

Initial Report on the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process - Phase 1(a)

Status of This Document

This is the Phase 1(a) Initial Report of the GNSO Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process Working Group that has been posted for public comment.

Preamble

The objective of this Initial Report is to document the working group's (i) deliberations on charter questions, (ii) preliminary recommendations, and (iii) additional identified issues to consider before the working group issues its Final Report. After the working group reviews public comments received in response to this report and completes Phase 1(b) of the PDP, the working group will submit its combined Phase 1 Final Report to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Table of Contents | |
| 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 3 |
| 2 WORKING GROUP APPROACH | 7 |
| 3 WORKING GROUP RESPONSES TO CHARTER QUESTIONS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS | 11 |
| 4 NEXT STEPS | 50 |
| ANNEX A - BACKGROUND | 51 |
| ANNEX B - WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE | 53 |
| ANNEX C - COMMUNITY INPUT | 57 |
| ANNEX D - EPDP PHASE 1, RECOMMENDATION 27, WAVE 1 ANALYSIS | 58 |
| ANNEX E - PROPOSED TRANSFER POLICY SWIM LANE DIAGRAM | 64 |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1 Executive Summary

37

1.1 Introduction

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

The Transfer Policy, formerly referred to as the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP), is an ICANN consensus policy that went into effect on 12 November 2004. The policy governs the procedure and requirements for registrants to transfer their domain names from one Registrar to another, also referred to as an inter-Registrar transfer. The goal of the Transfer Policy was to provide for enhanced domain name portability, resulting in greater consumer and business choice and enabling registrants to select the Registrar that offers the best services and price for their needs.

The Transfer Policy has been the subject of previous policy development work, and the most recent working group that reviewed the Transfer Policy recommended a comprehensive review of the policy-based changes to assess their efficacy and impact.¹ In addition to the policy recommendation directing a review of the policy-based changes, sweeping and significant changes to various data privacy laws affected the then current requirements related to gTLD registration data, including portions of the Transfer Policy. Accordingly, the ICANN Board adopted the [Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data](#), which established temporary requirements that allowed Contracted Parties to comply with ICANN contracts and consensus policies.

In light of the policy recommendation to review the Transfer Policy and the changes to the Policy from the Temporary Specification, on 18 February 2021, the GNSO Council [initiated](#) a two-phased policy development process (PDP) to review the Transfer Policy. The PDP is tasked with addressing the following topics:

- Phase 1(a): Form of Authorization (FOA) (including EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 FOA issues²) and AuthInfo Codes
- Phase 1(b): Change of Registrant (including EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Change of Registrant issues)
- Phase 2: Transfer Emergency Action Contact and reversing inter-Registrar transfers, Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (including EPDP Phase 1,

¹ See [Final Report on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - Part D Policy Development Process](#), Recommendation 17, pp. 6-7. For more information on the policy development history, please refer to Annex A of this report.

² For additional information about the EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Report, please see pages 52-56 of the [Final Issue Report](#).

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

69 Recommendation 27, Wave 1 TDRP issues), Denying (NACKing) transfers³,
70 ICANN-approved transfers

71
72 The working group charter was [approved](#) by the GNSO Council on 24 March 2021. The
73 Phase 1(a) working group held its first meeting on 14 May 2021.

74
75 For additional background on this PDP, please refer to Annex A of this report.
76

77 1.2 Preliminary Recommendations

78
79 In Phase 1(a) of the PDP, the working group was tasked to provide the GNSO Council
80 with recommendations on the following topics:

- 81
- 82 • Losing and Gaining FOAs
- 83 • AuthInfo Codes
- 84 • Denying (NACKing) transfers
- 85 • EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 as they relate to FOA
- 86

87 Following its analysis of each of the questions outlined in its charter related to this task,
88 the working group has arrived at a set of preliminary recommendations and conclusions.
89

90 The working group will not finalize its responses to the charter questions and
91 recommendations to the GNSO Council until it has conducted a thorough review of the
92 comments received during the public comment period on this Initial Report and
93 completed Phase 1(b) of its work. At this time, no formal consensus call has been taken
94 on these responses and preliminary recommendations, but this Initial Report did receive
95 the support of the working group for publication for public comment.
96

97 Notwithstanding the above, the working group is putting forward preliminary
98 recommendations on the following topics for community consideration:
99

100 **Preliminary Recommendation 1:** [Gaining FOA](#)

101
102 **Preliminary Recommendation 2:** [Losing FOA](#)

103
104 **Preliminary Recommendation 3:** [Notification of TAC Provision](#)
105

³ The topic of denying (NACKing) transfers was later moved to Phase 1(a) by a [Project Change Request](#) to ensure that the working group could examine all elements of the security model for domain name transfers in a holistic manner as part of its Phase 1 deliberations.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

- 106 **Preliminary Recommendation 4:** [Notification of Transfer Completion](#)
- 107
- 108 **Preliminary Recommendation 5:** [Update Term “AuthInfo Code” to “Transfer](#)
- 109 [Authorization Code \(TAC\)”](#)
- 110
- 111 **Preliminary Recommendation 6:** [TAC Definition](#)
- 112
- 113 **Preliminary Recommendation 7:** [TAC Composition](#)
- 114
- 115 **Preliminary Recommendation 8:** [Verification of TAC Composition](#)
- 116
- 117 **Preliminary Recommendation 9:** [TAC Generation, Storage, and Provision](#)
- 118
- 119 **Preliminary Recommendation 10:** [Verification of TAC Validity](#)
- 120
- 121 **Preliminary Recommendation 11:** [TAC is One-Time Use](#)
- 122
- 123 **Preliminary Recommendation 12:** [Service Level Agreement \(SLA\) for TAC Provision](#)
- 124
- 125 **Preliminary Recommendation 13:** [TAC Time to Live \(TTL\)](#)
- 126
- 127 **Preliminary Recommendation 14:** [Terminology Updates: Whois](#)
- 128
- 129 **Preliminary Recommendation 15:** [Terminology Updates: Administrative Contact and](#)
- 130 [Transfer Contact](#)
- 131
- 132 **Preliminary Recommendation 16:** [Transfer Restriction After Initial Registration](#)
- 133
- 134 **Preliminary Recommendation 17:** [Transfer Restriction After Inter-Registrar Transfer](#)
- 135
- 136 **Preliminary Recommendation 18:** [Format of Transfer Policy Section I.A.3.7](#)
- 137
- 138 **Preliminary Recommendation 19:** [Revised Reasons that a Registrar of Record MAY](#)
- 139 [Deny a Transfer](#)
- 140
- 141 **Preliminary Recommendation 20:** [New Reasons that a Registrar of Record MUST](#)
- 142 [Deny a Transfer](#)
- 143
- 144 **Preliminary Recommendation 21:** [Revised Reasons that a Registrar of Record MUST](#)
- 145 [Deny a Transfer](#)
- 146
- 147 **Preliminary Recommendation 22:** [Revised Reasons that a Registrar of Record MUST](#)
- 148 [NOT Deny a Transfer](#)
- 149

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

150 1.3 Conclusions and Next Steps

151
152 This Initial Report will be posted for public comment for 42 days. The working group will
153 review the public comments received on this Initial Report and consider whether any
154 changes need to be made to its Phase 1(a) recommendations. The working group will
155 complete Phase 1(b) of its work, including a Phase 1(b) Initial Report followed by a
156 public comment period on the Phase 1(b) Initial Report. The working group will finalize
157 all Phase 1 recommendations in a single Phase 1 Final Report to be sent to the GNSO
158 Council.
159

160 1.4 Other Relevant Sections of this Report

161
162 The following sections are included within this report:

- 163 ■ Explanation of the working group’s methods and process
164 for reaching preliminary recommendations;
- 165 ■ Responses to the charter questions, preliminary
166 recommendations, and questions for community input;
- 167 ■ Background on the PDP and issues under consideration;
- 168 ■ Documentation of who participated in the working
169 group’s deliberations, including attendance records, and
170 links to Statements of Interest as applicable;
- 171 ■ Documentation on the solicitation of community input
172 through formal Supporting Organization/Advisory
173 Committee and Stakeholder Group/Constituency
174 channels and responses.
- 175 ■ A swim lane diagram documenting the possible future-
176 state process flow for inter-Registrar transfers as it will
177 exist if all recommendations are approved and
178 implemented. Note that this diagram is a working
179 product of the deliberations process to support
180 understanding of the recommendations’ impact. It is not
181 intended to be authoritative.

182

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

183 2 Working Group Approach

184
185 This section provides an overview of the working methodology and approach of the
186 working group. The points outlined below are meant to provide the reader with relevant
187 background information on the working group’s deliberations and processes and should
188 not be read as representing the entirety of the efforts and deliberations of the working
189 group.
190

191 2.1 Project Plan

192
193 The working group’s first deliverable was to provide the GNSO Council with a Phase 1(a)
194 project plan. To develop the project plan, the leadership team sought input from
195 members about the sequence in which to address topics and the amount of time each
196 topic would take to discuss. This input was used to develop the [project plan](#), which was
197 delivered to the GNSO Council for its consideration during the [22 July 2021](#) Council
198 meeting.
199

200 As deliberations progressed, the working group agreed that it was important to examine
201 all elements of the security model for domain name transfers in a holistic manner as
202 part of its Phase 1 deliberations. The working group determined that the topic denying
203 (NACKing) transfers should be addressed in Phase 1(a) rather than Phase 2 as originally
204 included in the charter. As a result, the working group leadership team submitted a
205 Project Change Request to the GNSO Council, which Council [adopted](#) on 16 December
206 2021. The expanded scope did not impact its target delivery dates to which the working
207 group committed.
208

209 2.2 Early Community Input

210
211 In accordance with GNSO policy development process requirements, the working group
212 [sought written input](#) on the charter topics from each Supporting Organization, Advisory
213 Committee and GNSO Stakeholder Group / Constituency. The input received was
214 incorporated into the working group’s deliberations as each topic was discussed. Since
215 all groups that provided written input also had representative members or appointed
216 subject matter experts in the working group, those members were well positioned to
217 respond to clarifying questions from other members about the written input as it was
218 considered.
219

220 2.3 Methodology for Deliberations

221

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Formatted: No underline, Font colour: Text 1

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font: Times New Roman

222 The working group began its deliberations for Phase 1(a) on 14 May 2021. The working
223 group agreed to continue its work primarily through conference calls scheduled weekly,
224 in addition to email exchanges on its mailing list. The working group held sessions during
225 [ICANN71](#), [ICANN72](#), [ICANN73](#), [ICANN74](#), and [ICANN75](#). These sessions provided an
226 opportunity for the broader community to contribute to the working group’s
227 deliberations and provide input on the charter topics being discussed.

228
229 All of the working group’s work is documented on its [wiki workspace](#), including its
230 meetings, mailing list, meeting notes, deliberation summaries, draft documents,
231 background materials, [early input](#) received from ICANN org, and input received from
232 ICANN’s Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, including the GNSO’s
233 Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

234
235 To develop the content included in the Initial Report, the working group progressed
236 through the charter questions by topic, following the sequence established in the
237 project plan. Because the Phase 1(a) topics are closely interrelated, the working group
238 took an iterative approach to producing and reviewing draft responses to charter
239 questions and draft preliminary recommendations to ensure that the full package of
240 outputs was coherent and comprehensive.

241
242 To ensure that all groups represented in the working group had ample opportunity to
243 provide input to the deliberations, the leadership team opened each working group
244 meeting with an invitation for members to step forward and provide any updates about
245 discussions happening within their Supporting Organization/Advisory
246 Committee/Stakeholder Group/Constituency regarding the charter topics, as well as any
247 positions or interests members wanted to share on behalf of their groups. To further
248 support fulsome discussion, the leadership team regularly deployed informal polls in the
249 meeting Zoom room to get a better sense of the “temperature of the room” and to
250 prompt the sharing of perspectives and viewpoints that may not otherwise be voiced
251 through less structured interaction.

252
253 For those working group members who were less comfortable speaking on calls, the
254 leadership team encouraged additional feedback on the mailing list and through written
255 contributions to working group documents.

256

257 2.4 Use of Working Documents

258

259 The working group used a series of working documents, organized per charter topic, to
260 support its deliberations. Archives of the working documents are maintained on the
261 working group [wiki](#). When a new charter topic was introduced, the leadership team
262 provided a working document for the topic, including (i) charter questions related to
263 that topic and for each charter question, (ii) context from the Transfer Policy Status

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

264 Report, and (iii) relevant inputs received from community groups through early
265 outreach. As the working group progressed through discussions, staff captured a
266 summary of deliberations on the charter question and eventually populated the
267 document with draft charter question responses and draft preliminary
268 recommendations to support further discussion and refinement of the text.

269 Working documents were updated on an ongoing basis and working group members
270 were encouraged to provide comments and input in the working documents between
271 calls.
272
273

274 2.5 Swim Lane Diagram

275
276 To further support deliberations and document the expected impact of proposed
277 recommendations, the working group developed a swim lane diagram to visually
278 represent the possible future-state process flow for inter-Registrar transfers as it will
279 exist if all recommendations are approved and implemented. This diagram serves as a
280 working document to support the deliberations process and is not intended to be
281 authoritative, but it is included in this Initial Report to demonstrate the working group's
282 understanding of the recommendations' impact on the inter-Registrar transfer process.
283 The swim lane diagram is included in Annex E of this report.
284

285 2.6 Data and Metrics

286
287 The [Transfer Policy Status Report](#) produced by ICANN org in 2019 served as the working
288 group's primary resource for data and metrics related to inter-Registrar transfers. In the
289 course of its deliberations, the working group identified additional data that would be
290 valuable to support its work. The additional data provided by ICANN org's Contractual
291 Compliance Department in response to these requests is available on the working
292 group's [wiki](#).
293

294 2.7 ICANN Org Interaction

295
296 To help support a smooth transition from policy development to eventual
297 implementation of GNSO Council adopted and ICANN Board approved
298 recommendations, the working group has been supported by early and ongoing
299 engagement with ICANN org subject matter experts. Liaisons from ICANN org's Global
300 Domains and Strategy (GDS) and Contractual Compliance departments regularly
301 attended working group calls, providing input and responding to questions where it was
302 possible to do so in real time. The liaisons acted as a conduit for working group
303 questions to ICANN org that required additional research or input. The liaisons also

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

304 facilitated early review of working group draft outputs by ICANN org subject matter
305 experts.
306

307 2.8 Accountability to the GNSO Council

308
309 As is now the case with all GNSO working groups, the working group delivered monthly
310 “project packages” to the GNSO Council to update the Council on the status of its work.
311 An archive of these packages is available on the [wiki](#). The GNSO Council Liaisons, Greg
312 DiBiase [and Osvaldo Novoa](#),⁴ served as [additional points](#) of connection between Council
313 and the working group.

Deleted: an

314

⁴ On 19 January 2023, the GNSO Council voted to approve Osvaldo Novoa as the new GNSO Council Liaison to the TPR Working Group. Osvaldo Novoa took over for Greg DiBiase who served as the Liaison beginning in April 2021.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

3 Working Group Responses to Charter Questions and Preliminary Recommendations

The WG was chartered to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations regarding the issues identified in the [Final Issue Report on a Policy Development Process to Review the Transfer Policy](#).

Following its analysis of each of the questions outlined in its Charter related to this task, the working group has arrived at a set of preliminary recommendations and conclusions.

Within the text of this document, the key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 148 \[RFC2119\]](#) [[RFC8174](#)].

The working group will not finalize its responses to the charter questions and recommendations to the GNSO Council until it has conducted a thorough review of the comments received during the public comment period on this Initial Report and completed Phase 1(b) of its work. At this time, no formal consensus call has been taken on these responses and preliminary recommendations, but this Initial Report did receive the support of the working group for publication for public comment.

The working group believes that when it formulates its final recommendations, if approved by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board, there will be substantial improvement to the current environment. The following sub-sections of this report are organized by topic. Within each topic, the working group provides responses to the relevant charter questions and corresponding preliminary recommendations:

- Section 3.1: Gaining and Losing Forms of Authorization (FOA)
- Section 3.2: Transfer Authorization Code/AuthInfo Code Management
- Section 3.3: EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Report
- Section 3.4: Denying (NACKing) Transfers

3.1 Gaining and Losing Forms of Authorization (FOA)

For context on this topic and the associated charter questions, please see pages 7-14 of the [Final Issue Report](#).

