ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 26 July 2022 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/5AIVD
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, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review EPDP working group call taking place on Tuesday the 26th of July 2022.

For today's call, we have apologies from Prudence Malinki (RrSG), Steinar Grøtterød (At-Large), and Owen Smigelski (RrSG). They have formally assigned Jody Kolker (RrSG), Lutz Donnerhacke (At-Large), Essie Musailov (RrSG) as their alternates for this call and for remaining days of absence. As a reminder, an alternate assignment must be formalized by way of a Google assignment form. The link is available in all meeting invite e-mails.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. If you have not already done so, please change your chat selection from host and panelists to everyone in order for all participants to see your chat, and so it's captured in the recording.

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.

Alternates not replacing a member should not engage in the chat or use any of the other Zoom room functionalities.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now. And seeing no one, 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 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: Thanks, Julie. I'm going to change up the agenda slightly just because we have some timing issues today. So I'm going to ask Berry if he can jump on real quick and walk us through the matrix for number three on our agenda today to help us walk through this item. Staff created a matrix to help us walk through this. So I'm going to have very talked to that first here. So Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Roger. Since Roger labeled it as the matrix, it's not to be confused with the movie, it's just a simple table for us to analyze our work going forward. So if you had a chance to look at the table that Emily sent out after the agenda yesterday, the purpose of this is to try to tee that up and introduce what the approach or proposed approach should be like.

What I want to kind of start off with is when we look at the change of registrant policy or now properly labeled the inter registrant policy back in the day, the IRTP C and the IRT, they had a luxury, and maybe some others would claim it to be a curse. But this policy was developed from a blank slate. And, of course, it was also in the context of what had just come out of the IRTP B.

For us, though, we don't have the luxury of this blank slate approach. And I guess, depending on how what the outcome of our work is here, we'll get to determine whether that was a curse or luxury as well, kind of jokingly. But as I noted on the last call, because we do have an existing policy to deal with, even if there were full consensus to get rid of the policy, we are also required and mandated to provide that rationale, because of course, even if we went to public comment saying that the policy was no good, if there was no rationale there, we wouldn't get support for it whatsoever. So that's kind of the guardrails or the circumstances that we're having to deal with here.

Now, while we don't have a blank slate approach here or the opportunity for it, we do have the ability to ask ourselves a very important question. And I think every aspect of the group's deliberations from this point forward should be in the context of kind of a fake blank slate. But asking ourselves, would the change of registrant policy as it's shaped today have been developed to the way that it is understanding two core components that this group has provided in the phase 1A?

So those two primary components is one, if the TAC is only being revealed at request versus today's world where it's just sitting there, and in most circumstances generated at creation, but then

EN

secondarily, if there was a post transfer restriction of 30 or 60 days, or whatever, would that have been enough of a mechanism to try to warrant what IRTP C was originally trying to overcome, which was predominantly around trying to minimize or mitigate the hijacking of the domains?

So we've also admitted to ourselves that we really don't have data for us to analyze and work with. So really, our only approach is to do a systematic analysis of the existing requirements, and basically make an interpretation or a determination whether the existing requirements are fit for purpose, not only with the issues that the group understands today, but again, back in context of phase 1A.

And so that table is hopefully an attempt to meet that need. So I believe on the screen is the current policy. And there's two key components here that we're dealing with. Our prior calls, we tried to review through each particular line item and kind of have initial discussions about what the group's feelings and thoughts and positions are about that particular policy.

But what I want to draw your attention to specifically first is Section A, and that contains basically definitions of what a change of registrant is, or more specifically, what a material change means. And what are the triggers, and I'm using air quotes around this, what are the triggers that then invoke what is mostly published in Section C.

And Section C, it's about the process of implementing based off of these particular triggers, whether that's an approval or a lock being applied, and those kinds of aspects. But I want to kind of

have a step back a little bit and just generically label it the actions. So what we're going to be analyzing in detail is the trigger, and then what are the current actions or possible actions that warrant some sort of restriction or component based on that trigger type.

