
BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 4th of June, 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Jim Galvin, RySG, and Jody Kolker, RrSG. Jody formerly assigned Christopher Patterson, RrSG, as his alternate for today's call and for remaining days of absence. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form link can be found in all meeting invite emails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. Steinar.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, hi, this is Steinar. There's minor change in my SOI. I have stopped working for IQ Global but had taken some small consulting hours for TLD registry that runs two Chinese top level domain names. And it's all been set in the SOI, but I have some problems accessing this now. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Steinar. Anyone else? And then as a reminder for those who weren't on, the wiki page is currently experiencing issues. All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. 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.

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.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Last meeting before our send off to ICANN 80. For those that are traveling, safe travels. For those that are staying home, lucky you. I think to kick us off, there's not a whole lot to go. I would say we're going to cover some of the homework that we had over the last two weeks. It looks like the registrars have at least started. I don't know if they're done or not going through the process. But one of the goals for our meeting next week was to go through any of the can't live -- go through all the can't live with. And right now, only the registrars have put anything in. So I don't know if that means everyone's done or not. If they're not, if they can get it finished before everyone heads off this week, that would be greatly appreciated. If we get there and something gets identified, obviously we'll discuss it while we're there. But we want to be as prepared as we can before leaving for Rwanda. So those that haven't had a chance to finish, please try to get something in there before we leave. Again, we'll obviously talk about anything that comes up next week as well. But just a reminder, if you're done, great. That's great news. If not, please make sure you take a look at that. I think I'll jump in and let Zak go here. Zak, please go ahead.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:

Thanks, Roger. Zak Muscovich. So I just want to let you all know that I consulted with the BC on the draft recommendations. And I'm pleased to report that the BC as of now can live with all of them. So I thought I'd share that with you. There's no room on the form to put that. And you guys are not optimists.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. I appreciate that, Zak. Thanks. And that's awesome. And you're right. I think the last time we did homework, we did have a spot that we're okay. But yeah, on this one, we just had the three options. So appreciate that. Okay. I think before we jump into our agenda, then I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups that have anything to bring forward. Any comments, questions, concerns that they want the working group to try to address. So I'll open the floor up to anyone. Thanks, Steinar, for that in chat. That sounds great.

Okay. I think we'll go ahead and jump into our agenda. Christian, I don't know who is going to run with this.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

I'm happy to lead on this. So we had, as everyone knows, we had the homework here that had all of our draft recommendations. And we received a number of items from the RrSG. Thank you again for that. So we can just go through those today. And if someone from there, Sarah or anyone else, if anyone would like to go through these and kind of explain to the group so we can kind of discuss these. Otherwise I'm happy to read it. But please go ahead. Anyone who'd like to speak to these. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD:

Thanks. Hi, this is Sarah. So I can speak to some of these. I was the person who put it into the document because everybody knows I love to fill out forms. But the comments were collaborative among the whole

stakeholder group reps. So it's not really only me. So we're going to take them one by one and different people will speak to different ones.

For this one on 5.3, as you'll notice, there's no specific, I guess I should have put it in the rationale column instead of update. There is no specific update request. We wanted simply to note again. And maybe this is something that we can talk about as a group to add in. We're noting that there's a requirement that these notifications to the domain owner should explain how to take action if the transfer is invalid. But there's no guidance for what that should look like. What kind of process should there be? What kind of recourse should be offered? And this is something that we talked about, having a reversible process and we ended up not doing that. But we should consider as a group whether we want to have more information as to what to do in that circumstance. So maybe I'll pause there and see if anyone has feedback or what the next steps are for that.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Sarah. And I think, I don't know if it was you, but I think the registrars have brought this up before. Thanks, Christian, for going down or whoever is going down.

SARAH WYLD:

The registrars have definitely brought this up before, yes. So thank you for your patience with us in that regard.

ROGER CARNEY: And again, I don't know if it's specific to 5.3. I think the comment was a bit larger than 5.3 in that. And my only thought process, and again, I hope the working group jumps in here and say whatever they wish here, is the concern here, Sarah, is if a transfer follows the rules, there's not a process to move it forward. I don't know if the TEAC can be used in that instance or not. And again, I'll just throw that out for the discussion of the working group. If a registrar feels that, can they go in and file a TEAC and try to get it moved forward that way?