Deleted: 15 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 26 January 2023 25 January 2023 19 January 2023 19 January 2023 18 January 2023 17 January 2023 16 January 2023 5 January 2023 21 December 2022

353

354 3.1.1 Charter Question a1

355

356 *Is the requirement of the Gaining FOA still needed? What evidence did the working*
357 *group rely upon in making the determination that the Gaining FOA is or is not necessary*
358 *to protect registrants?*

359

360 **Working Group Response:**

361

362 The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - Part D Policy Development Process Working Group
363 (IRTP WG D), previously examined the question of “Whether the universal adoption and
364 implementation of Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) AuthInfo codes has eliminated
365 the need of FOAs.” The IRTP WG D ultimately determined to retain the FOA until more
366 evidence was gathered. The Transfer Policy Review Working Group was asked to revisit
367 the same question and has determined there is now strong evidence that the Gaining
368 FOA can be eliminated from the Transfer Policy without negatively affecting the security
369 of inter-Registrar transfers. The working group further believes that requirements for a
370 Gaining FOA or a similar replacement are unjustified under data protection law and no
371 longer necessary from a practical perspective to facilitate the transfer. The working
372 group recognizes that this is a significant departure from existing policy and has
373 therefore provided a detailed rationale for its conclusion.

374

375 Prior to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) coming into force, the Gaining
376 Registrar was required to confirm the Registered Name Holder’s (RNH) intent to transfer
377 by sending an email to the RNH asking for confirmation to proceed. In order for the
378 Gaining Registrar to be able to send the Gaining FOA, it needed to obtain the RNH’s
379 contact information from the publicly available Registration Data Directory Services
380 (RDDS). With the introduction of the GDPR, Gaining Registrars were no longer able to
381 obtain this information via RDDS, as personally identifiable information was largely
382 redacted within RDDS. In recognition of this new obstacle, ICANN org deferred
383 Contractual Compliance enforcement on Gaining FOA requirements. While still a
384 requirement on paper, in practice the Gaining FOA does not currently exist and cannot
385 exist.

386

387 The working group considered that it could recommend some form of replacement for
388 the Gaining FOA to be included in future policy requirements. If it did so, there would
389 need to be a method and a justification for the Registrar of Record to transfer the RNH’s
390 contact information to the Gaining Registrar.

391

392 The working group considered that it is likely possible from a technical perspective to
393 facilitate the transfer of the RNH’s contact information from the Registrar of Record to
394 the Gaining Registrar for the purposes of confirming the RNH’s intent to transfer.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

395 However, the working group did not pursue specific methods for doing so because it did
396 not believe this transfer is feasible from a legal perspective.

397
398 In its deliberations on applicable law, the working group considered the principles of
399 data minimization and privacy by design. Under these principles, in order to justify the
400 transfer of personally identifiable information (PII) from the Registrar of Record to the
401 Gaining Registrar and the subsequent processing of this data (in order to send the
402 Gaining FOA) by the Gaining Registrar, one would have to demonstrate that this transfer
403 and processing of PII is necessary to facilitate the transfer. The working group noted
404 that the transfer process has functioned without the Gaining FOA since the GDPR went
405 into force, and the working group has not encountered any evidence that there has
406 been an increase in unauthorized transfers since the Gaining FOA was functionally
407 eliminated. It has not found any other indications that the transfer process is
408 malfunctioning without the Gaining FOA requirement. Therefore, the working group
409 sees no evidence that the Gaining FOA is needed for the purpose of facilitating the
410 transfer or protecting the RNH from unauthorized transfers.

411
412 The working group notes that the recommendations in this report should be viewed as a
413 package. The recommendations include adjustments and enhancements that seek to
414 provide an appropriate level of security for the inter-Registrar transfer process while
415 also taking into account the customer experience, applicable law, and operational
416 considerations for Registries and Registrars.

417
418 The working group looked at the value that the Gaining FOA provided to ensure that
419 equivalent value is covered by newly-added elements of the process going forward, as
420 appropriate.

421
422 The working group noted that when the Gaining FOA requirements were in place, the
423 transfer could only proceed once the RNH had responded to the Gaining FOA. This
424 meant that the RNH always actively confirmed the intent to transfer before the transfer
425 took place. The Gaining FOA therefore served a notification function and also a
426 confirmation function. To the extent that the party obtaining the Transfer Authorization
427 Code (TAC) and requesting the transfer was an individual other than the RNH, the RNH
428 had the opportunity to confirm that they were aware of the request and wanted it to
429 proceed.

430 The working group notes that in the current transfer process, the Losing Registrar must
431 send the Registered Name Holder a notice of the pending transfer to confirm the
432 Registered Name Holder's intent to transfer the domain name. This notice is also
433 referred to as the Losing Registrar FOA or Losing FOA. If after five calendar days, the
434 Registry Operator has not received any objection to the inter-Registrar transfer, it will
435 process the transfer request. As detailed in Recommendation 2, the working group
436 anticipates that this element of the transfer process will remain in place, although the
437 working group recommends using the term "Transfer Confirmation" in place of Losing

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

438 FOA. While the Transfer Confirmation does not require affirmative consent, the working
439 group believes that it does provide an important notification function and also gives the
440 RNH an opportunity to take action prior to completion of the transfer if the transfer is
441 unwanted.

442 In addition, the working group believes that the new notifications detailed in
443 Preliminary Recommendations 3-4 ensure that the RNH receives the necessary
444 information with respect to an inter-Registrar transfer. These notifications provide
445 instructions on what to do if the RNH wants to either stop or reverse the process
446 because the action on the account is unauthorized or unintended.

447
448 The working group noted that while it was in use, the Gaining FOA provided a record to
449 assist ICANN's Contractual Compliance department in investigating complaints,
450 especially those related to unauthorized transfers. It also supported the resolution of
451 disputes. The working group noted that records associated with provision of the TAC,
452 the Transfer Confirmation, and new notifications detailed in Preliminary
453 Recommendations 3-4, will provide the necessary paper trail for this purpose.
454 Preliminary Recommendation yy provides specific guidance of record keeping.

455
456 The working group recalled that the Gaining FOA pre-dated the Transfer Authorization
457 Code (TAC), formerly referred to as the AuthInfo Code, and that prior to the
458 introduction of the TAC, the Gaining FOA was an essential element for facilitating the
459 transfer and also provided a function that was important to prevent the unauthorized
460 transfer of domains. With the introduction of the TAC, an additional layer of security
461 was added to the process, and the Gaining FOA became less essential. The
462 recommendations in this report further evolve the security model for the transfer
463 process, including with respect to the TAC. The working group believes that the security
464 model presented in the package of recommendations offers the appropriate elements
465 to reduce the risk of unauthorized transfer to the extent possible within the bounds of
466 the Transfer Policy. Key elements of the model include the following:

- 467 • The issuance of the TAC is the means of confirming that the RNH intends to
468 transfer the domain. The first and most important line of defense and the
469 primary point of control is logging into the account at the Registrar. This is the
470 "affirmative consent" to initiate the transfer. The working group understands
471 that certain threat vectors, including hacking of the RNH's email or unauthorized
472 access to the RNH's account at the Registrar, are legitimate concerns. At the
473 same time, the working group considers them outside the scope of the Transfer
474 Policy and therefore outside the scope of this working group.
- 475 • Acknowledging the role that the TAC plays as a token to enable the transfer
476 process, the working group has recommended specific enhancements related to
477 TAC security:
 - 478 ○ Minimum requirements for composition to the TAC (Recommendation 7),
479 seek to reduce the risk of an unauthorized party guessing the TAC to
480 initiate an unauthorized transfer.

Deleted: ¶
:T

Deleted: With respect to the confirmation function that the Gaining FOA served, the working group believes that this is duplicative and therefore unnecessary. ¶

Deleted:

Deleted: The working group further noted that it has recommended a series of measures to increase the security of the TAC and reduce the risk that the TAC is obtained by an unauthorized person, as detailed in Preliminary Recommendations 7-13. With added security measures, the TAC becomes a stronger means to demonstrate that the TAC holder is an appropriate party to request the transfer, which makes the authorization element of the Gaining FOA unnecessary. ¶

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202319 January 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

- o Limiting when, where, and for how long the TAC may be vulnerable to theft once generated. The TAC is only generated at the point that it is needed to initiate an inter-Registrar transfer (Recommendation 9.1). It is stored securely at the Registry (Recommendation 9.2). The TAC has a maximum lifetime of 14 days, preventing the existence of a long-lived TAC, which could be used as part of an unauthorized or unintended inter-Registrar transfer (Recommendation 13).
- Once a domain is transferred, the Registrar must restrict the RNH from transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 days. To the extent that the transfer is unauthorized, this restriction will consistently prevent the transfer of a domain multiple times in rapid succession, a practice associated with domain theft that makes it difficult to recover the domain.
- [Any additional recommendation(s) regarding reversal of a transfer/dispute resolution.]

Preliminary Recommendations:

Preliminary Recommendation 1: The working group recommends eliminating from the Transfer Policy the requirement that the Gaining Registrar send a Gaining Form of Authorization. This requirement is detailed in section 1.A.2 of the Transfer Policy.

Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 1: As discussed in detail in the working group's response to charter question a1, the inter-Registrar transfer process has functioned without the Gaining FOA since the GDPR went into force, and the working group has not encountered any evidence that there has been an increase in unauthorized transfers since the Gaining FOA was functionally eliminated. It has not found any other indications that the transfer process is malfunctioning without the Gaining FOA requirement. Therefore, the working group sees no evidence that the Gaining FOA is needed for the purpose of facilitating the transfer or protecting the RNH from unauthorized transfers.

Deleted: ↵

The working group noted that while it was in use, the Gaining FOA provided a record to assist ICANN's Contractual Compliance department in investigating complaints, especially those related to unauthorized transfers. It also supported the resolution of disputes. The working group noted that new notifications detailed in Preliminary Recommendations 3-4 will provide the necessary paper trail for this purpose. ¶

3.1.2 Charter Question a2

If the working group determines the Gaining FOA should still be a requirement, are any updates (apart from the text, which will likely need to be updated due to the gTLD Registration Data Policy) needed for the process? For example, should additional security requirements be added to the Gaining FOA (two-factor authentication)?

Working Group Response:

As described in the above response to charter question a1, the working group has determined that the Gaining FOA should no longer be a requirement.

Deleted: s

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

549

550 3.1.3 Charter Question a3

551

552 *The language from the Temporary Specification provides, “[u]ntil such time when the*
553 *RDAP service (or other secure methods for transferring data) is required by ICANN to be*
554 *offered, if the Gaining Registrar is unable to gain access to then-current Registration*
555 *Data for a domain name subject of a transfer, the related requirements in the Transfer*
556 *Policy will be superseded by the below provisions...”. What secure methods (if any)*
557 *currently exist to allow for the secure transmission of then-current Registration Data for*
558 *a domain name subject to an inter-Registrar transfer request?*

559

560 Working Group Response:

561

562 As noted in the response to charter question a1, the working group considered that it is
563 likely possible from a technical perspective to facilitate the transfer of the RNH’s contact
564 information from the Registrar of Record to the Gaining Registrar for the purposes of
565 confirming the RNH’s intent to transfer. However, the working group did not pursue
566 specific methods for doing so because it did not believe this data transfer is feasible
567 from a legal perspective.

568

569 3.1.4 Charter Question a4

570

571 *If the working group determines the Gaining FOA is no longer needed, does the AuthInfo*
572 *Code provide sufficient security? The Transfer Policy does not currently require specific*
573 *security requirements around the AuthInfo Code. Should there be additional security*
574 *requirements added to AuthInfo Codes, e.g., required syntax (length, characters), two-*
575 *factor authentication, issuing restrictions, etc.?*

576

577 Working Group Response:

578

579 As described in the response to charter question a1, the working group believes that the
580 package of recommendations presented in this report provides for a transfer process
581 with appropriate levels of security within the bounds of the Transfer Policy, including
582 enhancements to the security of the Transfer Authorization Code. Please see the
583 response to charter question a1 for additional details.

584

585 3.1.5 Charter Question a5

586

587 *If the working group determines the Gaining FOA is no longer needed, does the*
588 *transmission of the AuthInfo Code provide a sufficient “paper trail” for auditing and*
589 *compliance purposes?*

Deleted: The working group has presented a series of enhancements to the security of the Transfer Authorization Code (TAC), formerly known as the AuthInfo Code, in Preliminary Recommendations 7-13. The working group believes that the TAC will provide sufficient security with these improvements in place.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri)

Deleted: It is the working group's view that a sufficient "paper trail" will be provided by records associated with provision issuance of the TAC to the RNH, the transmission of the Transfer Confirmation to the RNH, and notifications to the RNH outlined in Preliminary Recommendations 3-4.¶

Working Group Response:

The working group acknowledges that with the elimination of the Gaining FOA requirement, the AuthInfo code becomes even more important for the transaction and for any Compliance investigation related to it. The working group further agrees that it is important to properly document and retain all notifications related to the transfer sent by the Losing Registrar, so that information about such records can be sent to ICANN Compliance when investigating a complaint, as needed. Therefore, the working group is providing a specific recommendation on requirements regarding the retention of these records and provision to ICANN upon reasonable notice.

Preliminary Recommendation yy: The Registrar MUST retain all records pertaining to the provision of the TAC to a Registered Name Holder, as well as all notifications sent per the requirements under the Transfer Policy. At a minimum, the records retained MUST document the date/time, means, and contact(s) to whom the TAC and notifications are sent. The Registrar MUST maintain these records for the shorter of 15 months or the longest period permitted by applicable law, and during such period MUST provide such records to ICANN upon reasonable notice.

Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation yy: This recommendation seeks to ensure that the necessary information is available to ICANN.org in the case of a Compliance investigation related to an inter-Registrar transfer. The 15-month retention period specified in this recommendation is consistent with requirements anticipated to be included in the Registration Data Policy.

3.1.6 Charter Question a6

Survey respondents noted that mandatory domain name locking is an additional security enhancement to prevent domain name hijacking and improper domain name transfers. The Transfer Policy does not currently require mandatory domain name locking; it allows a Registrar to NACK an inter-Registrar transfer if the inter-Registrar transfer was requested within 60 days of the domain name's creation date as shown in the Registry RDDS record for the domain name or if the domain name is within 60 days after being transferred. Is mandatory domain name locking an additional requirement the working group believes should be added to the Transfer Policy?

Working Group Response:

The working group understands that this charter question refers to a lock that some Registrars apply by default to protect their customers from accidental or malicious inter-Registrar transfers. Registrants may, however, request lock removal, and Registrars

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Deleted: 20-21

Deleted: 20-21

Deleted: The working group notes that there will be greater security related to inter-Registrar transfers following the implementation of Preliminary Recommendations 7-13 for enhanced security of the TAC.

644 must remove the lock within five days per requirements of the Transfer Policy.⁵ Charter
645 question a6 asks whether this lock, which some Registrars choose to apply today, should
646 become a policy requirement for ALL Registrars. For the avoidance of doubt, the lock
647 addressed in this charter question is distinct from potential requirements for a Registrar
648 to restrict the RNH from transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 days
649 of the initial registration date and within 30 days of the completion of an inter-Registrar
650 transfer. Unlike Preliminary Recommendations 16-17 regarding inter-Registrar transfer
651 restrictions, the lock discussed in this charter question is a default lock that is generally
652 removable upon the request of the registrant,⁶ while the restrictions discussed in
653 Preliminary Recommendations 16-17 are triggered by a specific event and are not
654 removable upon the request of the registrant.
655

656 The working group does not believe that mandatory domain name locking as presented
657 above should be added to the Transfer Policy. The working group believes that the
658 security model presented in response to charter question a1 provides for a transfer
659 process with appropriate levels of security within the bounds of the Transfer Policy. It is
660 the working group's view that Registrars are in the best position to determine whether
661 locking a domain by default upon registration is appropriate for their customers in
662 combination with other security features implemented by the Registrar. The working
663 group expects that Registrars will continue to use their own discretion to implement any
664 additional measures that may be appropriate for their business model and customer
665 base.
666

667 3.1.7 Charter Question a7

668
669 *Is the Losing FOA still required? If yes, are any updates necessary?*
670

671 Working Group Response:

672
673 The working group extensively discussed the function and utility of the Losing FOA,
674 which the working group recommends re-naming the Transfer Confirmation, both in
675 initial deliberations leading up to publication of the Initial Report and in the context of
676 reviewing public comments on the Initial Report. Ultimately, the working group did not
677 reach agreement to eliminate or substantially change the Obligations of the Registrar of
678 Record described in Section I.A.3.1 - I.A.3.6 of the Transfer Policy, and therefore
679 anticipates that these requirements will largely remain in place with the minor
680 modifications presented in Recommendation 2.
681

⁵ Please note there are some instances, which are specifically spelled out in the Transfer Policy, where a Registrar may not unlock a domain name, even if requested by the Registered Name Holder, e.g., the domain name is subject to a UDRP proceeding or locked pursuant to a court order.

