CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the NARALO Monthly Teleconference call on Monday, the 13th of December 2021 at 20:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, Adrian Schmidt, Alfredo Calderon, Bill Jouris, Daniel Nanghaka, David Mackey, James Galvin, Jessica Starkey, Jonathan Zuck, Jose Lebron, Maureen Hilyard, and Sarah Wyld. We have received apologies from Wes Boudville, Dana Perry, and Judith Hellerstein. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.
	Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name when taking the floor for the transcription purposes. Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Eduardo.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you so much, everyone. I'm not sure I will be able to share this, not now, in our social media. We got a connection problem. But anyhow, welcome, everyone, today. Happy holidays. Today, we have a very interesting panel discussion on Transfer Policy EPDP. Glenn McKnight will be moderating that.
	But we want to give you some administrative information about things that are happening. At this point, you may know that the ICANN73 that is going to happen in March 5 to 10 of 2022 is going to be a virtual meeting. Next year, we are planning a General Assembly for our region,

which we are planning to do next to the ARIN meeting that is going to happen October 20-21 at Hollywood, California. This might happen or might not happen. It depends if ICANN travel is still on or if it's off. If it's off, then this will not happen. It goes virtual. So that means we will move the General Assembly and then we can do a face-to-face meeting, not even a hybrid one, but face to face. So it might take next year, the following year. Glenn, you have some requests for the community for topic and speakers. Do you want to take that one?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. We have a link that we can share. Claudia, can you share that on the screen? It's a link to the Google Doc. And we've asked that a couple of months ago for suggestions for speakers. So this is something we'd like you to fill out. We're not asking you to chase these people that could be a topic leader. But if you have a particular topic, please let us know. So we're in January, we're going to be doing a summary of what we've done and looking forward. So February is open, but March we're going to be doing our March meeting corresponding to the ICANN meeting that was supposed to be face to face. The rest of the year is pretty wide open. So if there's a particular topic that you're dying to learn more about, please fill out this form and send it to us, and we'll follow up on it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Glenn. Just to let you know that our next NARALO meeting is going to happen in January 10. It's going to be the second Monday in January. And this time, we're going to do a different call. We're going to

put the year 2021 in perspective, give you kind of a summary of the things that we have done and the things that happened around ICANN that affects the region. Also, we're going to give you some ideas where we are planning ahead for 2022. I don't know if Judith is online. I'm not sure. I don't see her. Maybe she's trying to—

CLAUDIA RUIZ: She's an apology for today's call.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. My bad. She might be traveling. She went to the IGF in Poland. Just to remind everyone else, we have the Additional Budget Request process. This is the additional budget for special projects, events, things that need communication, flyers, banners, stuff like that that you can think of. We need to have your proposals in before January 7 so we can go into the different committees that will have to look at it in the end. Before it goes to Finance, it has to be approved by ALAC. Claudia, I don't know if you have the form or the links to put that explains the ABR and the forms that need to be filled up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Go ahead. Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. I've already put it into the chat. So please, everyone, I know a few of you already have some thoughts about Additional Budget Request, but you have just a couple of weeks to get back to your RALO before they send it to the ALAC Finance and Budget Subcommittee. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much, Heidi, for that clarification. Are there any questions, comments, views, anything before we jump into the panel discussion? Yes?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: There's one more thing that I need to mention. I'm calling out Jonathan and David Mackey, they volunteered. We're going to be assessing our web presence, the navigation, the look and feel. So the committee will be assembling with yourself, Eduardo, fairly soon. I think we've closed that committee, so we should be organizing our first Zoom call fairly soon. So I'm not sure, Eduardo, are you around next week?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Next week? No, I'm not going to be around, but send me an e-mail. I don't know where I'm going to be or if I have access to Internet.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'll send out a Doodle to all four of us. So the idea being is we want to look at the navigation, we want to see if we're getting the message out.

It's one of our primary tools to talk about NARALO. So that'll be a topic. The first meeting is going to be the scope of our project, and then move forward with recommendations. So we'll report on that and possibly January latest in February.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. So with that, Glenn, take it over.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thanks, everybody. It was interesting. I mentioned to Eduardo. And this is the thing about Eduardo. He's very clever. I said, "You know what, I think we should learn a little bit about Transfer Policy." He says, "You're right." He says, "We need to understand the relevance of Transfer Policy to the end users." I said, "You're right." And he says, "You will moderate the session," so I said, "Okay, I'll do it."

Now I have to let everybody know this is something I'm no expert at all. I'm happy to moderate this. And I think we brought in a great panel. In fact, I've asked Michael to join us as well after the introductions, and then we're going to ask Michael to sort of give some historical context because I can't do that. I went through, honestly, the ICANN website. It's sort of convoluted. But maybe because Michael was on the Board years ago, maybe he can level set the historical context. So, Sarah, Daniel, and James, you're off the hook on the first thing, but I wanted to do a quick round the table so you guys know who everybody is. If I may, starting with Sarah, maybe you can just open up your mic and say a little bit about yourself.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, I'm Sarah Wyld. I work with Tucows. I've been here for just over four years. And before this, I was working at another registrar for about 10 years. So I've been in the industry for some time now. My title is policy and privacy manager. So I spent half of my time enjoying ICANN policy development work, and the other half doing internal data governance within the Tucows organization.

In terms of the Transfer Policy, my first sort of real memory of the new one, the new Transfer Policy, is from the 2013 RAA when that new policy I think came into place at the same time or together connected. So we had to implement that at my previous workplace. So I got the really operational implementation fun part of it as a user. And then now I have the pleasure of being a member of the Transfer Policy Development Working Group helping to represent registrars. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Thank you. I guess you missed Graeme that he moved on to the DNS Abuse Institute.

