

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 31st of August, 2022 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

And just to cover our apologies received, we have received apologies from Sarah Kiden, Gopal Tadepalli, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bill Jouris, Judith Hellerstein and from Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet. From staff side, we have Heidi Ulrich, Claudia Ruiz, Chantelle Doerksen and myself, Yeşim Sağlam. And I will be doing call management for this meeting. And as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation provided, and our interpreters are Claudia and Paula on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Camila on the French channel.

Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And one final reminder is for the real time transcription service provider, I've just shared the link with you here. Just a heads up that unfortunately we do not have the integrated calls capturing on zoom. However, the RTT link, the real time transcription link is working. Please do check the service, use the service using the link I've just shared. And with this, I think I'm good to hand the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

---

*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.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and as you were speaking, my internet appears to have frozen, so I can't open the actual page where we have our agenda. So I'm going to have to ask if Jonathan could take this piece with apologies for my lack of internet connectivity.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the CPWG call. This is Jonathan Zuck, co-chair of the CPWG, standing in for the dashing Olivier Crépin-Leblond, whose internet is not behaving. If we look briefly at the agenda, we can see that we will be first looking at work group and small team updates. We have an apology from Justine, hopefully you know, Yeşim. And then after that we will be looking at the policy comment updates, and we'll be getting a presentation from Hadia and looking at what's coming up.

And then finally we will be looking at transfer policy review a little bit about what's going on ICANN75. And then any other business, is there anything anybody would like to add for any other business, anybody want anything added to the agenda?

All right. Well then that is our plan for the meeting. Let's get back up to the top here and jump right into our action items. Let's see. Volunteers needed to review the RDAP contract. Hadia, were you going to be looking at the RDAP contract requirements?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So Jonathan, I think it was assigned to someone else, however I'd be happy to do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I don't remember who it was assigned, do apologize. In fact, I sort of remember it, us deciding that we didn't probably need to make a statement because it's such a narrow change to the contract but...

HADIA ELMINIAWI: But I could actually take a look and present it next time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Sounds good. And to teach to review universal acceptance, Public Comment proceeding once it's published. I don't think Universal Acceptance Public Comment has begun yet. Has it, Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi Jonathan, no, it has not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. So that's a still in progress action item as well. So then let's go ahead and move on to the we group and small team updates. And then I see Steinar in the agenda twice. Did we move his presentation from now until later in the agenda? Sorry, I'm just noticing that.

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jonathan, it's Chantelle. He's item five right after Hadia's presentation. He's going to want 40 minutes to review the site and have some more questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Then what's going on with the EPDP on IDNs. Satish, is that you?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, so there is no update this time because we are involved in a fairly complex piece of work and it's not been resolved either way. And only after that is done, can we report it back to CPWG. So no updates this time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, great. And the RDP scoping team, is that Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, the report is being finalized and we have until the 15th to submit a report or any statements that will be added to the report after it. But before it's considered by the GNSO council, it'll be considered in Kuala Lumpur. And I'm still in the process of reviewing it to look at whether we have enough cause to warrant an ALAC statement appended to it. So I'll get back to this group sometime over the next few days and we'll present it formally next week if indeed there is -- I think there is one. So something coming there, but nothing to consider in detail today.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good. Thank you so much. And then back to you again on the SSAD ODA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, a very short update. They have scheduled a meeting for next week to tell us what's happening with ICANN org and the implementation, the review of what was called SSAD Light, there've been various names. It is currently called the Whois Disclosure System, I think. But regardless of the name, we'll be getting a report next week. I think it is on Tuesday. Let me double check which case I will be able to update this group. Yeah, it's on Tuesday. So I will have a more substantive report next week on what's happening with the ODA.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, that sounds good. Thanks, Alan. I guess that takes us next into the policy comment updates. We have a presentation from Hadia next. Hadia, my dear take it away.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, sure. Hi this is Hadia Elminiawi for the record. So I'll be giving you an update about the Public Comment in relation to Phase 1 of the Expedited Policy Development Process system for Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs. If we can have a next slide, please.

So first I will briefly mention the required inputs on the Public Comment part one and part two. I will also briefly mention ALAC previous

---

comments, and then I will ask you for the way forward. I do present a recommendation though. So if we can have the next slide please.

So the Public Comment consists of two parts. The first part addresses the draft Registration Data Consensus Policy and that's Phase 1 of recommendations of Phase 1 of the EPDP. And then the second part asks about the updates to the policies and procedure that were impacted by the Registration Data Consensus Policy. We can have next slide, please.

So part one which addresses the policy recommendations of Phase 1 of the EPDP on registration data consist of 12 sections in addition to addendum one, addendum two, the implementation notes and the background section.

So section one basically talks about -- it's the introduction. Section two talks about this scope of the registration data. Section three is about definitions and interpretations. Section four is about the date of when the Registration Data Consensus Policy will be required to be implemented. Section five is about the data protection agreement with the ICANN organization and contacted parties. We can have the next slide, please.

Section six is about the collection of registration data. Section seven is about the transfer of registration data from registrar to registry operator. Section eight is the transfer of registration data to data escrow providers. Section nine, addresses the publication of the main name, registration data. Section 10 addresses, disclosure requests. Section 11 is about the log file. We can have the next slide please.

---

Section 12 addresses retention of data. And then we have addendum one, addendum two. Addendum one actually addresses seven items, two of which actually remained with us until the end, which the two were legal versus natural, and actually having unique contact.