⁶ Ibid.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: provided

Deleted:

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: provides

Deleted: provide

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: registrant

Deleted: registrant

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: FOA

688 Early working group deliberations revealed that a number of working group members
689 supported eliminating the **Transfer Confirmation** in light of other working group
690 recommendations that sought to increase security and improve efficiency of the
691 transfer process. Those advocating for this approach raised the following points:
692
693 • The working group is recommending that the Registrar of Record must send a
694 Notification of TAC **issuance** to the RNH when the TAC is **issued** and a
695 Notification of Transfer Completion to the RNH following completion of the
696 transfer. These notifications largely fulfill the notification function that is
697 currently provided by the **Transfer Confirmation**.
698 • It is not necessary to give the RNH an opportunity to confirm or deny the
699 transfer via the **Transfer Confirmation**, because the act of logging into the
700 control panel at the Registrar of Record in order to request the TAC is, in itself,
701 an indication of consent. If the registrant has a high-value domain, the registrant
702 should select a Registrar of Record that offers extra features and services to
703 protect the security of the account and domain transactions. It is outside of the
704 scope of the Transfer Policy to address Registrar account security.
705 • The registrant always has the opportunity to select a Registrar of Record who
706 conducts additional due diligence after the TAC is requested and before the
707 Registrar of Record **issues** the TAC. The working group has recommended that,
708 as is the case in the current Transfer Policy, the Registrar of Record must have up
709 to 5 days to **issue** the TAC. If notifications replace the **Transfer Confirmation**, and
710 the RNH selects a Registrar who takes extra time for due diligence, the RNH will
711 also have additional time to receive and respond to Notification of TAC **issuance**,
712 allowing them to stop the transfer process if it is unwanted.
713 • The current **Transfer Confirmation** process can delay the transfer for up to an
714 additional five calendar days. By eliminating the **Transfer Confirmation**, the
715 working group reduces the overall maximum time of the transfer process,
716 making it possible to transfer a domain almost instantaneously, which is
717 beneficial for some registrants.
718 • The working group is recommending additional security features, which will
719 reduce the security risks associated with transfers. In particular, the working
720 group has recommended that the TAC must be generated on demand, reducing
721 the window of time in which the TAC is vulnerable to theft. In addition, the
722 recommended 30-day post-transfer lock helps to ensure that if a domain is
723 stolen, domain hopping will be slowed, allowing the Losing and Gaining
724 Registrars to work together to resolve the problem.
725 • Further, during its work in Phase 2, the working group could potentially
726 recommend a mechanism to more quickly reverse an unwanted transfer
727 fulfilling the principle of being able to “reject” the transfer.
728 • In the current process, the **Transfer Confirmation** has limited utility in a common
729 attack scenario. Specifically, if an attacker obtains access to the control panel,
730 the attacker can change the recipient of the **Transfer Confirmation** to the

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

747 attacker's own email address, thereby eliminating the utility of the **Transfer**
748 **Confirmation**.

Deleted: FOA

749
750 In line with the above points, the working group's Phase 1(a) Initial Report included a
751 recommendation to eliminate the **Transfer Confirmation** and replace it with a
752 Notification of TAC **Issuance** and a Notification of Transfer Completion. In its review of
753 public comments and subsequent deliberations, the working group extensively
754 discussed key concerns that were raised:

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Provision

755 • Domains are important and valuable assets. It is important for registrants to
756 have a genuine opportunity to approve or reject a transfer before the transfer
757 takes place. In some cases under the procedure recommended in the Initial
758 Report, the transfer will have already taken place by the time the registrant has
759 received the Notice of TAC **Issuance** and wants to take action to stop the
760 transfer. This process takes agency away from the registrant. It increases the risk
761 of a domain being stolen without the knowledge of the registrant, in particular
762 where an unauthorized party has accessed the TAC to initiate a transfer that the
763 registrant doesn't want.

Deleted: Provision

764 • Some working group members indicated that the working group could introduce
765 a "fast undo" process in Phase 2 to more quickly reverse an unauthorized
766 transfer. It is not yet clear if the working group will be able to obtain consensus
767 to recommend such a mechanism. Even if such a mechanism is recommended
768 and ultimately implemented, transfer reversal is less desirable than the ability to
769 reject a transfer before it occurs. Once the domain is transferred away, there has
770 been a disruption. The DNS has changed and service may have stopped. It
771 requires a higher level of effort to remedy the situation and more parties will
772 need to be involved.

773
774 While there was disagreement among working group members about the utility of the
775 **Transfer Confirmation** from a security perspective, it was understood that from a RNH
776 perspective, elimination of the **Transfer Confirmation** results in a sense among some
777 RNH's that they have lost an important element of agency in the process. Working
778 group members acknowledged that in many cases of theft, the email and/or Registrar
779 account is hacked, eliminating the value of the **Transfer Confirmation**, but this is not
780 true in every case. If the TAC is stolen once it has been generated, the **Transfer**
781 **Confirmation** can assist the RNH in stopping an unwanted transfer.

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

782
783 Some working group members advocated for an alternative means to provide additional
784 agency to the registrant while reducing the overall maximum timeline of the transfer
785 process. Specifically, they proposed that the Registrar of Record must be required to
786 send a notification to the RNH once a TAC is requested. The RNH can respond to the
787 notice by either accepting or rejecting the release of the TAC. If there is no response by
788 a given period of time (a period of less than 5 days), the Registrar proceeds to issue the
789 TAC. Those advocating for this approach noted that the proposal provides notice and

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

828 opportunity to accept or reject at the moment the RNH is thinking about the transfer, shortly after they have requested the TAC.

830 Those opposing the proposal noted the following concerns:

- 831 • The proposal can stop the initiation of a transfer but does not stop a transfer that is pending. The TAC is vulnerable to theft once it is generated, and if the TAC is stolen once created, the RNH does not have a way to NACK the transfer as it does with the Transfer Confirmation.
- 832 • The proposal creates a need for system updates, process updates, and user education and may not fully satisfy those who want to keep the Transfer Confirmation. Therefore, the change is not worth the effort.

833 Ultimately, the working group did not come to agreement to pursue this proposal further. As a default, the Transfer Confirmation will be maintained.

834 Preliminary Recommendations:

835 Preliminary Recommendation 2: The working group did not reach agreement to eliminate or substantially change the Obligations of the Registrar of Record described in Section I.A.3.1 - I.A.3.6 of the Transfer Policy. Therefore, the working group anticipates that these requirements will largely remain in place. The working group recommends the following minor modifications:

- 836 • The term "Transfer Confirmation" MUST be used in place of "Standardized Form of Authorization (FOA)."
- 837 • The Transfer Confirmation language MUST include the Gaining Registrar's IANA ID and a link to ICANN-maintained webpage listing accredited Registrars and corresponding IANA IDs. If available, the name of the Gaining Registrar MAY also be included.
- 838 • The Transfer Confirmation MUST be provided in English and the language of the registration agreement and MAY also be provided in other languages.
- 839 • The timeframe of five (5) calendar days specified in section I.A.3.5 of the policy MUST be expressed in both calendar days and hours: "Failure by the Registrar of Record to respond within five (5) calendar days / 120 hours to a notification from the Registry regarding a transfer request will result in a default "approval" of the transfer."

840 Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 2: Please see response to charter question a7 for a summary of the working group's deliberations on the Transfer Confirmation. Regarding the minor modifications recommended by the working group:

- 841 • The term "Losing Form of Authorization" may be confusing to the RNH, and therefore the working group recommends an update in terminology to "Transfer Confirmation," which more accurately describes the function that is served.

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: Losing FOA

Deleted: The working group acknowledged that the Losing FOA serves a number of important functions:

- The Losing FOA notifies the RNH that a transfer has been requested.
- In cases where the party requesting the TAC is different from the RNH receiving the Losing FOA, the Losing FOA provides an extra layer of security in the form of a "second factor" to ensure that the RNH is aware that the transfer is taking place.
- The Losing FOA provides a paper trail to assist ICANN's Contractual Compliance department in investigating complaints, especially those related to unauthorized transfers. It also supports the resolution of disputes. Following the deferral of Contractual Compliance enforcement of Gaining FOA requirements, the Losing FOA has taken on particular importance for complaint investigation.
- The working group agreed that the transfer process must have appropriate security measures in place and that the RNH must continue to be notified when an inter-Registrar transfer is expected to take place. Furthermore, the w ... [1]

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: [

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

Deleted: ¶

Deleted:]¶ ... [2]

Deleted: [

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

Deleted:]

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: Losing FOA

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: [Include a brief summary of the rationale for any proposed minor adjustments to the Losing ... [3]

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

- With inclusion of the IANA ID in the Transfer Confirmation, the RNH can confirm that the Gaining Registrar matches the Registrar to whom the RNH intends to transfer to domain. If the pending transfer is not consistent with the RNH’s intent, the IANA ID is an important data point to assist the RNH with investigating the issue.
- Providing the Transfer Confirmation in English and the language of the registration agreement improves accessibility for the RNH.
- Consistent with the other recommendations in this report, the working group recommends specifying timeframes in both calendar days and hours for greater clarity.

Preliminary Recommendation 3: The working group recommends that the Registrar of Record MUST send a “Notification of TAC issuance”⁸ to the RNH without undue delay but no later than 10 minutes after the Registrar of Record issues the TAC.⁹ For the purposes of sending the notification, the Registrar of Record MUST use contact information as it was in the registration data at the time of the TAC request.

3.1: This notification MUST be provided in English and in the language of the registration agreement and MAY also be provided in other languages.

3.2: The following elements MUST be included in the “Notification of TAC issuance”:

- Domain name(s)
- Explanation that the TAC will enable the transfer of the domain name to another registrar
- Date and time that the TAC was issued and information about when the TAC will expire
- Instructions detailing how the RNH can take action if the request is invalid (how to invalidate the TAC)
- If the TAC has not been issued via another method of communication, this communication will include the TAC

Deleted: ¶
 ¶
Preliminary Recommendation 2: The working group recommends eliminating from the Transfer Policy the requirement that the Registrar of Record send a Losing Form of Authorization.⁷ This requirement is detailed in section I.A.3 of the Transfer Policy.¶

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: , as listed in the Registration Data at the time of the TAC request,

Deleted: provides

Deleted: must

Deleted: **Implementation Guidance on Recommendation 3:** In cases where a customer uses a Privacy/Proxy service and the contact information associated with the underlying customer is known to the Registrar of Record, the Registrar of Record mayMAY send the notification directly to the underlying customer.¶

Deleted: written

Deleted: English or

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: provided

Deleted: provided

⁸ The working group recognizes that this notification MAY be sent via email, SMS, or a secure messaging system determined by the Registrar. These examples are not intended to be limiting, and it is understood that additional methods of notification MAY be created that were not originally anticipated by the working group.

Deleted: other

Formatted: Highlight

⁹ The working group recognizes that from a security perspective, it is best for the “Notification of TAC issuance” to be delivered by a method of communication that is different from the method used to deliver the TAC. If this is not possible, and the same method of communication is used, the Registrar of Record MAY choose to send the “Notification of TAC issuance” and the TAC together in a single communication.

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: Provision

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

996 **Implementation Guidance on Recommendation 3:** In cases where a customer uses a
997 [Privacy/Proxy service and the contact information associated with the underlying](#)
998 [customer is known to the Registrar of Record, the Registrar of Record MAY send the](#)
999 [notification directly to the underlying customer.](#)

1001 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 3:** This recommendation seeks to
1002 [ensure that the RNH consistently receives the necessary information with respect](#)
1003 [to an inter-Registrar transfer. If the RNH receives the notice and determines that](#)
1004 [the action on the account is unauthorized or unintended, the RNH may seek to](#)
1005 [invalidate the TAC before the transfer completes.](#)

1007 **Preliminary Recommendation 4:** The working group recommends that the Losing
1008 Registrar¹⁰ MUST send a “Notification of Transfer Completion”¹¹ to the RNH without
1009 undue delay but no later than 24 hours after the transfer is completed. [For the purposes](#)
1010 [of sending the notification, the Registrar of Record MUST use contact information as it](#)
1011 [was in the registration data at the time of the transfer request.](#)

Deleted: , as listed in the Registration Data at the time of the transfer request,

Deleted: must

Deleted: ¶

1013 **4.1:** This notification MUST be [provided in English and](#) in the language of the
1014 registration agreement and MAY also be provided in other languages.

Moved down [1]: **Implementation Guidance on Recommendation 4:** In cases where a customer uses a Privacy/Proxy service and the contact information associated with the underlying customer is known to the Registrar of Record, the Registrar of Record MAY send the notification directly to the underlying customer.¶

1016 **4.2:** To the extent that multiple domains have been transferred to the same
1017 Gaining Registrar or to multiple Gaining Registrars at the same time, and the RNH
1018 listed in the Registration Data at the time of the transfer is the same for all
1019 domains, the Registrar of Record MAY consolidate the “Notifications of Transfer
1020 Completion” into a single notification.

Deleted: written

Deleted: English or

1022 **4.3:** The following elements MUST be included in the “Notification of Transfer
1023 Completion”:

- 1024 • Domain name(s)
- 1025 • [IANA ID\(s\) of Gaining Registrar\(s\) and link to ICANN-maintained webpage](#)
- 1026 [listing accredited Registrars and corresponding IANA IDs. If available, the](#)
- 1027 [name of the Gaining Registrar\(s\) may also be included.](#)
- 1028 • Text stating that the domain was transferred
- 1029 • Date and time that the transfer was completed
- 1030 • Instructions detailing how the RNH can take action if the transfer was
- 1031 invalid ([how to initiate a reversal](#)) [and any deadlines by which the RNH](#)
- 1032 [must take action.](#)

¹⁰ This is the Registrar of Record at the time of the transfer request.

¹¹ The footnote on Preliminary Recommendation 3 regarding the method by which notifications are sent equally applies to the “Notification of Transfer Completion.”

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: [Losing FOA]

Deleted:]

Deleted: , which makes the process more clear and transparent to the RNH

Deleted: Note: The working group has included the following question for community input regarding Preliminary Recommendation 4.3 as part of the public comment process on the Initial Report:

As detailed in Recommendations 3-4, the working group is recommending replacing the Standardized Losing FOA with two notifications to the Registered Name Holder: (i) a required "Notification of TAC Provision" and (ii) a required "Notification of Transfer Completion". Recommendation 4 details the minimum elements to be included in the Notification of Transfer Completion, including, for example, domain name, date/time of transfer completion, instructions on how to take action if the transfer is invalid. The working group discussed the possibility of including the IANA ID of the Gaining Registrar within this notification.

Note: The IANA ID is the unique number provided by ICANN to each accredited Registrar. The IANA ID can be helpful in identifying the correct Registrar, especially in situations where Registrars have similar names and/or have multiple subsidiaries with similar names.

In the working group's discussion, Registrars noted that not all Registry Operators use the Gaining Registrar's IANA ID when notifying a Losing Registrar of a pending transfer request. Instead, some Registry Operators use a separate, internal client ID that does not correspond to the IANA ID. Registry representatives asked if this question could be included in the public comment forum to allow additional time to discuss if it would be feasible to include the IANA ID when notifying the Registrar via EPP or otherwise, which would then allow the Losing Registrar to provide the IANA ID in the Notification of Transfer Completion. Please note all commenters are welcome to respond to this question, not just Registry Operators.