SARAH WYLD: I do. And of course, I'm still in contact with Graeme. I was talking with him only just a few minutes ago. But I do miss getting to work with him on a day-to-day basis. Yes.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Okay. What I'm looking on the screen, I'm just going to go across the top. James, would you mind introducing yourself?

JAMES GALVIN: Sure. Thanks, Glenn. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I am part of the Transfer Review PDP. I'm representing Registries in that context, one of our two designated delegates there. I have a long history with ICANN. I've been around since pretty much its inception. My role started with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. I grew into the Registry Stakeholder Group when I joined Afilias back in 2009. And now I'm actually part of Donuts since Donuts acquired Afilias just about a year ago, in fact. We're like 10 days shy of having been acquired a year ago. So just been around, involved in things a long time.

I consider myself a security technologist. I have been all of my career, which spans more than three decades. Just a lot of activity in standards development. Policy development has been the last 10 or 15 years of my life. I started out my career doing protocol development and security technology development and deployment and that kind of thing and just migrated up to being a public face of activities that are going on. So that's where I am today, and a lot of activity.

I should probably mention just for completeness. One of the hats that I do wear today is I was appointed as the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) as their liaison to the ICANN Board, a seat which I took on October 28 of this year at the AGM. But I'm here representing wearing my Donuts hat and representing registries in general, just to be clear for the transcript. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Thanks again, James. Carrying on, Michael, how do you pronounce your last name properly? I may have messed it up.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Palage.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, perfect. Michael, tell us about yourself.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Well, I would say most people have known me. Anyone who's been around ICANN probably have come across me. My first exposure to the domain name space was 1994. And one of the first people I actually met was actually a Fellow, Attorney John Berryhill. We are both attorneys in Philadelphia. So as John and I like to joke, we were probably doing domain name disputes when they were still free, before Network Solutions even started charging for it. As a result of that initial interest, I was involved. We were one of the first 35 or 37 ICANN accredited registrars, served as the initial chair of the Registrar Constituency, served the three-year term on the ICANN Board. There's probably not any position I have not yet held except for the GNSO Council, although I have no interest in ticking that box before I head out the pasture. But I generally work, I would say, predominantly with Registries over the last, say, 15 to 20 years, but do work with Registrars as well as Business, IPC, pretty much everyone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. I'll circle back to you in one minute. But let me turn over to our colleague, Daniel. Please go ahead and say a little bit about yourself and how you're involved with the committee.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Glenn and the team. I'm happy to be invited for this NARALO meeting, especially in the Transfer Policy Review Working Group also as a representative of At-Large. Just a brief history about my involvement with ICANN and the technical community. It dates way back from 10 years plus, especially when I started my engagement with the AFRINIC—that is the African Network Information Center—as a Fellow. And then later on, I started diving deep into engagement with ICANN. I happen to be a member of the Registration Data Services Working Group. At the time it was being chaired by Chuck Gomes, who later left on to take on other respective tasks.

But when it comes specifically to the domain industry, I have been involved in the domain industry for over eight years of experience. And I've been working with various registrars, trying to make sure that domain disputes are solved. My latest role is trying to deploy the Internet Africa, a platform to be able to promote the modern Internet standards. If we look at modern Internet standards, DNSSEC comes in strongly, and if we look at the domain industry, it also comes in because if you were to check the validity of the domain, whether it is following the standards, a lot of things happen.

With reference to the end user experiences, there are quite a number of challenges that come in. Some of these challenges are being discussed in the TPR. Just to mention most of the end users are happy to work with resellers and they seem not to know the underlying issues of policies that govern their respective ownership of the domain. So they don't know whether there is registrant or not. So probably we shall be diving deep into this discussion. Let me get back to Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. You're biting to jump on the horse and ride. So just hold that thought. It's excellent, excellent stuff. I've been amiss to acknowledge a few people. I'd like to acknowledge first of all—I don't know what time it is, Maureen, and where you are. I'm not sure if you're in New Zealand right now or Cook Islands, but it must be in the middle of the night. Thank you so much. Maureen Hilyard is the chair for At-Large. Thank you so much for joining us today. But also, I want to do a shout out to Naela and Joe of the North American ICANN group. They have also joined us in our own special ALAC member which is Marita and Jonathan. So thank you all for coming.

I want to start off with some history. As I said earlier on, I thought myself, I said, "Let me find some history here." The website that ICANN had was a little bit convoluted. And I said, "I know somebody who has been there at the early days." So I e-mailed Michael. I asked Michael, "Could you join us and give us, for the benefit of everybody, a little bit of a history on what the Transfer Policy and the rationale?" And what's important and for all of us here is we're part of the end user community. Why is this policy relevant to us? Over to you, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Glenn. I think, in starting this journey, we need to basically go back to, if you will, the whitepaper and the recognition of ICANN. So ICANN was incorporated, I believe, November of '98. It was recognized shortly thereafter. And one of the first announcements that ICANN did was, I believe, in March of '99 where they announced the first five testbed registrars. Let me see if I can remember them. Register.com, AOL, Melbourne IT, and now I'm sitting there. I'm drawing a blank on the other two. I remember them before. Well, that was AOL. Anyway, what happens is ICANN announced the five testbed registrars. When they did the announcement, they actually listed all 37. I believe there was 35 or 37 applicants. So ICANN basically initially approved all of the initial registrars, but it said it was going to move forward with a testbed stage where they identified those first five companies.

One of the things that we began to learn in those early days when those first transfers away from Network Solutions began to happen was that there was some criminal activity amiss. There were some people that were actually, if you will, submitting transfer requests. Now what's important here from a historical perspective—and, Jim, you'll appreciate this—before the EPP, during this testbed stage, during this initial commercialization or the bifurcation of the registry and the registrar market, the old protocol was the Registry/Registrar Protocol. I was actually in preparation for this. I was going through some of the old RRP documentation, and one of the things I saw in version two was they actually put in basically a NACK request, the ability to deny a transfer request. So initially, when ICANN starting off, this was all about how do we sit there? And do we facilitate the movement of domain names,

domain name portability to spur innovation, all this good stuff. But surprise, surprise, the criminal element decided to exploit that.