So let's go ahead and flip over now to the table. And I just want to walk through a couple of high-level explanations to this. First and foremost, I have to go with the disclaimer that the responses that you see in the table, Emily highlighted this in her e-mail, are just draft responses and they're in no way an indicator of staff position, or anything. They're basically formed around some of the concepts that some of the working group members had talked about. But we fully expect that based on input and working group deliberations, that all of these are subject to change, and really just there to try to provide an example, to enhance your ability to understand how this table would work, by even calling out some of the extremes instead of just currently trying to list down what the current requirements are.

So basically, the triggers that I mentioned which are Section A of the policy are the first column on the left. And when you look at that particular column, you're going to know that I'm dissecting each of the triggers in isolation of themselves. And we'll get into that in a little bit.

But the point here is what I'm really trying to do is draw solid lines around key components of the policy, as we understand them today. They're basically what's going to allow us to look at the triggers and proposed actions in isolation to what they actually mean or translate into, what we experience in the marketplace today.

EN

So the first one, as I noted, is when you look at rows four and five specifically, is the first line that we're trying to draw, is that particular transaction a legitimate one or an illegitimate one? And we can get into some of the details about whether that is possible or not to distinguish. I think in most cases, we probably only recognize that it's illegitimate in that as a result, and not as a proactive component. And if they're even legitimate, we may not even never know that they happened other than some transaction being written in a log or something somewhere. So this first line is legitimate versus illegitimate. And that drives the logic moving left to right on these two rows.

So what's really going to be happening next is the second line. And this is really trying to understand what is important of what is actually happening based on the trigger. So columns F and G [in 10] are essentially an action or a possible action. But in the context that the domain, any changes to that contact information of the domain is with the understanding that there is no intention to move to another registrar. And there's no intention to really move to a different registered name holder, call it what [inaudible] an account level change, a warm body change of ownership of the domain. It's strictly within the confines of a single edit to the current registered name holder's information.

But as we move over to the next two columns, we get into columns H and I, this somewhat changes a little bit because there is possibilities or probabilities, however you want to call it, that, yes, there are probably going to be changes in contact information. But they're also in connection with a change of

ownership, change of control that was used originally from IRTP B, part C, inter registrant change.

But at the end of the day, there's something else going on to the domain other than just necessarily a change of contact information. And this will probably be our most challenging part of the analysis, because some of these triggers may have an action before that potential change and certainly after that potential change, and we want to try to get into the details of that.

And then moving finally over a little bit further are columns J and k, Juliet and Kilo. Now, this, of course, is, as we've heard many times, there's a lot of frustration in the marketplace about, "I need to change my contact information, because I also want to change registrars, my e-mail address has changed," whatever the reasoning is. that change, which is inter registrant or material change, is mucking up the process with legitimate intent, essentially, to also change registrars. And we'll dive into some of the analysis there. But this is probably where we can start to leverage some of those phase 1A type recommendations.

And then finally, for each of these three columns sets, as I noted, there's a proposed actions column. And here is kind of a space where we can start to brainstorm and understand, is the current restriction that is applied today still fit for purpose or applicable to the change being made? What are some other ideas that we might consider? The group talked about instead of approval, maybe it's just the notification. Is the lock or restriction warranted and those kinds of things?

And then finally, moving far over to the right is column K, and this is our outcomes. This is going to be the column that has the solid substance for further deliberations, possible recommendations, rationale for why the group comes up with changes and essentially, that starts to enter into our phase 1B initial report, as that supporting material for recommendations that get developed, if any.

So finally, just to wrap up here, the general cadence is, what do we have in the policy today? What are the impacts based on these existing requirements? How does it adversely affect the market? What are some possible ideas or actions that could counter the issues that are being experienced today? And in the context of our overarching principle about trying to enhance the security and the protection of these domain names for registered name holders. And then finally to take all of this analysis and compile some outcome or possible recommendation. And Emily's going to later on talk about how we're going to facilitate input into this, as well as probably run through rows four and five to just give a better example.

One final thing I want to note is when you look at rows four and five, you're going to see that it's literally just the name that is changing. But if you look at rows six and seven, it's the name change and a change in the physical address and phone number. And now it's very probable that a lot of the material or responses that this group deliberates over time will be almost possibly the same copies when we look at rows six and seven, but they are distinct types of triggers that we need to account for, and see if there's, because of this additional relationship, does it warrant a

separate level of a possible restriction or action than just name change by itself?