Question to the community: Should the Gaining Registrar's IANA ID be provided by the Registry Operator to the Losing Registrar so that it may be included in the Notification of Transfer Completion sent by the Losing Registrar to the Registered Name Holder? Why or why not? Please explain.

1046 **Implementation Guidance on Recommendation 4:** In cases where a customer uses a
1047 Privacy/Proxy service and the contact information associated with the underlying
1048 customer is known to the Registrar of Record, the Registrar of Record MAY send the
1049 notification directly to the underlying customer.

1051 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 4:** This recommendation seeks to
1052 ensure that the RNH consistently receives the necessary information with respect
1053 to an inter-Registrar transfer. If the RNH receives the notice and determines that
1054 the transfer is unauthorized or unintended, the RNH may seek the appropriate
1055 remedy.

1057 **Preliminary Recommendation xx:** The Registry Operator MUST provide the Gaining
1058 Registrar's IANA ID to the Losing Registrar in the notification of a pending transfer
1059 request, which will enable the Losing Registrar to provide this information in the
1060 Transfer Confirmation and Notification of Transfer Completion.

1062 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation xx:** Currently, not all Registry
1063 Operators use the Gaining Registrar's IANA ID when notifying a Losing Registrar of
1064 a pending transfer request. Instead, some Registry Operators use a separate,
1065 internal client ID that does not correspond to the IANA ID. This recommendation
1066 enables the Losing Registrar to consistently provide the IANA ID in the Transfer
1067 Confirmation and Notification of Transfer Completion. In the case of a legitimate
1068 transfer, this information allows the RNH to confirm that the desired action was
1069 completed as requested. If the transfer is not consistent with the RNH's intent, the
1070 IANA ID is an important data point to assist the RNH with investigating the issue.

1072 **3.1.8 Charter Question a8**

1073 *Does the Contracted Parties House (CPH) Proposed Tech Ops Process represent a logical*
1074 *starting point for the future working group or policy body to start with? If so, does it*
1075 *provide sufficient security for registered name holders? If not, what updates should be*
1076 *considered?*

1077 **Working Group Response:**

1078
1079 The CPH Tech Ops Group, "agreed that the requirement to notify the Registrant about a
1080 transfer request should be mandatory. As general business practices of Registrars and
1081 individual transfer scenarios vary, the group concluded that such notification does not
1082 have to be an email, but rather may incorporate other means of more modern
1083 communication."¹²

¹² Full text of the CPH Tech Ops proposal can be found in Annex B of the [TPR Final Issue Report](#).

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138

The working group agreed with Tech Ops that it is important to notify the RNH when a transfer is expected to take place and has recently taken place. The working group further supported the idea that given variations in Registrar business models and individual transfer scenarios, different secure means of communication may be appropriate for the provision of notifications.

1139 3.1.9 Charter Question a9

1140
1141
1142
1143
1144

Are there additional inter-Registrar transfer process proposals that should be considered in lieu of or in addition to the CPH TechOps Proposal? For example, should affirmative consent to the Losing FOA be considered as a measure of additional protection?

1145 Working Group Response:

1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151

The working group appreciates proposals received during the Public Comment period on the Phase 1(a) Initial Report and considered these proposals in its review of Public Comments. Please see Public Comment review working documents on the working group's wiki for additional details.

Deleted: The working group did not identify any additional proposals to pursue in this regard.

1152 3.2 Transfer Authorization Code/AuthInfo Code Management

1153
1154
1155
1156

For context on this topic and the associated charter questions, please see pages 15-19 of the [Final Issue Report](#).

1157 3.2.1 Charter Question b1

1158
1159
1160
1161
1162

Is AuthInfo Code still a secure method for inter-Registrar transfers? What evidence was used by the working group to make this determination?

1162 Working Group Response:

1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172

The working group agreed that it should first establish clarity around the function and definition of the AuthInfo Code and ensure that terminology is clear before addressing specific security requirements. The working group used the following text on [ICANN.org](#) as a starting point for discussion on the definition of the Transfer Authorization Code (TAC): "An Auth-Code (also called an Authorization Code, Auth-Info Code, or transfer code) is a code created by a Registrar to help identify the Registered Name Holder of a domain name in a generic top-level domain (gTLD). An Auth-Code is required for a Registered Name Holder to transfer a domain name from one Registrar to another." The working group agreed that the term "identify" is inappropriate in this context, because

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1175 the code does not verify identity in practice. Instead, the TAC is used to verify that the
1176 Registered Name Holder (RNH) requesting the transfer is the same RNH who holds the
1177 domain.

1178
1179 The working group considered that a number of different terms currently apply to the
1180 same concept, including AuthInfo Code, Auth-Info Code, Auth-Code, Authorization
1181 Code, and transfer code. None of these terms clearly describe the function of the code.
1182 The working group believes that it is clearer for all parties, and particularly the RNH, if a
1183 single term is used universally. The working group believes that “Transfer Authorization
1184 Code” (TAC) provides a straightforward description of the code’s function, and therefore
1185 should serve as the standard term in place of the alternatives.

1186
1187 Regarding the security of the TAC, the working group agreed that metrics could support
1188 deliberations on charter question b1. In particular, working group members were
1189 interested to see if there has been a change in the number of unauthorized transfers
1190 following adoption of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. ICANN’s
1191 Contractual Compliance Department provided the working group with updated metrics
1192 regarding complaints received, which covered the periods both before and after the
1193 Temporary Specification went into effect.¹³ Contractual Compliance subsequently
1194 shared additional metrics that included the “closure codes” associated with complaints
1195 about unauthorized transfers.¹⁴ While the working group agreed that it is difficult to
1196 draw conclusions from the data, the working group noted that there was no notable
1197 increase in complaints following the date that the Temporary Specification went into
1198 effect.

1199
1200 The working group considered that in addition to examining metrics regarding past
1201 performance, it is important to consider future-state objectives for the TAC. The
1202 working group agreed that from this perspective, additional security features are
1203 appropriate to protect the RNH, [drawing on elements of RFC 9154](#). In considering
1204 potential security enhancements, the working group considered the benefits of
1205 requiring these measures, while also taking into account usability considerations and
1206 operational impacts on contracted parties in implementing new requirements.

1207

1208 **Preliminary Recommendations:**

1209

Deleted: particularly in light of working group preliminary recommendations to replace requirements for the Gaining and Losing FOA with notifications to the RNH

¹³Available at:

https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/181307054/Compliance_Transfer%20Data_presented%2029%20June%202021.xlsx?version=1&modificationDate=1638449700087&api=v2

¹⁴Available at:

https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/181307054/Compliance_Unauthorized%20Transfer%20Data%20Aug%202020-Sept%202021_presented%209%20November%202021.xlsx?version=1&modificationDate=1638449975000&api=v2

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1213 **Preliminary Recommendation 5:** The working group recommends that the Transfer
1214 Policy and all related policies MUST use the term “Transfer Authorization Code (TAC)” in
1215 place of the currently-used term “AuthInfo Code” and related terms. This
1216 recommendation is for an update to terminology only and does not imply any other
1217 changes to the substance of the policies.

1218
1219 **Implementation Guidance on Preliminary Recommendation 5:** ICANN publications and
1220 [webpages should also be updated to reflect the recommended terminology change](#)
1221 [described in Preliminary Recommendation 5.](#)

1222
1223 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 5:** [As discussed in the response to](#)
1224 [charter question b1, it is clearer for all parties, and particularly the RNH, if a single](#)
1225 [term is used universally. “Transfer Authorization Code” \(TAC\) provides a](#)
1226 [straightforward description of the code’s function.](#)

1227
1228 **Preliminary Recommendation 6:** The working group recommends that the Transfer
1229 Authorization Code MUST be defined as follows: “A Transfer Authorization Code (TAC) is
1230 a token created by the Registrar of Record and provided upon request to the RNH or
1231 their designated representative. The TAC is required for a domain name to be
1232 transferred from one Registrar to another Registrar and when presented authorizes the
1233 transfer.”¹⁶ Relevant policy language MUST be updated to be consistent with this
1234 definition.

- 1235 • [“Designated representative” means an individual or entity that the Registered](#)
1236 [Name Holder explicitly authorizes to request and obtain the TAC on their behalf.](#)
1237 [In the event of a dispute, the RNH’s authority supersedes that of the designated](#)
1238 [representative.](#)

1239
1240 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 6:** [As noted in the response to](#)
1241 [charter question b1, this definition is a revision of a text included on the](#)
1242 [ICANN.org website, updated to make clear that the TAC’s function is to verify that](#)
1243 [the Registered Name Holder \(RNH\) requesting the transfer is the same RNH who](#)
1244 [holds the domain. For the avoidance of doubt, the term “designated](#)
1245 [representative” introduced by the working group in Recommendation 6 is distinct](#)
1246 [from the concept of a “designated agent,” which is defined in Transfer Policy](#)
1247 [Section I.A.1.2.](#)

1248
1249 **Preliminary Recommendation 7:** [The working group recommends that the minimum](#)
1250 [requirements for the composition of a TAC MUST be as specified in RFC 9154, including](#)
1251 [all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to Secure](#)
1252 [Authorization Information for Transfer. The requirement in section 4.1 of RFC 9154](#)
1253 [regarding the minimum bits of entropy \(i.e., 128 bits\) should be a MUST in the policy](#)

Deleted: ¹⁵

¹⁶ Note: This definition draws on elements included in Preliminary Recommendation 9.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1255 [until a future RFC approved as “Internet Standards” \(as opposed to Informational or](#)
1256 [Experimental standards\) through the applicable IETF processes updates the security](#)
1257 [recommendation.](#)

1258
1259 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 7:** The working group supports the
1260 [statement in RFC 9154 section 4.1 that “For authorization information to be](#)
1261 [secure, it MUST be generated using a secure random value.” Recommendation 7](#)
1262 [brings requirements for the composition of the TAC in line with RFC 9154,](#)
1263 [including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to](#)
1264 [Secure Authorization Information for Transfer.](#)

Deleted: The working group recommends that the minimum requirements for the composition of a TAC MUST be as specified in RFC 9154 (and its update and replacement RFCs). In addition, where random values are required by RFC 9154, such values MUST be created according to BCP 106.¹⁷

1265
1266 **Preliminary Recommendation 8:** The working group recommends that, [at the time that](#)
1267 [the TAC is stored in the Registry system,](#) the Registry **MUST** [verify](#) that the TAC meets
1268 the [syntax](#) requirements specified in Preliminary Recommendation 7.

Deleted: verifies

Deleted: at the time that the TAC is stored in the Registry system ...

1269
1270 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 8:** Registry verification provides a
1271 [check on the randomness of the authorization information generated by the](#)
1272 [Registrar.](#)

1274 3.2.2 Charter Question b2

1275
1276 *The Registrar is currently the authoritative holder of the AuthInfo Code. Should this be*
1277 *maintained, or should the Registry be the authoritative AuthInfo Code holder? Why?*

1279 Working Group Response:

1280
1281 In considering this charter question, the working group focused on evaluating and
1282 defining specific roles and responsibilities of Registries and Registrars in the transfer
1283 process, noting that each party has an important role to play in the transfer process.
1284 While some working group members expressed the view that Registry management of
1285 the TAC would be more uniform, standardized, and transparent, others noted that
1286 standards will be set through policy and enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance
1287 regardless of whether the authoritative holder is the Registry or Registrar; therefore, it
1288 is not clear why it would be better to have the Registry be the authoritative holder.

1289
1290 The working group ultimately did not identify a compelling reason to shift ownership of
1291 the TAC to the Registry and therefore determined that the Registrar **must** continue to
1292 generate the TAC, set the TAC in the Registry platform, and **issue** the TAC to the RNH or
1293 their designated representative. The working group further agreed that the Registry
1294 should continue to verify the validity of the TAC [and in addition, going forward, the](#)
1295 [Registry must verify that the TAC meets the syntax requirements specified in Preliminary](#)
1296 [Recommendation 7.](#) The working group provided preliminary recommendations to
1297 improve security practices with respect to the TAC to be implemented at the Registry.

Deleted: **should**

Deleted: **provide**

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1308 The working group has also recommended that the Registry enforce the 14-day validity
1309 of the TAC.

1310
1311 **Preliminary Recommendations:**
1312

1313 **Preliminary Recommendation 9:** The working group recommends that:

1314
1315 **9.1:** The TAC MUST only be generated by the Registrar of Record upon request
1316 by the RNH or their designated representative.

1317
1318 **9.2:** When the Registrar of Record sets the TAC at the Registry, the Registry
1319 MUST store the TAC securely, at least according to the minimum standard set
1320 forth in RFC 9154 (or its successors).

1321
1322 **Implementation Guidance for Recommendation 9.2:** RFC 9154 recommends
1323 using a strong one-way cryptographic hash with at least a 256-bit hash function,
1324 such as SHA-256 [FIPS-180-4], and with a per-authorization information random
1325 salt with at least 128 bits.¹⁸

1326
1327 **9.3:** When the Registrar of Record issues the TAC to the RNH or their designated
1328 representative, the Registrar of Record MUST also provide information about
1329 when the TAC will expire.

Deleted: provides

Commented [A1]: Is 9.3 a duplication of 3.2, which specifies that this information must be included in the Notification of TAC Issuance? If so, delete 9.3?

1330
1331 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 9:** Currently, it can be the case that a
1332 TAC exists and is stored over an extended period of time and therefore can be at
1333 risk of breach or theft, for example at the Registrar of Record or via an RNH's
1334 email account. This recommendation seeks to reduce the risk of unintended
1335 disclosure of the TAC by ensuring that the TAC is only generated at the point that
1336 it is needed to initiate an inter-Registrar transfer, reducing the risk of the TAC
1337 getting in the wrong hands once it is generated (Recommendation 9.1). This
1338 recommendation further protects against breach or theft at the Registry by
1339 ensuring that the Registry stores the TAC in a secure manner (Recommendation
1340 9.2).

1341
1342
1343 **Preliminary Recommendation 10:** The working group recommends that the Transfer
1344 Policy include the following requirement: Registry Operator MUST verify that the TAC
1345 provided by the Gaining Registrar is valid in order to accept an inter-Registrar transfer
1346 request.

Deleted: confirms the following provision of Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy contained in the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data: "4.

Deleted: "AuthInfo

Deleted: "

Deleted: code

Deleted: r

Deleted: ," with terminology updates in accordance with other relevant recommendations

¹⁸ [FIPS-180-4] National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce, "Secure Hash Standard, NIST Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Publication 180-4", DOI:10.6028/NIST.FIPS.180-4, August 2015, <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/180/4/final>.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372

Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 10: This recommendation is consistent with Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy contained in the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data.

Preliminary Recommendation 11: The working group recommends that the TAC as created by the Registrar of Record according to Preliminary Recommendation 7, MUST be “one-time use.” In other words, it MUST be used no more than once per domain name. The Registry Operator MUST reset the TAC to null¹⁹ when it accepts a valid TAC from the Gaining Registrar.

Deleted: clear un

Deleted: -

Deleted: the TAC as part of completing the successful transfer request...

Rationale for Recommendation 11: The one-time use principle limits the number of transactions that can be completed using a single password to one, reducing the damage that can be caused by a bad actor. The working group believes that it is good practice to manage the TAC following the one-time use principle.

3.2.3 Charter Question b3

1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379

The Transfer Policy currently requires Registrars to provide the AuthInfo Code to the registrant within five [calendar] days of a request. Is this an appropriate Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the Registrar’s provision of the AuthInfo Code, or does it need to be updated?

Working Group Response:

1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392

The working group agreed that the Transfer Policy should continue to require Registrars to issue the TAC to the RNH or their designated representative within a specified period of time following a request. While some working group members felt that the standard time frame for issuance of the TAC should be shorter than five calendar days, working group members noted that exceptions may be necessary to accommodate specific circumstances. The working group did not identify a compelling reason to change the five-day response timeframe but believes that it is appropriate to update the policy language to highlight that five calendar days is the maximum and not the standard period in which the TAC is to be issued. The working group also agreed that it is more clear to express the time frame in hours rather than calendar days.