SARAH WYLD: Well, the TEAC is just a point of contact, isn't it? Is it a process or is it a contact point? Like to file a TEAC.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep, yep. And again, the TEAC is, yeah, is a contact point with some process around it. It's obviously the TEAC has the communication requirements involved. Now, it does not guarantee a reversal or anything. It just supports the idea of a conversation. That's correct, Steinar. The registrant wouldn't know, but Sarah is specifically asking is it from a registrar? I think, right, Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Well, we were thinking about what information is provided to the registrant in the notification. It would be instructions for how to initiate a reversal. So maybe the instruction is contact the TEAC at the gaining registrar, but I don't know how the domain owner would find that info.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, no, yeah, that wouldn't work. You're right. So I guess I'm understanding your request better here as how to reverse it. I mean, yeah, that's a good point. And I don't know when you look at it operationally how that would work. Maybe others have thoughts on it. I don't know.

SARAH WYLD: Right. And so as a working group, I think we need to consider like what is the right level of instruction to provide or the right amount of flexibility for the circumstance. I wanted to talk through the next couple items in the chart, but I see Theo's hand, and if it's on this topic, then I think we should go to Theo.

ROGER CARNEY: Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. And it is on this topic. So as Steinar pointed out, the registrant doesn't know, the TEAC, doesn't need to know it in my opinion. I mean, they only want to know like my domain name is stolen, can you help me? And what the process is behind it is irrelevant for the registrant, only the goal, what is to be achieved there. That is important for the registered domain name holder. That's important for them. And I think the rest of the TEAC requirements we came to these requirements after some discussion, and I think they're still valid. And I don't think that we need to be more detailed here on what we've got now. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. And so just to operationalize that for, I think that the notification to the registrant would just be contact your registrar losing registrar in this point. And discuss that issue. And if the registrar feels like, yes, it was a compromise or whatever it is, then they'll take that process that we did agree on. So I hopefully that makes sense.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. So maybe let's go back down to the chart and just talk through a couple more items there. Okay, so 22 and 23. Now, these were regarding the reasons why a transfer would be denied. So 3.7.6, this is really difficult to look at when it's not all in one spot. I ended up pasting it into like a notepad, and then scrolling back up to the ones that we were concerned with. So let's go up to 3.7.6.

So I just pasted into the chat the recommended, the suggested changes. Now we're going to look on the screen at IA37, they both say 3.7.6. Wait, did I, 22 and 23. Oh, dear. Oh, dear. What have I done? So this is talking about the domain name needing to be—sorry. Does any other registrar know what the heck I'm talking about here? I am suddenly lost and confused, and I'm not sure why. I'm so sorry, friends. I know this made sense when I looked at it earlier. Can we look at Rec 22? Is that the one that's up on screen right now? Oh, okay. Oh, dear. Sarah.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes, this is Rec 22, Sarah. New reasons that a registrar must deny a transfer, and these are kind of going through kind of almost redlining

items from the transfer policy. So 3.7.6 referring to the 60 days after transfer. I think your comment is about the mention of the exceptions to this rule, right?

SARAH WYLD: Yes, thank you. So if Rec 19 says that there are exceptions to this lock, and this one says there's a lock, then maybe this one needs to say that there could be exceptions?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and you're right. I mean, this -- and 22 is as Sarah says, a lock, because it's a must. So you must deny this. But I think the exception removes the restriction. So do you need to mention it? I don't know. So the restriction wouldn't be there, technically. That's a good point, though.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yeah, I feel like it might be confusing when somebody reads it. The fact that I just found it so confusing does suggest to me that others would also find it confusing.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and maybe that's not that hard to add just the clarifying there's an exception process here.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, like subject to this, then that.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And maybe Christian can note that we should update the chart there, the Rec 19 now that we updated numbers.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Thanks. Yeah, no, I'm making notes of this, too.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep. Okay, thanks. But other thoughts on that? I think that to me that makes, again, I can work through it in my head. But yeah, you're right, Sarah. Maybe it's easier if we add something. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, I think here was the order of operation on these, just to make sure that everybody would apply them in the same order of which overrides. Do you get the exception, or do you have to universally apply this? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, I guess to me it makes sense to add it. So I would say if someone doesn't want clarification on the exception here added, maybe we can come up with some wording. Sarah during her short little flight over maybe can come up with some words there as well.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, I make no commitments to coherence while flying, but I appreciate your faith in me. The other one was about, so the second last comment in the chart that I want to talk about was for Rec 23. I think I wrote it wrong in the chart. So I've corrected that now. It should have been 3A5, which is highlighted on screen here. This talks about the 60-day lock after core, but I thought we don't have that anymore. Okay, thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, I think that's a good catch. Any comments from the group on that?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: I think the revision, yes, that this section is not applicable. And I can scroll down back down to the rest.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Number 24. Go ahead, Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yes. So I had proposed this one. It was really a couple of registrars in review had talked to me about a concern whereby if a domain were transferred during the auto-renew grace period where the unit had been incremented and so the domain extended a year, and then the fee

