
**ICANN Transcription
Transfer Policy Review PDP
Friday, 14 May 2021 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/T4aUCQ>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

Page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Friday the 14th of May, 2021, at 18:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind or ask everyone if you're on the telephone to please let yourself be known now, if you're on the phone only. All right.

We have no apologies for today's call and all members and alternates are promoted to panelists. Members and any alternates who are replacing members, when using the chat feature, please select "panelists and attendees" in order for everyone to see your chat. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only.

Alternates not replacing a member are not permitted to engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom room functionalities, such as raising hands or agreeing and disagreeing. If you are an alternate not replacing a member, please rename your line by adding three Z's before your name and add, in parenthesis, "alternate," after your

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.

name. This will drop your name down to the bottom of the participant list. To rename yourself in Zoom, hover over your name and click “rename.”

As a reminder, the alternate assignment must be formalized by way of Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you do need assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

Please remember to state your name before speaking. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY:

Excellent. Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everybody. Thanks. It looks like a good turnout for a late Friday afternoon kick-off, so I appreciate that. Hopefully, we keep that enthusiasm going for the next, let's just say, several weeks—not any longer than that. We'll make this PDP as quickly and efficiently as possible, so we won't put an [inaudible] but we'll say let's keep the enthusiasm going for a while.

Let's jump into introductions. I'll kick off. I'm Roger Carney. I've been in the domain business for about, I don't know, ten years, now, with GoDaddy. I am not wearing my GoDaddy hat, here. We have other participants that have volunteered from GoDaddy, so I will be the neutral facilitator, here. I won't be pushing any agendas for the

registrar side. I will be trying to get everybody's input and move it along.

When I agreed to be chair for this, my two main goals were, one, as a registrant, I remember, I don't know, many years ago, ten/15 years ago—it was before I got into the industry—I tried to transfer a domain for a soccer club that we were involved with.

It was a painful process, so it was interesting to go through that and then get into the industry and see why, and how, and where I made some mistakes, and all that. But still, I think it's something, when I first signed up, that was, "Yeah, let's make sure that we look at the registrant and make sure that they're getting something that's useful for them."

And my second big goal was actually to ... I guess I've been part of a lot of PDPs and a lot of them have gone on for a long time. I kind of want to try to get back into the PDPs that get work done and get moving forward so we can show the community that this process does work, and is good, and can produce good results. So, those are my two main goals.

Obviously, I think, yes, the transfer policy does need to be reviewed. Does it need to be updated? I'm going to leave that to this group to decide, but it definitely needs to be reviewed. I think that's about it for me. Greg DiBiase is going to be our GNSO liaison. Greg is currently on paternal leave so he'll be joining us when he returns. I'm not sure, exactly.

I haven't heard his timeline on that but it will be a few weeks, yet, before he's back. As well as I want to introduce Steve Crocker, who

is joining us not as a representative of any specific group. Steve is joining us as a subject matter expert in the security side of things and he's got a few ... Most people probably know Steve but he has got a few items that he is definitely interested in discussing but also he's going to be there for us to bounce any concerns or issues off of, as well. So, I'll just turn it over to Steve if he wants to say a few more words about himself.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you so much, Roger, and thank you for welcoming me into this group. I sent out a note some time ago. I don't know that it propagated to everybody. I'm happy to send it again. I bring, as Roger said, those two aspects. One is I'm here to be as helpful as I can on security/stability issues that may come up, but in addition I had a couple of points that are the reasons why I wanted to join.

I've been doing quite a lot of work on registration data structure and, also, I've done quite a lot of work in DNS continuity during transitions, and particularly related to sign zones, to DNSSEC sign zones. One somewhat subtle thing that a lot of people don't think too much about is that, when you move a registration, it's often quite entangled with the underlying DNS service that is being provided by registrars are the most common provider of DNS service.

If you move a registration from one registrar to another, that frequently means that you also have to move the DNS service. If it is an arms-length transition of "I'm done with this domain and I'm selling it to somebody else," then there is no service involved because it's not actually actively used, then that's not a big issue.

But if it's a domain that is in active service and you want continuity of service so that people looking up the names don't find that it's out of service for a while, then there are some technical issues underneath the covers that have to be done. It is doable. It is doable without any kind of perceived glitch on the part of the users but it has to be done carefully and in sequence, particularly if these are sign zones.

Then, there is extra work to be done with respect to the management of the keys. It's a peculiarity, in my view, of the way ICANN is structured that registrars and registries are explicitly acknowledged and built into the structure of the system but DNS operations are outside of the structure.

And so, that means that when we structure the procedures inside of ICANN the DNS operations just don't exist in some sense, but, in a practical sense, they have to exist. So, I can obviously say a lot more about that and I have been deeply enmeshed in all that, but that is one of the things that caused me to be interested, here.