So basically, we have previously addressed in our comments and advises all these parts. However, I think what's different this time is that we are able to comment on the recommendations after the whole EPDP has concluded. So this is why we might have now different thoughts than before, not necessarily those. If we could have the next slide, please.

So the second part of the comment is in relation to recommendation number 27 which says that we need to look into policies that were affected by the new registration policies and policies could be affected due to many factors. Like for example the disappearance of the administrative and technical contacts, those now do not exist. And many of the existing policies either refer to those fields or use them and in some form or another. Initially the recommendation addressed or talked about seven policies. However, it ends up that we have more policies that are actually, it ends up that we have more policies that are affected by the new registration policy. So if we can have the next slide, please.

So we end up actually with 18 policies that are affected by the registration policy. And this is something we haven't looked at before at At-Large or ALAC. So the Public Comment includes the policies that were actually affected and the modification to the policy in order to be consistent with the existing policy. Of course, when we look at those policies, we don't need to look at the whole policy or deeply get

---

involved in every detail of the policy. What we need to mainly look at is the web line part in relation to the registration data. So this is something we haven't done before. So those are the policies; if we can have next slide, please.

So here we have 21, but actually they're not 21. It's because some of them are rules. So you have the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, and then you have the UDRP rules. You have the URS and then you have URS rules. So they're not really 21 different policy. If we can have the next slide, please.

So the Public Comment also allows us to add or attach a statement. So as you all know, the Public Comment now is in the form of form that we need to fill in. And part one and part two I got them straight from the form, but also if we want, we could attach a statement so we could fill the form of part one and the form of part two. And in addition to providing a statement, or if we want, we could just attach a statement.

If we could go to the next slide, please. So previously, ALAC has provided statements. We have provided minority statements. We have provided advises. We have provided addendums to our statements. So previously, generally speaking, we have addressed the issue of Thick WHOI], the issue of legal versus natural, the issue of accuracy, registrant contact emails, the WHOIS directory service.

The first phase was the -- and this is the one we are commenting on now. It's mainly the initial recommendations that concern many items. I have already stated them when talking about part one and its different sections. Phase 2 was mainly about a standardized system for access



---

and a disclosure. And in the end, we actually as ALAC, we did not support that system. We did have issues with the priority levels, the evolution of the mechanism, automation of requests and replies, the service level agreements, the sustainability of the system.

And of course, we continue to have issue with the differentiation between legal and natural persons, and also having unique contact addresses, email addresses for registrants. So generally speaking, we have previously provided a lot of advice and comments in relation to the first part of the Public Comment. However, we have never before provided any input in relation to the policy updates.

If we can have the next slide, please. So the ask here, should we provide a Public Comment? Should we comment on part one, part two and if required, also provide or attached statements. My recommendation would be yes, that we need to actually provide a Public Comment.

Again part one, we did comment on it before in many forms, however, we never had the opportunity to comment on it after the whole process system has been concluded. And we actually know now exactly where we stand. Before, when we used to provide comments, there were other phases coming up and we didn't know exactly where things will line up or end up with.

Again, the second part of the comment, we actually never provided comment on it, and I think it's worth -- we need actually to look at the policies and see those updates. Again, we have many sections, we have 12 sections in part one, and then addendum one, addendum two, the

---

implementation notes and the background, but those could be like broken down into for example, six sections by six sections. And so whoever's going to actually be the 10 holders, I volunteer to be one of the 10 holders.

I could look into the first six sections and provide a feedback and a comment on those six section at the CPWG. And then I could look at the other. So we can actually phase this out, we have enough time and I think it is better to do it not all in one, but to do it in several stages. So address the first part. And then the second part. If we could have the next slide, please, I think I'm done. Yeah. So that's it. So I stop here. If we can go to the previous slide, please. Yes, I stop here and I thank you. And await your responses, comments, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia, for your presentation. What is your feeling on the second half of these questions in terms of an attachment versus the Public Comment form to see, have you seen the Public Comment form and is it sufficiently granular to -- it seems like some of this will be redundant with the work we've done, so we could do some cutting and pasting, or even maybe just some referencing to things that we've said before. But what does the form look like? And do we need to go beyond that and create some pros and attach it as well?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Okay. So I think the forms are enough, so I have seen the form. So I did log on as if I'm going to fill in the form. So I've looked at the form. I think it's enough and it does provide -- the first part of it is a multiple

---

choice. And then you have a field where you could actually provide a comment. So the multiple choice part it's basically the degree of support to the to the section. And then the comment box, you write whatever comment you want in relation to that section. So my initial feeling that the forms would be enough.

However in the end, if we would like to provide also an attachment that's possible as well. And yes, as you mentioned, we will be stating many of the things that we did state in the past. Thank you. I see Alan's hand is up.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alan. Yeah, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you very much. I guess I have a question to ask, what are we commenting on? Are we commenting on, again, the fact that we didn't like the recommendations, or is this an opportunity to be commenting on whether we believe the implementation for better or worse was implemented correctly?

I mean if we're commenting on saying we hated it before we still hate it, but by the way, yes you seem to have implemented that's instructed. Who are we saying that to? It has no meaning saying it to the group who has created the policy, who has written the policy based on the report. I guess it might be seen by someone else, but what's our intent? I'm not quite sure here normally one would comment on what is being

---

published here, not where it came from. So I guess we need some consensus on what we're trying to achieve. So that's part number one.

