

---

ICANN74 | Prep Week – Initial Report of the GNSO Transfer Policy Review  
Thursday, June 2, 2022 – 16:00 to 17:00 AMS

JULIE BISLAND: Hello, and welcome to the initial report of the GNSO Transfer Policy Review Meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at that time to speak.

All participants in this session may make comments in the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select Respond to All Panelists and Attendees. This will allow everyone to view your comment.

Please note that private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent to an attendee will also be seen by the session's hosts, co-hosts, and other panelists.

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

---

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, first name and last name or surname. To rename your sign-in name for this webinar, you will need to first exit the Zoom session. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

Thank you. With that, I will hand the floor over to Emily Barabas.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Julie. Hi, everyone. My name is Emily Barabas. I'd like to thank you for joining us for today's session. I'm a member of ICANN Org's Policy Support Team, and I'm one of the team members who is supporting the Generic Names Supporting Organization's Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process Working Group. Long name.

I'm joined today by working group chair, Roger Carney. Hi, Roger. Welcome.

---

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: The focus of this session today is going to be talking about the status of the PDP, and more specifically a big milestone coming up. The initial report and preliminary recommendations of the PDP's Phase 1A are expected to be delivered shortly after ICANN74, and we want to share some information about that with you today.

As you heard earlier from Julie, there's going to be an opportunity for question and answer towards the end of the session. And while we'll focus on question and answer at the end, if you already know there's something you'd like to ask, you can go ahead and drop that in the Q&A pod at any time.

So I think that is it for housekeeping. It may be useful at points in the webinar to reference some of our working documents from the working group, and I'll share those in the chat here. And with that, let's get started.

Roger, hi.

ROGER CARNEY: Hello.

---

EMILY BARABAS: So, you know, some of this is going to be familiar to some participants, but we're going to begin at the beginning for those who are less familiar with the topic. Can you tell us a little bit about what this PDP is about?

ROGER CARNEY: Sure. So I guess the main focus here is on the Transfer Policy that dictates contracted parties and how a registrant really handles transferring a name from one registrar to another. I think the Transfer Policy [inaudible] possible has gone through a few iterations, but it's ...

Once again, I think more than a dozen years ago we went through this process, but we're taking a holistic view of the Transfer Policy and see if any changes are needed to make it easier, more standard, more secure, hopefully, so that the ... It's a good experience for registrants, but also a very practical experience for the ecosystem.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks. Can you talk a little bit about why the Generic Names Supporting Organization decided to charter this group now, as opposed to at another point in time?

---

ROGER CARNEY:

You bet. So actually, like I mentioned, it's been, I think, a little more than 10 years ago that the last big review of the Transfer Policy was done. And that actual PDP recommended a review of their recommendations to make sure that what they were recommending made sense. And it actually worked out well. They realized that the environment is ever-changing, so what they recommended may need to be updated. So we got that easy prompt from that last group, actually, to say, "Okay let's take a review of this."

And as those foreseers of that group predicted, a lot did change. GDPR came along. The Temporary Spec came along and changed some of the Transfer. A lot of registration data affected the Transfer Policy as well. So it was one of those where it was definitely time to take a look at it, and we were fortunate that we got into a good place in between some other PDPs and it just worked out as a good time to do this.

EMILY BARABAS:

Okay, thanks. And for those of you who are less familiar with some of the implications of the General Data Protection Regulation and Temporary Specification, we'll be talking a bit more about that later on.

So, where is the PDP now? We touched on it briefly, but to reiterate, what's the status?

ROGER CARNEY:

You bet. Yeah, and actually the PDP's in really good shape. The group—and, you know, quite a few different stakeholder groups participated—has done a really good job over the last year. Just over a year. I think we started last May on our Phase 1 work—Phase 1A work, to be specific.

There are two big phases in the PDP. And I would say two big phases, but maybe two and a half phases total. The first phase looking at the Transfer Policy as a whole. And that was broken up into inter-registrant transfers between a registrant wanting to move between different registrars and intra-, just a change of registrants.

So Phase 1A focusing on the inter-transfer. And Phase 1B, which we're going to be starting soon, is focused on the Change of Registrant. And then the final phase [inaudible] is focused on those other ancillary things, transfer dispute and things like that, that affect transfers.

