
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP

Tuesday, 01 June 2021 at 16:00 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/6AjQCQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 1st of June 2021 at 16:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay. And for today's call, we have apologies from Thomas Keller, RrSG. They have formally assigned Jody Kolker, RrSG, as their alternate for this call and the remaining days of absence.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. 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

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.

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 Zs before your name and add, in parentheses, “alternate” after your name, which will drop your name to the bottom of the participant list. To rename yourself in Zoom, hover over your name and click “rename.” As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite emails. Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing no hands, if you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO secretariat.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. As everybody sees, we’re going to try to do this in less than 60 minutes today—hopefully 55 minutes or so—so we can give everybody a couple minutes to get over to the policy session that’s starting right after this. So let’s jump in. We have two new members joining us from the NCSG, actually. I wanted to give them a chance to introduce themselves

and let us know why they joined the group and what they're looking for out of this group. So let me introduce Farzaneh. Please go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Hi. My name is Farzaneh Badiei and I joined the group because I was a part of the EPDP on privacy in WHOIS at some point and it turns out that it has some implications for the transfer policy or it might not have. So I'm here to observe that and stop anything from breaking. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thank you. All right. And Wisdom, please go ahead.

WISDOM DONKOR: Hello. Thank you very much. My name is Wisdom Donkor, NCSG. I'm a Council member. The reason for joining this policy group is because of the region that I'm coming from, the developing world, Africa. I think that a lot of issues within our part of the continent and I want to actually contribute to the process and see how some of them could be resolved.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks a lot. Well, welcome aboard, everyone. Let's jump into ICANN meeting coming up, as you've just heard. ICANN pre-week, everything starting this week. And ICANN actually officially starts in less than 2 weeks. We will be meeting June 16th at 12:30 UTC, I think, if that's correct. If not, staff, please correct me.

And we've decided to split our time at ICANN 71 between setting up or agreeing on what the goals of the team are going to be for the team and the policy and everything. There's some highlighted in the charter. We want to review them, make sure that that's the direction we're heading. We want to spend some time on that. But the other half of the time, we're going to spend on digging into the Auth-Info details. So just wanted to give everybody a heads up on what we're looking for from ICANN.

As well, our outreach to other SOs and ACs is currently being drafted. The team will get to see it once it's into an actual true rough draft. We'll give it to the team to take a look at and see if it's heading in the right direction, if we need to add anything. The goal is to actually have it out to the SOs and ACs before the end of the month. So we've got 30 days or so to get it done. I think that's about all the intros we need. Staff, am I missing anything? Okay. Great. Thanks, Emily. 14:30 Central Europe. Okay.

All right. Then let's go ahead and jump into the Phase 1B charter topics. Okay. So similar to last week, I hope everybody took the homework to heart, and looked through these things, and thought about the three poll questions that we'll ask on each of these. We'll obviously do this at the larger topics. We won't get into specific charter questions but just taking a look at the overall policy—the change of registrant and policy side of this which, if I remember right, is part two of the current policy.

We'll go ahead and ask the poll questions, if we can pull those up. Is Terri running those? Thank you. Again, same poll questions. Just go ahead and answer. Again, this is for just the active members.

SARAH WYLD: Hi, Roger. Can I just ask a clarifying question?

ROGER CARNEY: Sure, Sarah. Please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. On the second question, for any known dependencies, I would think that for change of registrant, one thing I would like to see before making a decision about what to do with it is evidence about the success or lack of success of this policy in preventing the problems that it was supposed to prevent. So is that the kind of dependency we're asking about here or is this policy-related dependencies, like how, for example, that doesn't make sense. The form of authorization would be an example of other policy dependency.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Thanks, Sarah. That's a good clarification. My idea on that would be just policy because we just want to make sure we're working everything in the right order—not specifically inputs into that. Just the policies themselves.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you. Okay. Hopefully that was enough time. Can we see the results? Okay. So it looks like we're pushing to the large-medium side of this. I think that that's good to know, that we'll be probably looking at, again, at least a medium on the far-end side. Okay.

Dependencies, it looks like there were a few people that thought there were some policy dependencies. If anyone wants to jump on a suggest what dependencies we have, either that have to be worked with this or have to be worked before this, even. Please go ahead and raise your hand and I'll call on you. Kristian, please go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. The change of registrar has to be done first, which we also planned for. But the reason is that today, the easiest way to do a registrant transfer is actually to do a registrar transfer because we can't pick the old registrant information from the old registrar because we can't pick the old registrant information from the old registrar so we always have to put in the new information when we do a registrar transfer. Then, the fact we the registrant transfer in the process. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Kristian. Okay. And on the third question, Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Roger. Just as a reminder, now that we've shifted out of Phase 1A and looking at Phase 1B charter questions, the rationale for the two-phased approach within this section is first dividing the amount of work across the full gamut of us reviewing the transfer policy. But more importantly, there were signals in the original scoping team that there were concerns about discussion of the change of registrant and how that might be impacted by, also, if the domain is transferred from one registrar to another and that there were possible overlaps here.