Part number two is although it talks about -- I haven't looked at it in detail, but I'm assuming it talks about in the section on impact and other policies. It talks about the other policies, the impact on the policies that are actually implemented. The largest impact is on the policies that were not implemented yet, specifically Thick WHOIS, and privacy proxy. And I don't think that this document, that this comment is talking about it because there are only altering policy that exists not policy that should have existed if we had done it right. So I'm not quite sure how we handle those. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, Alan, my understanding, that they actually looked into all policies, including Thick WHOIS. So my understanding is, though I haven't looked at each and every one of them, but my understanding is that they're addressing all policies and rules related to those policies. As for the objective and I was thinking also, what's the objective of this whole Public Comment. And again, the part that none of us have looked at is actually the policy part.

As for the recommendations, my understanding that part of the comment actually includes the implementation notes. And I think, if we are having the Public Comment now in relation to the implementation notes, that means that whatever we put in there, could actually impact implementation. That's at least how I understand it. Alan, yeah.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I guess that doesn't really answer the question. I mean, ICANN org and the group, the community group that created this policy are bound by what the policy recommendations were that were approved by the GNSO and then the board. So they can't deviate from those policy recommendations. So the fact that we didn't like the policy recommendations, doesn't alter what they can do with them.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: But my understanding, Alan, that the Public Comments are taken into consideration. And then you have the final policy out. And my understanding that up until today, this is a draft policy and not a final policy because the Public Comments have not been considered yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, of course it is a draft. I'm not saying it is the policy, but it is based on the rec policy recommendations that were in the PDP report that were approved by the GNSO and the board. So we may have said this was a stupid error, mistake. It shouldn't have been done to a particular EPDP Phase 1 recommendation. And we did say that, but the group that created this policy is bound to follow the words there, not what we thought that it should have be. So I'm trying to understand the motivation for going back and saying again, we thought it wasn't something that was right.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think now we have the opportunity, Alan, to be more specific and try to change if we can some parts that we do not agree with. Again, I'm

---

saying this statement with hesitation, but again Public Comments are there for people to provide their comments and then those comments will be considered, and then we will have the final policy. So maybe our comments actually do impact what comes out in the end as final.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is Jonathan Zuck again. I mean is there even a process in place to make changes to policy though? Isn't this fully into an implementation phase? At this point, my impression was this is just the Public Comment about whether or not the implementation is reflective of the policies that were in theory agreed upon and approved by GNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Jonathan, that's the point I'm making. If the wording in the PDP report that was approved could be interpreted multiple ways and we believe they interpreted it the wrong way, that's certainly something we should be saying. I don't think we should be going back and rehashing the fact that we didn't agree with it. If indeed they have implemented it faithfully, according to us. But one of the problems is we're having difficulty with the word policy.

The PDP came up with policy recommendations that were approved by the various bodies. The task then is to translate that into contract words. And that is what this is doing. The actual contracts form, the formal policy that will exist. And this is the process of translating the recommendations into the contractual terms that constitute the policy. So the policy recommendations were made, and those are casting

---

concrete at this point. It's the implementation, are they being faithfully rendered in the contract?

So as an example, one of the recommendations says you can only transfer data from a registrar to registry if all the parties agree, which is virtually impossible to have it. That means Thick WHOIS is effectively dead, effectively; hasn't changed the words, but it's effectively not going to work.

We never commented on that explicitly. We commented on a whole bunch of general. We may have raised that issue. We may not, I can't even remember. But the fact that the recommendation in the policy here, the actual contractual words, make it very clear that yes, you can transfer data if the legal agreements are in place is a faithful rendition of what the policy said. So although, I think it was a horrible mistake. It is what it is.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. I think we're already on the record on that topic.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

But then if we look at the form and section number 7 asks us about the transfer of registration data from registrar to registry operator. It has a multiple choice for how much do we support this policy, and also there is a box in there for us to write the comment. So I think we should not care at which stage is the implementation now. We should just go ahead and provide the input that we would like the -- which I think is right.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. Steinar needs a bit of time for his presentation. What I'm going to request is that maybe Chantelle follow up with corresponding staff on this question to see whether or not there's something we're missing with respect to this comment, because I think Alan and I are on the same page as to what this what the intention is here and so you're making the suggestion that we disregard what the intention is in the call for Public Comments, but if it's something that will just simply fall on deaf ears and it's repetitive of things you've already said, it may not be worth the effort to restate that.

And in fact, if we have actual implementation suggestions, they'll be lost in a flurry of you ignored the intention, et cetera. And then those particular recommendations might not even be followed. Olivier, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. The actual submission form has instructions that provide further details of what is actually looked for. I'll briefly mention it. It says: the goal of part one of this guided submission form is to lead respondents through the sections and requirements of the Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLD, and identify if they accurately reflect the intent of the EPDP on the temp spec for gTLD registration data Phase 1 and Phase 2, priority two consensus probably two recommendations. Please limit your feedback to the implementation of the policy recommendations



---

and not the policy recommendations themselves. I think that's one of the answers we're looking for.