The second thing, which is sort of lightweight but essential, is we have this carry-over of admin, and tech contacts, and other kinds of contacts, left over from the earliest days of the network. There is no formal definition as to what those roles entail. People named in these roles often don't know what they're obliged to do and what they're able to do.

People who look up those names also don't know what to expect. If you were designing a system from scratch and you designed these roles, you would pretty clearly say, "Here's what it means to be in that role," and people who are [near] that role would be obliged to

acknowledge that they have accepted both the authority and the responsibility.

I don't know to what extent that will be important in this working group but that is, in my view, one of the loose ends, one of the rough edges, in the whole registration system, and it should be cleaned up at some point.

And in particular, to the extent that admin contacts were still used in some contexts for authorizing transfers, as I said, one of the loose ends is, surely, somewhere, it should be written down that if somebody is named in that role they should know that they are named in that role, and that, during the registration, it's obliged to notify them that they have been ...?

So, that's the end of my speech on this. The other thing is I know that we're going to spend some time on the 60-day rule about no changes after that. That's a tuning parameter that was intended to tamp down on various kinds of abuse but it also has the counter-effect of slowing things down and making life hard for situations that should otherwise proceed.

From a systems point of view, if one is designing a system and then you have some parameters like the 60-day, you want to know, what is the right number and what is the effect of shifting it one way or the other? To what extent does it increase or decrease the unintended effects of false-positives and false-negatives of inhibiting things that should happen or not inhibiting things that shouldn't happen? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Steve. I appreciate that. So, I think now we'll just kind of go around the virtual room here and just have all the members give a brief introduction of themselves, their experience, what interests brought them here. So, I think I will try to go down the list. Hopefully, I don't mess up too many names, but I'll just grab names as I go down the list, and just a brief couple of minutes. Antonia?

ANTONIA NAN CHU: Hi, everyone. This is Antonia Chu from Alibaba Cloud Registrar. I have been working with domain business for almost ten years and my work focuses on ICANN policy, its practices, and also compliance. So, it's a great opportunity for me to join this working group and I do hope that my previous knowledge and experience can make necessary contributions to this working group. And also, I can provide some constructive ideas from a registrar perspective. That's all from me, thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Excellent. Thank you very much. Barbara? I can't hear you, Barbara. I'm not sure if you're double-muted somewhere?

JULIE BISLAND: Your mic is open, Barbara.

BARBARA KNIGHT: Amongst, I am double-muted, so I apologize, everyone. I'm Barbara Knight. Thank you. I've been with Verisign for about 18 years as their senior director of registry compliance. I manage a team of

people who not only onboard registrars for our products but we also, back in the day, when registry operators were tasked with resolving transfer disputes, I managed that team, as well. So, I'm pretty familiar with the transfer policy. My capacity in this particular working group is representing the Registries Stakeholder Group, so I will be wearing that hat, but bringing the Verisign experience to the table. That pretty much sums it up for me.

ROGER CARNEY: Excellent, thank you. Catherine?

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Hello. My name is Catherine Merdinger. I am a lawyer. I work for Donuts Inc but I am here representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group on behalf of Name.com. I've been with Donuts for about two years and this is my first PDP, so everyone be nice.

ROGER CARNEY: Welcome. Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KHAUKA NANGHAKA: Hi, everyone. I'm Daniel. I'm representing the ALAC stakeholder group and also I have over eight years in the domain experience, and all because I have been [assigning different domains with the registry, or registrant data]. And also, I have a ... This is, I think, my second or third PDP that I'm getting involved in. I was previously in the [defunct] GNSO RDS Working Group, and then also I was a member of the ATRT3 and also, now, I'm here

representing in the transfer policy the ALAC. Thank you. Back to you, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you. Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Roger. Jim Galvin. I am with Donuts. I have been in the registry industry for just over 12 years. I've been around ICANN since it was created. I'm basically a security technologist. That has been my formal training and all of my work to date. I've spent a lot of time doing Internet security standards in my early days and have moved into where I am today, having a strong role in policy and standards development. And I am here along with Barbara to represent the Registries Stakeholder Group. So, thanks very much.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks. Kristian?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Hey. I've been working with domain names for more than 20 years. The last 12 years, I've been working at a small registrar. It was only four people but with more than 200,000 domains. Last year, that company was acquired, so now I am working for One.com, which is a pretty big registrar in Denmark. I'm also GNSO councilor for the registrars. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you. Mike, please go ahead.

MIKE RODENBAUGH: Hi, this is Mike Rodenbaugh. I am a lawyer in Santa Cruz, California. I started working in ICANN circles early 2000's. I was a trademark lawyer at Yahoo. I'm representing the IPC in this group but I also work with registries and registrars. I handle a bunch of different new TLD applications. I also have a client that's a domain name marketplace and I'm often working with domain name transfers.

