to add onto the conversation. Once the AuthInfo code has been issued by the losing registrar and the transfer is initiated, there are two things that must happen. One is the domain must not have a transfer log because once the transfer lock is there, then it will prevent the domain from being transferred. And secondly, the AuthInfo code has to match the data of the losing registrar and hence, once the AuthInfo code has been submitted by the gaining registrar and they match, then the transfer can successfully take place.

But looking at the whole kind of discussion here is that, what happens in case a reseller goes out of business and [inaudible]? And that's the thing

---

whereby there are these key fields that have got to be filled in of the administrative contact, the technical contact and so forth. So, once those details are filled in, of which most of the times, the end-users or the domain owners do not take this as a responsibility to have all these respective inputs. So, these are some of the respective hindrances that take place.

And taking the situation whereby we were trying to discuss the various ways of how security can be enhanced especially in the domain transfer but no conclusion has come up yet because the deliberations are still going on. And that's where the FOA point comes in that, where do we position the FOA? And here, when we come to the CPW, you want to get a clear position of the end-user on how this can be enhanced in respect to the domain transfer.

So, that's where the discussion comes in. Looking at the case of Net4India, that is one of the cases whereby websites went down for like 72 hours. And this is the point whereby rapid action had to take place. And through that, it has to guide us in the transfer policy that in case such a circumstance happens, how do we fall back and how do we protect the end-user data and how can we have all these respective details to be transferred? And some of them is DNS settings, DNSSEC that have already been enabled and all that. And probably, in case there is more explanation, I'm happy to receive any respective question. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Daniel. I note a number of hands up. Steinar, was that you who just tried to jump in?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No, I didn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No. I just heard a few hesitant voices. I also noted that Christopher Wilkinson had his hand up and then he's put his hand down so I'll take it that he no longer wishes to speak. We'll go to Alan Greenberg and Amrita Choudhury, obviously, I think both of them speaking about Net4India. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. Thank you. One of the problems with Net4India is they stopped working but they didn't officially fail. The process for registrar failure is, ICANN says, "Fine, you're failed. You're dead. I will initiate the transfer to another registrar using the data from escrow." The problem here is Net4India didn't fail. They just became quiet for some aspects of their business. Other parts seem to keep on working, some of the automated parts but not all of the automated parts.

So, the problem was it was a never, never land of it hadn't failed, ICANN could not step in and do anything according to ICANN's view of the world and therefore everything was on hold for months and months. But that's a different issue. It's an issue for instance thick WHOIS would have fixed, but we don't have thick WHOIS necessarily for most domains.



---

But in any case, the real problem right now we're looking at is, one of the problems with the diagram that's showing is it doesn't show the AuthCode process. So, there is a communication with the registrar of record to get the AuthCode but there's no communication afterwards until after the domain is changed and at that point, it may be too late. It also doesn't address the issue of a rogue registrar. So, from my point of view, the current situation under the Temp Spec, we've lost significant security that was carefully put into the transfer policy before and although it's very convenient to say, "It doesn't matter," I don't believe that's the case. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, just a quick question. You mentioned the data that is held by ICANN in escrow. Is that affected by the EPDP on gTLD registration data or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is it's not 100% clear. It probably isn't. It's a technicality perhaps but it's not clear and when I've tried to raise and the registrars have basically said, it's not a problem, it doesn't happen. The current definition under Phase 1 says, "Under email addresses, it is an anonymized email address or a web form." And both of those require the registrar to be alive to be working. That's number one. And number two, the original email address that was in the WHOIS record which was redacted is not listed as an RDDS field.

My understanding is most registrars when they send in escrow data, put the real address in. Technically, that's in violation of the policy that we

---

enacted in Phase 1 because the escrow data is for RDDS data and the actual real email address is not in the RDDS data. So, they're grabbing it from another field in their database and stuffing it into escrow but in fact, the policy doesn't say they should be doing that. So, there's a potential problem there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Next is Amrita...

ALAN GREENBERG: It's ugly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Looks like it, yes. Amrita Choudhury is next.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Olivier. I would go back to the Net4 case and I don't know the entire process which is happening but from the end-user perspective, it has been difficult. Net4 was not in business. They were not giving any support and so many of them during the—renewals had an issue. However, when ICANN decided to transfer it to another registrar, there was another issue which happened because the transfer for many of these customers took very long. They did not get any information. For example, I was contacted by a Nigerian ISP to help them reach to the concerned people to resolve the issue and it took more than seven—rather four days their website was down. They could not do anything. The domain name was down.