The other one, the goal of part two of this guided submission form is to lead respondents through the review of existing policies and procedures impacted by the Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLD. Please review each policy or procedure thoroughly and provide input on whether these suggested red line changes, accurately reflect the intent and scope of the Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLD. And here I was looking at the policy commenting page and I had trouble finding a Redline document in there. So I think you're suggesting that Chantelle follows up with staff and that some clarification is made on this is I think would be very welcome. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. And Alan, go ahead, but quickly, if you can, just because I think we need --

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll be very quick. From what Olivier read out, I don't think Chantelle needs to do anything, it's really clear. They said don't comment on whether you like the palsy, comment on whether we have implemented it properly. So I think that's really clear. I would like to see the questionnaire, the document and what Livy just read. So without having to sign on and pretending I'm answering the questions.

So if that's attached to the comment form somehow or to the Public Comment webpage, if we could get it extracted and sent to this group

---

would be useful; if it's not there, if Chantelle could get a copy and send it to the list, that would be useful. So we can all look at what it is we're supposed to be answering without having to fake pretending we're going to answer so we can see it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. That makes sense. So Chantelle has that as an action item and thank you, Hadia, for your presentation and for leading this discussion. And with that, we're going to move on to Steinar's presentation.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yeah. Hi, this is Steinar Grøtterød for the record. Maybe we can put up the slides, the first of the slides that I distributed to the mailing list. And in a couple of times I have distributed these slides to the mailing list. And also the last time I added the four questions that if we had the time to try to feel the temperature of the room in some sort of certain questions regarding the change of Registrant policy. So next slide, please.

To my understanding, the change of Registrant policy was included in the Registrant policy to prevent domain named hijacking. The 60 days transfer lock was set to give a window to sort out a potential hijacking or an exit executed hijacking because mitigation of a hijacked domain is harder when the domain name has been transferred to another Registrar, hence the proposed and the practice of a transfer lock.

Based on the discussion in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy PDP working group, the Registrars have kind of signaled that they are not

---

happy with the present change of Registrant policy. It is very, very hard for them to identify that the change is some sort of an intent of a hijacking, or it is a legitimate change of Registrant data.

This, of course then it creates a significant number of support tickets to the Registrars. We have been discussing and we have asked, and there is no statistics about the number of hijacked domain names, that is due to the change of Registrant data policy. There is nobody saying that. The Registrars signaled in the working group that the numbers are extremely small, it's more of a hassle to keep track of what is going on inside the system.

We must remember that the change of Registrant data is an operation involving all the sponsoring Registrars. If you take a look at, and if you remember the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy discussions, this involves a losing Registrar and gaining Registrar, the change of Registrant data is only connected to one Registrar. And we have to discuss this change of Registrant policy in the light of the proposed security measures in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy that is recently out for Public Comments and which we have discussed during several meetings in this CPWG calls. Thank you, next slide, please.

There's a word coming up here that is of importance to the discussion. It is the material change and what will trigger a material change? What is the material change that will trigger a transfer lock for in the present policy? A very common scenario is that when a Registrant domain name holder wants to transfer his domain name from one Registrar to another Registrar, he enters the present Registrar control panel to

---

check whether the data is accurate and making the transfer as smooth as possible.

It can be very easily and it's very common that the email address used when the domain name was registered is out of date or being replaced by an email address connected to the domain name and not like a Hotmail or Gmail address or whatever. It can also be the pure fact that the Registrant has been married and thereby change his family name. That is quite common, honestly. So it's been often used as an example of how difficult it is to validate any changes of Registrant data and further update a postal address or phone number can also be triggering a transfer lock.

And this makes a problem because we have as a Registrant, as a domain name holder, we have the obligation to keep the WHOIS audit data accurate. And if this process that we're actually doing to be in line, be in compliance with the policies creates or prevents or postpones what we intended to do is to transfer domain into another is not particularly user friendly. So let's go into the next slide.

There are not that many slides. So in the present policy, there are a set of examples that should be considered material change, a change to the registered name holder, name or organization that does not appear to be merely a typical correction, a change of Registrant name holder, name or organization that is accompanied by a change of address or phone number and any change of Registrant name holder's email address -- and this is something that, to my understanding, prevents a lot of frustration for the Registrars because they have to track these changes in their system and identify whether it is logic or whether it is

---

okay, or whether it kind of triggered a material change. And there were also the transfer lock.

So let's go to the next slide. This is the wording of the present transfer lock in the change of Registrant. And it says that the Registrant must impose 60 days into Registrant transfer lock, following a change of Registrant provided whoever that the Registrant may allow the registered name holder to opt out of the 60 day Inter-Registrar transfer lock prior to any change of Registrant request.

So there is an opening that the Registrant may implement an opt out feature, but the problem is that, first of all, not all Registrars have done this and they not allow an opt out, meaning that if you do something that the Registrars consider a material change, you will be locked out for transferring your domain name before 60 days has come. And secondly, I have seen personally that it is hard to find the opt out section in the form given by the Registrar. So it is in my view, not particularly user friendly at all, as it is today.

And I'd like to mention also that several ccTLDs, the ccTLDs do not have a transfer lock at all. They are totally depending and trust the Registrar handling the data in accordance with the Registry agreement between the ccTLDs and the accredited Registrar, and thereby there is no transfer lock. There is nothing, it is more like to be in compliance as we are keeping your data accurate and up to date.

And it's my personal recommendation, and that is something that I hope that we could discuss in this meeting, is that I believe this section, the transfer lock should be removed or actually the change of Registrant

---

section in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy should be removed totally. It shouldn't be any reference to any operational issues and policies requirements for the Registrar when the Registrant has updated any of the contact data.