So I hope I made that clear. I'll try to stay on for a minute or two for questions, but I do need to run. Other than that, both Emily and Julie are pretty well versed in this approach here. So thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Berry. Thanks for going through that for us real quick. Theo, please go ahead real quick before Berry has to drop.

THEO GEURTS: Oh, we can wait. If Berry wants to have some questions specific to this. I can wait.

BERRY COBB: Oh, I've got two minutes. And then I can then I do need to drop.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. If anybody has anything specific on this. It sounds like Theo's is a little more general.

BERRY COBB: Okay. Thank you, everybody. I'll be sure to catch the recording and apologies for dropping early.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Berry. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: And after the call last week, when it became very clear that we needed to come up with more of a rationale and make sure that we have reasoning behind the decisions that we have, I sort of took upon a little project last week to see if we can get some more data points into this working group so that we can either take that into account or not, I leave it up to the group.

But the previous iteration of this working group, we didn't have much information to go on. And something like two factor authentication was not out there back in the day. I mean, it just started out. It was not something that you could look at, like, is this a factor that we should factor in, in our deliberation. That was simply not possible.

However, times have changed. So I've been looking at quite a lot of registrar colleagues and the companies to see if they are offering to have a and see if there's, if that is sort of a practice that got traction over the years, and it does. It's no surprise when I named companies like Namecheap, GoDaddy, the larger registrar, they've all got two factor authentication.

So drill down to your real smaller ones. Like I don't want to belittle these companies, by any means. But for example, [inaudible] which is not a large registrar, they offer 2FA. So at some point I really had to dig down to see if I could find a registrar who did not offer 2FA authentication. And I couldn't find one. I did not check all 2200 registrars out there. I just took the most ones that I'm familiar with or I knew that they don't have many domain names. And I think that everybody, most of the registrars have it, especially the

larger ones, which is good, which means that most of the registrants can have a very good protection into their account.

So that is very, very good. So I think times have changed a lot since we first started discussing all of this in the previous iteration, like more than a decade ago, and those data points are available. I mean, it's not that hard to drum up that information to see what registrars are doing in terms of security, and it seems we are in pretty good spot. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, that's a really good point. Because we always bring up, has the landscape changed? And security gets better and data privacy comes in. And so it's changing landscape on us. But it's a good call out that the factor is more of a, I guess, not just known, but a very well used feature throughout the industry. And to your point, you're probably talking 90 plus percent of domains have that function, that security functionality available to them. So yeah, I think that's a great call out on the landscape changing from then to now on something that is obviously adding more security to the ecosystem. So great, thanks, Theo.

I think I will turn this to Emily and see if she has more discussion on this table here. And I didn't want to confuse this matrix with the movie trilogy—is there four now? I don't even know. I think there's four now. So it's not whatever trilogy is for four. Okay. But this table here that we're using. So I'll turn this over to Emily.

EMILY BARABAS:	Thanks, Roger. Maybe an unpopular opinion, but I think only the first Matrix really matters. So I'm a little squeaky. I have a cold, but I will do my darndest to get us through this. We needed to move pretty fast in the first pass of introducing what this is. So I certainly welcome, as we go through, questions, but I think what we'll do is just do a little bit of a deeper dive into this sample or example answer that we put in here to sort of demonstrate the idea of how this table can be used by the group. But before doing that, if there's anything that people kind of want to—I didn't want to make anyone feel rushed as Berry exited. So if there are questions as I go, just raise your hands.

So as Berry mentioned, we have this idea of trigger and action. And kudos to Berry for developing this concept. We've been kicking around a lot of different ways to break this conversation down. And I think that no table or chart or poll will capture everything perfectly in everyone's mind. But I think this is really a good starting point. And we can always tweak if people think that there's better ways to adjust it.

So, as Berry mentioned, we start with this trigger idea. And the first sort of use case that we're looking at is a prior registrant name change. So you're looking here at the combination of 2A 1.1.1, which is—I'm going to switch over to the transfer policy for a moment. This is the first definitional piece under the definition. So change to prior registrant name. And it's being presented in combination with this first piece of defining a material change. So it's a change to the registered name holder's name or in this case, just the name that is not a typographical correction.