And so, I'm looking forward to working on a PDP again. I have not worked on one in quite a while, on purpose, but had a lot of PDP experience when I was on the GNSO Council back in 2006 for about six years. So anyway, looking forward to working with everybody. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Mike. Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi, everyone. I have been involved in the ICANN community since 2007, when I was in the IPC and represented them on a working group back then for registration data. I then spent almost seven years on ICANN staff in contractual compliance, where I was a director of registrar compliance and very involved with registrars and processing of transfer complaints.

So, I bring that experience to this. I left ICANN and I am now head of compliance at ICANN relations, at Namecheap, a domain name registrar. I am also vice-chair for policy for the Registrar Stakeholder Group and I'm here representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group but bringing along the registrar perspective as well as the ICANN perspective, because you can only imagine the number of horror stories that we see in those complaints from registrants.

So, I also was ... In part, I feel partially responsible for this PDP because part of the issue with [beginning FOA] was something that was impacting Namecheap, and I advocated very hard for that and was able to get a lot of support for this. I kind of do look forward to the review and, hopefully, making everything go much nicer. I'm also on the ePDP Phase 2, as well as 2A, teams. So, that counts as, I think, about ten PDPs, each of those. So, happy to be here and I'm looking forward to working together. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. Prudence, please go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hi, everyone. I'm currently in the Global Industry Relations team at MarkMonitor. We're a corporate domain name registrar. I'll be representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I've been with MarkMonitor now for six years working with registries, [underlining] and helping develop policy with regard to day-to-day processes and things. But yes, this is my first PDP, so be nice, be kind. I'm really excited to be involved. [Back to you].

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thank you. Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Hi. Rich Merdinger with GoDaddy registrar. I've been with GoDaddy since 1997 and have been working in the ICANN community pretty much since the new Gs started coming around. I'm primarily focused on operational and technical implementation in commercial issues as they relate to policy, so I'm looking forward to engaging this PDP to make sure that the policies that we create are something that the implementation teams will be able to actually run with to the benefit of our registrants. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you. Salvador, please go ahead.

SALVADOR HERNANDEZ: Hey, this is Salvador Camacho. I'm an IP attorney from Mexico City. I've been involved in domain name disputes since ten years. Ten years, I've been working with that. Also in transfers, domain names, portfolio management. This is my first PDP and I'm on behalf of the IPC, working along with Mike Rodenbaugh. I've been involved in ICANN since four years ago and I'm very happy to be here. Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thank you. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Hi, everyone. I'm Sarah Wyld. I'm the policy and privacy manager at Tucows and I've been in the domain name industry now for about 15 years. I actually started off in this field working in the customer service department and a big area of difficulty for our customers were transfers. It was a hard process, to confluence of confusion and security issues.

So, I've really wanted to improve this process for quite a long time. And then, more recently, I helped the TechOps team draft their proposed transfer process, which was used to inform the charter for this working group, and you might remember me from the ePDP. So, I'm really excited to help represent the registrars here. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. This is Steinar, representing ALAC. I've been involved in the domain name industry since the mid-'90s, both being experienced as an ISP, a registrar, also a registry operator. Even though it's my first PDP, I hope to bring some of my experience also connected to the ccTLDs, which I have been quite involved with during the time as a registrar. Looking forward to the process. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks. Theo.

THEO GEURTS: Hi, everybody. This is Theo. I'm with Realtime Register since 2009, Dutch registrar. I'm the GRC officer there. I have done countless IRTs and working groups and, just like Sarah and Owen, I'm also on the eternal-PDP. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thank you. First of all, congratulations, Roger, on being the chair, or condolences, depending on how you look at it. But I'm very glad to be here. My name is Zak Muscovitch. I'm a lawyer in Toronto, Canada. I've been practicing domain name law and private practice for over 21 years, now. I do business law, trademark law, and other kinds of law, and I'm here on behalf of the Business Constituency.

I'm also general counsel of the Internet Commerce Association, which is an industry trade group on behalf of secondary market participants. I previously was in the IGO Working Group, and in the Phase 1 of the RPM Working Group, and looking forward to the Phase 2 of that, eventually.