So this is my intro, and I hope there is some comment and I hope to answer them. And I hope to that the rest of the PDP At-Large working group members could assist me in this. So I give the floor to anyone that wants to make a statement before we go into the discussion, taking an informal poll. Hey, Marika, welcome. You're on.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Steinar. I think you can hear me. I think you said this, but I just want to confirm, the 60-day transfer lock, was the reason for that was to deter abusers, is that correct?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I think what is been referred to in the discussion in the working group is preventing domain name hijacking that the domain name that a domain name couldn't be hijacked and the Registrant data couldn't will be altered and then easily being transferred to another Registrar without the present security measures being monitored.

MARIKA KONINGS:

And you're suggesting that that be dropped. So would that enable hijacking?

---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No. And that's because if we look at what we proposed and what the outcome of the discussion in the Phase 1 A in the Inter Transfer working group discussions is that there are a new set of security mechanisms that will make a transfer from one Registrar to another Registrar more secure in my opinion, hence this part of the 60-day transfer lock due to a change of Registrant is, in my view, no longer needed.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you for clarifying.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: It's okay. Thank you very much. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two issues; in terms of, is it needed based on your last explanation, I don't agree because once the change of Registrant is done and it used to be your do your registration now for either, because you told me to, or because I did it without you knowing it's now my email address and my name that's there. The transfer of registration to a new Registrar, all of the security measures have really no impact because I'm the Registrant and I'm going to approve it. And I'm going to get the notice to say it was transferred, to let me know if you object.

So once the Registrant has been transferred, all of the security mechanisms associated with the Registrar transfer really have no meaning. Yes, they're there, but they're talking to me, the guy who now owns the domain, not the one who did it before, and if it was legitimate transfer, that's perfect. And if it wasn't a legitimate transfer, then the

---

original Registrant is completely out of the loop and doesn't have an opportunity to comment, unless their website stops working or something completely peripheral to the registration itself. So I don't think the extra security or the new security process at the beginning removes the potential need for this.

But I want to focus on something you said earlier that is the registrars have a problem, because they have a real problem understanding is this legitimate or not? If I come in and say, I just got married, I have a new family name. How are they going to question that? If I'm accessing the account and seemingly have access to all the information, how do they know I'm not me? And that of course is a real problem.

And that comes back down to the, a core problem that the Registrant has to be satisfied that I'm their customer in terms of I'm going to pay my bills and things like that. But there's no real certification of identity in any of this process, nor has there ever been. And it is a real problem, but I don't see how the increased registration process, the increased Registrar transfer process or the changed Registrar transfer process impacts this.

I see them as two completely orthogonal things. And if we remove the lock altogether, which by the way is effectively there, if the Registrar does implement the opt out, then I as the new Registrant -- sorry, if I'm changing the registration name, I can say, I want to opt out of the transfer and have a smooth path to change registrar.

So the opt out is already there, which I don't agree with. But to remove it all together, I think is removing a level of security that we have right



---

now. Now, whether it should be 30 days or 45 days instead of 60 it's a different question, but I don't see that the change in the Registrar transfer has really fixing the need for this particular walk. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you, Alan. I may respond totally to you before I go to Jonathan, is that -- I think I agree with you. One of the critical elements here is how the end user access the registrar control panel or similar service, that's a kind of a very, very tricky. That that's a critical thing. If that's security is good, then I will say that any updates done by those who have access to the Registrant data should be considered as legitimate where if I have a domain name that I have sold to another party, I think one of the processes I have to do is to make sure that the Registrant data is reflecting the new owner.

If I have noticed that the WHOIS audit data is inaccurate, I need to access the Registrant portal and update this. And thereby, there's a lot of the new security mechanism, that's also totally depending on emails, but it is two sets of email. It is what is being considered in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy proposal is the losing Registrars data regarding the Registrant email and is the gaining Registrar data for the email that they have received when the Registrant initiated a transfer.

But one other question is also is the transfer lock preventing anything. In my view, it doesn't really prevent a system being hijacked. It just makes a hassle when you are doing something that suddenly what you intended to do has to be postponed, or maybe in one year because of the expiration date in when you wanted to transfer. But is another, not

---

a black and white stuff. That's why we had to make some sort of a choice. That's my first input. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Steinar. I might be a little bit lost because we had quite a bit of discussion about this lock and ended up supporting a 30 day lock. And so this is now just because of a change of registrar. Or change of Registrant to -- we're still within a change of Registrant of a specific registrar, is that right?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No. In the Inter-Registrar discussion. The process of moving a domain from one Registrant to another.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So this is if both things are happening, a change of Registrant and registrar at the same time?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No, it's not. This is purely the fact that there is a change of the Registrant data at the present registrar today. And what we proposed in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy is an alternative like 30 days. But here we have a mismatch saying that if we keep on the present change of Registrant policy and the registrar hasn't has not adopted the opt out feature, their domain name will be prevented for a transfer to another Registrant for 60 days, even though if you didn't change anything, it was 30 days after initial creation or 30 days after a successful transfer.