Deleted: provide

Deleted: provision

Deleted: provided

Preliminary Recommendations:

1393
1394

¹⁹ In the context of this recommendation, “reset the TAC to null” is to have the opposite meaning of setting the TAC. In other words, Recommendation 9.2 provides that the Registrar of Record sets the TAC at the Registry; here, the Registry is reversing that action.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Deleted: provide

Commented [A2]: Express the timeframe in BOTH calendar days and hours as the working group is doing elsewhere in this report?

Deleted: provided

1402 **Preliminary Recommendation 12:** The working group confirms that the Transfer Policy
1403 MUST continue to require Registrars to set the TAC at the Registry and **issue** the TAC to
1404 the RNH or their designated representative within five calendar days of a request,
1405 although the working group recommends that the policy state the requirement as 120
1406 hours rather than 5 calendar days to reduce any risk of confusion. The working group
1407 further recommends that the policy MUST make clear that 120 hours is the maximum
1408 and not the standard period in which the TAC is to be **issued**.

1409
1410 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 12:** As described in the response to
1411 charter question b3, the working group did not identify a compelling reason to
1412 change the five-day response time frame but believes that it is clearer to express
1413 the time frame in hours rather than calendar days. The working group
1414 recommends that the policy MUST make clear that 120 hours is the maximum and
1415 not the standard period in which the TAC is to be issued, in order to highlight that
1416 quicker turnaround is possible and desirable in many cases.

1418 3.2.4 Charter Question b4

1419
1420 *The Transfer Policy does not currently require a standard Time to Live (TTL) for the*
1421 *AuthInfo Code. Should there be a standard Time to Live (TTL) for the AuthInfo Code? In*
1422 *other words, should the AuthInfo Code expire after a certain amount of time (hours,*
1423 *calendar days, etc.)?*

1424 **Working Group Response:**

1425
1426
1427 The working group clarified its understanding that the Time to Live (TTL) is the period of
1428 time that the TAC is valid once the TAC has been created. The working group noted that
1429 there are no existing policy requirements regarding TTL. The working group believes
1430 that it is good security practice to have a standard TTL for the TAC, because old, unused
1431 TACs are vulnerable to exploitation.

1432 **Preliminary Recommendations:**

1433 **Preliminary Recommendation 13:**

1434
1435 The working group recommends that:

1436
1437
1438
1439 **13.1:** The TAC MUST be **valid for 14 calendar days / 336 hours** from the time it is
1440 set at the Registry, enforced by the Registry.

Deleted: A standard Time to Live (TTL) for t

Deleted: /336 hours

Deleted:

Deleted: ies

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

Deleted: after a period of less than

Deleted:

Deleted: s

Formatted: Superscript

1448 **13.2:** The Registrar of Record MAY reset the TAC to null²⁰ prior to the end of the
1449 14th calendar day / 336 hours by agreement by the Registrar of Record and the
1450 RNH.

1451 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 13:** The purpose of the standard Time
1452 to Live (TTL) is to enforce security around unused TACs (e.g., requested/received
1453 but not used), in a situation where the TAC may be stored in a registrant's email or
1454 other communications storage. The working group arrived at the conclusion that
1455 the TAC TTL must be no more than 14 calendar days / 336 hours and notes that a
1456 14-day / 336 hour period is appropriate in order to accommodate transfer-related
1457 business processes associated with different registrar models.

1458 The working group extensively discussed whether the Registry or Registrar should
1459 enforce the 14-day TTL and requested community input on this question through
1460 public comment on the Phase 1A Initial Report. The working group recommends
1461 enforcement by the Registry for the following reasons:

- 1462 • For accuracy: If the sponsoring Registrar is required to expire the TAC by
1463 updating it to null, there is a possibility that at the time when the TAC is
1464 set to expire, either the Registrar or Registry systems have an outage (or
1465 there is a communication interruption). This means that the TAC
1466 expiration would be delayed until the transaction could be completed,
1467 opening a window for possible usage of a TAC that the sponsoring
1468 Registrar had deemed expired.
- 1469 • For consistency: Having a centralized approach at the Registry allows
1470 prospective Gaining Registrars to know that every TAC will be expired at
1471 14 days / 336 hours regardless of the sponsoring/provisioning Registrar.
- 1472 • For security: Every TAC in a Registry has a maximum lifetime that is
1473 enforced consistently. This prevents the existence of any long-lived TAC,
1474 which could be used as part of an unauthorized or unintended inter-
1475 Registrar transfer.

1476 With respect to 13.2, the working group acknowledged that there may be a variety
1477 of circumstances in which the Registrar of Record and the Registered Name Holder
1478 may want to mutually agree to reset the TAC to NULL prior to the end of the 14th
1479 calendar day. The working group included this language to ensure that Registrars
1480 are permitted to do so under relevant circumstances.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

Deleted: The working group noted that the standard Time to Live (TTL), as referenced in Preliminary Recommendation 13.1 is the period of time that the TAC is valid once the TAC has been created. The purpose of the standard TTL is to enforce security around unused TACs (e.g., requested/received but not used), in a situation where the TAC may be stored in a registrant's email or other communications storage. The working group agreed to a maximum standard TTL of 14 days.¶

¶ In discussing this Charter Question, the working group initially discussed the benefits of placing the Registry in the role of enforcing the standard TTL. The working group noted that Registry authority would be more secure and streamlined due to the lesser number of Registry Operators as compared to ICANN-accredited Registrars. ¶

¶ Registry Operators, however, have expressed two concerns in taking on this role: 1) Registries do not have a customer relationship with registrants, and, accordingly, cautioned that having Registries preemptively invalidate a TAC directly impacts registrants; 2) this gives Registries a compliance responsibility over Registrars since they would be required to respond to authorities and potentially registrants investigating any concerns with the efficacy or expiry of a TAC. ¶

¶ Question to the community: Who is best positioned to manage the standard 14-day TTL – the Registry or the Registrar, and why? Are there specific implications if the TTL is managed by the Losing Registrar?¶

1486 3.2.5 Charter Question b5

1487 ²⁰ Ibid.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1522 *Should the ability for registrants to request AuthInfo Codes in bulk be streamlined and*
1523 *codified? If so, should additional security measures be considered?*

1524
1525 **Working Group Response:**
1526

1527 As a general rule, the working group believes that one randomly generated TAC should
1528 be provided per domain name, because this is a good security practice (see Preliminary
1529 Recommendation 7). The Working Group recognizes that for cases where multiple
1530 domains are being transferred, it would be more convenient to have a streamlined
1531 approach for requesting and using TACs. Some working group members suggested a
1532 carveout to the standard TAC requirements that would allow use of the same TAC for
1533 multiple domains if specific additional requirements were met to ensure security of the
1534 transaction. The working group did not agree on specific conditions under which this
1535 should be possible. Therefore, the working group is not making any recommendations
1536 with respect to exceptions for multi-domain transfers.
1537

Deleted: At the time of publication of the Initial Report,

Deleted: t

1538 3.2.6 Charter Question b6

1539
1540 *Does the CPH TechOps research provide a logical starting point for future policy work on*
1541 *AuthInfo Codes, or should other options be considered?*

1542
1543 **Working Group Response:**
1544

1545 The working group carefully reviewed the TechOps proposal²¹ and considered input
1546 from those involved in development of the proposal. The working group appreciated the
1547 expertise and relevant experience of those who developed the proposal and therefore
1548 considered it a logical starting point for discussion. The working group agreed, however,
1549 that it is important to consider (i) the range of views and interests that may not have
1550 been represented in the development of the proposal, and (ii) any new information or
1551 interests that have come to light since the development of the proposal. Therefore, in
1552 developing its preliminary recommendations, the working group deliberated on each of
1553 the charter questions, taking into account both the relevant elements of the TechOps
1554 paper as well as all other available information and inputs, including proposals
1555 submitted during the Public Comment period on the Phase 1(a) Initial Report.
1556

1557 3.2.7 Charter Question b7

1558
1559 *Should required differentiated control panel access also be considered, i.e., the*
1560 *registered name holder is given greater access (including access to the auth code), and*

²¹ Available in Annex B of the TPR [Final Issue Report](#).

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1563 *additional users, such as web developers would be given lower grade access in order to*
1564 *prevent domain name hijacking?*

1565
1566 **Working Group Response:**

1567
1568 The working group does not believe that there should be any new policy requirements
1569 in this regard.
1570

1571 3.3 EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Report

1572
1573 For context on this topic and the associated charter questions, please see pages 52-56
1574 of the [Final Issue Report](#).
1575

1576 3.3.1 Charter Question c1

1577
1578 *How should the identified issues be addressed?*

1579
1580 **Working Group Response:**

1581
1582 The working group reviewed the Transfer Policy-related issues from Section 3.11 of the
1583 Wave 1 Report and noted seven (7) of the ten (10) "key issues" were relevant to the
1584 current phase (Phase 1(a)) of its work.²² The working group reviewed and discussed
1585 these seven issues and has provided a response to each issue. The detailed responses
1586 can be found in Annex D of this report.

1587
1588 **Preliminary Recommendations:**

1589
1590 **Preliminary Recommendation 14:** The working group recommends the following
1591 specific terminology updates to the Transfer Policy:

- 1592 (i) The term "Whois data" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".
- 1593 (ii) The term "Whois details" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".
- 1594 (iii) The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".
- 1595 (iv) The term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".

Deleted:

²² Key Issues 4, 6, and 7 related to Change of Registrant, and, accordingly, the working group agreed to discuss these issues during Phase 1(b) of its work.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1597 For the avoidance of doubt, the terms referenced in above in Recommendation 14 (i) -
1598 (iv) are intended to correspond to the definitions in the [Registry Agreement \("RA"\) and](#)
1599 [the Registrar Accreditation Agreement \("RAA"\)](#), [as appropriate](#). In the event of any
1600 inconsistency, the [RA/RAA](#) definitions, if updated, will supersede. The working group
1601 also recommends that the outdated terms should be replaced with the updated terms,
1602 e.g., all references to "Whois Data" should be replaced with the term "Registration
1603 Data," etc.

1604
1605 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 14:** This recommendation is
1606 consistent with the EPDP Team's Phase 1 Recommendation 24. [The working group](#)
1607 [additionally notes that for purposes of the Transfer Policy, Registration Data](#)
1608 [means the contact data collected by a Registrar from a legal or natural person in](#)
1609 [conjunction with the registration of a domain name. It is not meant to include](#)
1610 [additional customer data such as credit card details and email correspondence.](#)
1611

1612 **Preliminary Recommendation 15:** The working group recommends removing any
1613 reference to an "Administrative Contact" or "Transfer Contact" in the Transfer Policy
1614 and replacing it with "Registered Name Holder" unless specifically indicated.

1615
1616 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 15:** Under the [upcoming](#) Registration
1617 Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer [required to be](#) collected by
1618 the Registrar, [and therefore cannot be relied upon for Transfer Policy](#)
1619 [requirements](#). Accordingly, the Registered Name Holder would be the only
1620 authorized transfer contact.
1621

1622 3.3.2 Charter Question c2

1623
1624 *Can the FOA-related Transfer Policy issues (identified in paragraphs 5 and 9 of Wave 1*
1625 *Report), as well as the proposed updates to the Gaining and Losing FOAs, be discussed*
1626 *and reviewed during the review of FOAs?*

1627 **Working Group Response:**

1628
1629 As noted above, the working group reviewed the seven key issues from Section 3.11 of
1630 the Wave 1 Report that are directly related to [Phase 1\(a\) of its work](#), including the issues
1631 related to the Gaining and Losing FOAs. The working group [determined these specific](#)
1632 [issues are in scope for it to address during Phase 1\(a\)](#) and discussed and reviewed these
1633 issues during its plenary meetings. For the detailed responses on the key issues, please
1634 refer to Annex D of this report.
1635

1636
1637 The working group noted many key issues alluded to terminology inconsistencies, which
1638 are the direct result of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations. For example, EPDP Phase 1,
1639 Recommendation #5 provides an updated list of data elements to be collected by

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1640 Registrars. Notably, the administrative contact field, which was a required data field
1641 under the 2013 RAA, is no longer a required data element for Registrar collection and
1642 subsequent processing. Because the administrative contact field is referenced many
1643 times within the Transfer Policy, the working group noted those references should be
1644 removed.²³ Similarly, the working group observed that the multiple references to
1645 “Whois” need to be updated.
1646

1647 3.4 Denying (NACKing) Transfers

1648
1649 For context on this topic and the associated charter questions, please see pages 43-48
1650 of the [Final Issue Report](#).
1651

Deleted: ¶
The topic of denying (NACKing) transfers was originally planned for Phase 2 of the PDP. It was later moved to Phase 1(a) by a [Project Change Request](#) to ensure that the working group could examine all elements of the security model for domain name transfers in a holistic manner as part of its Phase 1 deliberations.¶

1652 3.4.1 Charter Question h1

1653
1654 *Are the current reasons for denying or NACKing a transfer sufficiently clear? Should*
1655 *additional reasons be considered? For instance, ICANN Contractual Compliance has*
1656 *observed difficulties from Registrars tying transfer denials involving domain names*
1657 *suspended for abusive activities to the denial instances contemplated by the Transfer*
1658 *Policy; or should any reasons be removed?*
1659

1660 Working Group Response:

1661
1662 The working group conducted a thorough review of the reasons for denying or NACKing
1663 a transfer and has provided a series of preliminary recommendations detailed below.
1664 Please see the rationale for each proposed change for additional information about why
1665 these updates are being recommended.
1666

1667 While discussing sections I.A.3.7 through I.A.3.9 of the Transfer Policy, the working
1668 group spent a significant amount of time considering I.A.3.7.5 and I.A.3.7.6 and the fact
1669 that in some cases, a domain is locked against inter-Registrar transfer for 60 days
1670 following the registration of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to a
1671 new Registrar. Requirements regarding post-registration and post-transfer locks appear
1672 in some Registry Agreements and are reflected in corresponding Registry-Registrar
1673 Agreements. This practice is neither required nor prohibited in the Transfer Policy and is
1674 applied inconsistently across the industry.
1675

1676 The working group considered that this inconsistent practice may cause confusion
1677 among registrants and may lead to poor registrant experience. The working group

²³ Additional context from the working group’s discussion can be found in Annex D of this report.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1685 supported establishing a standard set of requirements that apply across the industry.
1686 While some members also supported opportunities for opt-outs or flexibility in the
1687 requirements (for example a minimum lock period with an option to implement a longer
1688 lock period), the working group ultimately agreed that consistency needs to be
1689 maintained.

1690
1691 In the course of deliberations, the working group discussed three possible time periods
1692 for post-registration and post-transfer locks:²⁴ 10 days, 30 days, and 60 days. Working
1693 group members supported maintaining consistency between the period that a transfer
1694 is prohibited following registration and following inter-Registrar transfer. Some working
1695 group members have advocated for establishing a “fast undo” process along the lines of
1696 the Expedited Transfer Reverse Process (ETRP) considered in Inter-Registrar Transfer
1697 Policy (IRTP) Part B Policy Development Process. The IRTP Part B Working Group
1698 ultimately did not adopt the ETRP proposal. “Fast undo” discussions will continue in
1699 Phase 2 of the Transfer Policy Review PDP, and the working group has not yet
1700 considered this topic in depth. At this stage, some working group members noted that if
1701 a “fast undo” process is ultimately adopted, the period for which a domain is eligible for
1702 “fast undo” following an inter-Registrar transfer should likely correspond to the lock
1703 periods, and should be sufficiently long to identify the need to invoke the “fast undo”
1704 process.

1705 1706 **Preliminary Recommendations:**

1707
1708 **Preliminary Recommendation 16:** The Registrar MUST restrict the RNH from
1709 transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 calendar days /720 hours of
1710 the initial registration date.²⁵ To the extent that a Registry and/or Registrar has an
1711 existing policy and/or practice of restricting the RNH from transferring a domain name
1712 to a new Registrar for a different period of time following initial registration, all policies
1713 and practices MUST be updated to be consistent with this new requirement.²⁶

1714
1715
1716 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 16:** The working group believes that a
1717 single requirement across the industry will result in a better experience for

²⁴ Use of the term “lock” is not intended to imply or require a specific technical solution for implementation. Rather, it is used as shorthand meaning that the domain is ineligible for inter-Registrar transfer for a period of time.