And although I don't have the technical knowledge that many of you do here from the registry and registrar side, I am somewhat familiar with the issues that registrants, businesses, and individuals face when they need to transfer domain names. So, I'm looking to hear, learn, and participate more in the discussion about uniformity, and transparency, and efficiency when it comes to that. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Zak. I think that was all the members. If I missed somebody, please go ahead. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: There we are. You can hear me? Yes, good evening, everybody. My name is Jacques. I'm based in Bordeaux. I am managing a registrar called ProDomaines. I'm here on the behalf of the Registrar Stakeholder Group as an alternate. I've been in the domain name business for 20 years, now, I guess, and also being glad to be part of the ATRT3 team. So, I guess I'm enjoying ICANN's development groups and working groups. So, I sure hope I will be able to bring whatever I can to the table.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, thank you. I think I will let staff ... Any of the staff want to introduce themselves, say anything? Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: I'll break the ice. I consult with the GNSO policy team, sitting in third chair, so to speak. My colleagues Emily and Caitlin are kind of taking the helm from a staff perspective and the support that the team provides. Being in third chair, I'm probably more aligned with Roger's goal of making the group more efficient and showing how the multi-stakeholder model works. My role is mostly in regard to serving kind of a project management function to make sure that we're attempting to deliver to our committed dates, and we'll have more of that a little bit later.

I have been involved with ICANN since about 2009, right about the time that the IRTP Part A spun up. And to my shock, not one introduction mentioned prior involvements with those four phases of the IRTP. But as part of my role, I'm hoping that this time around will be much more effective, as well as efficient, in terms of producing proper outcomes to address the issues that are identified in the charter. So, thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Berry. I'm not sure if no one mentioned that so they didn't get blamed or we're just far enough along that people are trying to forget it. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Roger. Hi, everyone. This is Emily Barabas from the Policy Support Staff team. I'm based in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and I've been with ICANN doing policy support work for about five years, now. Just about. As Berry said, Caitlin and I will be doing a lot of the primary support of call support, and document drafting, and just making sure that all of you have what you need to get the work done.

So, I'm looking forward to meeting those of you that I haven't worked with, other PDPs. And my goal for this work is really to make sure that you all have as productive and rewarding an experience as possible, that you all feel supported, and that we have a good time working together. So, looking forward to it, and please feel free to e-mail me if you have any questions. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. I have worked at ICANN since the end of 2012 and I've been on the GSO Policy Support team since 2018. I'll just echo everything that Emily said. Together with Emily, Berry, Andrea, and Julie, we're here to support this group and hope that it is as productive and as enjoyable an experience as possible. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Caitlin. Holid? Sorry if I messed up your name.

HOLIDA YANIK: Yes, thank you. Hello, everyone. My name is Holid Yanik and I am a member of ICANN Contractual Compliance team since 2017. I am based in Istanbul, Turkey. I have a good experience in processing transfer complaints and addressing them with registrars when necessary. I will be attending these meetings and following working group's work as a compliance point of contact. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you very much. All right. I think that closes out our introductions. We can move on. Working group vice-chair. So, we had the opportunity to select a vice-chair. It would be selected by this group. At this point, I think that we don't need a vice-chair. It's my opinion. I don't foresee myself being [donned] but, if that does happen, I think staff will be able to either reschedule or handle the meeting without me.

But if the working group believes that we should have a vice-chair, it's something that we can definitely discuss. Again, it would have to be a fairly impartial person, not someone probably participating currently, so we'd have to look outside this group. But at this time, I'm not sure that it's needed. So, unless someone from the working group wants to bring that—and they don't have to bring it up now.

We can talk about it later, as well. So, just give it some thought. And if the group does think so, we can look for someone. Otherwise, we'll continue on without. Okay? I think we can move forward. The charter, okay. I think I'll turn this over to staff, since they do a much better, cleaner job than I do. Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Roger. I'll be happy to walk through these slides.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Sure thing. Hold on. There we go. So, we're not going to go through every element of the charter but I did want to talk through just a few of the key highlights for the group for those who are still wading through the required reading for the PDP. Hopefully, you all saw in the e-mail that we made a little reading list for everyone with the intention that we have a sort of level-set from the beginning and everyone has the same information to start with. And the charter is a great place to start if this is all new to you.

So, first we'll talk a little bit about the mission, and the scope, and what we're going to be covering in this PDP. Hopefully, this is just a review, but it's good to touch on it, anyway. So, we're here to conduct a holistic review of the transfer policy and determine if changes to the policy are needed to improve the ease, security, and efficacy of inter-registrar and inter-registrant transfers.

The PDP is broken into two phases with different subject matter in each of those phases. The first phase is going to have two parts, part A and part B. The goal here is to create manageable chunks of work. Some of you might be familiar with PDP 3.0, which is an initiative by the GNSO Council to make the policy development work more efficient and effective.

One of the outputs of that is to charter work in a way that is easier to monitor progress, and make sure that things are remaining on schedule, and that elements of the work are in distinct chunks. And so, you'll see that the charter is structured with that philosophy in mind, and Berry will talk a little bit more about the work plan and the approach there later today, but that's just a preview.

So, we're currently in Phase 1A. That's where we're starting. Phase 1A is going to focus on two issues: form of authorization and auth-info codes. And the work around form of authorization will include the outputs of the Rec 27 wave-one report from the EDP regarding form of authorization. And if you're not familiar with that report or what that is, I'm going to pop a link into the chat. It's the broader reading list of resources for this PDP and that includes a link to that report.

