

EPDP Team – Temporary Specification Discussion Summary Index Template

Temp Spec Section	Appendix G-P2	Date (last update)	22 August 2018	Category	3
Current text	<p>2. As used in the Transfer Policy:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.1. The term "Whois data" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.2. The term "Whois details" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.3. The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.4. The term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> <p>3. Registrar and Registry Operator SHALL follow best practices in generating and updating the "AuthInfo" code to facilitate a secure transfer process.</p> <p>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.</p>				
	Support as is	No strong Opinion	Does not support as is		
	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%		
Dependency on other sections of the Temp Spec	7.4				
Related Charter Questions	<p>Transfer Policy</p> <p>p1) Should Temporary Specification language be confirmed or modified until a dedicated PDP can revisit the current transfer policy?</p> <p>p2) If so, which language should be confirmed, the one based on RDAP or the one based in current WHOIS?</p>				
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 be 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