---

So, for an ISP not being able to give any support to their own customers is a very difficult situation. So, in these kind of situation when the customer has no clue because of some internal transfer issues and they are not informed what is happening, it not only affects economically but also how people view their business. So, that is important, and will this new process actually take care of those kind of issues? As in, are the learnings going to be used here, is one of the important things because the new registrar just gave some standard replies not even—and there was no contact number where people could reach out or anything. So, it still is a bad process. And one of them, again, had their websites down because they were supposed to update something and within 24 hours since they didn't, it was taken down. So the process, still now the transfer has not been smooth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Amrita, for this. And you're reporting on something which was supposed to be a well smoothed system to save and transfer, etc. Well, all of it seems to be sticking a little bit somehow. Steinar, back to you. It sounds like you are presiding over a dog's breakfast at the moment.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. I should never got into this. Well, I don't want to comment on the Net4India stuff. Just having one thought, could that also happen in the post Temp Spec policy stuff? But anyway, in the meeting invite, we also indicated that there will be a poll. And my proposal is that we run the poll for this certain question but we rerun it when the working group

---

and the At-Large representatives comes back with the outcome of the discussion with the transfer authentication management, because that is something that may change the output. So, if you agree, let's have the poll. It's not binding. It's just ... how do you phrase that in English? In Norwegian, it's a finger in the air but it's...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just to gain the temperature of the room, basically. Gaining the temperature of the room at the moment. Okay.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. If it's okay for everybody, let's have the poll.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. There we go.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's the wrong one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, take us through the poll then, Steinar?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not the right poll.

---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I don't think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just like a [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: This is not about noncapital city names.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I don't think that's what we're discussing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the meantime, whilst this is being worked out, I noticed that Alan Greenberg has put his hands up. Alan, you have the floor and then we'll see if the poll can work in the meantime. Go ahead, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you very much. The Net4India is a serious problem but it's not a problem necessarily with the transfer policy. How we've recovered from the problem may show some failures of the transfer policy because there are transfers involved. But it's not a registrant-initiated transfer. In general, if a registrar fails, it's ICANN taking over and a completely different process is used.

So, it's a serious problem. There's no question it's a serious problem and it was a serious problem that hung around almost for a year before

---

ICANN took any action to try to address the problem because of legalities. But let's not confuse the issue with the regular registrant-initiated transfer policy which I personally feel the post EPDP, the post interim spec one has lost something and I believe we need a way of getting it back.

Remember, the problem was caused by the fact that the gaining registrar prior to the transfer does not have the information about how to contact the registrar. That's because the only way the gaining registrar could have gotten it before was looking in the public WHOIS and, of course, they can't get to the public WHOIS. From my perspective, there were other ways to address that problem which the EPDP chose not to even look at but simply said, "The transfer policy PDP will handle it."

We could have said that the gaining registrar is in a privileged position, a gaining registrar, and does have access to that information. We didn't choose to do that. There are ways around the problem. So, let's not pretend that we are completely without power. The fact that something is not in the public WHOIS does not necessarily mean the gaining registrar couldn't get it if we change the policy to allow it. The EPDP chose not to look at that policy and this current PDP is the one looking at it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Let's turn to staff. Have we managed to find the poll?

---

DEVAN REED: Yes. I'm sorry. I figured it out and I got it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Devan. Thank you. Let's see. Here we go. So, the question is, can At-Large accept that the FOAs are not needed in the final new IRT policy? That's the transfer authentication code is sufficient. Can At-Large accept this? So, we'll give it about 20 seconds for everyone on this call to vote on this. This is just to take the temperature of the room in general. And Devan, let us know how many people have voted so far so we get an idea on [inaudible].

DEVAN REED: I have 19 of the 42 people in here voting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Get voting, please. Even if you're not sure, just go on "not sure." Okay. I think that everyone must have made up their mind. Christopher Wilkinson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah. Here, the screen is totally non-responsive. None of the options respond to a click and not even submit. So, whether this is at the level of this laptop or the Spanish Internet or somewhere else but I have zero [inaudible].