We have just finished work as a working group on the Phase 1A stuff, and we are in the midst of publishing our Phase 1A Initial Report. That's a huge milestone, and I'll thank Berry for keeping us on track here and hitting our timeline. So, the group has done a good job.

---

EMILY BARABAS: We all thank Berry. And for those who are less familiar, he does a lot of the project management work for this project and does a fantastic job. So, thanks to him.

So this is a GNSO PDP, but the participation, as you mentioned, is pretty broad. Can you talk a little bit about who participates and who the members are?

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. So, I think that we touched on every community in multiple ways. We invited all supporting organizations, advisory committees, and GNSO stakeholder groups to participate. And they had a chance to send some representatives to the working group to participate directly.

But also, we did an early invite. So we actually sent out a request to all of those groups for early written input, and we did receive some good input back from those groups. And again, it worked out well. And those groups even supported those comments as went along, so it helped out quite a bit.

The topic of transfers is probably more near and dear to the contracted parties, the Registrars, and registries. But it affects registrants too, so I can see the interest from other groups, from the registrant's perspective, quite a bit as well.

---

So I think that, again, we've had a pretty good, broad participation really. And obviously, it ebbs and flows a little throughout the conversation depending on the topic we're on, but we've gotten good, broad support.

EMILY BARABAS:

And you mentioned the interest of registrants in this, so I guess that's my next question. There's a clear tie here to registrars and registries. They'll be the ones implementing the recommendations of this group. But for registrants or those who represent end users, why does this work matter?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah, and I think that's the important thing. Truly, the Transfer Policy is for registrants. Obviously, there's a lot of applications for registries and registrars, but the whole policy is for registrants so that they can have that freedom of choice, which is great. So I think that the registrant ... And I think the group tries to keep that as a main focus, that registrant out front, so that we're driving toward that.

And I think that that's some of the big things, especially looking at providing enough security so that registrants feel comfortable, but also providing an efficient mechanism to actually move away from a registrar to another. I think some of the big focus from the



---

group has been that security to make sure hijacking or anything like that doesn't occur, but set standards so registrants can have the same general experience no matter what registrar they're going to. So I think that the registrant here is the key piece [of the] policy.

EMILY BARABAS: Great. Thanks for that.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet.

EMILY BARABAS:: And I'll also just mentioned that when we do the public comment, just like with other PDP public comment periods, even if you haven't been involved in the PDP in the past, even if you're not part of one of the groups represented or a group that's not represented, that public comment period is open. So if this work interests you, that is an opportunity for you to also participate in a sense.

So I think before we dive into talking about specific recommendations, we'll do a quick pause to go through a couple of terms that we'll be using here because it can get a little bit technical and we want to make sure that everyone can follow the

---

discussion. And that also gives Roger a moment to pause and take a sip of his water or coffee.

So first, I will talk about the registrars involved in a transfer. There's the Losing Registrar. That's the registrar from which a domain is being transferred. And up until the point of the transfer being completed, that's also called the Registrar of Record.

Then there's the Gaining Registrar. That is the registrar to which the domain is being transferred. And when the transfer is complete, that will become a Registrar of Record. So we'll be using those terms a lot.

The next one you might hear is Auth-Info Code, also known as an Auth-Code or Authorization Code or Transfer Key, Transfer Code. The working group talked a lot about this. This is something that already exists, but the working group has made recommendations to enhance and modify it. But at the beginning of its conversations, the group talked about using more consistent terminology to ensure that everyone understands what we're talking about.

And the term that the group would like to use going forward and has recommended is used going forward is the Transfer Authorization Code, or TAC. So in this discussion, that's what we're going to be ... When we talk about something you might

---

know as the Auth-Code in the past, we're talking about the Transfer Authorization Code, or TAC, in the future.

And the working group also discussed having a more coherent and consistent definition of TAC to be used going forward. And the definition that they have in the preliminary recommendations is “a token created by the Registrar of Record and provided upon request to the registrant or designated representative by control panel or by other means within five calendar days.”

This TAC is required to transfer a domain name from one registrar to another registrar and, when presented, authorizes the transfer.

And then finally, we're going to talk about two forms of authorization included in the Transfer Policy—the Gaining Form of Authorization and the Losing Form of Authorization.