EN

I got a little bit tripped up with this first column, I admit, because obviously, you can't frequently tell if an action is legitimate or not. But I think the helpful distinction here is that we really want to be weighing, as we develop policy, the impact on everyday users just doing what they do, be it positive or negative, alongside the impact of these use cases that are probably much more unusual, but potentially very impactful such as malicious domain theft or something like that, and think about, does the action stop those bad things from happening or slow down those bad things when they're happening? And how do we weigh that against the potential impact of these restrictions or requirements that may inconvenience everyday users?

So I think that's what we're trying to get out here. And it may be helpful in some of these cases to think about what some of these legitimate or not legitimate actions or transactions may be. It may not be helpful to get that granular, but I welcome all of your thoughts on that. So in this case, we're just sort of looking at these two potential paths for each trigger. Any questions about what we're trying to do there? Not yet.

I think for a lot of these different triggers, the answer is going to be that you really, as Berry mentioned, are not going to be able to tell off the bat if something is legitimate or not, which obviously makes it challenging. But I think recognizing that that's not something you're going to be able to do upfront is a useful thing and thinking about what the actions might be down the line. So this will probably be something that we repeat, for many rows.

This is more relevant in some cases than others, the question of whether it's possible to distinguish between a typographical

correction or an another type of update. That's obviously most relevant in these cases where that's the language that we're looking at in the trigger, so something like this. And I think often, again, the answer is going to be, "Hey, it's really hard to tell if something's a typographical correction or it's not. That's kind of a judgment call in a lot of cases." And whether or not that's a problem is something that group can discuss.

So before I go on to our pink columns and talk about the example, does anyone have any questions or want to just sort of weigh in on the approach on these first few white columns? Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. Yeah, and again, I think I just want to reiterate what you said. And I think that these first few columns should be pretty easy to answer. And maybe they all lean kind of one way, but I think it's important, as you mentioned, later on when we start talking about actions and that leading to the—especially the first column here, the yes or no, and it's like, okay, and as you go through the actions, it makes a little more sense.

But also on the line of the idea of knowing at the time. Obviously intent is very hard to know, impossible to know, some would say, but it's important that—and again, you drew this line, Emily, that, again, when we look at action, you're talking about, okay, yes, we don't know upfront, but maybe something, okay, yes, they did this, and then they took ownership or whatever it is. So that it leads to draw—a tighter line. So, yes, I think that these first few columns, as you look at it, seem pretty simple and maybe not that useful. But I think you have to think about using them later on in the

process of as we go through this. So I just wanted to bring that up. Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. And would you like me to just continue to kind of move horizontally on this first use case for the moment?

ROGER CARNEY: Please. Yeah, and again, as Berry mentioned, you may agree with all these answers, but it's not a statement of this working group or anything. It was just an example so that we can walk through it. So thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. As we discussed before, the other thing that's a little bit tricky here is this concept of change of control. The term that was used at the origins of the policy development work for IRTP part C, I think the term was used in part B as well as they were sort of referring this work to the Part C group. And that evolved into what we have now in the policy in terms of definitions.

We like this term, because it is sort of the genesis of where this all came from. But as you will probably note, there isn't a clear, concise definition. And it may be quite hard to sort of define that and tease that out from some of these other triggers. So for the moment, we're just kind of thinking of that as a concept and trying to think about if you could define it, does it matter that there's change of control happening versus just a trigger in isolation? So that's the idea. And we can certainly pause for a bigger debate

EN

about change of control if this is a good moment for it, or I can just keep powering forward with the example. And then we can circle back to that when it seems appropriate.

No hands yet, so I'm going to keep powering. So looking at, I'm now in columns, F and G, this is sort of the simplest case where you have an update to the registrant name. It doesn't appear to be a typographical correction, and nothing else is happening. All that's happening is the name being updated. So you can think about what those examples might be. Someone gets married, someone has an identity change, whatever it is, and they change their name. But there isn't clearly any sort of change of control or inter registrar transfer associated with it.

So the question is, in this case, the requirement currently is that there's affirmative consent required from both the prior registrant and the new registrant. Well, I guess I'll mention that, of course, the lock requirement comes into play as well, although since in this case, there is no inter registrar transfer being initiated, the lock is sort of irrelevant.