Early on, I would say that was probably in the summer. We met in Reston—I don't know if it was the Marriott or the Sheraton—down there in Town Center, and the initial registrars came together. Jim, you'll appreciate this. That was actually the first time where I met Hal Lubsen and Scott Hemphill face to face at that meeting. I give Network Solutions credit. To the best of my recollection, I believe they paid for the hotel space. That was rather nice of them. But invited to that meeting was a representative from the FBI who said, "This is not good. You really need to sit there and to begin to address this problem." So that at the earliest days, even before full competition, there were criminal activities happening, and registrants and businesses were being harmed. Now, that was, as you say, the earliest of days.

What has happened after that was these were some of the internal processes that were put in place. And initially, before we were actually able to address it from a technical perspective, the lawyers actually got involved in saying, "Okay, when we identify this, how can we come up with agreements that will allow us to get the domain name back to where it needs to be?" So this was an example of the lawyers actually trying to move quicker, while the technologists tried to come up with standards.

Now, if you move forward, when the EPP protocol was first rolled out, and that would have been the first two registries that rolled out—and I just saw Jeff—that would have been Afilias and Neustar or New Level. When .info and .biz were launched, these were two registries that first

implemented EPP … the EPDP … I'm sorry. I'm mixing—the EPP protocol—and, Sarah, I know you're smiling there that I'm mixing up my acronyms there. But what was very interesting was that there were mechanisms in place to provide for the Auth-Code. But one of the things that we saw—and, Glenn, this goes to a lack of knowledge not only from a registrant but also from a technology standpoint—one of the things that we saw at Afilias early on was certain registrars were literally using the same EPP Auth-Code for their entire portfolio of all domain names under their sponsorship, thus, not providing a high degree of security. Jim, I think you could talk about this. SAC007 was one of the first SSAC documents that actually identified some early problems and potential best practices.

So I guess I'll stop there. I think that's a good stopping point for myself from a historical perspective.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: James has been around a long time on this, or Sarah and Daniel. Did you guys want to make a comment on what Michael has said at all just before I turn to the next question? Anybody want to—

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Can I say something?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, that's a great introduction. But I'd like probably, if we could also speak about the issue of the 60-day transfer lock, because also this has been one of the issues that has been a contentious discussion, whether those days were adequate enough. And since now, technology has transformed and the rate at which the lock is enforced could be minimized or increased. Because various debates have been going on both of them at At-Large and also I think in the NCUC about whether the 60-day clock is adequate. Probably it would be good also to give a brief history of the 60-day lock because that will also help our discussion here.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sure. The 60-day lock, interestingly enough, Jeff Neuman and I had some discussions about this. I'm trying to follow in the chat while speaking as well. I'm sure Jeff will speak to this. So the original 60-day lock, ironically, was not intended to benefit the end user. That initial 60-day lock was primarily implemented to benefit the registrars and specifically it was register.com. So what happened was, going back to my story of bad things happening, the criminals exploiting this new market, not only were they in the process of trying to misappropriate someone else's name, they were also in the process of using stolen credit cards to test out. It was a small dollar transaction, can I register a domain name, test it, and then move on to bigger and more purchases. So one of the problems that happened was the initial framework—and during that time during the testbed period, domain names actually cost $9, not $6—but what happened was registrars were basically being hit with these charge backs, because back then they didn't have the APIs to verify, so charge backs were generally coming a month or two later. So

what happened was the registrars, specifically register.com, advocated that they wanted to be able to lock a domain name for the purposes of ensuring that they got paid. Basically, how can we get outside the credit card charge back window? And then what happened was if in fact there was a credit card chargeback in that scenario, the registrar, as was explained by register.com is, "Well, if we've not been able to be compensated, we've had to pay since we've already paid then Network Solutions or paid the registry operator, we have the ability to perhaps recoup that by reselling the domain name." So that is the interest. That is why the 60-day came into play. It was purely originally about registrars being protected about credit card charge backs.

Now, as Jeff and I have discussed over time, that 60 days has been relied upon for other reasons and has now kind of taken a life on of its own. I'm not saying whether that's good or bad. But going back to why it was originally done, it was not about registrants, it was all about registrars.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, perfect. Thank you. I'm going to turn to Sarah. Oh, sorry, James. Go ahead. James?

JAMES GALVIN: I was just going to comment. Maybe Sarah can add to this. Well, maybe not. But Michael might know the answer to this too. Since Michael mentioned SAC007, which was done back in 2006, and that was SSAC's first entree into saying all of the things which—they've been updated a little bit piecemeal. But this current Transfer Review Policy, one of its

interesting things is it's finally taking a holistic view about the Transfer Review process and really giving the Auth-Info Code its due. It was in that 2006 in SAC007 that we first called out the fact that the Auth-Info Code is used authorized transfers. And in fact, as Michael said, there were all of these problems in the way that they were used. So it had adopted a usage which was inconsistent with the characteristics of its implementation. And the Transfer Review Policy is now addressing this particular fact and getting to this issue.

And so with that, I'll leave that. I don't know if anyone knows. The question that I had was I've never actually clearly identified whether the FOAs came about before or after 2006. I don't know when those appeared. And if anybody knows, that would be a good thing to get track of. Sarah says before.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. So does Sarah. Okay, Sarah, did you want to respond to what James was asking, or can I go on to the next thing?

