EPDP Team – Temporary Specification Scorecard Template

Temp Spec Section	Appendix G-P2	Date (last update)	22 August 2018	Category	3

Current text		2. As used in the Transfer Policy:
		    2.1. The term "Whois data" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".
		    2.2. The term "Whois details" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".
		    2.3. The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".
		    2.4. The term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".
		3. Registrar and Registry Operator SHALL follow best practices in generating and updating the "AuthInfo" code to facilitate a secure transfer process.
		4. Registry Operator MUST verify that the "AuthInfo" code provided by the Gaining Registrar is valid in order to accept an inter-registrar transfer request.			

		Support as is	**No strong Opinion**	**Does not support as is**	
		IPC, GAC, ISPCP, BC, ALAC, SSAC	NCSG, RrSG	RySG	
Dependency on other sections of the Temp Spec		7.4			
Related Charter Questions		Transfer Policy p1) Should Temporary Specification language be confirmed or modified until a dedicated PDP can revisit the current transfer policy? p2) If so, which language should be confirmed, the one based on RDAP or the one based in current WHOIS?			
Proposed Response to Charter Question(s)					
DPA / EDPB Guidance		None			
Proposed Changes / Rationale for Change					
RySG		As with Sections 1.1 – 1.2, Sections 2-4 are intended as temporary, stop–gap measures. In addition, as previously noted the community is already engaged in efforts to replace/modify the transfer policy and therefore these sections would not be considered an appropriate inclusion for the Consensus Policy			
RrSG		Registry operators need to make sure their limits are able to process authcode changes in bulk			
IPC		The IPC is supportive of this section, subject to further clarification on "best practices". Will there by agreed-upon mandatory practices?			

BC	No comment
ISPCP	No comment
NCSG	NCSG might have comments on this section in the future which might lead to changing its answer.
ALAC	No comment
GAC	No comment
SSAC	Agree in general, with some caution on 2.3: 'The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".' These two terms are not equivalent, because access to RDDS is envisaged as being context dependent. As a result, the availability of a particular dataset (like the contact data referenced in the Transfer Policy) can no longer be taken for granted in a given context.
High level summary of the deliberations and/or recommendation(s)	
Proposed modification of text (if appropriate)	
Level of Support	