---

So we have to do something about the 60 days whatsoever. If the 30 days in the Inter-Registrar proposals are being the final policy. Is that what you --

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess so, yes. I apologize if I'm missing the point here. So, we just have a disconnect because it's 30 days in when it's a change of registrar, but 60 days, if it's a change of Registrant data in the same registrar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. The present policy says it's a 60-day Inter-Registrar transfer log when there is a material change of registrant data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Why don't we just normalize that to the 30 days that we recommended before?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Well, why don't we just move out and remove the change of Registrant section of the policy?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will that lead to the other policy staying in place then? Because the other policy was just specific to a change of registrar, right?

---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Change of registrar. Yes. If we leave out the change of Registrant policy in the Inter-Registrar policy, this will not affect whatever we agree upon in the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But is what you're proposing. And maybe this is what Alan is getting at, is what you're proposing is if I just changed my name because I get married that there will be no lock, no inter-registrar lock, I could immediately, if I can change Registrant data and then immediately transfer registrars. Is that what you're proposing?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. If it is within, let's say that the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy ends up with 30 days and then if it is after the 30 days of the initial registration, or after 30 days after a successful registration, you can change your email, address, your phone number, your post address, whatever you change. And it will not reflect on a new transfer lock.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. Okay. I'll reserve the right to revisit this, but I'll let Alan back into the conversation. Thanks.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, Alan, welcome back.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. If you, the Registrant, are changing your contact information, you have a new email address, you have a new name, you've moved physically and want a new street address; all of that's innocent and fine and there's absolutely no reason to say you can't transfer registrars afterwards. So if the change of contact information is innocent and reasonable and either does not imply a real change of Registrant, or it is a change of registrant with the consent and knowledge of the original Registrant, then everything is fine and there's absolutely no reason to stop a registrar transfer.

If I am selling my domain to you, then we have to change the fact that you now own it, but you should be able to own it on the long term with your registrar of choice, not my registrar of choice. So all of that's quite reasonable. Or the issue comes up where it is a change of Registrant that is not legitimate, a hijacking, so to speak. At that point, hijackings are hard to fix. They are difficult because they end up essentially saying, whose story do you believe?

The person, the entity that initiated the change and approved it, or this person who now says, hey, it needs to be mine. And now it isn't anymore. And it was hijacked. And some of those today get fixed. And some of them, unfortunately don't get fixed, but in both cases, you're dealing with the registrar that the original registrant worked with. So there is some level of credibility of that original Registrant with the registrar. They probably still have an account. They probably still have a credit card number. They may end up winning or losing, but there is a relationship between the original Registrant and the registrar.

---

If we facilitate changing registrar immediately after the change of Registrant, that connection is now gone. And the original Registrant for who had a domain hijacked has virtually no leverage at all to fix the problem, because they're now have to deal with a registrar who they have no contact with, perhaps don't speak the same language with, and it makes that recovery of a hijacking that much more difficult. That's why I have some problem with this.

And of course, I similarly have a problem with the opt out of the 60 day because if it's a hijacking and the registrar implements this option, then as the hijacker, I can opt out and then I can transfer the domain. So that's why I have a problem with that part. But since you say, not all registrars have to implemented this, then at least it gives that level of security. It gives the registrar the ability of giving their customers that extra level of security, which is gone if we take this lock off completely. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Well, thank you, Alan. In many ways, I would agree with you more. If we have some sort of an indication that hijacking domain names is a high volume, I don't have that information. And none of the registrars in the working group kind of signaled that there is a volume in this. So we have the present policy is kind of indicating that there's a significant problem. That's why it's been set to as it is with the ALAC.

But if the experience from the registrars doesn't indicate it is a big problem, why should we have regulations that kind of are tailored

---

towards something that is not the real life scenario. That's my personal opinion.

If a registrar is being hacked and there is a legal entrance to their system, I don't think we can create policies that could solve this in a smooth and decent way, whether for the end users for the registrars or whatever. But in short, I think in the simple thing, maybe you have to trust the registrars or not. That's my opinion, but please signal your views in the poll that we will have later on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I may, one more comment. You say there's no indication that this is a high-volume problem, but we are talking about an environment with 200 million registrations, if 100th of 1%, which is a tiny number happened in a year, that would be 20,000 hijackers. So correlating the absolute number and the percentage which clearly implies it is a low volume thing is not the relevant issue. It's to what extent our Registrants potentially affected by this not, is it a high volume, is it happening one at 10, 10 registrations? Of course, it isn't. It's happening with a tiny, tiny fraction, but the question is how many people or Registrants are impacted potentially by that. So, thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I see your point. Although I want to add some comments into this discussion; should we go to the polls, if not more to, I want to add some comments. As I said, I have distributed the poll questions and we have four questions. And my intention is that I would summarize what this discussion is and the result of this informal poll in a way and update the

---

PDP working group with the outcome of this discussion. I will distribute my proposed verdict shortly after this meeting hopefully by tomorrow. And then you can take a look at it and comment whatever I'm proposing. Greg, come on.

GREG SHATAN:

Hi, it's Greg Shatan for the record. Thank you, Steinar, for all the work that you've done here. One additional issue that often comes up in these cases is that the registrar that has been -- that is the in essence, the gaining registrar in the hijack is a friendly registrar to the Hijacker or purported Hijacker, and may even be a registrar that essentially makes its business out of dealing with sketchy Registrants. And that is often the case, not all registrars are equally worthy and above-board businesses and that's another factor in why it's dangerous to let a registration go here.