So first, Gaining. In the Transfer Policy as it's currently written, the Gaining Form of Authorization is a required form sent by the Gaining Registrar to the Registered Name Holder to confirm the Registered Name Holder, or RNH's, intent to transfer the domain. This has typically been an email sent to the RNH with a link that can be clicked to confirm the intent to transfer.

And we talked a little bit about, before and after the General Data Protection Regulation kept coming into force, before GDPR, that transfer cannot occur without the confirmation of the RNH.

---

And then next, the Losing Form of Authorization. So, the losing registrar sends the Registered Name Holder this Losing Form of Authorization. It's a notice to confirm the RNH's intent to complete the transfer. And absent objection to that transfer within five days, the Losing Registrar processes the request.

So, with those definitions in mind, we will start with Transfer Authorization Code and recommendations associated with that. So, Roger. The Transfer Authorization Code plays an important part in the working group's recommendations. Can you tell us why it's important and what the working group is recommending on this topic?

ROGER CARNEY:

Absolutely, yeah. It's where we started the whole conversation with the Transfer Authorization Code, or TAC for short. You can think of it as being the key that unlocks the whole Transfer process. It's a very important piece. It is the piece. It's the token that actually authorizes the transfer. Really, nothing else is needed except for that to make that happen. Obviously, there's some checks and things like that, but the important thing is that that TAC is that true key that will allow you to move.

And with that, the importance of security around that TAC is also important. Not just now or not just when we implement this, but going into the future, looking at security mechanisms to make

---

sure that the TAC is not just a code that can be used, but also one that is not duplicated or anything like that. So it's one of those where we have to continuously keep up with security to make this happen, to make sure that important key is protected.

And I think jumping into some of the specifics around the TAC, to be secure and everything, we went through this process and we came up with, you know, that it needed to be randomly generated and sufficiently complex. The goal here was to be standard. Today, different registries have different policies around what the current Auth-Info is and what the TAC is going to be.

We're going to standardize on that so that it's more consistent and more secure across those registries. And we're going to be following a set of standards that have been drafted at IETF, the Internet Engineering Task Force. And we're going to use those standards so that we can not just make it secure now, but again, as I said, secure as it lives.

Another thing that we added to the TAC was a time to live value, meaning that the TAC is only valid for so long. And in this case, 14 days is the standard time to live for it. So once a TAC is created, it's only valid for 14 days.

And a lot of this was done to help out on the security side of ... You know, if someone has a TAC in their email or in their text message or whatever and it's been there for 30 days, 40 days, two years

---

and someone finds it, it's no longer valid. So it's one of those security mechanisms that was added.

And along with that, it's a one-time use only. The TAC is only valid until it's used. So within that 14 days, once it's used, it's no longer valid. So the transfer will occur and that TAC no longer can be used for anything else. So it's a one-time use. And again, just within those 14 days.

Another big change that we made was the TAC is truly a Transfer Authorization Code in that it's only created upon request. In today's environment, the Auth-Information a lot of times is created at domain registration time, create time, or at some other earlier time.

But again, with the time to live and the fact that a one-time use, that code can only exist for so long. So it's only created and stored on request from the RNH. So it's when that transfer request is initiated.

And the storing of the TAC was an important part, too. The TAC is going to be generated by the registrar at the time of the request, but it will be stored at the registry. And again, securely going back to the IETF standardization RFCs where it's going to be stored securely via those mechanisms that are provided by the IETF.

---

And again, the hope here is that using the IETF standards as standards change, it can be updated to use the more current secure mechanisms. So, I think those are the big things for the TAC.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. A lot of changes.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, for sure.

EMILY BARABAS: And I think we'll next dive, then, into a topic that's closely related. The Gaining FOA, or Form of Authorization, was a key element that Council, through the charter of the working group, asked this working group to consider, and a big part of the recommendations for Phase 1A.

Can you tell us why that is?

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. If you look at the Gaining FOA, I mean it goes back quite a ways. I think it's been since the '90s, actually, I think it's been in effect. And maybe even prior to that. And the Gaining FOA was intended to allow the Gaining Registrar—the registrar that the

---

registrant wants to move to—to authenticate that that person had the right to make that move.

So what occurred today—or I should say, now, four years ago prior to GDPR—it used to be that the Gaining Registrar would pull the WHOIS or the registration data information from the publicly accessible data and then send an email or letter to that person saying, “Okay. There's been a request to move this. Can we move this?”