SARAH WYLD: I had a couple of things to add. Thank you very much, Glenn. But what I had to say, it wasn't super related to what Jim said. Kind of went back to what Daniel was saying and just a couple other thoughts that I'll share real quick. So the 60-day lock is an open topic of discussion in the working group right now. We ran a survey in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. My coworker Owen Smigelski from Namecheap put that survey together, asking registrars whether that loss shouldn't they'll be mandatory or optional and how long it should last for. And what was

interesting to me was that the feedback that we got was just all over the place. There didn't seem to be any patterns. Just that people had a lot of different opinions. So I'm still really uncertain what I think about that one because we're not seeing an issue with charge backs now. I guess the long word. But then does that mean do we need to keep it? Or if we get rid of the lock will we see an increase in charge backs again? I'm really not sure.

The other thing I wanted to mention is just to bring a little bit of focus on to another major change that came with the 2016 changes to the policy, which is that that brought in the change of registrant process. So until then, the Transfer Policy was always relating to domains moving from one registrar to another. And since then, we also have a process to follow when the ownership of a domain name is changing its ownership transfer. So that's something that we haven't yet tackled in the working group. That is for a later phase but it's definitely an important difference in the original to the updated Transfer Policy. So it's something else to keep in mind. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, Sarah. I believe Jeff wants to jump in either to embellish what you were saying or additional information. Welcome, Jeff. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Hey, thanks, Glenn. Yeah, I just thought some more historical information. At the time, the first Transfer PDP, I was actually a participant in that. I remember Tucows, especially Ross Raider being—I can't remember if he was the chair or was just so incredibly involved.

But we were having an issue at the time. All the registrars we're having an issue because Network Solutions at the time was finding reasons to NACK or deny almost every single transfer request. And they were the ones that were hurt the most by the Transfer Policy because they had 100% of the market. As Michael said, they introduced five new testbeds. So fairly quickly, Network Solutions went from 100% to less than 50%. So they were trying to keep a stronghold on their customers. So for a lot of reasons, we have this Transfer PDP.

Now, when I was participating in it, as Michael said, all the "new registries" at the time were using EPP, the Extensible Provisional Protocol, which called for the creation of Auth-Codes, which was not in the original RRP that was still being used at the time by Verisign for .com, .net. I think when it started, it was for .org. I mean, they used it for .org as well but I think the PDP was overlapping with the .org transition. So some of us that ran EPP registries were pushing for just relying on the Auth-Code without FOAs simply because that didn't, in our minds, add any benefit. Because the Auth-Code, once the problems that Michael and the SSAC worked out, that you shouldn't use an Auth-Code for every single registration, they should be unique, it should be a secret. Once that was all worked out, there was no reason to have an Auth-Code and a Form of Authorization. But for a number of reasons, I won't go into, mostly political, the community wanted the same process, whether it was a .com on the RRP, Thin registry, or whether it was .biz and .info on the EPP which had Auth-Code. So they wanted one process and that one process that joined it all was the FOA. That's an issue now still, whether FOA should be requested and whether it really

adds value. But that was important to note that initially that was requested by some of the EPP registries but turned down.

Then I think Sarah's got an excellent point, which is that the issue of a registrant transfer wasn't dealt with at all until 2016. But what we saw there were some registrars that were locking domains within or for 60 days after a contact change was made, which made it impossible to change a contact and then transfer the name. Because if you change the contact to a new owner, you have to wait 60 days just to transfer it. Those are some of the issues you're still grappling with, but that's just some more historical context. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. For the benefit of everyone, Jeff, you're just not stopping in here because you have nothing else to do today. But give us a little bit of background on yourself so that the audience can appreciate your contribution to ICANN.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure. I am a unaffiliated member of the ALAC, so I'm here at that capacity, really. I've been in the ICANN community for, well, as Michael knows, since pretty much before there was an ICANN. I've been in a number of different capacities including—sorry, Jonathan, you're right, the At-Large. I am terrible with the use of terms but I'm still learning. But yeah. I've been served in a number of capacities. Initially, in 1997-98, I was an IP attorney, and so I was one of the first members of the IPC. Then joined the Registry in 2000, joined Neustar, did that for 15 years, and then joined the Registrar for the next five years, and then

went out on my own as a consultant now for the past year. Many of you know me because I'm heavily involved in the new gTLD process and was the former co-chair with Cheryl Langdon for the SubPro PDP that just ended earlier this year. Currently, I guess, the ODP liaison for SubPro.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, great. Thank you. And if you saw the chat, I'm going to hit you up as a speaker in 2022. So please fill out the form. Now that we got you on this call, we're not going to let you run away.

Okay. So I want to turn to James. James, do you have a chance? Do you want to talk about the new policy or the new policy changes? But now we have a level set in terms of where we are historically, do you want to move us forward on what can we expect? What's really important is how this policy affects the end users. Go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Let me make two points and maybe I'll put on a slightly different hat for my second point. But from the point of view of Registries and our role in this Transfer Review Policy, we view this transfer process in general really as primarily an issue for registrars to deal with and to address. In that role, we're trying to have a very light hand in what happens and what goes on there. Because from our point of view, our job is to facilitate and support the registrars. We already have a role, which is that a gaining registrar submits—what is previously being called an Auth-Info Code, we're going to change its name as part of all this and call it Transfer Authorization Code. So we're going to give it a name that represents its role and call it a TAC, and that's useful. Registrars will be

able to work on giving it all the proper set of requirements that it ought to have and give it the attention it ought to have. But the gaining registrar submits a TAC us and we just look to see if the TAC that they submitted matches the one that we have. And if it does, then we interact with the registrar of record to make sure that they don't reject the transfer. As long as they don't reject it, or the NACK as Michael referred to it, historically, that's the way the protocol is worked up to this point. They have an opportunity to say no, then we effect the transfer. So the registries will then change the internal master database to be in agreement with that. And then the new registrar can make whatever update to do what they want on behalf of the registrant. That's one set of things. We're trying to leave that role to keep that minimal role in this process. We just want to be supportive of that and let the registrars do what they need to do.