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I definitely would not blame the Spanish Internet. Let's not start blaming individual countries but let's think maybe it's the version of Zoom that is not the latest version, I don't know.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Nor do I. I'm not sure and by and large, I'm happy for Alan to cast my vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's find out what the results are, please. Is that the only question? That is the only question, isn't it, that we have, Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep. Okay. Then let's please have the results displayed. Okay.

DEVAN REED: Interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, that's quite varied. It's kind of a third, a third, but there's a slight majority of nos which means that Steinar and Daniel, you guys are going to have to make some noise on this group, I'm afraid.



---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Well, at least I...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 41%.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: And I sense the temperature here. Let's have the same poll when we report back after the finalization of the TAC maintenance discussions in the PDP Working Group. And I also promised that we should make an updated figure about how this transfer looks like and will look like and so on. Apologize for bringing a slide that in my thinking was okay. It was [actually] made by Lutz but anyway, apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for...

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for clarity, if we can make sure the new slide shows the three scenarios, before the temporary spec, after the temporary spec and what is being proposed. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I think that's a good [KPI.] Alan, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan and...

---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: And please specify what is an FOA. I understand the gist of the issue but I still, to this day, I can't explain to a third party what is an FOA.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Form of authentication.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, but that is not in any of the documents that I've seen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And let's please record the results that we have here.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you. Thank you for the discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So, we record the yeses at 32%, the no at 41% and the not sure at 27%, and that's just taking the temperature of the room. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's make sure the next poll doesn't have effectively double negatives in it which makes it rather confusing to answer.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, coming from the champion of double negatives. I think that's a good point you're making.

ALAN GREENBERG: I use triple negatives. I'm proud of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. I think we need to move on especially since Mr. Greenberg is about to leave in five minutes' time and has to report along with his colleague Hadia Elminiawi on the Policy Development Process, the EPDP on temporary specification for generic top-level domain registration data. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give a quick comment and Hadia can add something to it. I'm leaving on the hour. I suspect Hadia is also. In terms of the comments for Phase 2A, there were a number of comments in the Google doc. Most of them were editorial and not substantive. There were one or two semi substantive ones and I'll address those in the Google doc and directly with the people. In terms of the Phase 2 advice to the Board, my apologies. I did plan to have it ready for beginning of this week but other things came up and just didn't allow me to do it. But it will get done within the next day or so. And that's really all I have to report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Hadia Elminiawi?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you. If we could scroll a little bit in order to take a look at the document. So, as Alan mentioned in relation to the... yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Is this the document? If we could have the Recommendation 1, if we can scroll a little bit down. Okay. Yeah. Recommendation 1, is this the right one? It's not. Just one...

JUSTINE CHEW: I think we're on the wrong document.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. I'm not sure what this is, so yeah. I could share the link. I will share it, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: While we're going through the document, I did note that—sorry. I did note that the Recommendation 1, the question one that is, we were talking about adding significant stuff related to the public good. And Hadia has put that text in. I did talk about that last week. It didn't end up in the document. My apologies on that.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, exactly. So, what we did is we actually added the public interest in here. So, I don't think that we actually discussed this. So, the RDDS data is a public good associated with the protection of the public. As the GDPR is also a public good associated with protecting the data of the registrants and therefore a balance between those two public goods is necessary and this balance cannot actually be achieved if we are redacting more data than what is required by GDPR.

This is also in line and consistent with what new possible laws or legislation are coming up with. So, I think this is the only thing that we haven't really discussed and it is worth exploring. And then if we go to Recommendation 3, yeah, Recommendation 3, can we scroll down a little bit? Yes. And the first question is, should there be a standardized data element available for Contracted Parties to use? If yes, why? And if not, why not?

And the thing that we added in here is actually the reference to ICANN RDDS consistent labeling and display consensus policy. So, this standardized data element is consistent with an ICANN consensus policy. And the goal of this policy is to align the way registries and registrars label and display registration data output. So, before also, we did not refer to this but we think that referring to this consensus policy is very important because again, this standardized data element does exactly what this policy says. Also definitely standardization improves the quality of the data. It creates consistency across the systems and makes it easy to use.

