2024-03-26 Transfer Policy Review PDP WG Call

The call for the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group will take place on Tuesday, 26 March 2024 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

For other places see: https://tinyurl.com/mpe37d4n

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome and Chair Updates
2. Overview of Group 1(b) Recommendations Review
   a. High-level overview of review document [docs.google.com] format and expectations
   b. Discussion of timeline for completing document (all participating groups are asked to provide input as a group)
   c. Updates made as a result of last week’s discussion
3. Overview of CORD Impact Analysis
4. AOB

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

PARTICIPATION

Apologies: Osvaldo Novoa (GNSO Council Liaison)

Attendance

RECORDINGS

Audio Recording
Zoom Recording

GNSO transcripts are located on the GNSO Calendar
Notes/ Action Items

Action items and main discussion points

1. Welcome and Chair Updates
2. Overview of Group 1(b) Recommendations Review

a. High-level overview of review document [docs.google.com] format and expectations
   - CORD Recommendations Worksheet: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_lZLOmNQJKqAsAqHVTv8WSTQeRlmS8YsS4vCPIwEdbE/edit?usp=sharing [docs.google.com]
   
AI: Members to complete the above document based on feedback from their constituency.
   
- Members to provide input for each recommendation based on the documents instructions.
- Feedback is needed and will be used for initial report.

b. Discussion of timeline for completing document (all participating groups are asked to provide input as a group)
   
AI: Deadline for completion of document: 2 weeks – 9th of April 2024 (possibility of extension should the need arise)

AI: Updates made as a result of last week's discussion
   
- Rec.3.4 has new text [docs.google.com]: "Unless the RNH previously opted out of receiving CORD notifications (...) “c. the Registry MAY additionally send the CORD notification to the RNH via SMS or other secure messaging system.
- Rec 3.4. and 3.3. [docs.google.com] seem to be contradictory in terms of methods of communication.

AI: Staff to look at wording.
   
- Rec.1.1 [docs.google.com] further clarity needed on definition of “Material Change”.
- Input from Staff: The current implementation notes of the policy provide: Material Change: Section II.A.1.3 defines Material Change to mean a change that is not a typographical correction. Registrars have some flexibility to determine what a typographical correction is. Examples of typographical corrections could include: Changing the Registrant Name field from oJhn Smith to John Smith. Changing the Registrant Name field from Jane Kgan to Jane Kang. Changing the Registrant Organization from Example, Icn. to Example, Inc. For more clarity members suggested to change wording for Rec3.4. as Rec 4 will have impact on it.

AI: Members will provide input on the document and staff will implement based on feedback.
   
- Rec 4. [docs.google.com] Text change from MUST to MAY for opt out option.
- Rec also includes a note, that explains that opt out might be added at the data field level. Members asked why is this a note and not a recommendation?

AI: Staff to consider changing it into a recommendation?

- Rec. 4.1 and 4.2. were split.
- Rec. 4.4. [docs.google.com] additionally added explaining that Registrar MUST maintain a record of who has requested an opt out.
- Members raised complexity of Opt Out model that might only suit some business models and not for all.
- Members pointed out Opt Out options and lack of notifications might open up security holes. Notification represent a key part of the security principle of transfers.
- Members suggested that opting out from notifications might create unexpected security risks.
- Members added that in some circumstances certain business models might need opt out options from notifications.
- Group 1a) Rec.17: [docs.google.com] Members pointed out that 30 day log is critical for the security profile. Exceptions should only be made in anomalous cases.
- Members added that next to security concerns Rec17 gives flexibility for business models.
- Members suggested that recommendations are tailored for smaller markets but might but others at risk.

AI: Staff calls for the WG to consider substance or a definition of “case by case basis” and more rationale or substance on the meaning of Established Relationship

3. Overview of CORD Impact Analysis
   - Not discussed

4. AOB
   - Not discussed