So, Phase 1B is going to focus on change of registrant, including Rec 27 wave-one change of registrant issues. Phase 2 will have a number of different issues, which include transfer emergency action content and reversing inter-registrar transfers, the transfer dispute resolution policy, including Rec 27 wave-one [TERP] issues, [mapping] transfers, and ICANN-approved transfers.

So, that's the broad overview of what is included in this PDP. The charter outlines a sequence of milestones. So, they're sort of a typical set of steps that you'll see in a GNSO PDP, for those who are participating for the first time—things like an initial report, a final report, a series of opportunities for input, and so forth. Because of the way that this is phased, there is actually going to be a slight variation on this.

And so, I'll just run through it quickly. The full PDP is initiated under a single charter. The Phase 1 work will be completed, and then an initial report will be published, then Phase 1 will be completed. I'm sorry, 1B will be completed. An initial report will be published for that. Each of those will have their own public comment period, so each of those initial reports will have an opportunity for community input.

And then, they will be put together into a combined Phase 1 final report, and the goal there is to make sure that the work that was completed for each of those elements line up, and fit together, and work as a single unit for Phase 1. So, that final report will go to the GNSO Council, then there will be a charter review to make sure that the charter is still functioning the way it needs to and any changes that need to be made can be made.

And then, there will be Phase 1, which will just have a single initial report and a single final report. And if the Phase 1 recommendations are approved by the GNSO Council and the board, once the final report has been submitted, implementation can begin to occur in parallel with the Phase 2 policy development work taking place. So, that also has the opportunity to realize some efficiencies with the work happening in parallel, if that ends up being possible.

A little bit about the working group composition. Hopefully, you have some sense of that also from the e-mails you received from SO/AC support with the meeting invitation and so forth. So, all SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs, we're invited to appoint members and alternates.

Some chose not to do so or have not yet identified volunteers but still may do so in the near future. The numbers of members and alternates are different for different groups and you can go to the charter and get the details on that. In terms of a structure, we have a chair, as you know. That's Roger. You have members. Members are responsible for active participation, preliminary deliberations, and consensus.

Members are to represent the views of their appointing organizations in deliberations and consensus calls. There are alternates. So, alternates are those who participate only if a member is not available and will be responsible for keeping up with the working group. Alternates may always join calls but may only speak if they are standing in for a member who is absent.

There is additional structure around that in the meeting invitation, as Julie introduced at the beginning of the call. Just a reminder that,

if you are an alternate who is not standing in for a member, I know this is very tempting, to be typing in the chat, especially when it's just introductions and things like that.

But the intent is that alternates are not participating by typing in the chat, or speaking, or raising hands, putting checkmarks, and so forth. They're really there as a silent ... Well, I won't use the word "observer" because that's a different role but you are, essentially, observing the call. And we will put reminders and so forth if folks forget, especially early on, but please do be mindful of that.

Observers. Anyone, anywhere, can sign up as an observer. You can follow the mailing list. You can be on the call as an attendee, so you're also just a silent observer. That is open. If you are an observer, you can pop in and out, join some calls and not others, and so forth. You're not expected to stay up to date with all the details.

And then, we have the GNSO Council liaison, Greg, who is, as you all know, on paternity leave. He'll maintain a link to the GNSO Council, keep the council updated on the PDP's work, and so forth. So, we'll be welcoming him soon. He plays a very important role in the accountability of the working group.

If there are any questions about the roles, or responsibilities, or anything like that, you're welcome to ask now on the call. You're also welcome to e-mail staff or e-mail Roger and he'll consult with us, as well. But it's important for everyone to understand these different roles early on so that there is clarity and things run smoothly. So, thanks, everyone, for listening. Any questions? Okay.

So, next we're going to talk about some working methods, and then I'm going to pass it over to Caitlin to speak about that. Caitlin?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Emily. Thank you. So, as part of some of the background material that we have sent around, we'd also like everyone to familiarize themselves with the GNSO Working Group guidelines and PDP manual. I wanted to highlight a couple of things regarding this group's working methods.

Firstly, we'll be having regular working group meetings via Zoom. As we noted, we expect members to be regularly attending these meetings, and if you're not able to attend you can appoint an alternate to attend on your behalf. In order for the group to progress through its work, there will be offline assignments between calls and we encourage everyone to timely complete their assignments. There will be sessions during ICANN meetings as needed, and also there will be the opportunity for community input, as well as public comment on the group's initial reports.