So, this is a new element that we added in here and then we have also the other elements which is, of course, the—it could be possible in the

---

future that differentiation would be like mandated by new legislation and adding this element at a later stage, does it really make sense since Contracted Parties are already making changes to the RDDS because of Phase 1 recommendations?

So, making this change at this point in time makes perfect sense. If we could scroll down a little bit more. Yes. Okay. So, this is in relation to like if it standardized data elements, then which field should be a must, and there is no change in this. So, if the registrar differentiates, the fields must be used for those registrations where differentiation is made. The data element may be transferred to registries. The data element must be transferred to escrow providers, must be provided to SSAD or similar disclosure tools.

And then there comes another important question, if we have the standardized elements, registries and registrars who—do registries or registrars who wish to differentiate, must they actually use this data element or should this be an option? And, of course, again, if we do have standardized data elements, it should be obligatory to use. Again, this is consistent with ICANN RDDS, consistent labelling and display consensus policy. And also, it does not make any sense to have standardized data elements and then no one actually uses these data elements. So, you lose the benefit of having the standard if you make it an option.

So, those are just the few elements that I wanted to highlight. And as Alan said, we haven't yet completed the comments in relation to EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, the SSAD. We now have a small team group meeting. Most probably we can also discuss this with the team and by

---

next fall we should have this ready. So, again, the Google doc is available so please go ahead and take a look at it and make any additions that you can think of. Thank you. I stop here and I'm happy to take any questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia, and thanks for this update, Alan. So, the floor is open now for questions and comments from people on the call. No questions? No comments? Goodness. Okay. I guess, is there anything else to add on this update?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, I would just say check the Google doc during the upcoming two days because we might make some additions to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Thank you very much for this, Hadia. And maybe we should have an action item, and yes, Evin, I'll have the floor over to you but an action item to also publicize this again on the mailing list so as to get more input. Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. Hope you can hear me okay. I just wanted to clarify in the chat regarding the discussion on FOA just a moment ago with the transfer policy review reps. I just wanted to note that GNSO support staff has confirmed that there was a community outreach presentation from ICANN70. A couple of links have been shared in the chat with the

---

recording. And just to confirm, there are changes on the gaining registrar side but the FOA sent by the losing registrar is retained. And so, you may use this link as a reference to have any answers to questions regarding the before and after processes. I hope this helps and I'll also share it on the list as well. But that was for that the prior updates so sorry [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Got that. Thanks, Evin. Just to clarify, it's not the FOA from the losing registrar that went away with the temp spec. It's the FOA from the gaining registrar because they are the ones who prior to a transfer don't have the necessary WHOIS dated to generate an FOA. So, I think we need to revisit this question entirely potentially next week. Thanks, folks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan, and thanks, Evin, for this update. Right. So, we'll have this as an action item to revisit this next week. In the meantime, questions and comments on this, we've got an action item to send a note to the mailing list, to point people to this document that we have currently on the screen and have more input. I gather judging from the number of people logged in on the document, there are quite a few eyes at the moment and it will take a bit of time to get the feedback on this. But that's great. Anything to close off this section, Hadia and Alan?



---

It looks like they're both gone, aren't they? They both have had to move on to their next call.

Okay. With this, then, we have to move on as well and we can now go to the Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track, the IGO Work Track. And for this, we should be able to have our good friend, Yrjö Lansipuro. I am looking here, Yrjö, are you able to provide us with an update? And it doesn't look like Yrjö is on actually. I just checked on this. Carlos Gutierrez, maybe. Neither Yrjö Lansipuro nor Carlos, but our good friend Justine is here. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Olivier. I'm one of the alternates for the IGO track. Just to let you know that there wasn't a meeting this week so there's nothing new to update from what I gather. Yrjö has presented from last week and I'm sure he'll be back next week to provide an update for the next meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Justine. That's very helpful. Any comments or questions on this? I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment, so that effectively takes us to close this section off. Thank you for all the updates on these and we'll—well, no news on the IGO Work Track, I guess. Well, not so much. Let's move on to the policy comments updates. And for this, we have Evin Erdoğan and Jonathan Zuck.