taken out of the prepaid accounts of a registrar, and then a transfer occurs during that time, typically you can delete a domain during the auto-renewal grace period and you receive a refund. It's believed that the behavior of the registry is such that should a transfer occur during that auto-renew period, that the domain auto-renewal would be rolled back, the unit price reg fee would be restored to the registrar, the losing registrar, and then where applicable, that registrar, had they charged that registrant for the renewal of that domain, they could then review that and provide a refund to that registrant. And I just wanted to memorialize that so it was clear, because there was not certainty that all registries actually follow that auto-renewal transfer rollback process. Hopefully that was clear. I'm only on one cup of coffee. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jothan. I see what Jothan's trying to get at here. So I think again, this isn't a change but more of a clarity thing. To Jothan's point, this may not be a standard process today. That I don't know, to be honest. I think the auto-renew happens, the registrar of record at the point will get billed for it. To be honest, I don't know. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Yeah, new hand on this. Why don't I let Theo go first and then I'll go after Theo.

ROGER CARNEY:

Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So I wasn't involved in all these clarification edits and God knows what. I had a couple other things on my mind. So I'm seeing this for the first time. And my take on this is I think it's very good that we sort of explain where this is applicable, that we sort of have some language around this. Because it is always very confusing on how that process actually works when there is a renewal process ongoing and when there is a transfer ongoing. So having some more clarity on that, I'm in favor of that. That's it. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Follow-up, Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, yeah. So essentially this is just that we would state how it would work. Rather than go by whatever kind of is organically out there. So it's very clear and consistent for the industry that we just have that kind of memorialized in how this works. You know, I asked four different registrars. And Roger, in fact, it sounded like you weren't sure. You know, how does this work? You know, what happens if the registrar gets billed at the anniversary of the domain name for the auto renewal and then a domain transfers away? What happens? And I got inconsistent answers. And I think that the best thing to do here is to introduce consistency, just have it memorialized so that it's clear and consistent across the industry. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, and just thinking about it, because you mentioned it if it's a cash account where the registry has access to it or it's a billable account, that might change that as well. So the consistent flavor here makes sense.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Just a follow-up thought. So yeah, I think you're identifying where there's post pay and prepay type of registries, right?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes, correct.

JOTHAN FRAKES: And so, yes, I do think that might be mostly an issue where this is prepay, where a registrar is working from a balance. I mean, the thing that we'd want to avoid is where the registrar fee gets taken out and then the domain moves. And where it's incredibly problematic is in the place of what are called high, high premium domains where that renewal may not be the standard reg fee, that might be thousands of dollars. And it could tank the registrar balance pretty quickly. And then to have the domain get auto renewed like that, then have the customer move, you're not only losing the customer, but you're out that extra premium fee. So just the thought here was to make sure that it was consistently applicable. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and going along with that, another possible contentious spot would be, okay, the auto renew happens, so it's set to a year in advance, and then they transfer it, which is also going to get another year. So is that what the intention was and things like that as well? So Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTROD: Yeah, hi, this is Steinar for Record. I'm a little bit confused because the way I read Recommendation 24 is actually wording that prevents the registrar to NACK a transfer due to unpaid fees for coming years. And the way I understand Jothan saying here is that this is not -- well, let me put it this way. If we're going to add more wording into this, it still has to be very, very clear that there is no reason for the registrar to deny a transfer due to no payment of coming fees. That's the essential here.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And I think Jothan agrees with that. He's just saying that the registrant's not going to get charged, but the registrar may be charged, and that money should be also going back before that happens, I think is what Jothan's saying. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, sure. And Steinar, I do agree with you. I think in some cases there are bundles, there are a variety of different situations where the fees associated with the auto renewal may have been tied to another product or service where the domain is in fact not really charged on the customer, but it's included in a service, and that registrant may opt to