So our example text is to say, are these requirements fit for purpose? Well, if it's legitimate, our example person says, "Look, I don't think that the name change alone is a change of control and I only think that there should be extra requirements if there actually is some sort of change of control because the risks are lower in that case." And our example person also notes that the current policy language makes it pretty hard to tell if updates are actually appropriate to trigger the requirements. Our example person proposes that we replace this confirmation requirement with a notification requirement, which is something we've

discussed previously as a possibility, and eliminates the 60-day lock for this use case.

In the case that the transaction is not legitimate, the base language is the same here. But our example person notes that if there is a malicious actor at play, if you are just updating the name and nothing else, and taking no additional action, the impact is fairly limited. And once alerted to the change, the RNH can then seek to remedy through dispute resolution. And that's a relatively straightforward case. And the recommendations are pretty much the same here in terms of proposed action, and also notes that dispute resolution will be explored further in phase two. So is everyone—are we all along for the ride here of what we're sort of doing with this table so far? Any questions?

Okay, we'll do a little more then. So next, thinking about a case where this update is not just an update with nothing else, but it's in close proximity to or is part of a change of control. And those are obviously two different things. But we're kind of trying to capture the package of that in these cells to avoid having a million different columns.

So to the question of whether a policy requirements are fit for purpose, here, the person says that in and of itself, this update is not a change of control. If there is a change of control afterwards, or as part of this change, then that would be the thing that triggers additional requirements. And here, the person notes just below, it seems unlikely that a malicious actor would first update the name and then initiate a change of control afterwards, it just doesn't seem like there's a strong use case for that happening repeatedly. In terms of proposed actions, it's basically the same. Essentially,

there's nothing additional here that's required. And then if there is a change of control, that might be appropriate to trigger something additional in terms of requirements.

And then finally, looking at the use case where this update is followed by an inter registrar transfer, our hypothetical person looking at the case where the transaction is legitimate, or the update is legitimate, our example person says that the requirement is confusing and burdensome to our registrants and in many cases, those are legitimate actions that the person is taking, that the Phase One A recommendations followed—that under those recommendations, following the inter registrar transfer, the domain won't be able to transfer to a third registrar for 30 days. So it will first transfer from one to another registrar. But after that, what we're calling a lock, but really the restriction will be in place. So an additional hop will not be able to happen. And the registrar will receive notifications regarding the transfer. So this is sufficient to contain the risks associated with domain name hopping, should it exist, for our example user.

If the transaction is not legitimate, the 60-day core lock—so that's an inter registrar lock after the update happens. That is helpful in the scenario where the update plus the transfer is in some way not legitimate or is malicious. But at the same time, the requirement is still confusing and burdensome for the sort of standard transactions that happen. And those are much more common. So from this person's perspective, ultimately, there are a few ways to address domain theft using policy that are not overly restrictive to legitimate activity. And so this person says, "I think the 60-day lock

should never be applied in this use case, it should just go away completely."

If the lock is needed according to the working group, registrars should be required to allow registrants to opt out of a lock before it is applied from this person's perspective. And the proposed actions are very much along the same lines. So it notes that the 60-day lock should be eliminated for this use case and the Phase 1A measures are sufficient to contain risk. And the proposed action in the malicious use cases is very similar as well.

It's noted that if the name update is malicious and followed by an inter registrar transfer, but the e-mail address is the same as it had been and the RNH can still access that e-mail account, the RNH will be receiving notifications about the transfer and that will allow them to take action and seek remedy.

So our final column here is just a summary of what's been presented in the previous cell, so I won't read through the whole thing. But it's sort of summarized just to say, for this set of use cases, the person believes there shouldn't be a core lock, 30 or 60 days, there shouldn't be a requirement for prior consent, there should be a new requirement for notifications of the update to the name, that a dispute mechanisms should be considered further in phase two, that provisions 2A 1.1.1 and to 2A 1.3.1 should be reviewed to determine if they're fit for purpose. And finally, that the title change of inter registrant should be reviewed if it's still applicable, which is sort of a broader concept for this part of the policy.