²⁵ [The initial registration date referenced in this recommendation corresponds to the Creation Date in the RDDS.](#)

²⁶ [For the avoidance of doubt, this includes, but is not limited to, a 60-day post-creation lock currently specified in some Registry-Registrar Agreements \(RRAs\). Preliminary Recommendation 16 seeks to standardize the inter-Registrar transfer restriction period to 30 days across all gTLDs. Accordingly, an RRA or registration agreement that specifies a period other than 30 days would need to be amended pursuant to this recommendation, as a 60-day post-creation lock \(or period other than 30 days\) would no longer be permitted under the Transfer Policy.](#)

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1718 registrants. The working group recommends that 30 days is the appropriate period
1719 for this requirement because:

- 1720 • It provides a window of opportunity to identify issues associated with
1721 credit card payments, including unauthorized use of a credit card. This may
1722 assist with addressing criminal activity and deterring fraud.
- 1723 • It provides a window of opportunity for a complainant to file a Uniform
1724 Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) proceeding without the
1725 domain being transferred to a new registrar. Once the proceeding is
1726 underway, the domain will be locked in relation to the dispute.
- 1727 • For registrants who legitimately want to transfer a domain shortly after
1728 registration, the working group believes that 30 days is a reasonable period
1729 of time to wait.

1731 **Preliminary Recommendation 17:** The Registrar MUST restrict the RNH from
1732 transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 calendar days / 720 hours of
1733 the completion of an inter-Registrar transfer. To the extent that a Registry and/or
1734 Registrar has an existing policy and/or practice of restricting the RNH from transferring a
1735 domain name to a new Registrar for a different period of time following an inter-
1736 Registrar transfer, all policies and practices MUST be updated to be consistent with this
1737 new requirement.²⁷

Commented [EB3]: The WG will return to the small group proposal to revise recommendations 17 with an established relationship exception. The proposal is available here:
<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/222268449/DraftRevisionstoPreliminaryRecommendation16and17v2-0001.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1674227532000&api=v2>

1738
1739
1740 **Rationale for Preliminary Recommendation 17:** The working group believes that a
1741 single requirement across the industry will result in a better experience for
1742 registrants and will also consistently prevent the transfer of a domain multiple
1743 times in rapid succession, a practice associated with domain theft. The working
1744 group recommends that 30 days is the appropriate period for this requirement
1745 because:

- 1746 • It provides a window of opportunity to identify issues associated with
1747 credit card payments, including unauthorized use of a credit card. This may
1748 assist with addressing criminal activity and deterring fraud.
- 1749 • For registrants who legitimately want to transfer a domain again shortly
1750 after an inter-registrar transfer has taken place, 30 days is a reasonable
1751 period of time to wait.

1752
1753 **Preliminary Recommendation 18:** I.A.3.7 of the Transfer Policy currently reads, “Upon
1754 denying a transfer request for any of the following reasons, the Registrar of Record must
1755 provide the Registered Name Holder and the potential Gaining Registrar with the reason
1756 for denial. The Registrar of Record **MAY** deny a transfer request only in the following
1757 specific instances:” The working group recommends the following revision, in bold, to

²⁷ Idem.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1758 the first sentence: “Upon denying a transfer request for any of the following reasons,
 1759 the Registrar of Record must provide the Registered Name Holder and, upon request,
 1760 the potential Gaining Registrar with the reason for denial.” The working group further
 1761 recommends expressing the two sentences of this provision as two distinct provisions of
 1762 the policy.

1763
 1764 **Rationale for Recommendation 18:** The addition of the words “upon request” to
 1765 the first sentence is intended to clarify that while the Registrar of Record always
 1766 provides the reason for denial to the RNH, the Registrar of Record only provides
 1767 the reason for denial to the Gaining Registrar upon request. There is no
 1768 automated process to provide the reason for denial to the Gaining Registrar. This
 1769 is currently the case and is expected to continue to be the case in the future. The
 1770 two sentences of I.A.3.7 express two distinct concepts and therefore should be
 1771 separated into two different provisions.

1772
 1773 **Preliminary Recommendation 19:** The working group recommends revising the
 1774 following reasons that the Registrar of Record **MAY** deny a transfer request as follows:
 1775

| Reference | Current Text | Revision | Rationale |
|-----------|--------------------|---|--|
| I.A.3.7.1 | Evidence of fraud. | Evidence of (a) fraud or (b) the domain presents an active DNS Security Threat as defined here: https://www.icann.org/dns-security-threat. | ICANN’s Contractual Compliance Department has observed difficulties from Registrars tying transfer denials involving domain names suspended for abusive activities to the denial instances contemplated by the Transfer Policy. The working group considered several possible revisions to I.A.3.7.1, including those submitted through public comment on the Phase 1(a) Initial Report, to appropriately address the issue identified while ensuring that the text is clear and narrowly-tailored. <u>The working group wanted to avoid recommending broad language that might enable a registrar to either a) prevent a transfer arbitrarily or b) prevent an RNH from transferring a domain from a jurisdiction where certain content or activity is illegal or restricted to another jurisdiction where that same content or activity is considered legitimate speech.</u> The working group’s <u>proposed revision</u> seeks to strike this balance. <u>The WG intentionally points to an ICANN-maintained webpage in the text to allow for changes in the specific threats</u> |

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: violation of the Registrar’s domain use or anti-abuse policies.

Deleted: A

Deleted: with the goal of ensuring that the text is clear and narrowly-tailored while

Deleted: addition of “violation of the Registrar’s domain use or anti-abuse policies”

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| | | | that may be considered a DNS Security Threat in the ICANN context. |
| I.A.3.7.2 | Reasonable dispute over the identity of the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact. | Reasonable dispute over the identity of concern that the transfer was not requested by the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact. | <p>The working group believes that the term “identity” is not appropriate in this context, in part due to concerns regarding data privacy implications. Because the issue at hand is more precisely about authority over the domain, the working group refined the text to focus on the key underlying concern, namely that the transfer request was made by a party other than the Registered Name Holder.</p> <p>Under the Registration Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the Registrar, therefore this term has been removed. This update is consistent with Preliminary Recommendation 15.</p> <p>The Working Group considered adding language to address other types of invalid requests or disputes by other parties. The Working Group determined that the use cases they discussed are appropriately covered by the revised language in I.A.3.7.2.</p> |
| I.A.3.7.3 | No payment for previous registration period (including credit card charge-backs) if the domain name is past its expiration date or for previous or current registration periods if the domain name has not yet expired. In all such cases, however, the domain name must be put into "Registrar Hold" status by the Registrar of Record prior to the denial of transfer. | Nonpayment for previous registration period (including payment disputes or credit card charge-backs) if the domain name is past its expiration date at the current Registrar of Record or for previous or current registration periods if the domain name has not yet expired. In all such cases, however, the domain name must be put into "Registrar Hold" status by the Registrar of Record prior to the denial of transfer. | <p>The working group has added the term “payment disputes” to reflect problems related to payments other than a credit card charge-back.</p> <p>The working group received input from ICANN’s Contractual Compliance Department that the term “expiration date” in this provision is not sufficiently precise, because during the Auto-Renew Grace Period, the domain will not show as expired at the Registry level, but will show as expired at the Registrar of Record. By adding “at the current Registrar of Record” the working group has clarified that if the domain name is past its expiration date at the current Registrar of Record and the RNH has not paid for the registration period prior to that</p> |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>expiration date, the Registrar of Record may deny the transfer.</p> <p>The working group notes that the sentence beginning “In all such cases. . .” dates back as early as the 2002 ICANN DNSO Transfers Task Force Final Report & Recommendations. The working group believes that the Expired Registration Recovery Policy now provides the necessary guidance on treatment of domains post-expiration and that this sentence is unnecessary in the Transfer Policy text.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789

Preliminary Recommendation 20: The working group recommends changing the following reasons that the Registrar of Record currently **MAY** deny a transfer into reasons that the Registrar of Record **MUST** deny a transfer and revising the text as follows:

| Reference | Current Text | Revision | Rationale |
|-----------|---|--|---|
| I.A.3.7.4 | Express objection to the transfer by the authorized Transfer Contact. Objection could take the form of specific request (either by paper or electronic means) by the authorized Transfer Contact to deny a particular transfer request, or a general objection to all transfer requests received by the Registrar, either temporarily or indefinitely. In all cases, the objection must be provided with the express and informed consent of the authorized Transfer Contact on an opt-in basis and upon request by the authorized Transfer | Express objection to the transfer by the authorized Transfer Contact Registered Name Holder . Objection could take the form of specific request (either by paper or electronic means) by the authorized Transfer Contact Registered Name Holder to deny a particular transfer request, or a general objection to all transfer requests received by the Registrar, either temporarily or indefinitely. In all cases, the objection must be provided with the express and informed consent of the authorized Transfer Contact Registered Name Holder on an opt-in basis and upon | Under the Registration Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the Registrar. Accordingly, the RNH would be the only authorized transfer contact. The working group believes that it is logical that the Registrar of Record must deny a transfer if the Registered Name Holder expressly objects to the transfer. This update is consistent with Preliminary Recommendation 15. |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| | Contact, the Registrar must remove the lock or provide a reasonably accessible method for the authorized Transfer Contact to remove the lock within five (5) calendar days. | request by the authorized Transfer Contact Registered Name Holder , the Registrar must remove the lock or provide a reasonably accessible method for the authorized Transfer Contact Registered Name Holder to remove the lock within five (5) calendar days. | |
| I.A.3.7.5 | The transfer was requested within 60 days of the creation date as shown in the registry Whois record for the domain name. | The transfer was requested within 60 30 days of the creation date as shown in the registry Whois RDDS record for the domain name. | Per working group Preliminary Recommendation 16, the Registrar MUST restrict the RNH from transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 days of the initial registration date. "Whois" has been updated to "RDDS" consistent with Preliminary Recommendation 14. |
| I.A.3.7.6 | A domain name is within 60 days (or a lesser period to be determined) after being transferred (apart from being transferred back to the original Registrar in cases where both Registrars so agree and/or where a decision in the dispute resolution process so directs). "Transferred" shall only mean that an inter-registrar transfer has occurred in accordance with the procedures of this policy. | A domain name is within 60 30 days (or a lesser period to be determined) after being transferred (apart from being transferred back to the original Registrar in cases where both Registrars so agree and/or where a decision in the dispute resolution process so directs). "Transferred" shall only mean that an inter-registrar transfer has occurred in accordance with the procedures of this policy. | Per working group Preliminary Recommendation 17, the Registrar MUST restrict the RNH from transferring a domain name to a new Registrar within 30 days of the completion of an inter-Registrar transfer. |

1790
1791
1792
1793

Preliminary Recommendation 21: The working group recommends revising the reasons that the Registrar of Record **MUST** deny a transfer request as follows:

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| Reference | Current Text | Revision | Rationale |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| I.A.3.8.1 | A pending UDRP proceeding that the Registrar has been informed of. | A Pending UDRP proceeding that the Registrar has been informed notified of by the Provider in accordance with the UDRP Rules. | The working group has refined the current text in an effort to clarify that Registrars must deny inter-Registrar transfer requests that are received after a Registrar has been notified by a UDRP Provider of a UDRP proceeding in accordance with the UDRP Rules. |
| I.A.3.8.2 | Court order by a court of competent jurisdiction. | N/A | The working group believes that this provision continues to be appropriate and that the language is sufficiently clear. |
| I.A.3.8.3 | Pending dispute related to a previous transfer, pursuant to the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. | Pending dispute related to a previous transfer, pursuant to under the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. | This revision is editorial in nature. It is not intended to change the meaning of the provision. |
| I.A.3.8.4 | URS proceeding or URS suspension that the Registrar has been informed of. | Pending URS proceeding or URS suspension that the Registrar has been informed notified of by the Provider in accordance with the URS Procedure. | The term “pending” has been added for consistency with language in I.A.3.8.1 and I.A.3.8.3. In addition, the working group has refined the current text in an effort to clarify that Registrars must deny inter-Registrar transfer requests that are received after a Registrar has been notified by a URS Provider of a URS proceeding or URS suspension in accordance with the URS Procedure. |
| I.A.3.8.5 | The Registrar imposed a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock following a Change of Registrant, and the Registered Name Holder did not opt out of the 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock prior to the Change of Registrant request. | N/A | The Working Group is not proposing any revisions at this time. Per the working group charter, Change of Registrant will be addressed in Phase 1(b) of the PDP. The working group will revisit I.A.3.8.5 once it has completed deliberations on Change of Registrant. |

1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799

Preliminary Recommendation 22: The working group recommends changing the following reasons that the Registrar of Record currently **MAY NOT** deny a transfer into reasons that the Registrar of Record **MUST NOT** deny a transfer and revising the text as follows:

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| Reference | Current Text | Revision | Rationale |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| I.A.3.9.1 | Nonpayment for a pending or future registration period. | Implementation Guidance Regarding the Auto-Renew Grace Period : Registrars are prohibited from denying domain name transfer requests based on non-payment of fees for pending or future registration periods during the Auto-Renew Grace Period, provided that any auto-renewal costs borne by the Registrar are reversible for future period. | The Working Group has provided Implementation Guidance in response to input from ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department that it would be helpful to provide additional guidance consistent with the Registrar Advisory dated 3 April 2008 which states, "Pursuant to the Transfer Policy, registrars are prohibited from denying domain name transfer requests based on non-payment of fees for pending or future registration periods during the Auto-Renew Grace Period." |
| I.A.3.9.2 | No response from the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact. | No response from the Registered Name Holder. or Administrative Contact | Under the Registration Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar. Accordingly, the RNH would be the only authorized transfer contact. This update is consistent with Preliminary Recommendation 15. |
| I.A.3.9.3 | Domain name in Registrar Lock Status, unless the Registered Name Holder is provided with the reasonable opportunity and ability to unlock the domain name prior to the Transfer Request. | A registrar-applied inter-registrar transfer lock is in place on the domain name in Registrar Lock Status , for reasons other than those specified in I.A.3.7 and I.A.3.8 unless and the Registered Name Holder is not provided with the reasonable opportunity and ability to unlock the domain name prior to the Transfer Request pursuant to the requirements in sections I.A.5.1 - I.A.5.4. | The updates are primarily intended to improve clarity of the provision, use terminology that will be commonly understood, and refer to the relevant provisions that should be referenced alongside I.A.3.9.3. |
| I.A.3.9.4 | Domain name registration period time constraints, other than during the first 60 days of initial registration, during the first 60 days after a registrar | Domain name registration period time constraints, other than as defined in I.A.3.7.5 | The working group updated the language to reference the applicable provisions of the policy rather than repeating the details of those provisions. Change of Registrant will be addressed in Phase 1(b) of the PDP. Reference to the "60-day lock following a Change of |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| | transfer, or during the 60-day lock following a Change of Registrant pursuant to Section II.C.2. | and I.A.3.7.6 ²⁸ during the first 60 days of initial registration, during the first 60 days after a registrar transfer, or during the 60-day lock following a Change of Registrant pursuant to Section II.C.2. | Registrant pursuant to Section II.C.2” may need to be revisited following completion of Phase 1(b). |
| I.A.3.9.5 | General payment defaults between Registrar and business partners / affiliates in cases where the Registered Name Holder for the domain in question has paid for the registration. | General payment defaults between Registrar and Reseller, as defined in the RAA, business partners / affiliates in cases where the Registered Name Holder for the domain in question has paid for the registration. | The update is not intended to change the meaning of the provision, but rather to update legacy language to be consistent with currently used and defined terminology. |

1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821

Additional Topics Discussed

Transfer Fees

In the course of discussing the topic of Denying (NACKing) Transfers, the working group considered whether it is appropriate to make a recommendation with respect to transfer fees, a topic that NCSG representatives raised in working group deliberations, and also a subject that was raised in public comments on the Phase 1(a) Initial Report. The working group noted that some Registrars charge the RNH a fee for transferring a domain away to another Registrar. The Transfer Policy does not prohibit such fees.

From one perspective, transfer fees can be burdensome, particularly for non-commercial applicants, and should be prohibited or limited. From another perspective, there are scenarios where such fees correspond to value-added services from the Registrar, and therefore the fees are appropriate. Further from this perspective, regulating fees charged by Registrars is typically outside the scope of GNSO policy development.