not continue that service. And so the domain may have already auto renewed, though. And so the registrar would be out the cost of that auto renewal. And this would just make it much more clean. And if there were paid fees to the registrar for the renewal, that's also included in the suggestion that not only are we saying, hey, we'd like to see consistently how the registry would treat this situation with respect to rolling back the term and refunding the amount, but also that if there's a fee collected tied to that registration, that that would be refunded to the registrant where that's applicable by the losing registrar. But we want to avoid a situation where the losing registrar not only loses a customer, but loses a bunch of money as well in the process. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, and again, to Steinar's point, the purpose needs to stay clarifying text if needed should be added. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, just to see if we are all still in sync and aligned here when we're talking about this subject. I mean, this is a process which we encounter all the time, which is why we completely automated this. Because as a wholesale registrar, it happens a lot that we just auto renew a domain name, and then to find out that the registrant didn't pay the reseller and move the domain name to somewhere else within that period, which we paid for and the registrant didn't pay anything. And then it's logical that after the transfer has been completed, that the registry goes like, okay, we're gonna refund the money for the auto renewal for

Realtime Register. And it makes sense in my world. So I kind of hope that this little example sort of aligns us all on the subject. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great, thank you. Okay, so it seems like it makes sense to add some clarity here. And maybe I'll ask Jothan and others to come up with some good wording for that. If it's beyond what they have here, it seems to make sense so that we can discuss that as an additional clarification to this point.

Okay. Again, if we can get some wording and we can talk about it next week as well. So that'd be great. Christian, if you want to scroll down, okay. And I will open it up to the registrars to—Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you, hi, this is Sarah. So in this one, it's not a policy change. It's just for the way that the impact is described. Because right now, it says the recommendation requires a new notification instead of the current process of generating the auth code at the time of registration. But it doesn't matter when the auth code is generated. What we're talking about here is the notification. So we're going to say what we suggest is to stay instead. It requires a new notification, whereas currently there is not a separate notification. So that's that suggestion.

Okay, hearing no feedback, we'll move down to suggestion for Rec 5. Just what we're looking at in Rec 5 is it says the losing registrar must send this notification. And the registrar of record must use the contact info that was on the registration at the time of the request, right? But

they're not the registrar of record anymore, because the domain's already moved away. The transfer already happened. So they should, in both parts of that sentence, we think they should be the losing registrar.

And then finally, we're suggesting in Rec 26, it says there should be a standalone policy here. And I think we all agree that we're not saying we need to do a new PDP. We have done the work. We just think they should be two separate policies instead of one smushed together. So the suggestion is to just make it really clear in the language that nobody is saying we need to do yet another PDP here. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Sarah. And specifically on the last one, I think that that's not really up to us to begin with. So I think the extra wording, Sarah, is yes, we're not saying there has to be one, but it's not up to us to dictate that. But anyway. Okay. Any comments on 4, 5 or 26? And again, I know everybody's just seeing this for the first time. So, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

I'm going to take that back. I've got a problem with the entire notification to the registrant. That's not something I would do, actually, because I just send a poll message to the reseller and then the reseller can just send an email or whatever smoke signal to the registrant. I don't think we should be the ones doing all the notifications to the registrant because we are only very limited in that matter. So I would actually sort of rewrite this entire thing. But that's just me, I guess. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Theo. Yeah, and again, who does that a reseller, registrar that's left up to that agreement. You know, the responsibility is that it does get sent. Okay, any other comments on these? And again, I know everybody's seeing these for the first time, and we'll definitely talk about them next week as well, especially any of the clarifying text suggestions for those couple that we said needed clarifying language on them. Again, not changing the purpose, but just adding clarity. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. I'm just still thinking about the recommendation 26 thing. And maybe Christian could scroll back up there to that part. So just like if the idea is that there needs to be, we're recommending to split up the policies into two, eliminating section two and instead making a change of registrant policy. Is it possible that—like who would say that this now needs to go become a new PDP? Would that be that the ICANN board looks at the recommendation and they make that decision? I guess I'm just surprised that the idea that it wasn't an assumption that we all shared. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sarah. I think that to me, council would make the decision on how to make policy on that. So if council said that there needed to be a new PDP, then that would happen. If that's how I see it, Catherine, please go ahead.