It's interesting that the second point that I'll make is along the way, and very supportive of the fact that the registrars are absorbing a desire to want to enhance the security, if you will, the overall emphasis on protecting the registrant as part of this transfer process. And that opens up an opportunity to get into a lot of potential changes that provide benefits to a registrant. I will only speak about the things that affect the registry. I'll leave the rest to Sarah to represent. But I've tried to be a bit of a contributor on the security side to some of the principles that letting the group deal with them. But what affects a registry in this respect is there is an opportunity for registries to help support registrars in their management of the TAC. The registrars have been giving some consideration to placing interesting rules, like when the registry stores the TAC when it has one that it now has to worry about on behalf of the

gaining registrar, for example, that should be encrypted. I mean, that should be an obvious requirement and I think that most registries probably already do this. I know that we do, for example, and I'm sure that many others do. But it's not a requirement and it really ought to be. I mean, you really ought to provide that particular protection to that particular characteristic. And there are some analog restrictions or requirements on registrars that are consistent with that. That Sarah will talk about when she talks about the registrar role.

So there are a number of things that we're getting into. Then the last point that I'll make in this space is that using the TAC as a Transfer Authorization Code and declaring that it functionally has that role provides a basis for re-examining the presence of the FOA and those authorization forms. Now, the Temporary Specification, of course, made the FOAs not be necessary. So that was deployed in 2018. But now we're making that an integral part of policy and we're adding all the rest of the details around that. So giving the Auth-Info, now a TAC, a well-defined role, a well-defined name, gives you the opportunity to create all the appropriate characteristics that really do get us to a place where the FOA is not necessary in a digital world. You really want to create a more digital opportunity for these things to happen. That I think is a good thing and we're on that path. That's our role as registries, to support registrars in this tremendous pick up that they're doing in going towards this. So I'll turn it back to you and let Sarah speak about those issues.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Exactly. I want to turn over to Sarah. You were singled out, Sarah. Before I turn to Daniel, can you address that issue that James brought up?

SARAH WYLD:

For sure. James was just talking about the gaining registrar FOA. I'm actually going to take a little step back and speak a little bit differently before I get to that. When we're focusing in this new PDP working group, we're focusing on reviewing every aspect of the transfer process, as has already been said, to make sure that we keep what makes sense, keep what is helpful, and get rid of what's not working. I really do believe that this can only benefit the end user. Because they're going to end up with a process to follow that both helps keep their domain name safe where they want it to be, while it also lets them move that domain name to where they want it to go as easily as possible. Everything that Jim just mentioned about the security of the process is really geared towards that end user, just the ability to own and manage your services where you want them. And that's of course really crucial for registrars as well. We want happy customers.

I think the most noticeable change that we're going to see coming out of this policy has already happened and that's no longer using the gaining registrar Form of Authorization, the FOA e-mail, as Jim just mentioned. I could get into a why we can't do that for a variety of reasons if people are interested. I think the real upshot is that it's been—what? Two and a half years already? When was 2018? It was a while ago and we have not seen any problems. There's maybe a couple of problems but we don't have a systemic issue to resolve without FOA.

So getting rid of it is a very safe choice, I think, and just makes more sense for everyone.

Then thinking about TAC security, Jim mentioned that it's encrypted. We're going to see other standards or security requirements for registrars to follow. So there would be a standard for how long it needs to be in terms of how many characters. There could be, I think, a standard for what types of characters to use. I actually can't remember offhand if we're going to formalize that or make a suggestion. Some things need to be in policy, some things can be implementation notes, and still be beneficial.

Then the other really interesting thing is that it will have a TTL, a time to live, that once that TTL expires, the code disappears and can't be used anymore. So if a person does request their code and then not do their transfer, they don't have to worry that if they forget about it, leave it in their e-mail, and then it gets hacked a year later, that they're going to lose that domain name. So that TTL, I think, will be very beneficial.

Then also, the code won't always exist. It will only be created when the registrant requests it, not when the domain is created. So it gets created when it's needed, then it expires. When the transfer is completed, it gets blanked out again entirely. And the registry doesn't even know what the code is because it's encrypted. So they can confirm that the code provided matches the code that the registrar previously set. But it can't just be accessed and pulled out of their system. So those are all really helpful security things.

There's one more kind of new idea that we're thinking about that I don't think exists. Actually, I'm sure it does not exist in the policy yet, which is that if somebody attempts to do a domain transfer and provides an invalid TAC for a certain number of attempts that we haven't yet quite settled on, the registry must notify the registrar who must notify the domain owner. Maybe may notify the domain owner. It's a process. That's a really important security thing. Just like how if somebody tries to log into your Gmail account and then they use their own password a few times, you'll get a notification, I think. It's a good security feature.

The other piece of work that we've been looking at is on the losing FOA. What kind of communications does the current losing registrar, the Registrar of record, need to send to the domain owner? What's useful but then what's not useful anymore? How much information do they actually need to provide? So we're thinking about that.

Now looking at the chat. Jeff: "What if it is just a typo?" That is an issue. But if somebody is entering a typo three times, they have a problem and they need some help with that. It's not always malicious but it is indication that there's an issue of some sort.

To David's question about how many domains are transferred, I don't know. I would be very curious to have that information but I don't have it.

Then, Jeff, yes, there is a threshold. I think it's three to five attempts. To your other question about using Auth-Codes for other purposes such as credentialing, I think the answer is no, partly because once it's set in the

registry, it gets hashed. But the registrar still has to know that it is. So I'm not sure. I'm going to look that up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: There's so much you said in that short amount of time. I'm learning so much about Transfer Policy more than I ever wanted to know. This is fantastic. Thank you all.