So the whole point is that while Phase 1A will conclude to an initial report and go into public comment, that when this group diverts its attention to the Phase 1B topics and change of registrant, that there is an exit criteria that we review the change of registrant—possible changes or recommendations in the context of the phase 1A topics, just to make sure that we're not missing anything or that we're not breaking anything and the consideration of both of these together, that ultimately conclude into a final report that will be shipped over to the GNSO Council. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Berry. Okay. Moving on to question three. Any new or different topics that should be explored. It looks like someone answered yes so if you want to come to the mic and suggest what we should be looking at. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: My intention of putting a yes on this one is that we have scenarios where the registrant did the registration to a reseller of a registrar

that, for some reason, has not been identified or going out of business and hence the registrar doesn't have any records of that registration and can't assist. Or the registrant has problems in reaching the registrar due to this lack of information. So I was hoping this could be included in some way. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay. Thank you. All right. Any other comments on the overall change of registrant policy? Okay. Let's move on to the 60-day lock. I know we've had some discussion on this in the prior section. So please go ahead and answer the three poll questions.

Okay. If we can see the results. Thank you. So very similar to the last one. Heavy-medium but edging toward a bigger medium, I guess. So that's good. I think that was somewhat consistent with when we talked briefly about it in the above section. Any known dependencies? It looks like there's a few that people may have saw, if I can ask you to come up to the mic and suggest what dependencies we're looking at—if we need to work this with something or it needs to be worked after something else. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi, Roger. Thank you. Just repeating what I said in the chat. And I hadn't really thought of it the same way on the first question so my answer was a bit different. But yes, actually. I do see Kristian's point that this is really tied into what happens during a registrar transfer. So we want to get that update. The updates to that

process, we want to have them stable so that we can take that into account when making changes to this process, I think. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Sarah. All right. Any other comments on that? Okay. Perfect. Then we can move on to the privacy/proxy. All right. And let's go ahead and ask the poll questions.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Roger. So far there's just a slight delay on my side. I'm getting there.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. No problem. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. There you go.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Terri. Okay. Perfect. Can we see the results, please? There we go. Okay. We're being consistent on the size, here. Again, it looks like medium's winning here but there's some tendency to the higher side of that. So good. Dependencies, it looks like there's a few people that thought there were some dependencies that we need to look out for. Again, I'll ask for anyone that has one of those dependencies in thought, come to the mic and let us know what those are. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yes. Thanks, Roger. When I saw that question, I was immediately thinking of the current IRT that is still dealing with the privacy/proxy—the PPSAI one. I can't even remember where we are in the process for that IRT but I can't immediately exclude the scenario that there might be something coming out of the pipeline there that might have some effect. But I am no longer sure. It's been so long ago. But it could be. I don't know.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Theo. Yeah. And if I remember correctly, yes. It's deep into the IRT phase for the PPSAI. They were working on the final documentation for that so I think it's quite a ways along. I just don't know the status of bringing it back or not. So it's something to watch ... Oh. There we go. Berry also put it that it is on hold for a Council decision. Okay. Any other dependencies people think should be raised here? Okay. The third question, it doesn't look like anybody had anything additional to add so that's good. That makes it clear. Okay. So moving on to designated agent. Thank you.

Okay. Can we see the results, please? Okay. So a little on the smaller side of medium this time, maybe, I'll say. But medium again. Okay. And dependencies, it looks like there were some thoughts on dependencies. Anyone want to come to the mic and suggest what those dependencies might be? Some dependencies but just unknown ones? No one? Okay. It looks like no additional topics at this point so that's good that we have that clear. Good. Okay. Moving along quickly today. Additional questions? Okay.

Okay. Let me see the results, please. All right. So maybe a low to medium size here, it looks like. Fairly consistent results between those. Okay. No known dependencies at this time so we can work that when we need to. That's good. And no additional topics to add. It's clear enough to discuss. Good.

I'll just note that Sarah did put a dependency in for the last topic in chat. She just mentioned if we have a change of registrant process at all or not. So one to remember on all of it. Thanks, Sarah. Yeah. Exactly.

All right. And then finally, Wave 1, Recommendation 27. If we could pull up the poll on this one. Sorry. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. Hi, everyone. Just as we're starting to dive into this whole question, I thought it might be helpful for us to pull up the relevant section of the report so you can see that.

ROGER CARNEY: Perfect.

EMILY BARABAS: So as a reminder—I'm sorry for the background noise—the Wave 1 report is intended to basically outline some of the potential impacts of the EPDP recommendations on other policies, including the transfer policy. And there's just one element of that report that focuses on change of registrant.