CATHERINE PALETTA: I think you're right, Roger. Like we can't prevent the GNSO Council from calling up another PDP. But I do think we can make it clear that we're not saying we need one. And I think that's the difference or that's kind of what I was trying to get at with the comment—because this was my comment—that we're not recommending—and obviously the recommendations themselves don't say spin up a new PDP. But I think to make that clear that we're not suggesting to spin up a PDP. Obviously, we can't prevent that from happening, except through the GNSO Council. But I think we might benefit from making that clear just by splitting these out. I can see people jumping to the conclusion of like, oh, then they didn't deal with it, even though there's all these recommendations. And that was all I was trying to say. But I think you're right, Roger. I just think maybe trying to make a little different point.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Catherine. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, and I agree with Catherine here. I think the recommendation is clear. I mean, and it also reflects the work and thinking we put into this. So that sort of is there also. And yes, if the board agrees with the recommendation and the council wants to do something with it or not, that's up to their decision. I mean, that's how the process works. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thank you. Okay, I think that sounds good. We can add that in that we're not specifically calling for a PDP to resolve this. Unless anyone has issues with that. Okay, I think that's good. And Christian, I think there was just a couple syntactical issues left in the chart.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes, and I do want to also highlight a comment here from Jothan on recommendation 25. Jothan, if you'd like to speak to your comment here.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, so essentially, yeah, sorry I put that in there. I figured out we had our own registrar document later. So in this case, there's two types of guidance. One says that we have to make sure and treat the change of an email address as a material change that requires this. But then in the same policy, we're saying it doesn't apply if this is a change of privacy proxy service provider. And I could see that if we're not clear about this, that some might interpret this to be, well, we don't need to send an email where the email address is different. And I thought we could clarify this. Hopefully I articulated that well. So essentially, you're using a privacy proxy service provider. The email address for that is something other than the registrant's email address. And then you change the registrant data to reflect the registrant's email address or vice versa. Is that something that still requires this? I think it should be very clear because, again, I'm repeating myself and I apologize. This could be interpreted by one party as you don't have to, but by another party as you do have to. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Jothan. Any comments on that, about adding some clarity? Again, as we're in the depths of this, maybe it makes sense a lot to us, but maybe stepping back and reading it, someone that hasn't been in it for three years, as Jothan mentions, can go one way or the other here. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I think some clarity wouldn't be a bad idea. I mean, a lot of people within the community think that the privacy proxy services and what they see in the WHOIS, that sort of reflects the entire database. They've got a very single-sided view on the operational things that happen at a registrar. I mean, when we talk about privacy proxy services, that is something that is being displayed in a WHOIS or RDAP server and has nothing to do with the actual registrant database, which is hopefully not even connected to any RDAP services with registrant data in any shape or form. But these are complete different databases, and when something happens within the registrant database at a registrar, that doesn't need to be connected to a proxy service. So, yeah, clarity is always good there.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thank you. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, I think it could be very simple just to state that regardless -- I don't know if it's a 25.4 or we just reword 25.1 and 25.3 to state clearly

without any exception that the change of registrant data does not apply to the addition or removal of privacy proxy service provider. Maybe you would just add to the end of 25.3 as a possible suggestion. In all cases, 25.1 will apply. And then that helps be very clear about how this would work. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD:

Hi, this is Sarah. I'm so sorry. I feel like that makes it less clear. Like right now, 25.1 says it's name or their email, and then 3 says but not if it's WHOIS privacy. So saying name or their email -- I don't know. I'm just saying, yeah, I feel like it's clear as it is. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Should 25.3 refer to 25.1 saying 25.1 doesn't apply if 25.3 does? Is that what we're saying? Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Right. So, Sarah, how do you envision the -- we could make sure this is very clear about the email change. Would you apply 25.1 until you get to 25.3 and say, oh, okay, this is privacy proxy-related, nothing needs to happen? Or would you interpret it as we always need to do 25.1?