So I'm going to pause. Are there any questions about this example and kind of what we're trying to do here? As you can see, a lot of it's kind of repetitive. But I think that those patterns that you see help to sort of create the culmination here in the gray box, which is the final recommendation across the different scenarios, and across the different considerations of malicious versus legitimate transactions. I'll pause there. Thanks. And Roger, do you want me to manage discussion? Or do you want to take care of that?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Emily. I can take care of it. And we'll go from here. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks, Emily. This is really great walk through through the entire thing. So I think this is going to be really helpful in the determination. On the subject when it comes to malicious activity, I've always said and I'm still of the opinion that the current change of registrant policy as it is now is the perfect FAQ for people who want to steal a domain name, you just read the policy, make sure that you don't trigger anything of it. So it's pretty good that we go into that subject and that you also made the considerations on what the impact is there. So I think, all in all, great work. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Any other general comments from anyone on this? Okay, so thinking about this chart, and hopefully it's fairly easy and as Emily went through it, it made some more sense to

everyone how it was organized and why it was organized that way.

I guess the big question is, does this group want to go through this on a call? Does this group want to take a blank sheet and fill it out themselves and staff can pull all those together and we can review the comments from—again, don't have to be attributed, we can just leave it as that. But pull them all together so that we can discuss them next time or the time after? Thoughts on how to proceed through this? Other thoughts?

Is it easier to make it go across? Is it easier to go down when you're thinking about it? The change of some data element and there not being an appearance or even if a registrars' watching it, no ownership or no inter registrar transfer happens, I mean, those columns F and G become pretty easy when you think about that and you're going through. Is it easier just to work down that scenario real quick? And again, if we're going to do this offline and everybody takes the week to fill this chart out—and again, I think that, as Emily mentioned, it gets a little repetitive, but it really does help drive to the fact of the conclusions that we get to. I don't think it's a lot of work. But just wanted to get thoughts from the group if we wanted to walk through these on the calls, or seems to make more sense to, "Okay, everyone take a stab at it. We'll take everybody's comments in and review them as a collaborative effort on the next call" or something. Theo, please oga.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, so I'm not 100% sure here. Just to make sure. Let's say we do this offline and we get some input from several people here.

Am I correct in understanding that at some point, we still need to go through the entire thing to make sure we did the work so we are accountable in some kind of fashion? Or how does that work? It feels to me like, at the end of the day, we should have gone through this entire thing anyways, so maybe we should bite the bullet and go ahead. But I go with the group. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and the idea is if this is a homework assignment—and maybe everybody doesn't do it, or four or five people turn it back in, we'll spend a call going through all those and discussing all those comments everyone's made, and seeing if the group agrees or not and if that raises any other questions. So we'll be stepping through these. And as we're doing this, to your point, Theo, I think that as we're walking through this and we get to some of these conclusions, they're actually indirectly answering all of our charter questions. And that's what we're set out to do, is get those charter questions answered.

And in processing this, the idea is once we get to these conclusions, it actually does answer the charter questions, again, what this group is supposed to do so. Okay, any other thoughts, comments on this? Okay, quiet group today, which is okay.

I think where I want to go with this here then is, I think let's take this and staff can give us some timelines. But let's plan to do this as a homework assignment. And again, if you're not sure on one of them, just say that and then move on. But I think honestly, someone could go through this fairly quick and get this chart filled out pretty easily. And then staff will just pull them all together and

provide us a deduplicated—because I'm sure a lot of it is going to be similar—back to us so that we can cover those. And I think that it'll help discussions, especially if someone's not sure or has a slightly different opinion, I think they'll pull that out quickly and allow us to focus on those areas. And those areas where everybody says, "Yeah, that's simple" and everybody agrees to it, we don't have to spend a lot of time on it. So I think, moving forward, let's plan to do this as a homework assignment and we can get—Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. I was just going to talk about timelines when you're ready.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. Perfect. I think that's a good time.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So we have two more calls before we do our summer pause. And I think this is really a matter of getting feedback from all of you about what's feasible, because I think for this to be a productive exercise, we don't just have a handful of people respond, but really get folks'—ideally, everyone's—responses individually. I think if there are people who would rather team up with a buddy and work on it together, of course, that's fine. Or even several buddies from your groups, I think that's totally fine as well. But I think we do want to get a sampling of responses from different perspectives, or else we're just reading out people, just reinforcing the same ideas. And ultimately, that's going to make it

harder for us to get to this final column here, which is the key, the sort of responses to the charter questions, essentially.