One thing we wanted to note: as this is a representative group, one thing to keep in mind is that you are representing your appointing organization, so please keep that in mind when you're speaking. There are some members or alternates that may have been a part of multiple groups, or switched their constituency, or may have had experience in different spaces of the DNS, but please remember to only speak on behalf of your group and not other groups. In terms of the group's transparency, similar to all working groups, the mailing list will be publicly archived and calls are recorded and transcribed.

One of the reasons that we wanted everyone to take a closer look at the charter is that the working group will be following the working group guidelines. Section 3.6 talks about the standard methodology for making decisions. This charter calls out something specific, and that's because the transfer policy may not be of interest, equally, to all groups on this call and all groups within the ICANN space.

So you'll note that, when you look at the charter, there are certain groups, specifically the contracted parties, that were allotted more membership slots than others. However, we do note that all perspectives are important here and it is, of course, important to keep in mind the registrant's perspective in the working group's deliberations and its outputs.

And Roger, as the chair, will ensure that all perspectives are appropriately taken into account, particularly when assessing the consensus designations on the working group's final recommendations. All members were asked to sign a statement of participation, and I'm just going to quickly highlight a couple of items within that statement of participation.

Members all agree to work cooperatively toward consensus and treat all members of the working group with civility, respecting everyone's time and commitment. Sometimes, we may disagree during the discussion, but please remember to treat everybody with civility and keep in mind the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

As Emily touched on earlier when we talked about the different ... The membership model, here, members are required to regularly attend all scheduled meetings and are asked to send apologies in

advance when unable to attend. And of course, you can designate an alternate when you're unable to attend.

Members have also agreed to follow through on completing all homework assignments between calls and meeting-agreed deadlines. With most working groups, it is important to remember that, in order for the group to make timely progress, inter-sessional work is needed, so there will be homework assignments that we ask everyone to do. Also, members agree to abide by the working methods and rules of engagement as outlined in the charter.

And we did have a question and would like to know if there are any additional agreements the working group members want to make now about how we all work together. So, if anyone has anything additional to add, please feel free to raise your hand at this time. Okay. I don't see any hands. Next slide, please. I'm now going to pass it over to Berry Cobb, who is our work plan expert and guru. Thank you.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Caitlin. "Expert" and "guru" I consider out of line and not proper. Nonetheless, I will be talking a little bit about our work plan. This topic will evolve more over the coming weeks as this group continues its [spin-up]. But most of you, or many of you, I should say, were probably familiar with the GNSO Council's effort around PDP 3.0. The rationale for doing so was, as I noted earlier, to kind of provide some guidelines and context around the operations of our Policy Development Process in the working groups that support those policy discussions.

One aspect of that is to take a more project-management approach to controlling and managing how a group develops its consensus policies, it deliberates on the topics, and those kinds of aspects. As part of that, there is a requirement where, once we have set our work plan schedule, that we're basically all being held to account to deliver to those committed dates and the key milestones that will be established there within, such as hitting a particular date for initial report and getting to a public comment.

And as Emily noted earlier, this is kind of a semi-complex schedule before us, given the two different phases and how Phase 1 is separated between a Phase A and a Phase B. Project management works great for building widgets.

Obviously, we're not building widgets here. This is deliberations on complex policy topics. It's very difficult to gauge the amount of time it will take to fully exhaust deliberations, depending on the complexity of a particular topic, as well as understanding the exact dependencies between some of the topics that we'll be discussing.

That said, we have created a template in terms of managing a project schedule that some of you that participate on the ePDP for the past couple of years have seen initial signs of. But in essence, we are essentially lifting the key charter topics and its subsequent charter questions into a project plan that will define the overall schedule.

It will highlight the key dependencies that it takes for us to get to finalizing an initial report, getting to a public comment, reviewing those comments, and delivering a final report. And as part of our

early discussions, this group will do a high-level review of each one of those topics and questions.

And one of the exit criteria when we do this comprehensive overview is to get a better understanding of how one topic may be more complex than another, try to get a better understanding if some of these topics can be deliberated or worked in parallel versus others that may take a more iterative approach to resolving or don't have any dependencies to themselves.

And coming out of all of that will better inform the project schedule so that we can more appropriately assign a duration that we will deliberate all of these topics. So, the ultimate goal here is that, once we have completed this exercise to better understand the duration and the dependencies, we're going to get to some kind of X-date that we'll review and take a look at that says, "We think we can deliver an initial report by this date," and kind of reconfirm our original assumptions of doing that.

But once we're satisfied with what our deliverable dates are going to be, the Transfer Leadership team will be submitting that proposed plan to the GNSO Council for their adoption. There is no formal resolution or anything along those lines but they are, basically, acknowledging that this is our work plan that we're committing to and the dates that are defined by that plan.

Now, as with any project, and certainly within the ICANN arena, it is challenging to deliver to committed-to dates. There are relief mechanisms that can allow us to shift dates. We'll do that either through building in some slack within our plan of the committed

dates, depending on the range of positions about a particular topic or the order in which they're discussed ...