And that was really ... Again getting back to the TAC and the key, that was really the key that allowed something to be moved. And again, the Gaining FOA has been around a long time, but obviously when GDPR came into effect and when the Temp Spec came in to address the GDPR regulations, that really broke that cycle. That registration data was no longer available for the Gaining Registrars to look at. So there had to be something else being done as the Gaining FOA, again, for the past four years hasn't been used.

So, it's one of those where there was no data for the Gaining Registrar to go get. And again, I think it was in May of 2018 the Temp Spec came into effect or deferred compliance on the Gaining FOA. And again, if you look at today's policy, it still talks about it and it's still in there and everything like that. But for the past four years, it's not been used and Org's deferred that



---

compliance check because of GDPR and the Temp Spec, specifically.

So I think that, obviously, it was definitely something that had to be looked at. It was used, again, as that key for many years. And the last four years it wasn't, so it definitely needed to be looked at.

EMILY BARABAS:

Yeah. I think that inconsistency between the policy and the current practice made it, indeed, ripe for policy development.

So after all the deliberations and looking at some of these issues you mentioned, what did the working group decide to include in its preliminary recommendations for the initial report on Gaining FOA?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah. So again, I think the recommendation is that the Gaining FOA is no longer going to be needed. So we're going to remove the Gaining FOA requirements from the policy. And I think, again, when we look back at that, why was that something we would do when the Gaining FOA was the key? Well, again, we're replacing that key with the TAC being that true key.

---

And as I mentioned earlier, the Gaining FOA actually predated the Auth-Info, so Gaining FOA existed prior to any systematic check available. So it's one of those where that wasn't even an option when the Gaining FOA came out. So it's one of those where we're replacing one key with a new key, and the goal here is to add security and standardization to it.

In looking at, you know, one of the big reasons of dropping the FOA is, yes, we replaced it with another valid secure key. But we also looked at ... We started this process a year ago, which meant the Temp Spec was in place for three years, meaning that Gaining Registrars hadn't used the Gaining FOA for over three years.

So when we look at is it needed to make transfers function? Obviously, it's not needed to make them function. So that's what the group determined—okay, it wasn't needed. But then that's not the only thing—the thing about, is it secure enough? So we took a look at ICANN Compliance numbers related to transfer complaints. And prior to the Temp Spec and since the Temp Spec, it definitely did not increase any complaints or any different types of complaints.

And I think you could argue that, actually, it seems to have decreased. Now, you know, you can't attribute the fact of no Gaining FOA to that. But without using the Gaining FOA, we didn't

---

see an impact in any transfer issues. So again, I think that was one of the big things.

What else there? Let's see. Okay, yes. Let's look at, again, like I said, replacing the key with a new key. The TAC being that security mechanism. And we focused on adding a lot of security mechanisms to the TAC. Again the complexity, the length of it, the standardization—or the standard use of a standard TAC versus every registry having a different one.

Also, again, the time to live that we added to it that helps that. A TAC's only created on request. And also, we've added some new notifications that the Losing Registrar will need to send when the TAC's been requested and when the transfer's been completed.

So it's one of those where, yes, we've eliminated the requirement for the Gaining FOA. But we've also supplemented again with an improved TAC and some additional messaging to the registrant.

That's about it, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Great. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet.

---

EMILY BARABAS:: You mentioned those new notifications, so let's dive into that a little and talk about it in conjunction with the Losing FOA and what the working group has recommended regarding the Losing FOA going forward.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And early on, I think some of the goals with this group was to make it secure/simple. Efficient, though. And I think that some of the current messaging and some of the current timelines and everything made it a little not efficient. And again, a different standard, so it's one of those things we all looked at to do.

And the Losing FOA I think ... Again, here, we're not removing the Losing FOA, but we're replacing it with a couple of notifications. It's one of those where a Losing FOA added an additional five days to the process. Or up to, I should say. It didn't have to be, but it was up to five days to the process. So looking at trying to make it more efficient and simple. It's one of those where we thought that the formality of the Losing FOA could be replaced with some proper notifications.

And again, the TAC being that key to allow this and being secure, we ... Supplementing the Losing FOA now with two new notifications. And that being, specifically, a notification on request and a notification on completion of the transfer.