Let's move back to Daniel and I want to make sure—I think, James, you're leaving at the top of the hour, right? Okay. I want to make sure we circle back to you. I want to make sure your thoughts are captured that we don't lose you in the mix because you're going to be gone in 10 minutes. Okay. Daniel, please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Glenn. Absolutely. Sarah has spoken a lot about security. And just one of the things that we looked at in the TPR, the Transfer Policy, is that when it comes to notifications, in case an unauthorized transfer is taking place, how does the registrant or the registered name holder be notified? So there is a series of notifications back and forth in every respective process that the domain is going to be transferred. Before we get into the TAC, there is an issue of a domain lock. Before a domain can be transferred, the domain lock has to be disabled. Then after that, you have to provide the TAC. Then after that, the registry has to check with the other respective registry, whether the TAC is able to—whether they match, then after that, a transfer can take place. But then within all that respective process, the registered name

holder can decide to say, "No, I would not want to transfer my domain," and then the domain transfer can be halted.

So when it comes to the end user experience, the policy working group is making sure that the domain transfer are successfully transferred in a legit way and also issues of domain hijacking can be solved within the new respective requirement. So the new recommendations are taking care of the end user perspective. But then also, the registrar has a big role to play in this. Back to Glenn. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. I mentioned in the chat to Marita and Jonathan, because they're the ALAC representatives for NARALO, is there anything either of you want to comment on with regards to ALAC's position regarding this current policy? Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Again, I feel like this is a topic where we're trying to approach this almost intentionally from a position of ignorance, if that makes sense. As end users, we're trying to think about just what is the end user experience with this, more so than what the intricacies are behind the scenes. To that end, I think that there are some within the At-Large community that would really like to see a more affirmative action on the part of the losing registrar. So that the losing registrant, even if it might be the same person, but the losing registrant at the losing registrar to actually get confirmation of that. And I realized that the Auth-Code is meant to play that role. I guess the scenario in which it's a concern is if there's some sort of a breach on the end of that account or

something like that. So it's such a valuable asset to people. I think that there's definitely a feeling that I'm having some kind of a check and balance there that I have to click something to approve it would be useful.

Then on the flipside of that, the long lock feels like something onerous for end users. So we really wonder whether it needs to be that long because that's just something that feels like an inconvenience on our end if we're not aware of—again, just speaking from our own experience/perspective, not selfishly. Those juxtapositions, on the one hand—I'm sorry, this is an ill-formed intervention. But on the one hand, we're saying that, "Hey, it's not really a problem anymore. We don't have the problems that we had when this first came out of the level of malfeasance associated with this. So therefore, we don't need to do the confirmations and the FOAs, but we still want to keep the 60-day lock because that benefits us." So there's this weird juxtaposition of those two things that I think is a cause of consternation among the At-Large community and certainly among NARALO. I hope that was clear enough to address that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Thank you so much. I believe Sarah's going to respond. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yes, I do have a couple thoughts on that. So this question about the TAC itself is valuable. But if there's an account breach, what happens? So this is something that we have been thinking about,

especially along the lines of "What happens if somebody else accesses my account at the registrar and gets the TAC and then transfers my domain away? How am I going to know what happened?"

So we're working out a requirement for a separate notification and we're just trying to figure out how to make it the most efficient and effective. But a notification that would be sent to say somebody has requested a TAC and it was sent to the domain owner. So if it's being sent by e-mail and that notification is by e-mail, then maybe I'm going to get two e-mails, maybe that's not helpful. But if it's requested in the Account Control Panel, then a separate e-mail could be a very useful notification.

We're definitely thinking about how to balance security and preventing charge backs against functionality and the ability of the user to select what their provider is. So something else that is on our plan but we haven't addressed at all is a question of a fast undo option. Some kind of emergency, "Hey, this transfer was wrong. It shouldn't have happened, put my domain back where it came from." That's the thing that I look forward to working out how we're going to accomplish that, because that's a really new thing. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Due to time, James will be leaving for a meeting and it's amiss for me to not congratulate you going on to the ICANN Board. So, good luck in the next three years. I'm sure Michael has lots of opinions on his life formerly—oh, he has no opinion. Okay. James, I want to give you an opportunity because you won't have a chance at

the end to reflect on what you've heard so far and maybe some things that have been missing in the conversation that should have been mentioned, and then we'll launch back into it after you leave. James, the floor is yours.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Glenn. Thank you for the acknowledgement and congratulations. I want to first applaud this discussion that's going on here. I think that all the right questions are being asked about issues surrounding this change and this opportunity for change. And as you're hearing, Sarah has been responding to most of the questions, but these are all things that have come up in the Transfer Policy too. I mean, in general, the commitment really is to protecting registrants. Speaking from a registry point of view, I want to commend registrars for really focusing on that part of the conversation in the discussions and in the Transfer Review PDP. There's a significant emphasis on how do we make it better for registrants and still keep all the protections that were put in place when the Transfer Review Policy—I mean, as it's evolved over the years, it obviously has gotten some good principles in place, can we make those principles implement better? And then while we're doing this review, can we add more that's even better for registrant?

So from that At-Large community point of view, you're asking all the right questions. And all those discussions, I haven't heard any question that hasn't already been opened and discussed in the group. I'll add a little bit that, again, registries are here and part of our role in this process is supporting registrars in their goal of wanting to better protect

registrants. We all want a better system overall. I mean, it's to all of our benefits to have something like that, obviously.

One of the interesting things is when Sarah was mentioning that a registry, we'd have to do some new work, and one of those new things is keeping track of how many attempts there are to use a TAC, and then notifying the Registrar of record of that stuff going on. Well, that's a new thing. That has not been done before and that's never been present before. But if we're going to move towards better managing these kinds of things, you want that process to exist, which means a registry is going to have to proactively, we need a mechanism for reaching out to registrars to do the right thing. And then as Sarah said, registrars need a rule or guideline that's still the discussion as to what they do, given that information with respect to the registrant.