And I think that from the end user perspective, at the very least, I think we would need to have positive data, that domain name hijacking or domain name theft, we might as well just call what it is, is such a minor problem that the severity of the problem doesn't dictate -- that even though it's a severe problem that we still are going to essentially get rid of historical protections for it. Maybe we don't have data either way.

So I don't think we can decide the domain name hijacking is no longer a problem. Especially after policy has been built around it being a problem, or I think we need, at the very least, we need to know more before we make drastic changes. And that is part of the question. So



---

anything I'm skeptical of any change that where there a recommendation for it is we need to trust the registrars. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yeah, I got your point. I disagree with you partly. And it is a challenge in general speaking for the Registrant for the domain name holder to select the best Registrar for their business or for their purpose. That's a challenge. And whether you kind of identify this small feature that the registrar you selected has this opt out possibility when you want to change your registrar data, preventing transfer lock. That's something that you may not investigate before you select your registrar, but I see your point. Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Steinar. Maybe it's outside of the point, but I just want to tell you that one of the problems also with the 60 day it's when the registrar, it's the end of your payment of your fees and the registrar, you want to leave, or you want to change something, ask you to pay before doing anything. And the second point it's that when it's not possible to join the registrar at all or when you send them a paper and they didn't answer. And at the end of the day, your domain name is taken by somebody else in Hong Kong. It's quite disappointing all that. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I do understand, Sebastien, that is a scenario that it's not something that anyone should experience. Unfortunately, these things happen;

---

whether it is how to prevent it, that's a different scope here. I don't know. I honestly don't know, but my point is that I personally, I feel that this is something that is out of date, the change of Registrant policy and we have to more or less somehow trust the Registrars in the same way that a lot of ccTLDs do. That's my point. Greg, is that an old hand?

GREG SHATAN: No, it's a new hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's going to have to be the last question because we do need move on. Sorry. So, yeah, Greg, you have the last question. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: My question is just whether the group has in fact discussed the prevalence of domain name hijacking and done any work in trying to determine what it is and to talk about any notable domain name, hijacking issues. For instance, I'm reading now about a group called sea turtle that has had a years long DNS hijacking campaign. So if the word sea turtle never came up in the discussion it seems that it benefits the registrars to not identify the issues here. So sea turtle, for instance, hijacked the Lenovo domain for a period of time. So there's stuff going on out there.

And I think that if there isn't any action in the group to actually face the issue of domain name hijacking, but rather just to try to pretend that it doesn't happen very often and therefore it's not a big problem. Then I

---

really can't credit the idea that this is an out of date or inconsequential issue. Thanks.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you, Greg. If you could put into the chat link to that article or that registrar, I will use as an example and asking for more statistics, et cetera, we are running out of time. And I hope that we could have the polls in a quick manner. So if we could take the first question to the poll.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks, Steinar, this is Yeşim. Sure, let me launch the first poll question. Would you like to read that?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, come on, please read it.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. Sure, with pleasure. So the first question is from an end user perspective: do you believe the present change of Registrant policy work works as intended. Yes, no, or not sure. Please do cast your votes, and just to update, I see that 40% have already participated, just waiting a bit more, so maybe we can have over 50%.

Okay 5%. I think we need just maybe a couple of people participating as well, not seeing anymore progress. Oh, okay. So currently we have 51% participated which is equal to 18 people. So please let me know,

---

Steinar, when you would like me to end the poll and share the results, if you would like.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I think we could end the poll now and share the results immediately.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sure. I've just ended the poll and sharing the results right now. So I hope everyone is able to see the results.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That looks like a very balanced response, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, it does. There's the pros and cons. Thank you. Let's go into the next poll question.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sure. Let me stop sharing for this one. And I'm going to pull up the second question and launching it right now. So the second question is asking, are you in favor of keeping a transfer luck period after a change of Registrant data? Yes, no, or not sure, please cast your vote.

And once again, I'm watching the percentage of the participation. Currently we are 44% and I will again wait for at least to get over 50%, hopefully, very shortly.

---

We are at 47% at the moment. So if maybe a couple of more people cast their votes, I'm not seeing any progress.

Steinar, would you like me to end the poll? We are at 47%, but I see that the result is very clear for this question.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Please send the poll and show us the results, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. Let me show the results. So you let me know --

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That's a kind of a clear signal here. Yeah, thank you very much.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. Shall we move on to poll question three?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, do.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: So question three, I'm launching it right now. If the TPR-PDP working group proposals to alter the transfer lock period, after a change of registrant data, what is your recommendation to the working group, a transfer log period, more than 60 days, a transfer log period less than 60

---

days, no transfer log period. Not sure. Please cast your votes. So we have 38 people already participated, which is 14 people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clarification, please. A clarification Steinar, if you think 60 days is right. Which of those do you pick, because you don't give that option?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Good question. I didn't think of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just tell us which is equal to, or less than or equal to, or more than.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Alternative one. I would say alternative one is a...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: More or equal than 60 days. Yeah, sorry. Is there any progress in the casting of votes?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yes. So 55% people have participated. Would you like me to end the poll?

---

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Please do.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. Ending the poll right now, and I'm going to share the results. Please let me know when you would like me to move on to poll question four.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you very much. That's also quite a clear signal. Yes, take question number four. Is that possible to make several choices or do you have to speak only one?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: As far as I know the questions are set as single choice.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: So then I ask everybody that casts a votes to select what do you believe is most important to result in a transfer lock in the alternative that comes up? If you could show with the poll question.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sure. Let's move on to poll question four and let me launch the poll. So updates to Registrant data; which information if any, should result in a transfer lock: registrant email address, registrant's name, registrant organization, or others.