So I'll just read it in case anyone hasn't had a chance to read the report yet. It says, "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 rates to other registrants freely. This language may be updated to clarify what updating registration data means, whether requirements differ according to whether a change of registrant changes anything that is displayed. So that's the item of focus. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Emily. Okay. Please go ahead and answer the polls on that, then.

All right. If we can see the results, please. Perfect. Okay. So possibly a medium. Quite a few lows on that as well but a medium, looks like. A possible dependency. Anybody want to speak on the possible dependency? Okay, Sarah. Thank you. Again, she's just mentioning that this is somewhat dependent on the process as a whole. So thank you. No additional topics to add at this time so that's good. All right. Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. I believe that this is the last question that we'll use the poll for. So if I might ask the group ... Most of the topics, at least with the exception of these last two trend to medium or higher, which gives me a signal that these are fairly substantial discussions to have.

But I'd ask the group. What is more important in terms of when we ... And this is subject to change, of course, as we deliberate Phase 1A topics and go out to public comment with that. And it may help inform some of the discussions for Phase 1B. But in isolation, what would you consider more important to discuss first, the 60-day lock or the actual change of registrant process, if we were to pick which one to start out of the gate?

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Barry. Comments, anyone? Suggestions? Thoughts on doing the overall policy first, 60-day lock first? Sarah's thinking the process first looks best. Sarah, if you want to go ahead, please.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yes. I would like to look at the change of registrant policy overall first. I would hope that we could do things like looking at data to see if the policy has been successful. And perhaps, if we do that, we will determine that we no longer need such a policy, in which case we don't need to spend time thinking about the duration of the lock that we are getting rid of. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Perfect. Thanks, Sarah. It looks like there's a lot of agreement in chat there to hit the policy first. Great. Any other comments, thoughts from people?

Okay. Great. I think we got through that nice and efficiently today. Jumping onto our last item on our agenda, just to remind

everybody, we do have a meeting next week, which will be our last one before ICANN—next Tuesday, same time. And then, we'll follow that up the following week with an ICANN meeting and then take our typical week off after. I'll make a call for any other business here. Anybody want to ...? Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Roger. Just regarding the schedule, as everyone knows, we've only scheduled meetings, so far, up until ICANN 71. If you have any feedback, especially members, about the timeslot that we've been using these last few weeks, please feel free to reach out to Roger or to staff—whoever you feel comfortable with—and let us know how it's going because, of course, we can seek alternatives. We can look into rotation and so forth.

So if this is working for everyone, we'll continue to schedule this out on an ongoing basis in the same timeslot. But if it's not, there are other options as well. If you don't feel comfortable speaking up on a call, please do reach out to us individually. We're happy to hear your feedback. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay. Again, I'll open up the mic to any other business. Anyone have anything to bring up? Questions on where we're going from here? Anything? Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. Just as a preview to next week, and subject to change after the leadership team meets, but in general, we'll take

the feedback from the polls, come up with the next iteration of the project plan. So we'll spend a little bit of time looking at the first version of that about possible deliverable dates for initial reports, public comments for both phases, getting into a final report.

Based on how quickly we've worked through this process, I think we're in a good place that this working group will submit its work plan to the Council for their acknowledgment and that we're committing to these particular deliverable dates. So we do have, easily, a good month before we send that over to the Council for final commitments.

Secondarily, I think for next week, we'll spend a little time focusing on the early input. That is requirement for the PDP process, sent out to the SOs, and ACs, and SGs, and Cs. Right now, that is looking mostly a replica of the charter questions that we have in the charter. But we also might consider a couple of additional questions based on some other feedback that may be included in that.

And then, finally, based on the feedback that we've gotten thus far, it sounds like, as Roger noted earlier, we'll start kicking off with the topic of Auth-Info code management. I would encourage members to submit to the list if they have ideas about how that discussion should look in context of those particular charter questions that will frame the discussion. But if you have ideas on what area can be discussed first, that might be helpful to form the discussions over the next several weeks as we start to hone in on that. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you, Berry. Okay. Anyone else with anything they want to bring up? Okay. Well, this is an overachieving group. We put a lot into 60 minutes, and that was done, and I even backed it down to 55 minutes and got done before that. That's great. Rich, please go ahead.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Thanks. I just wanted to let the folks on this PDP know. This will be my final PDP meeting as a primary or whatever we're calling that. I'm going to be stepping away from GoDaddy at the end of this week. And Ashley and Owen have been working on designating a replacement to make sure this PDP keeps the ground running and all. And I just wanted to apologize for stepping out early after just bootstrapping with everybody but time is of the essence in me not being here anymore. So anyway, I just wanted to let you guys know and say it's been a pleasure working with you all. I'm probably going to see a bunch of you around someplace, somewhere, but I don't know when and where. So cheers.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rich. Okay. Anyone else? All right. Staff, I think we can call it a day.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you very much, Roger. And everyone, this concludes the meeting. I hope you have a good rest of your day or night. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]