Another critical piece of this is how do you offer a final notification to a registrant that the transfer was successful? That really doesn't exist in today's system. So there's no way for a registrar of record really to notify a registrant that something happened. All you really have today are timeouts. But one of the things that we're talking about is registry supporting the registrar of record, and again, as additional enhancement to protect registrants, the registry will tell the registrar of record where the name went. That turns out to be another thing that the registrar of record doesn't know today. You really have no way of being aware of where a name went to. So if you want this immediate callback kind of process, well, you need some information to make all of that happen and to manage all of that. So that becomes, again, another piece that registries need to provide your registrars. You need to be able to tell the registrar of record where the name went so they could

use that information in an appropriate way. In principle, as part of notifying a registrant, gee, it was completed, it actually happened. By the way, this is where it went. Let's make sure that the right thing happened. Again, if a TAC is lost along the way, getting from a registrant to a gaining registry, a gaining registrar, all of these things are protected and enhanced by doing those kinds of things.

So, I just want to acknowledge the good work that's going in the Review PDP with the registrars. I congratulate At-Large in asking all right questions. I think that's important and we welcome all of that. So Daniel has been a good participant in all of that. Hopefully that interaction will continue. And we'll capture any questions that come up here that haven't been thought about. So thank you for the opportunity to be here. I apologize again for having to move on. I have a commitment here that I just can't get out of. So I'll pause for one more minute and listen to see if anything else comes up. But otherwise, I'll just say my goodbyes now. Thanks, Glenn, for the opportunity.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, no. Thank you so much. I appreciate your time. And I think this is a really intelligent discussion. It's so much more refreshing than having all kinds of slides, death by PowerPoint, but I think it's drilling down into the nuts and bolts. I could see Michael's face. His brain was ticking when you were talking and I know he's dying to say something. As you can see the smile, I know he's going to say something. So go ahead, Michael, you're going to react on what something James said.

MICHAEL PALAGE: No. Jim and I generally, I would say, tend to be aligned a lot philosophically, independent of our many years of working together. As I said in the chat, I am just actually thinking of some of the discussions that Milton raised in the IGF panel about digital self-determination and digital sovereignty. Going back to At-Large here, how do we really empower the user to have a voice and say in these important assets? So that's kind of where my brain was going and some of the other stuff that was going on. I don't want to delay Jim from getting to his other meeting.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Thanks, James, and thanks for joining us. You brought up Milton Mueller. I did attend that session with him and I think it's a wider discussion that he's having, even within the At-Large community, him and [inaudible], they're basically looking at the IGF leadership model, questioning the way the process that they actually select the people. So are you implying that maybe some of the concepts that Milton is looking at, that maybe some of the group innovations that Milton is saying that maybe should be brought into this policy group? I'm not sure what exactly what you're getting at.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I think one of the things that I was particularly interested is in the issue of digital sovereignty versus digital self-determination. I think sometimes sovereignty is used or convoluted in an individual capacity, which I think just messes things up. So I think Milton did a pretty good job of trying to firewall that, and I think it is important. From a digital

sovereignty perspective, there are certain rules that are going to be applied. So we within the multistakeholder model here could say, "This is what we think the policy should be." But it is quite possible that a national government could impose certain laws that they think is important to protect. In the U.S., there are OFAC requirements. In Europe, you have the DSA and NIS that are working their way through. In China, you have real-name verification.

So I think it's important that the ICANN multistakeholder model be very cognizant of how our policy development processes and practices need to work in a world that is very dynamically evolving. And that, to me, was what I really found interesting on some of Milton's contributions, that distinction between digital sovereignty, which nation states have historically had and recognized since the 16th century well formed, and this concept of digital self determination, and how we can protect individual users to the maximum extent possible within those national laws upon which they're bound. So these are just some of the thoughts that were kind of running through my mind when I was hearing all the other speakers thinking and how I was trying to correlate that to everything I heard from last week's IGF sessions. So hopefully that makes sense.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. When I have a chance, I'll send to the list the links to Milton's session. I was at the IGF, well worth listening to. Excellent points.

So let me turn back to the issue that we brought up a little earlier about the end user community and our representative, Daniel. Steinar is not on the call. Daniel, can you clarify some of the things that the At-Large community is actually having an input into shaping this policy? Is there something that we've had? If we were not there, Daniel, would certain things be missing that we are contributing? I guess I want the At-Large community here to realize what role we're playing in this policy process.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Glenn. One of the issues that we have been putting forward as At-Large is how does the 60-day lock affect the end user? That's one of the issues that we've been able to discuss. Another issue is the security of the domain when it comes to the end user. Once the end user owns the domain, how are they going to make sure that their domain is protected? How can we make sure that an unauthorized transfer is not taking place or maybe a domain hijacking isn't taking place? And what is the role of the resellers in the transfer process? Because most of the end users, they do not buy their domain directly from the registry. They end up using third-party resellers. And the third-party, does it contribute to a data breach for the security situation when it comes to the domain industry? So all these factors will affect the end user when it comes to the domain ownership.

One of the last discussions that came up was that when it comes to the registered name holder, in case they need to make a transfer, then the registry must be able to provide the TAC directly to the registered name holder without necessarily getting through the reseller. So the reseller at this point is not aware of the TAC in the process of the domain

transfer. So those are some of the issues that affect the end users. Thank you. I welcome any questions regarding to that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, great. Thank you, Daniel. I want to turn to the audience. We have 19 participants in the room and I want to give an opportunity for those who have been quiet to jump in and ask the panel any questions. Is there any? I believe Sarah is going to clarify something in one second. I just want to get people to formulate their thoughts and pose questions. Sarah, did you want to react? I believe Eduardo will jump in right after you. Is there something you wanted to clarify there?