---

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Okay. Thank you, Olivier. So, there are a few updates regarding ICANN public comments. You'll see on the agenda there the upcoming public comment proceedings have been updated. There are now two coming up in July this month and then several scheduled for September. There are a couple more later this year but for the coming months, you'll see those upcoming ones. And to answer a question from the last meeting, the greatly anticipated domain abuse activity reporting, DAAR 2.0 public comment is now scheduled to be opened in September, so stay tuned.

And there is one public comment for decision which recently opened, is the proposed renewal of the .aero registry agreement and this closes mid-August. So, that is just one for decision for the group. Otherwise, there are a few ALAC responses in development. There is actually a— you'll see a Google doc of an ALAC response to the draft whitepaper regarding registrant protection and DNS abuse mitigation and this was an invitation for ALAC comment cross-community from their chairs. So, this is actually near finalization. It will probably be going to ALAC vote later today.

And beyond this, Hadia and Alan have also just presented and provided updates on the ALAC draft comment regarding the initial report of Phase 2A and potential ALAC advice to the ICANN board on EPDP Phase 2. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Jonathan, maybe just to discuss that ALAC comment on the draft whitepaper or the public comment for decision. Thank you so much.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Evin. We received a couple of comments on the draft response to the registrar whitepaper on protecting registrants from malicious DNS abuse reports. So, hopefully, we've made some constructive comments there, and that's up for votes. If you haven't had a chance to look at it, feel free to take a look at it but it should be voted on by the ALAC fairly briefly because we want to get it back to the registrars. And so, then I guess what I would do is open it up for conversation on whether or not there's anyone on the call familiar with the .aero renewal and if there's changes to that agreement that seem to be of importance to us. And if not, is there anybody that's willing to take a look at that issue if they think that there's potentially something there about which we should be concerned. Justine Chew, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Hi. I'm prepared to have a look at it but I won't be able to come back to this group in the next two weeks. But it's only due on the 16<sup>th</sup> of August so we have some time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's excellent, Justine, and just let staff know when you'll be able to present on it and we'll—I mean, because initially, all we really need to know is whether or not we need to focus on it. So, perhaps even post an email saying, "Yes, we should focus on this otherwise, no, we don't need to." Thanks.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. What I can do is just have a look and if I don't see anything difficult, then I'll just send a note and say, "That's okay."

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Justine. Okay. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And we seem to have gone pretty swiftly with the policy comment update. And we're now moving into any other business. So, is there anything else that we should speak about today? [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, your microphone's become loose again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Because I'm a little windy, that's probably why. Okay. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: There you go. Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, what I was saying is there doesn't seem to be anybody wishing to take the floor at the moment. So, I think that we are ready to find out when our next meeting will be.

---

DEVAN REED: All right. Sounds good. And sticking with the rotation, the next CPWG meeting will be on Wednesday, the 14<sup>th</sup> of July at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday, 13<sup>th</sup> of July, 19:00 UTC. Is there anything that—it's Wednesday the 13<sup>th</sup>. I think it would be the 14<sup>th</sup>.

DEVAN REED: The 14<sup>th</sup>, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday, 14<sup>th</sup> of July, 19:00 UTC. I'm seeing a clear day on this so it probably is fine with everyone. And with this, I guess we can just say goodbye to everybody. Thank you for our interpreters and the real-time text transcription. And Jonathan, anything else that we need to add for this week?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, not at all. Thanks for Steinar and Lutz for—so in the process of this interaction, the process is almost as important as substance and let's keep this up. The polling and the discussions on At-Large priorities. I think it's definitely the direction we need to go and we'll iron out the difficulties. Thanks.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And we have a last-second hand up from Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Working Group will not have another meeting before the end of July. There is a conflict with the SSAD webinar the next Tuesday. And the Tuesday after, the chair is unable to attend so we will be—let me check the calendar. It will be July 27<sup>th</sup> is the first upcoming Transfer Policy Working Group meeting. Let's see whether we have some updates and a new discussion in the next meeting or we postpone it a little bit. I will discuss with the rest of my colleagues in the working group and get back to you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar and thanks to everyone on the call. Thanks to your colleagues for the update on this. That's the end of the call. Now, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night from [inaudible] and wherever you are in the world. Take care. Bye for now.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank all. Bye.

DEVAN REED: Thank you. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you for joining and have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**