The call for the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group will take place on Tuesday, 09 April 2024 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

For other places see: https://tinyurl.com/3k2nh6rp

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome and Chair Updates
2. Review WG inputs to CORD Requirements for Initial Report worksheet
3. Continue discussion of updated Group 1(a) Rec 17 (Established Relationships)
4. AOB

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

PARTICIPATION

Apologies: Osvaldo Novoa (GNSO Council Liaison), Eric Rokobauer (RrSG)
Alternates: Essie Musailov (RrSG)
Attendance

RECORDINGS

Audio Recording
Zoom Recording
GNSO transcripts are located on the GNSO Calendar

Notes/ Action Items

Main discussion and action items

1. Welcome and Chair Updates
2. Review WG inputs to CORD Requirements for Initial Report worksheet [docs.google.com]
   • BC raised some concerns regarding Rec 2.3 and 2.4. Could lead to confusion and misunderstanding.
   • Some comments include the lack of rationale.
   • Cannot Live with comments focus on Rec 2.3, 2.4, 3, 3.4 and 4.
   • How can WG explain that the aim is not to reduce security levels with some changes but to be adaptive for many business models?
   • Suggestion: Members could put questions to WG via webinar regarding Recs?
   • Group 1(a) organised a previous webinar focus on awareness raising rather than answering questions.
   • Rec 2.4: The working group recommends eliminating from the future Change of Registrant Data Policy the requirement that the Registrar impose a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock following a Change of Registrant.
   • WG suggested to remove 60 day lock for change of registrant, BC believes 30 day lock should be by default.
   • WG discussed the rationale of 30 days? Why that number why not other?
   • Some members suggested that current Rec 2.4 might cause compliance issues.
   • Others indicated that no amount of lock will provide more security.
   • BC doesn’t support opt-out of notification reg Rec. 3 due to security concerns.
   • BC suggests that for Rec 3.4 that notification should occur before change of registrant.
   • Can live with, but with changes focus on Rec: 3, 3.4, 4 and 17.
   • Members informed the WG that registrants have indicated to leave because they receive too many notification.
   • Members point out the importance of notifications due to security.
   • Initial comments results show the following input to the Recs:

CANNOT LIVE WITH

BC

• (2.3) Keep confirmation to prior/new before change
• (2.4) Reduce lock to 30 days, keep opt out
• (3, 3.4, 4) No opt out of notifications, notifications before not after
CAN LIVE WITH (with change)

At-Large

- (3, 4) No opt out of notifications
- (17) Established Relationship concern

RySG

- (17) require record-keeping for removing lock early

RrSG

- (17) torn - some satisfied with ER test, others would remove ER restrictions
- (4.4) Q - clarify record maintenance

BC

- (1.3) remove second part or require disclosure

GRAMMATICAL EDITS

RySG

- (3) add ref to Rec 2
- (4.6) update for consistency

RrSG

- (3, 3.4, 4.2, 17) clarity + grammar

SUPPORT REC AS IS

At-Large

- 1, 2, 3

RySG

- 1, 2, 3, 4

RrSG

- 1, 2

BC

- 1, 1.1, 1.2 (not 1.3)
- 2.1, 2.3 (not 2, 2.2, 2.4)
- 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 (not 3, 3.4)

3. Continue discussion of updated Group 1(a) Rec 17 (Established Relationships)

- At-Large and RySG have concerns reg Rec 17.
- At-Large considers the “Established Relationship” is confusing and difficult to understand. Reconsider wording?
- RySG would like to see changes regarding the record keeping.
- WG members suggested to discuss in more depth during the next call.

4. AOB

- Not discussed