---

EMILY BARABAS:                   Okay. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:                   You bet.

EMILY BARABAS:                   So I think that those are three key areas for this phase of the working group, but are there other areas of the initial report that you'd like to highlight around some of the other topic areas included in Phase 1A?

ROGER CARNEY:                   You bet. There's one big section in the current policy that talks about transfer denial reasons, and we spent quite a bit of time on reviewing those and updating those to the current recommendations. They were broken out into three kinds of denial reasons. One where a registrar may deny and transfer for these certain reasons. I think there were five or six in the current policy, and we've actually narrowed that down to just a couple.

And then there's another section about having ... You have to deny a transfer, so it was a must deny transfer. And again, we looked at [those] and updated language for some clarity, both for

---

contracted party clarity and for ICANN Compliance clarity, so that everyone knew the correct and why something was happening.

And there was one final section of the denying that you may not deny certain transfers—payment of things and reasons like that. And again we reviewed that section and updated it for clarity, just to make sure that it's still the intent.

Other than that, there's a long discussion on the windows of locking today that occur around domain create. Sometimes there was a 60-day lock, that you couldn't transfer for 60 days after a create. Then sometimes there wasn't. And then sometimes after a transfer completed, there was a 60-day window. And I think that all of those variable things made it a little hard—not a little—fairly hard for registrants to see or feel that experience from registrar to registrar because it was policies that were optional.

So we spent quite a bit of time talking about that and trying to come up with a standard around those so that it was more predictable, more transparent for the registrant. So we spent some time and you'll see some recommendations around that as well. It was really tough but from one registrar to another and a completely different experience. So I think coming up with those standards helps us a lot from a registrant standpoint.

---

EMILY BARABAS: Great. So do you mind if we talk in more detail about some of those standard requirements that have been recommended in terms of prohibiting post creation, post registration, and also post transfer?

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. Yeah. So the recommendations ... And again, we spent quite a bit of time. And I think we actually took a break and came back to them just to revisit them, knowing that it was important to get this right. So the new recommendations are post create, domain create or registration, and post transfer. There'll be a 30-day window that a transfer will not be allowed, and several reasons the group came up with, that period.

Again, it's going to be mandatory on both of those, so it won't be optional like it is today. So that was one reason we wanted to standardize that. And we thought that the 60 days was too long. We didn't see any impacts that far out, so we thought we would be able to shorten that. And again, more for a positive registrant experience than anything, shortening that up.

But we still thought that there was a window needed to address any payment issues, any credit card chargeback issues, or anything like that. It also allows for filing of a UDRP and selecting that Registrar of Record at the time. And honestly, it seems that a 30-day window is not prohibitive to a valid registration and later

---

transfer. It seems like within 30 days of a domain create, a transfer is not that high a priority.

I think those are the big things around that 30-day window. And again—

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Sorry, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Please.

ROGER CARNEY: I'll just continue on with the transfer window as well. Again, looking and trying to standardize and make this efficient for the registrant and getting back to that standard process, it's like, okay, we didn't want to have too many different time periods, so one of the reasons we stuck with the 30-day transfer window as well is to keep that consistent from the registration window so that you're not having to say, "Well, which one is which?" So it's just 30 days across the board.



---

And again, all the same reasons as a domain create as the transfer. You still have credit card payments. Any dispute mechanisms that want to be done, you can get those done within that 30 days. So I think the key here is that we're replacing a somewhat arbitrary 60-day optional value from registrar to registrar to a consistent mandatory 30 days for both domain creates and transfers.

EMILY BARABAS: Great, thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet.

EMILY BARABAS: So the public comment period is both an opportunity for the community to see the preliminary outputs of the working group. But it's also an opportunity for the working group to ask questions to the community on things that they're still thinking about, still working on, need additional input or expertise on.

Are there any areas of the initial report that you'd like to highlight of where the working group is seeking community input?

---

ROGER CARNEY:

You bet, yeah. And again, the working group's been going good for a whole year. We've come to a lot of agreements on a lot of things. But obviously, there's a few things where you just don't have all of the answers, so we're looking for some input. Or maybe there are some disagreements, so we're looking for the best additional input on those items.