May force the group to either have an increased, smaller-team-type discussions where a few of this group may go off, work on the side on a topic, and try to come to some sort of preliminary agreed conclusion or outcome that will help inform the plenary. We may have to resort to increasing the meeting schedule or the pace of the group to attempt to try to make our committed timelines.

And then, ultimately, as a last resort aspect, if we're fairly on track but we do originally recognize that we're going to need particular more time to get to that milestone deliverable, there is a formal project change request that can be submitted to the GNSO Council. But it doesn't necessarily mean that it's an automatic grant of extension. We need to provide rationale. We need to provide how we're going to mitigate the reason why we were delayed and ultimately take that to the council for approval.

And we'll get into more details of that down the road. The final thing I'll say about this is that how we're taking this approach is ... As I mentioned earlier, trying to determine the duration of how long it will take for us to deliberate a particular topic is quite difficult. But one of the things that we can do is what I've been terming as "the crank."

For each one of the policy topics and its charter questions that are defined in there, each one of those are basically equating to a block or a chunk of work that we're going to do. And as we review each one of these blocks or charter questions, etc., the process for reviewing them will be the same. Essentially, we'll have an introduction to the topic.

The group will deliberate based off all of the available information that it has around that topic, start to form some preliminary agreements, or conclusions, or outcomes, maybe possible draft recommendations. All of this, in parallel, will be documented by staff's assistants. But we get to where we have kind of a reading one, and then we have the opportunity for the full group to respond and react to, deliberate a little bit further, where we get to a reading two, final reactions, and then get to a point where we consider that topic stable, and then move onto the next block.

And ultimately, once we've met the exit criteria for each individual block, we'll have ... Basically, we won't circle back to relitigate or discuss any of those aspects unless some sort of new information comes along that may have changed those.

So the takeaway here, again, is it's kind of a very regimented approach about how we're going to tackle each one of the charter questions that feed up into a larger, overall plan that then, from there, can be lifted out from each block that fits into our initial report that takes us to our public comment. So, more to come there. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

All right, great. Thanks, Berry. I just wanted to jump in here because I did overlook one of our members and I wanted to give them a chance to introduce himself. So John, if you're ready, please go ahead and introduce yourself.

JULIE BISLAND: He might be having trouble with his mic, Roger. John Woodworth, are you able to open your mic?

JOHN WOODWORTH: Sorry, can you hear me? Hi. My name is John Woodworth. I'm the chief DNS architect at Lumen, formerly CenturyLink. I'm here in an ISPCP capacity. On the technical side, this is my first PDP, so first venture into the policy side.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, John. It did sound like we had quite a few first-time PDP-ers, so it's great that you joined this one because this one is going to go extremely smooth and efficiently. So, you'll be set up for all your next ones, so you'll know how good they can actually be. Well, let's jump into picking a reoccurring date that we can all make the meetings. I don't know if staff wants to go through this?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Roger. I'm happy to do that.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: So, this is our first challenge as a group, just to find a time slot that we can make work with various people's time zones, schedules, other PDPs, and all of that. Never easy, so we'll do our best to find something that works. The proposal is to initially meet once a week

for 90 minutes, noting that the working group may consider increasing the frequency to twice a week if that's necessary as the work progresses and seems appropriate.

But for now, we're going to start with weekly. We did a Doodle for this week and, if everyone is okay with it, maybe we'll keep this timeslot for one or two more weeks, if that seems okay, just while we nail down a more permanent slot. I know Fridays are a little bit unusual in the ICANN space but also less crowded, so this seemed to work for a fair number of people.

So, if there are major objections, please pop them in the chat, but this would just be temporary. And then, one time slot that we found in the schedule that seems to not conflict with too many other ICANN commitments are Thursdays at 18:00 UTC, noting that one hour into that will sometimes conflict.

So, 30 minutes of that slot will sometimes conflict with GNSO Council meetings, which would mean either the meeting would need to be just an hour for those times or would need to be shifted slightly in those instances. So, that's what we're proposing.

We're going to put that out to the mailing list so that people who aren't on this call can react and everyone has a chance to look at their calendars, as well. And if that is not workable for the group as a whole, we can also do a Doodle poll for a reoccurring slot that will give people a chance to weigh in more extensively. Theo, please.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, thanks. So, when I did the initial Doodle poll I didn't notice that the times were listed as UTC. I thought they were in my

timeline. So, I completely messed it up. My apologies for not paying attention. So, from our part, if we could redo the Doodle poll it would be really great. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. And I do see a couple of comments in the chat saying this is late on a Friday for Europe. I definitely understand that. Yes. Daniel, I don't think Friday is the opportunist time for any of us, so I don't know if Thursday at 18:00 ... Can we make that happen next week, Emily? Or if this group is okay with that.