So I think the question is, realistically do people think if we said, hey, by the end of this coming Monday, take a stab at filling out the chart in Excel, send it to staff, we'll compile it on Tuesday morning and start to go through it on Tuesday," is that reasonable? And if not, could everyone do a portion of the chart?

I think, as Roger said, because it's fairly repetitive, once you've done a couple, they'll probably be pretty similar. Maybe the folks will think that when we get down to e-mail address, there's probably going to be some differences there. But for some of these initial rows, I think it will be pretty fast moving. So I guess that's the question. Let's say if you got an Excel sheet right after this call, can you, by the end of day Monday, realistically take a stab at this in time for discussion on Tuesday? Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Yeah, and I'll just say that I think that's very reasonable, but I'll definitely let the group talk to that. And again, this first example, I hope helps a lot. And again, as Emily just mentioned, it will seem a little repetitive as you go through it. Obviously, there will be a few that you'll slow down and e-mail address maybe that one, or even a couple of them that way. Or maybe if all of them are changing, maybe that is a little more difficult. But I think that as you go through it, it does seem to fall together pretty quickly.

So I think almost a full week on this is probably pretty good. Theo and Sarah said they will give it a shot. And again, I think that—and maybe hit what you feel is most important as well. If you think e-mail is the most important one, start there and then hit the other ones as you go. But I do think that everybody will be able to progress through it pretty quick. But if anybody's concerned about that, please let us know. Going to assume everybody's good with it and everybody will turn it in by Monday. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Roger. Since we have some nice functionality in the Zoom room, I'm wondering if maybe we want to just ask folks to maybe raise their hands if they feel like they can do this and then maybe we'll do another one, checks and Xes. I don't know, maybe we can use one of these little—it doesn't need to be a poll, but I'd just love to hear—oh, we've got Jody. Thanks, Jody. Sorry, I don't need to be calling people out. But I would love to hear from a few more people just to know—if you don't think it's feasible, it's no problem. But if we're going to plan the agenda around it, I'd love to know that people feel like they're up to give this a go.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, I agree.

EMILY BARABAS: Fantastic. Anyone from the non-registrars? Sorry, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:	Yeah. And again, I think that's important. Because if someone's not comfortable, that's what we want to find out. Everybody that can give it a try is great. But I think that—good on the registrar side it looks like, but registries or BC, anyone that has any issues? Again, I'll take the silence. I know I'm always a little cautious. But I think the silence as everybody agrees with it. Thanks, John.

Okay, let's plan to do that then. Staff will send out a spreadsheet for everyone to fill out. And again, take some time and look through it. And I think as you answer the first one and move on to the next one, it'll start to get really easy for you. So I hope that anyway.

Okay. I think this was all of our agenda. We did jump into it right away. One thing I'd like to do is—we don't have to go through this since we'll do this as homework. So I'll give everybody some time back on their day today and they can get started on it.

But I did want to—as every call, we try to open up the mic for any of the stakeholder groups that wanted to talk about anything that's been occurring in their stakeholder groups that should come forward to be recognized by the group or any comments or anything that they want to bring forward. So I'll open up the mic to any stakeholder groups that want to bring anything forward from their groups.

Okay. And as Emily mentioned, we just have two more meetings. So let's get this homework done. And then the next meeting, we'll go through this and hopefully be in a good spot for that and be able to get all this wrapped up before we take a break and then

come back to public comments as well when we get back in September. So Emily, is there anything else we need to cover?

EMILY BARABAS: I was just dropping into chat that we'll send an e-mail just after this call with an Excel spreadsheet for everyone to do. E-mail us with any questions. And you'll have this example as the Google doc available as well. We'll just keep this where it is so that you can reference it. Look forward to supporting you all your homework. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Emily. Okay, well, again, I'll give everybody time back and they can get started on this hopefully in the next 35 minutes. And maybe somebody will finish it even in the next 35 minutes. But, again, driving down to this table here, we should be able to get to our end result of getting our charter questions answered. So please do the homework and we'll talk to everyone next Tuesday. Thanks, everybody.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Roger. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]