And really I think there's only a couple, but I think the biggest one was around enforcement of that standard TTL. The working group came to agreement on the fact that a standard 14-day TTL made sense. Great security mechanism. No issues with that. But there was a lot of discussion, and recently a lot of discussion on where that enforcement should be held.

And realistically, we were looking at two possibilities. It was originally thought that the registries would enforce, that but then further discussions raised some concerns around that. So the only other option that we came up with is that the registrars would enforce that. But I think that's a big thing for the community to provide input on.

And again, the working group had good discussions around it, but I think that the 14-day TTL, the working group was all behind. It was just who was going to enforce that. So I think that's a big question for the community to provide input on.

---

EMILY BARABAS: Great, thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet.

EMILY BARABAS: So as we've discussed here, the working group is really quite close to the finish line in terms of the initial report. We're talking about it today in terms of the recommendations that we have on it. So here we are.

The working group is meeting, however, at ICANN74. So what is the focus of the working group's discussions during that session?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and definitely a congratulations to the working group. They've done a lot of work to get to this initial report, and it's been a very positive experience, at least for me. I don't know about the other parts of the working group, but it's been a very positive and collaborative effort. So, shout-out to the working group that, hey, great job.

But for ICANN74, we're going to move on. As I mentioned early on, Phase 1 had two chunks of work in it, and we just completed the inter- Transfer Policy discussions. And this is the initial report for

---

that. But we're going to move on to the other large part of the current Transfer Policy, which is the Change of Registrant.

So, ICANN74. We'll start diving into that. Introduce the topics, the charter questions that we're looking to answer there, and start that discussion on the Change of Registrant. And I think all of this next phase is going to be focused on if we can identify any need for changes to that current section of the policy.

EMILY BARABAS: Great, thanks. No rest for the weary.

ROGER CARNEY: Nope.

EMILY BARABAS: And that Zoom room will be open for those who would like to join and learn more about Phase 1B.

So, just one last question for you, Roger. For those who are interested in reading that initial report and submitting a public comment, what are the next steps?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. And I think, just keep an eye out for it for the announcement, but we're planning to publish that initial report

---

probably really close to the conclusion of ICANN74. So hopefully by July—I'm sorry, not July—June 20<sup>th</sup> we'll have that published and out for public comment.

And again, I think it's important that we're making enough changes here that it's going to impact registrants, registrars, and registries altogether. So it's going to be important to take a look at those and see how that's going to impact you. And provide comments if it's going to negatively impact your area. So, yeah, please be on the lookout, and in a couple weeks hopefully everyone will have it in their hands and can comment.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks so much, Roger. So, that brings us to the end of our discussion of the report in this format. We're going to go to some question and answer. I believe Julie Hedlund from ICANN Org is going to read out the questions that have been entered in the pod.

And if those who are commenting want to either clarify or speak, as mentioned earlier, you should be able to do so by raising your hand. And your mic will be unmuted so that you can go ahead and also speak that way.

Julie, over to you.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Emily and Roger. This Julie Hedlund from staff. I currently have two questions that have been posted in the Q&A pod.

The first question is from Fidya Shabrina. It is related with the Transfer Policy Review. “What happens if registrants conduct transfers that aren't approved by ICANN? Can they go through? Should it be a redo after 14 days?” End of question.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. ICANN doesn't really approve a transfer, so it's really up to the registrant and the registrar. And actually, the 14-day window, that time to live is just for that TAC. So it's not like they have to finish it in that 14 days. If they don't, they just have to go back to their sponsor, current registrar and get a new TAC which would reset that 14 days. I hope that answers the question.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Roger. And then the second question is from Rubens Kuhl. And the question is, “Has the working group specified whether the 30-day window will be implemented by registries, registrars, or both? Or was this left to the IRT?” End of question.

---

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rubens. Yes, and the expectation from the working group is that the registrars will enforce that on their side.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Roger. I don't see any more questions at this moment. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Julie. So I think we'll just give it one more minute to see if any final questions pop up in the pod or if hands go up for additional questions. And if not, we will wrap this up.

Okay. I think the pod is looking pretty quiet, so we will call this a wrap. There will be a recording of this call for those who were unable to make it but are interested in this topic. Please feel free to share that link from the schedule page. And we look forward to seeing many of you, either remotely or in person at ICANN74.

Roger, thanks so much for your time.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Thanks, everyone, for attending.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**