The working group recalled that the Transfer Policy does not contain any provisions allowing the Registrar to deny a transfer for non-payment of transfer fees, and therefore in practice, these fees are not a barrier to transfer. The working group also

²⁸ In implementation, to the extent that there is re-numbering of applicable provisions, this reference should be updated accordingly.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1822 noted that in Preliminary Recommendations 19 and 22, the working group has
1823 recommended clarifications to language specifying when a Registrar may and must not
1824 deny a transfer in relation to non-payment of registration fees.

1825
1826 Ultimately, the working group did not come to agreement to make recommendations
1827 on this topic, noting that it is important for Registrants to carefully review the
1828 registration agreement, which discloses any fees associated with transferring the
1829 domain to a new Registrar.

1830 Sanctions

1831
1832
1833 In working group deliberations and in public comment, the NCSG raised concerns that
1834 ordinary non-commercial registrants who are based in sanctioned countries or serving
1835 customers in sanctioned countries are sometimes prevented from transferring domains
1836 to a new Registrar, even in cases where the Registrar is not legally obligated to prevent
1837 the transfer under applicable law. In other cases, the RNH is given an insufficient notice
1838 period to find a new Registrar before the registration agreement is terminated. The
1839 NCSG requested that the working group consider whether these issues are in scope of
1840 the PDP.

1841
1842 The working group discussed the fact that Registrars are obligated to comply with
1843 national law and that it is up to each Registrar to determine how to do so. The working
1844 group considered that the issue of sanctions impacts many elements of the domain
1845 name lifecycle, including domain creation, renewal, suspension, and termination. To
1846 address this topic in isolation in the context of transfers could result in a fragmented
1847 approach to the issues presented. To the extent that the concerns are addressed
1848 through policy development, the working group believes that they should be addressed
1849 holistically.

1850
1851 The working group further noted that WS2 implementation is ongoing, which includes
1852 work related to specific concerns around sanctions. In particular, WS2 recommendation
1853 4.1.3 recommends that ICANN clarify to Registrars “that the mere existence of their RAA
1854 with ICANN does not cause them to be required to comply with OFAC sanctions. ICANN
1855 should also explore various tools to remind registrars to understand the applicable laws
1856 under which they operate and to accurately reflect those laws in their customer
1857 relationships.”²⁹ The working group understands that the implementation of this
1858 recommendation may reduce the risk of Registrar over-compliance.

1860 3.4.2 Charter Question h2

1861

²⁹ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ccwg-acct-ws2-final-24jun18-en.pdf>

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1862 *Should additional guidance around cases subject to a UDRP decision be provided to*
1863 *ensure consistent treatment by all Registrars? If so, is this something that should be*
1864 *considered by the RPMs PDP Working Group’s review of the UDRP, or should it be*
1865 *conducted within a Transfer Policy PDP?*
1866

1867 **Working Group Response:**

1868
1869 The working group reviewed the World Intellectual Property Organization’s (WIPO)
1870 [detailed comment](#) in response to the [Transfer Policy Status Report](#) and has noted two
1871 concerns involving a UDRP proceeding vis-à-vis the Transfer Policy. Specifically, WIPO
1872 has noted issues related to: (i) the locking of a domain name subject to a UDRP
1873 proceeding (in order to prevent an inter-Registrar transfer during the pendency of the
1874 proceeding),³⁰ and (ii) the implementation of a UDRP Panel’s order to transfer a domain
1875 name to a complainant.³¹
1876

1877 **Domain Name Locking**

1878
1879 UDRP Rule 4(b) provides, in part, “Within two (2) business days of receiving the
1880 Provider’s verification request, the Registrar shall [. . .] confirm that a Lock³² of the
1881 domain name has been applied. [. . .] The Lock shall remain in place through the
1882 remaining Pendency of the UDRP proceeding. [. . .].” Additionally, Paragraph I.A.3.8.1
1883 of the Transfer Policy requires registrars to deny any requests for inter-registrar
1884 transfers during “a pending UDRP proceeding that the Registrar has been informed of.”
1885

1886 Within its preliminary recommendations, the working group has proposed to update the
1887 current Transfer Policy language to:

1888
1889 “The Registrar of Record MUST deny a transfer request in the following circumstances:
1890 • Pending UDRP proceeding that the Registrar has been notified of by the Provider
1891 in accordance with the UDRP Rules.”
1892

1893 The working group is proposing a slight refinement to the current text in an effort to
1894 clarify that Registrars must deny inter-Registrar transfer requests that are received after
1895 a Registrar has been notified by a UDRP Provider of a UDRP Proceeding in accordance
1896 with the UDRP Rules.
1897

³⁰ For specific policy requirements, please see [UDRP Rule 1](#) (definitions of Lock and Pendency, respectively), [UDRP Rule 4\(b\)](#), and Paragraph I.A.3.8.1 of the [Transfer Policy](#).

³¹ For specific policy requirements, please see [UDRP Section 4\(i\)](#), [4\(k\)](#), [UDRP Rule 16\(a\)](#).

³² [UDRP Rule 1](#) defines Lock as “a set of measures that a Registrar applies to a domain name, which prevents at a minimum any modification to the registrant and Registrar information by the Respondent, but does not affect the resolution of the domain name or the renewal of the domain name.”

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1898 In response to WIPO’s related concern that “the ambiguity associated with ‘locking’ a
1899 domain name has resulted in many improper domain name transfers,” the working
1900 group notes that the definition of Locking is part of the UDRP Rules, and, accordingly,
1901 appears out of scope for this working group to address. The working group does note,
1902 though, that the proposed updates to the Transfer Policy endeavor to make clear that
1903 Registrars are forbidden from implementing inter-Registrar transfer requests received
1904 following a notification from a UDRP Provider of a pending UDRP proceeding.
1905

1906 In the event a Registrar mistakenly or purposefully effects an inter-Registrar transfer
1907 during the pendency of a UDRP proceeding, this would be a clear violation of the
1908 Transfer Policy and should be referred to ICANN org Contractual Compliance for review.
1909 The working group will flag the definitional issue of “locking” with the Rights Protection
1910 Mechanisms (RPMs) Phase 2 Working Group, who will be closely reviewing the UDRP,
1911 and will be in a better position to determine if updates are needed.
1912

1913 Implementation of UDRP Panel Decisions

1914
1915 The working group also discussed WIPO’s noted concern regarding the reported refusal
1916 of some Registrars to effect a UDRP Panel’s decision to transfer a disputed domain
1917 name(s) to the Complainant.
1918

1919 Paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP provides that a UDRP Complainant may request the
1920 following remedies in its UDRP Complaint, “the cancellation of [a disputed] domain
1921 name or the *transfer* of [a disputed] domain name registration to the complainant.”
1922 (emphasis added). Paragraph 4(k) goes on to provide, in part, “if an Administrative Panel
1923 decides that [the disputed] domain name registration should be canceled or transferred,
1924 [the Registrar of Record] will wait ten (10) business days [. . .] before *implementing* that
1925 decision [to cancel or transfer the disputed domain name].” (emphasis added)
1926

1927 Registrar representatives within the working group noted various methods their
1928 companies use to implement UDRP decisions, including, for example, providing the
1929 AuthInfo Code to the Complainant to effect the inter-Registrar transfer, setting up an
1930 account for the Complainant and transferring the name to the new account, et. al. The
1931 working group discussed that so long as the Registrar of Record effects the Panel’s
1932 decision by allowing transfer of the domain name, the Registrar would be in compliance
1933 with the UDRP, and the working group was reluctant to recommend specific
1934 implementation restrictions.
1935

1936 The working group noted that a Registrar refusal to implement a UDRP Panel’s decision
1937 to cancel or transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, absent official
1938 documentation of a court proceeding,³³ would be a violation of the UDRP, and,

³³ See UDRP, Paragraph 4(k).

1939 accordingly, should be referred to ICANN org Contractual Compliance for review. The
1940 working group noted that it will refer this reported issue of UDRP decision
1941 implementation to the RPMs Phase 2 Working Group, as the working group believed the
1942 specific implementation around UDRP decisions to be out of scope for the Transfer
1943 Policy.
1944

1945 3.4.3 Additional Topic Recommended by SSAC

1946 *In its submission providing early input to the PDP, the SSAC recommended that the*
1947 *working group address the issue of ensuring DNSSEC operational continuity in the*
1948 *transfer of DNS service:*
1949

1950 *When a registrant bundles their DNS service with their registration, then it*
1951 *is essential that the transfer of DNS service be coordinated between the*
1952 *DNS service providers (who are most often the registrar when services are*
1953 *bundled) in order to ensure there is no discontinuity in DNS resolution (i.e.,*
1954 *the registrant does not lose the ability to use their domain name).*
1955

1956 *When the domain name is DNSSEC-signed in the bundled scenario, there is*
1957 *an additional risk of failure to validate if the transfer is not properly*
1958 *coordinated. Best practice security principles would ordinarily treat a*
1959 *security failure more harshly than a non-existent domain, the consequences*
1960 *of which will vary by application.*
1961

1962 *These risks are substantially reduced during a registration transfer if a*
1963 *registrant uses a third party DNS service provider, one who is independent*
1964 *of the registration service provider. It is important to note that these risks*
1965 *are not specific to registration transfers; they are present whenever there is*
1966 *a change in DNS service providers.*
1967

1968 *The SSAC recommends the Transfer Policy Review Team consider these*
1969 *concerns and seek the necessary enhancements to the current process that*
1970 *will ensure a secure, stable, and resilient transfer solution in the best*
1971 *interest of the registrant.*
1972

1973 *The working group noted that this topic was not included in the Final Issue Report or the*
1974 *working group charter. While the working group acknowledges that it is an important*
1975 *subject area for additional work, the working group agreed that it is outside the scope of*
1976 *this PDP and is better addressed in another forum.*
1977
1978

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1979

4 Next Steps

1981

1982 This Initial Report will be posted for public comment for 42 days. The working group will
1983 review the public comments received on this Initial Report and consider whether any
1984 changes need to be made to its Phase 1(a) recommendations. The working group will
1985 complete Phase 1(b) of its work, including a Phase 1(b) Initial Report followed by a
1986 public comment period on the Phase 1(b) Initial Report. The working group will finalize
1987 all Phase 1 recommendations in a Final Report to be sent to the GNSO Council for
1988 review. If adopted by the GNSO Council, the Final Report would then be forwarded to
1989 the ICANN Board of Directors for its consideration and, potentially, approval as an
1990 ICANN Consensus Policy.

1991

1992 Following a charter review process, Phase 2 of the PDP will commence.

1993

1994

1995

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

1996 Annex A - Background

1997

1998 The Transfer Policy, formerly referred to as the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP), is
1999 an ICANN consensus policy that went into effect on 12 November 2004. The policy
2000 governs the procedure and requirements for registrants to transfer their domain names
2001 from one Registrar to another, also referred to as an inter-Registrar transfer. The goal of
2002 the Transfer Policy was to provide for enhanced domain name portability, resulting in
2003 greater consumer and business choice and enabling registrants to select the Registrar
2004 that offers the best services and price for their needs.

2005

2006 On April 22, 2019, ICANN org delivered the [Transfer Policy Status Report](#) to the GNSO
2007 Council. ICANN org delivered the Transfer Policy Status Report pursuant to
2008 Recommendation 17 of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working
2009 Group's [Final Report](#), which provides, "[t]he Working Group recommends that
2010 contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant
2011 information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts." The Transfer
2012 Policy Status Report provided a foundation to review the history and underlying goals of
2013 Transfer Policy, the five policy development processes that sought to improve the
2014 Transfer Policy, and associated metrics on the Transfer Policy.

2015

2016 During its meeting on September 19, 2019, the GNSO Council agreed to launch a call for
2017 volunteers for a Transfer Policy Review Scoping Team, comprised of interested and
2018 knowledgeable GNSO members that were tasked with advising the GNSO Council by
2019 providing recommendations on the following:

2020

- approach to the review (for example, by initiating a new PDP);
- composition of the review team or PDP working group, and
- scope of the review and future policy work related to the Transfer Policy.

2021

2022

2023

2024 On April 6, 2020, the Transfer Policy Review Scoping Team delivered its [Transfer Policy](#)
2025 [Review Scoping Paper](#) to the GNSO Council for its consideration. The Scoping Team
2026 recommended that the GNSO Council instruct ICANN org policy support staff to draft an
2027 Issue Report, outlining, et.al., the issues described in its Scoping Report. On 23 June
2028 2020, the GNSO Council voted to approve a motion requesting a Preliminary Issue
2029 Report, for delivery as expeditiously as possible, on the issues identified in the Transfer
2030 Policy Initial Scoping Paper, to assist in determining whether a PDP or series of PDPs
2031 should be initiated regarding changes to the Transfer Policy.

2032

2033 The [Final Issue Report](#) addressed eight issues associated with the Transfer Policy, seven
2034 of which were specifically identified by the Transfer Policy Review Scoping Team:

2035

- a. Gaining & Losing Registrar Form of Authorization ("FOA")
- b. AuthInfo Code Management
- c. Change of Registrant

2038

Deleted: 15 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 26 January 2023 25 January 2023 19 January 2023 19 January 2023 18 January 2023 17 January 2023 16 January 2023 5 January 2023 21 December 2022

- 2039 d. Transfer Emergency Action Contact (“TEAC”)
- 2040 e. Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (“TDRP”)
- 2041 f. Reversing/NACKing Transfers
- 2042 g. ICANN-Approved Transfers
- 2043 h. EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Report
- 2044

2045 On 18 February 2021, The GNSO Council passed a [resolution](#) to initiate a two-phased
2046 PDP to review the Transfer Policy using the approach recommended in the Final Issue
2047 Report:

- 2048
- 2049 • Phase 1(a): Form of Authorization (including EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27,
2050 Wave 1 FOA issues) and AuthInfo Codes
- 2051 • Phase 1(b): Change of Registrant (including EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27,
2052 Wave 1 Change of Registrant issues)
- 2053 • Phase 2: Transfer Emergency Action Contact and reversing inter-Registrar
2054 transfers, Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (including EPDP Phase 1,
2055 Recommendation 27, Wave 1 TDRP issues), Denying (NACKing) transfers, ICANN-
2056 approved transfers
- 2057

2058 The topic of denying (NACKing) transfers was later moved to Phase 1(a) by [Project](#)
2059 [Change Request](#) to ensure that the working group could examine all elements of the
2060 security model for domain name transfers in a holistic manner as part of its Phase 1
2061 deliberations.

2062

2063 A small group of Councilors reviewed the draft charter included in the Final Issue Report
2064 and finalized the document. The charter was [approved](#) by Council on 24 March 2021.

2065

2066 The Phase 1(a) working group held its first meeting on 14 May 2021.

2067

Deleted: 15 February 2023
1 February 2023
26 January 2023
25 January 2023
19 January 2023
19 January 2023
18 January 2023
17 January 2023
16 January 2023
35 January 2023
21 January 2023
December 2022

2068 Annex B - Working Group Membership and 2069 Attendance

2070
2071 The Working Group held its first meeting in April 2021. Recordings and transcripts of the
2072 group's discussions can be found on its [wiki space](#). It has conducted its work primarily
2073 through weekly conference calls, in addition to email exchanges on its mailing list.

2074
2075 As instructed by the GNSO Council, the Working Group prepared a [work plan](#), which it
2076 reviewed on a regular basis. The Working Group Chair and the GNSO Council Liaison to
2077 the Working Group also provided regular reports to the GNSO Council regarding the
2078 status and progress of the group's work. Details of the project schedule, attendance and
2079 action items can be found in the monthly project packages.

2080
2081 The Working Group email archives can be found at
2082 <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gns0-tpr/>.