---

And again, just watching the poll. So currently 33% participated. Which is equal to 12 people.

GREG SHATAN: What if we want to choose all of the above? Should we answer 'other'?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No, I agree. This is a badly-phrased question. I think that you should prioritize what is most important for you to keep as a material change, whether it's the email address, registrant's organization.

GREG SHATAN: Too late. I already answered other, I think you should withdraw this question and reissue it as a multiple choice. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, I can withdraw all that. Maybe I just don't put any attention to that. Would I ever -- I propose as a feedback to the PDP working group. I agree. It was badly phrased, I'm sorry. Okay, but just for curiosity, can we have the result of this?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yes. Sure. Let me end the poll then and sharing the results right now.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay. Thank you very much. That was a fruitful discussion, I like that. Any last comment before we end this discussion? Is that an old hand, Greg?



---

GREG SHATAN: Yes. Sorry.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay. So what I will do, I will shortly after this meeting, hopefully by tomorrow my time, I will propose some wording that we could forward to the inter transfer PDP working group. I'll post that on the mailing list. Thank you very much. Over to you, Olivier or Jonathan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Steinar. It's Olivier speaking, let's jump quickly to Jonathan Zuck for the policy session agenda and the talking points of ICANN75, I think perhaps focusing on the talking points because we did focus on the agenda last week. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I don't think we need a lot of time. We've been getting feedback from the issue shepherds and Chantelle and I went through the schedule to try and get a sense of which we're going to be the hot topics of this particular ICANN meeting for the talking points. And so that continues the pace. It's all old material based on previous positions, etc. And so one exercise now is to try to get it 12 talking points down to three, that sort of thing. So we continue at pace on that, but we'll have something to share shortly. That's really it, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Jonathan. And that means we're just about on time then for the Any Other Business part of this call. And just before that, I know that Heidi last week did mention to me, we had forgotten one thing on this. So are we set, we're okay for ICANN75.

HEIDI ULRICH: Hi, Olivier, this is Heidi. I believe we are set now. So there were some, the board questions and those have been sent, they were discussed yesterday on the ALAC call, and there was also a discussion of the policy session, which I'm not sure if you would like to just take a minute to review that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that we did. Did we not touch on it last week? I thought we had.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so.

HEIDI ULRICH: That's fine. I think that we're set.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the one. Okay, fantastic. Thanks so much. And of course, would anyone be interested [CROSSTALK]. That's for the Any Other Business, I believe. So, Sebastian Bachollet.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier and Jonathan, we were supposed to go through the comment period and just to inform you, I know it's more in the OFB working group, but yesterday ICANN staff finally opened the comments on the Holistic Review Terms of Reference; therefore if you are interested, there is a small group working under the OFB on writing a comment. And it was just to let you know, and if you have any comments on that, please refer to OFB, either the chair or Cheryl or myself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sebastien, that's particularly important, the ALAC and the At-Large community have been a strong proponent of this ICANN holistic review, the last of which took place in another century. No, maybe in this century, but just about, so it would be great to have some strong supports from this community. I am looking at the queue at the moment and not seeing anybody in the queue at the moment. So that looks as though we've finished with any the business. And we can therefore look at when our next meeting will take place.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier, this is Yeşim speaking. So unfortunately there will be a clash next week if we use our regular time prep which is 1900 UTC. So there's a prep we call on Wednesday starting at 2000 UTC the holistic review pilots update. So I would suggest if you would like to hold a call next week, just keeping in mind that we will not have interpretation due to the prep week. What we can do is we can either maybe hold a call at 1800 UTC in order to avoid the clash with the prep

---

week call or if 1800 UTC doesn't work, then we can do 2100 UTC, right at the time when the prep call ends.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Yeşim. I have no outright preference, but some might have due to how late or early this makes it. Is there any thought I'm looking particularly at people at the [inaudible - 01:32:11] most of whom have signed off on today's call, actually come to think of it, Jonathan, any preference for you?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I'm plugged.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well let's do bearing in mind, we are always a little late on our call. Let's do it at 2100, do the latter time and 21, 22, 23, 24. Yeah, that makes it very late for Europe. I don't mind myself, but some people in Europe might be a bit annoyed. And before would just be one hour before, okay, let's do the 18:00 UTC slot. And people will be able to start with that with the dose of CPWG and then get the full taste of ICANN prep week after that. It will be the breakfast before they get the main course and with this, and by the way, I'm just doing this on the fly. So this might change in case anybody objects, even after the call.

But we've got either 18:00 or 21:00, then we'll work it out. But right now it's set for 18:00. So thank you very much to everyone who has participated and contributed to this call. Jonathan, is there anything

---

else that I've forgotten today apart from logging in on time to be able to start the call well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. You're only on time if you're early, I guess, is the adage that always applies, but no, I think we're good. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much then, and thanks to our interpreters and the real time text transcription service, that's been great again and very helpful for me as I didn't have high speed internet and just was able to read the transcript and to notice how fantastic Jonathan and how efficient Jonathan is. And for those of you who might not know, Jonathan is deemed to be our next ALAC chair. So get prepared for efficiency in this community. And with us have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you take care and goodbye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of your day. Bye bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**