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Glenn. Just the membership numbers that you shared in the chat maybe was a copy-pasting error. There are not 31 registrars working on this project. I can't imagine what policy would get 31 different registrars all working on it together. My goodness. That would be great. There are 10. There are 10 registrar representatives—up to 10. We don't usually get all 10 at the same meeting. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Just as the source that I took it from. It was from the ICANN site. So thank you for clarifying that. So that makes a big difference in perspective because if it was 31, the At-Large community would have a very small voice, for sure. Let me turn over to Eduardo. Go ahead, Ed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Glenn. Excellent discussions so far for this theme. I've learned a lot. I have a question because I hear about end user, and if I understood well, and I'm looking from the At-Large perspective, are end users that buy domains. But I was wondering if like, say, my mother, she doesn't know anything, she uses the Internet. Is this affecting her at all, this Transfer Policy? Or it's just end users that want buy domains? Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Who wants to tackle that? Okay, Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I have a couple of thoughts on this. Of course, the first thing I think is if your mother doesn't own a domain name, then I really can't think how this would affect her. But no, that is wrong because she uses the Internet. And so it's very important that the people who use the website, even if they don't own it, can rely that is where it's supposed to be that the website owner, the domain owner, is actually able to manage their domain name in an appropriate manner. This is one of the cornerstones of how the Internet works is that domain owners have that control over their domain name. So as a user of websites, you want to make sure that the system through which websites exist is working properly. So although it may not affect your mother directly in her use of the Internet, I think overall, it's really important that we maintain this system. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much, Sarah. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. I think Jonathan has a comment on that. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sarah pretty much said what I was going to say. I think that just to get more specific and less general in the answer, the implication for a typical end user is that the domain name might now point to a bad site. So it's sort of like an advanced form of phishing. Instead of coming up with a site name that's got a typo in it or something like that, which is the normal use, I would have the actual sites, and the domain would come to my phishing site instead of the site that it was meant to go to. So I think that's probably the largest impact on a typical end user of this Transfer Policy and why the At-Large is sort of doubly concerned about it is that the implication of this is about the mistransfer, if you will, of domain. That matters to end user registrants but it also matters to end users generally, if suddenly an ecommerce site or something like that, somebody's Etsy site or something now points to the wrong place. So that would be the implication.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Perfect. Thank you. Okay. I'm just looking for the next person to jump in and add a question or a comment. Maureen, if you have something to say, please jump in. If not, I am okay. Look, Naela, do you have anything from an ICANN point of view, any comments or your questions for the

panel? Jonathan, is that an old hand or a new one? Go ahead. Yes, please.

NAELA SARRAS: Hi, Glenn. Sorry. I saw you called on me. I was away. I don't have any specific questions for the panel. I think this was a very enlightening discussion. I commend you guys for having really great informative calls every month. I found this really fascinating. So thank you so much. No questions. Just keep up the great sessions.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you for the vote of confidence. I have to force Eduardo every month to have sessions like this. He wants to talk about bingo or he wants to talk about the baseball. He wants to talk about the NFL game last night. I said no. We've got to do our job. But it's tough, right, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, yeah. Yes, you have to force me, right.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Eduardo, I don't see anything else. We're going to be able to wrap up a little sooner than expected. But I wanted to turn back to the panel and let them, just like what we gave Dr. Galvin, he has a chance to do some final comments. So maybe, Sarah, I'll to give you, then to Michael, then to Daniel for some final comments.

SARAH WYLD: Super. Thank you so much for having me. This has been really delightful. it's funny. I really enjoy this PDP. It's just a lot of fun. And working on the Transfer Policy has been a goal of mine for longer than I worked at Tucows, so several years. And I'm just really happy to finally be able to do it. I really appreciate the focus that everybody has in this call. As I mentioned in the chat, and pointing to the chat, as I mentioned about the balance between security and ease of use or functionality or the user's ability to put their domain where they want it. We have to figure out how to balance that, but that's not a new issue. It's not a new question. That is the fundamental question of the Internet. Thank you, and have a good day.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Let me turn to Michael. Any final comments?

MICHAEL PALAGE: No. I appreciate being able to share some historical perspectives. I think this, as Sarah says, is an important topic that impacts the entire ecosystem. I think we need to get this right so that this process works to the benefit of the end user registrants as well as registries, registrars, and resellers within the entire ecosystem.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you so much. Over to Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Thank you very much, Glenn. I'm very happy to be part of this NARALO call to present about the TPR. One thing that I have experienced in the TPR is that we are touching every corner of the domain transfer, right from the end user to the registry, and we are looking critically at the issues of security in the transfer. I'm very sure that the recommendations that we are making from the TPR are going to be impactful and quite change in the way the domain are being transferred. But also the deliberations are quite really interesting and encouraging. Thank you.
GLENN MCKNIGHT:	Great. Thank you, Daniel. I appreciate you taking the time today to join us. I know you have an important surgery tomorrow. So thank you. I hope this was a great diversion for you. So thank you again so much for joining us today. So I'm going to turn it back. First of all, I'd like to thank everybody, including Jeff who came in and gave some really good comments in chat. Hopefully he realizes we're going to be asking him to come in as a speaker in '22. I'm going to turn it back over to Eduardo. And thank you very much. Over to you, Eduardo.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you so much, Glenn, and thanks for a great moderation and a great panel that we have today. I think it was very informative. This is the type of things that we want our members to understand, policy things that we're getting involved with on a [inaudible]. Just understand this from A to Z and I think we accomplished that. Thanks, everyone and all the panelists, in helping in doing that in this time. So, with this in

mind, if there are no more comments or questions, we can adjourn this meeting. Thank you so much.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thanks, everybody. Don't forget to fill out the survey and also any suggestions for future topics. So again, thanks, everybody. Hey, Marita. There you are. Great. Marita, we have you on the queue in January. So we're going to talk—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]