2083 2084 2085 **Plenary Meetings:**

- 2086 • 50 Plenary calls (w/ 4 cancelled) for 68.5 call hours for a total of 1506.0 person
2087 hours
- 2088 • 81.4% total participation rate

2089 2090 **Small Team Meetings:**

- 2091 • 8 Small team calls for 8.0 call hours for a total of 78.0 person hours
- 2092 • 100.0% total participation rate

2093 2094 **Leadership Meetings:**

- 2095 • 49 Leadership calls (w/6 cancelled) for 23.0 call hours for a total of 212.0 person
2096 hours

2097

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

2103 The Members of the Working Group are:

| Represented Group | SOI | Start Date | Depart Date | Attended % | Role |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | | | | 73.9% | |
| Nanghaka Daniel Khauka | SOI | 5/4/2021 | | 69.6% | |
| Steinar Grøtterød | SOI | 5/5/2021 | | 78.3% | |
| Commercial Business Users Constituency (BC) | | | | 91.3% | |
| Zak Muscovitch | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 91.3% | |
| GNSO Council | | | | 86.4% | |
| Gregory DiBiase | SOI | 6/4/2021 | | 71.4% | Liaison |
| Roger Carney | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 100.0% | Chair |
| Independent | | | | 23.9% | |
| Steve Crocker | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 23.9% | |
| Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) | | | | 32.6% | |
| Mike Rodenbaugh | SOI | 4/21/2021 | | 47.8% | |
| Salvador Camacho Hernandez | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 17.4% | |
| Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) | | | | 84.8% | |
| John Woodworth | SOI | 4/14/2021 | | 84.8% | |
| Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) | | | | 53.5% | |
| Farzaneh Badiei | SOI | 6/1/2021 | | 37.2% | |
| Wisdom Donkor | SOI | 6/1/2021 | | 69.8% | |
| Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) | | | | 88.7% | |
| Antonia Nan Chu | SOI | 5/6/2021 | | 97.8% | |
| Catherine Merdinger | SOI | 4/27/2021 | | 80.4% | |
| Crystal Ondo | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 76.1% | |
| Eric Rokobauer | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 95.6% | |
| Keiron Tobin | SOI | 6/7/2021 | | 90.5% | |
| Owen Smigelski | SOI | 4/27/2021 | | 87.0% | |
| Prudence Malinki | SOI | 4/27/2021 | | 97.8% | |
| Richard Merdinger | SOI | 5/5/2021 | 6/7/2021 | 100.0% | |
| Sarah Wyld | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 87.0% | |
| Theo Geurts | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 89.1% | |
| Thomas Keller | SOI | 4/26/2021 | 9/27/2021 | 56.3% | |
| Volker Greimann | SOI | 4/24/2021 | | 97.4% | |
| Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) | | | | 82.1% | |
| James Galvin | SOI | 4/27/2021 | | 80.4% | |
| Richard Wilhelm | SOI | 3/4/2022 | | 90.0% | |
| Totals: | | | | 75.8% | |

2104
2105
2106

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

2107 The Alternates of the Working Group are:

| Represented Group | SOI | Start Date | Depart Date | Attended % | Role |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------|
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | | | | 90.7% | |
| Lutz Donnerhacke | SOI | 5/8/2021 | | 89.7% | |
| Raymond Mamattah | SOI | 5/4/2021 | | 92.0% | |
| Commercial Business Users Constituency (BC) | | | | 100.0% | |
| Arinola Akinyemi | SOI | 8/12/2021 | | 100.0% | |
| Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) | | | | 71.4% | |
| Akinremi Peter Taiwo | SOI | 6/2/2021 | | 71.4% | |
| Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) | | | | 97.1% | |
| Andrew Reberry | | | | 0.0% | |
| Arnaud Wittersheim | SOI | 5/5/2021 | | 96.7% | |
| Essie Musailov | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 100.0% | |
| Jacques Blanc | SOI | 4/29/2021 | | 66.7% | |
| Jody Kolker | SOI | 5/7/2021 | | 100.0% | |
| Jothan Frakes | SOI | 4/23/2021 | | 100.0% | |
| Min Feng | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 50.0% | |
| Pam Little | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 50.0% | |
| Richard Brown | SOI | 4/26/2021 | | 100.0% | |
| Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) | | | | 97.0% | |
| Beth Bacon | SOI | 5/4/2021 | | 97.0% | |
| Totals: | | | | 95.8% | |

2108 There are a total of 33 Observers to the Working group.

2109
2110 ICANN org Policy Staff Support for the Working Group:

| Represented Group | SOI | Start Date | Depart Date | Attended % | Role |
|--|-----|------------|-------------|------------|------|
| Internet Corporation for Assigned Names & Numbers (ICANN) | | | | | |
| Berry Cobb | | | | | |
| Caitlin Tubergen | | | | | |
| Devan Reed | | | | | |
| Emily Barabas | | | | | |
| Holida Yanik | | | | | |
| Isabelle Colas | | | | | |
| Julie Bisland | | | | | |
| Julie Hedlund | | | | | |
| Michelle DeSmyter | | | | | |
| Nathalie Peregrine | | | | | |
| Terri Agnew | | | | | |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

2112 Annex C - Community Input

2113

2114 4.1 Request for Input

2115

2116 According to the GNSO's PDP Manual, a PDP working group should formally solicit
2117 statements from each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency at an early stage of its
2118 deliberations. A PDP working group is also encouraged to seek the opinion of other
2119 ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees who may have expertise,
2120 experience or an interest in the issue. As a result, the working group reached out to all
2121 ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well as GNSO Stakeholder
2122 Groups and Constituencies with a request for input at the start of its deliberations. In
2123 response, statements were received from:

2124

- 2125 ■ The GNSO Business Constituency (BC)
- 2126 ■ The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)
- 2127 ■ The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
- 2128 ■ The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2129

2130 The full statements can be found on the working group wiki here:

2131 <https://community.icann.org/x/tIT8CQ>.

2132

2133 4.2 Review of Input Received

2134

2135 All of the statements received were added to the to the relevant working documents
2136 and considered by the working group in the context of deliberations on each topic.

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

2137 **Annex D – EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 27, Wave 1 Analysis**

2138 For context on this analysis, please see pages 52-56 of the [Final Issue Report](#).
 2139
 2140

| Wave 1 Analysis Key Points | TPR Working Group Response |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Transfer Policy section I.A.1.1 provides that either the Registrant or the Administrative Contact can approve or deny a transfer request. (emphasis added) Under the Registration Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar. Accordingly, the registrant would be the only authorized transfer contact.</p> | <p>In its current set of preliminary recommendations, the TPR Working Group does not include the Administrative Contact as an entity that can approve an inter-Registrar transfer; instead, the preliminary recommendations only refer to the Registered Name Holder, or, in some instances, the “Registered Name Holder or their designated representative.”</p> <p>In light of the obsolescence of the Administrative Contact under the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations, any reference to an “Administrative Contact” or “Transfer Contact” within the Transfer Policy MUST be eliminated and replaced with “Registered Name Holder” unless specifically indicated, per Preliminary Recommendation 15. For example, Preliminary Recommendation 6, et. al., refers to the “Registered Name Holder or their designated representative”.</p> |
| <p>2. Transfer Policy section I.A 2.1, Gaining Registrar Requirements, relies on the specification of transfer authorities in section 1.1, defining either the Registrant and Administrative Contact as a “Transfer Contact.” Given that Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar, there may not be a need for “transfer contact” terminology, but such references can be replaced by “registrant” as the registrant is the only valid transfer authority. “Transfer Contact” terminology is referenced in part I (A) of the policy in sections 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.2.1, 2.1.3.1(b), 2.1.3.3, 2.2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7.4, and 4.1.</p> | <p>As noted above in Key Point 1, the preliminary recommendations currently refer to the “Registered Name Holder” instead of the “Transfer Contact”, noting that the Registered Name Holder is the now the valid transfer authority, rather than the “Transfer Contact” or “Administrative Contact”.</p> |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Transfer Policy section I.A.3 enumerates the reasons a registrar of record may deny a transfer. These include section 3.7.2, “reasonable dispute over the identity of the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact.” The Administrative Contact reference may be eliminated as the Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar. Section I.A.3 also enumerates the reasons a registrar of record may not use to deny a transfer request. These include section 3.9.2, “no response from the Registered Name Holder or Administrative Contact.” The Administrative Contact reference may be eliminated as the Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar.</p> | <p>The working group is recommending that the reference to Administrative Contact in Section I.A.3.7.2 must be removed due to the EPDP recommendation for elimination of the Administrative Contact. See also TPR Preliminary Recommendation 15.</p> |
| <p>4. <i>Transfer Policy section I.A.4.6.5 provides that both registrars will retain correspondence in written or electronic form of any Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) communication and responses, and share copies of this documentation with ICANN and the registry operator upon request. This requirement does not appear to be affected by the new Registration Data Policy, which provides for retention of data elements for a period of 18 months following the life of the registration.</i></p> | <p><i>Defer further discussion to Phase 2 of the PDP.</i></p> |
| <p>5. Transfer Policy section I.A.5.6 provides that the "AuthInfo" codes must be used solely to identify a Registered Name Holder, whereas the Forms of Authorization (FOAs) still need to be used for authorization or confirmation of a transfer request, as described in Sections I.A.2, I.A.3, and I.A.4 of the policy. Where registrant contact data is not published, and absent an available mechanism for the Gaining Registrar to obtain such contact data, it is not feasible for a Gaining Registrar to send an FOA to the registrant contact data associated with an existing registration, as required by the policy. However, the requirement for the Registrar of Record to send an FOA confirming a transfer request</p> | <p>In its preliminary recommendations, the working group is recommending eliminating the requirement that the Gaining Registrar send a Gaining Form of Authorization.</p> <p>For further rationale on the proposed elimination of the Gaining FOA, please see the working group’s response to charter question a1.</p> <p>With respect to the Losing FOA, the working group is recommending to <u>retain the Losing FOA requirements with minor modifications, although the working group is recommending that the term “Transfer Confirmation” is used in place of the term Losing FOA. For further information, please see Preliminary Recommendation 2.</u></p> |

Deleted: replace the requirement for the Losing FOA (see Preliminary Recommendation 2). Instead, the working group is recommending to introduce two new required notifications to be sent from the Losing Registrar to the Registered Name Holder, namely (i) a notification of provision of the Transfer Authorization Code (TAC), formerly referred to as the Auth-Info Code (see Preliminary Recommendation 3), and (ii) a notification of inter-Registrar transfer request completion (Preliminary Recommendation 4

Deleted: 15 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 26 January 2023 25 January 2023 19 January 2023 19 January 2023 18 January 2023 17 January 2023 16 January 2023 5 January 2023 21 December 2022

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(covered in section I.A.3) is still achievable as the registrar does not need to rely on publicly available data.</p> | |
| <p>6. <i>Transfer Policy section II.B.1, Availability of Change of Registrant, provides that "Registrants must be permitted to update their registration/Whois data and transfer their registration rights to other registrants freely." This language may be updated to clarify what updating registration data means, i.e., whether requirements differ according to whether a change of registrant changes anything that is displayed.</i></p> | <p>Defer discussion to Phase 1(b) of the PDP.</p> |
| <p>7. <i>Transfer Policy section II.B.1.1.4 references the Administrative Contact. The context of this provision is to define a change of registrant as a material change to certain fields, including "Administrative Contact email address, if there is no Prior Registrant email address." This section may no longer be necessary, as, under the new Registration Data Policy, Administrative Contact data is no longer collected by the registrar.</i></p> | <p>Defer discussion to Phase 1(b) of the PDP.</p> |
| <p>8. The Transfer Policy contains references to Whois in sections I.A.1.1, I.A.2.1.2, I.A.2.2.1, I.A.3.6, I.A.3.7.5, I.B.1, and the Notes section titled "Secure Mechanism." If updates are considered to this policy as a result of GNSO policy work, it may be beneficial to consider replacing these references with RDDS. (The Temporary Specification, Appendix G, Section 2.2.4, on Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy, provides that the term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS." This is carried over in the EPDP Phase 1 recommendation 24) Transfer Policy section II.C.1.4 provides that a registrar must obtain confirmation of a Change of Registrant request from the Prior Registrant, or the Designated Agent of such, using a secure mechanism to confirm that the Prior Registrant and/or their respective Designated Agents have explicitly consented to the Change of</p> | <p>For terminology consistency, the working group is recommending replacing current references to Whois to RDDS throughout the Transfer Policy for any references to Whois that remain. (Please see response to Key Item 9 below for more detail and Preliminary Recommendation 14.)</p> <p>Discussions related to Section II of the policy (Change of Registrant) will be deferred to Phase 1(b) of the PDP.</p> |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Registrant. The footnote to this section notes that “The registrar may use additional contact information on file when obtaining confirmation from the Prior Registrant and is not limited to the publicly accessible Whois.” If changes are considered to this policy as a result of GNSO policy work, it may be beneficial to consider updating this footnote to eliminate the reference to Whois.</p> | |
| <p>9. The EPDP Team’s Phase 1 Recommendation 24 recommends that the following requirements apply to the Transfer Policy until superseded by recommendations from the Transfer Policy review being undertaken by the GNSO Council:</p> <p>(a) Until such time when the RDAP service (or other secure methods for transferring data) is required by ICANN to be offered, if the Gaining Registrar is unable to gain access to then-current Registration Data for a domain name subject of a transfer, the related requirements in the Transfer Policy will be superseded by the below provisions:</p> <p>(a1) The Gaining Registrar is not REQUIRED to obtain a Form of Authorization from the Transfer Contact.</p> <p>(a2) The Registrant MUST independently re-enter Registration Data with the Gaining Registrar. In such instance, the Gaining Registrar is not REQUIRED to follow the Change of Registrant Process as provided in Section II.C. of the Transfer Policy.</p> <p>(b) As used in the Transfer Policy:</p> | <p>In its preliminary recommendations, the working group is recommending eliminating the requirement that the Gaining Registrar send a Gaining Form of Authorization (Preliminary Recommendation 1).</p> <p>In Preliminary Recommendation 14, the working group is recommending the terminology changes from EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation #24. Specifically:</p> <p>(b) As used in the Transfer Policy:</p> <p>(b1) The term "Whois data" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p>(b2) The term "Whois details" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p>(b3) The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> <p>(b4) The term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> |

Deleted: 15 February 20231 February 20231 February 20231 February 202326 January 202325 January 202319 January 202319 January 202318 January 202317 January 202316 January 20235 January 202321 December 2022

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(b1) The term "Whois data" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p>(b2) The term "Whois details" SHALL have the same meaning as "Registration Data".</p> <p>(b3) The term "Publicly accessible Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> <p>(b4) The term "Whois" SHALL have the same meaning as "RDDS".</p> <p>(c) Registrar and Registry Operator SHALL follow best practices in generating and updating the "AuthInfo" code to facilitate a secure transfer process.</p> <p>(d) 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> <p>These requirements are being implemented as part of implementing the Registration Data Policy.</p> | <p>With respect to (c) and (d), the working group has a list of very specific preliminary recommendations regarding generating and updating the TAC (formerly referred to as Auth-Info Code) that can be found in Section 3.2 of the Initial Report.</p> |
| <p>10. Feedback from some stakeholders in June 2019 during an ICANN65 session suggested an approach of starting from a clean slate rather than looking at specific transfer issues individually. This appears to be the path the GNSO is taking, based on discussions at the September Council meeting.</p> | <p>The working group has methodically worked through its charter questions, which has enabled it to review previously identified and longstanding issues in the Transfer Policy by proposing slight adjustments to specific transfer issues and/or proposing new methods.</p> |
| <p><i>Cross-reference: Transfer Policy section I.B.3.1 contains a footnote referencing the Expired Registration Recovery Policy. The context for this reference is a provision specifying when the Change of Registrant Procedure does not apply, in this case, when the registration agreement expires. The footnote provides that if registration and</i></p> | <p><u>Defer discussion to Phase 1(b) of the PDP.</u></p> |

Deleted: 15 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 1 February 2023 26 January 2023 25 January 2023 19 January 2023 19 January 2023 18 January 2023 17 January 2023 16 January 2023 15 January 2023 21 December 2022

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Whois details are changed following expiration of the domain name pursuant to the terms of the registration agreement, the protections of the Expired Registration Recovery Policy still apply.</i> | |
| <i>Cross-reference: Transfer Policy section I.B.3.5 references the Expired Domain Deletion Policy. The context for this reference is a provision specifying when the Change of Registrant Procedure does not apply, in this case, when the Registrar updates the Prior Registrant's information in accordance with the Expired Domain Deletion Policy.</i> | Defer discussion to Phase 1(b) of the PDP. |

2151

2152

Page 21: [1] Deleted Author

Page 21: [2] Deleted Author

Page 21: [3] Deleted Author