EMILY BARABAS: Roger, we can start. What we can do is send an e-mail to the list today just seeing if anyone else has any strong reactions to it. And then, unless we see an uproar, we can start with this Thursday at 18:00 UTC slot, try it for a few weeks, see how people do with it. We can always revisit it as the PDP progresses.

But if folks are ready to say, "You know what? For a little while, let's try the Thursday at 18:00 UTC," we can go ahead and get that scheduled. That's totally fine, as well. And just to clarify, the Doodle that we did before was just for a temporary time to get the first meeting or two kicked off. So, don't worry if you filled it out wrong or something like that. Don't worry about that. That won't affect anything in the long-term.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: So, I'm not seeing anyone objecting strongly at the moment. James, please.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah, sorry. I did type it in the chat room. I have a standing meeting, Registries Stakeholder Group standing meeting, at 18:00 UTC on Thursdays. It's actually a working group I chair. If I'm the only one with a conflict, I'll have to see if I can see about moving that around, but I would need a week or so to make that happen, which we would need a week or so to find another time if we were going to move it. So, that's just calling that out. Yeah, I'm already conflicted. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jim. Okay. Emily, do you think maybe we should try to get a poll out and then ... Jim, did you say this Thursday, as well? Is it every week that you have a conflict?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, Roger, it's every week. It's a standing meeting.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. So, what I'll maybe suggest then is I know for folks in Europe, myself included, Friday evening is not the finest time. But

I'm wondering if it might be possible to do just one more of these next week. We'll get, perhaps, a Doodle poll out with that Thursday option, and maybe we'll try to find a couple of others, and give everyone a chance to provide their options.

And eventually, we might consider, if there really aren't any good options at all, for example, rotating time slots or something like that. So, the proposal is to do this time for one more week, with apologies to folks in Europe about their Friday evenings, and then get the Doodle out with a few options and see what's workable for the most people, starting in the following week.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks sounds great. Thanks, Emily. And I think Jim Galvin said he would buy drinks for next Friday afternoon for all you European people. Just kidding, by the way. Okay. So, yeah, we'll move with that plan: next Friday, same time, for the one last time, and then we'll try to find a more suitable slot. Okay? I think that was the end of the agenda. Anybody have anything they want to bring up, or any questions? Yes. I see the party hat, Jim. I appreciate that. Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. I know that, right up front, there is a distinction made between inter-registrar and inter-registrant transfers. At least for my benefit, it would be useful to hear what the essential differences are that I suspect everyone else who is involved in this knows full well.

But in addition to that distinction, referring to what I was talking about earlier about transfers that involve moving continuing operation of DNS versus transfers that don't, I have a [mental] model in my head of maybe a two-by-two matrix, or maybe it collapses into few than four cases, in which, on the one hand, you have whether the transfers between registrars and registrants versus registrant ... And on the other hand, whether continued DNS operation is required or not.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think you end up with those four still, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: And sort of another question around the edges: what happens when the transfer is changing both registrars and registrants at the same time? So that those are not exactly alternatives but they could both be in effect.

ROGER CARNEY: Right, yeah. And I think that's one of the charter questions, actually, how to proceed with something like that, if that makes sense.

STEVE CROCKER: If you insist ... I mean, if the way to think about it is that they have to happen separately, that first you change registrant and then you change registrar, or vice versa, and make two steps out of it, then that has some consequences, perhaps financial, to the parties

involved and also, most likely, to the [inaudible] happen, and that affects the utility upon the part of the people you're trying to serve.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep, exactly. So, I think we will get to touch on those because that is, I think, one of the charter questions, if those can happen together or if they should happen together. So, we'll definitely review that. Berry, you have something to say on that?

BERRY COBB: Yes, thank you. Berry Cobb for the record. Just to highlight this is part of the reason why we have the Phase 1A and the Phase 1B. Back in the scoping team, there were ideas that, in discussing the change of registrant, could influence some of the outcomes that were determined with the other topics that you now see in Phase 1A.

And we didn't want to, basically, submit a final report on Phase 1A topics with that possibility in mind. So, the idea is, when we get into Phase 1B, and talk about change of registrant, and get into some of the details, even though those aspects of 1A have gone to public comment, there will still be the opportunity to revisit those based on new information or aspects of the change of registrant that may influence those before we package that up as a final report to the council. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Berry. All right. Any other comments? Well, since it is Friday late afternoon/evening for some of our European folks here,

being 20 minutes early, I think, is a good thing this time. So, I think we won't drag this on unless someone has anything else to add. And I think we can wrap this for the week. Staff, please go ahead.

JULIE BISLAND: All right. Well, thank you very much, Roger, and thanks, everyone, for joining. We will go ahead and end this meeting. Have a good weekend.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]