SARAH WYLD:

No, the first thing. So I would say under all circumstances, we do 25.1. But then there's an exception, which is that if there's adding or removing a privacy proxy service, then I don't have to do -- then it's an exception.

ROGER CARNEY: So does adding to 25.1, do we just simply add with the exception of 25.3?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, maybe that could work.

ROGER CARNEY: Something to noodle on. Think about it. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, I think that would help be the tiebreaker. I mean, that's really what I'm looking for here. It's not to proclaim one thing or the other, just to state that we need to be clear and intentional so that it's not going to be subject to fuzzy interpretation as to how that would work. Because that's where we get into our tangles later once we have this policy in place. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Jothan. Okay. We can look at that. And then again, something to think about. And we can cover that again next week when everybody's had a week to think about it, if that makes sense. To me, it doesn't change anything. As Sarah said, I would have read it down that way. But it does add that clarity that 25.3 and 1 are directly -- opposites with these others, so. Okay. Great. And I think that takes us to the end of this, right, Christian?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes. Just the only last things are just some grammar textual updates, typos. So these don't seem to be very substantive.

ROGER CARNEY: Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Would it be beneficial -- I know we're past when the homework was due. But would it be beneficial to migrate the suggestion or the request out of the document and somehow into this grid just to be consistent?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think that that helps, Jothan. Keep it trackable, more trackable. More easily trackable, however you want to say that. Okay. I think we can -- unless anybody has questions, comments, Christian, anything we need to finish here?

Again, I think that a lot of this is new, so we'll talk about it again next week just to cover it and make sure -- and again, those two items that suggested clarifying text, we should cover that as well next week. Or even sooner if you put it in this document so people can read it on their way there, that would be great. Okay. I think we can go to the next one then, Christian.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

Thank you. So as part of the agenda, we had suggested that if there wasn't enough cannot live with items or items to go over, then we could go over the items that are marked as high impact within that list. But since we do seem to have enough material here to go over, and if we could go over those outstanding items, and if registrars could provide updated text or notes for the items that they flagged, then we can go over those during the meeting. And then if we have extra time, staff can present those high impact recommendations with the working group, maybe adding some extra color to those. So that way, we can focus mostly on any -- with the face-to-face time that we have, focus on those items that need to be fixed before publishing an initial report. And then if we had extra time, maybe go over those high impact items in case there's any comments or further discussion to be had on those. Does that make sense to everyone? Does that sound like a plan?

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Christian. Yeah, I think that makes great sense. And again, I don't think—as smoothly as this went. And again, I think anybody has time to take a look at this. I don't even remember. Do we meet Tuesday, Christian, next week? So we have a week. Whatever date is that we meet. Take the time, take a look at these and read them through. I don't think there's a whole lot more to cover on them. But we'll definitely walk through them again to make sure that we've got everything. Thanks, Catherine. Next Tuesday. Make sure that we've got it covered. And again, as Christian mentioned, on the couple that we're looking for extra language on, let's make sure we get that ironed out so that we're clean before we put this into the initial draft.

And then we'll spend the rest of the time in Kigali on the high impact items. And in making sure that we have it not just recorded correctly, but everybody agrees that it's a big impact and what is truly being impacted. So we'll go over those. Christian, I don't remember the count of how many high impacts there were.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

I believe there are about 10. Those and they're only from group 1B. So there's the CORD recommendations that just because and their high impact, just because they're recommending substantial changes to the policy. And then there are some group 2 ones as well. Talking about the BTAPPA and all that, because again, there's just they're bigger changes. So those would be the ones that we would be discussing if we have time.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay. And on those high impact ones, I think a few two or three meetings ago, ICANN meetings ago, we had working group members speak specifically to certain recommendations and things. And I may call on people as we go through this as well to talk about specific recommendations in the high impact ones. So be thinking about that. And if there are some of them that you want to speak to, let me know. So I can make sure that I call on you. And otherwise, you can raise your hands and I'll call on you anyway. So but just be prepared. I'll probably reach out to those people when we're going through those to pull that forward. So I'm not doing all the talking and the working group that did

all the work can talk about it. Okay. Is there anything else on our agenda, Christian?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

Just talking about post ICANN 80 plans. I think everyone's probably can surmise that the plan is to kind of go through the what once we figure everything is we need to say has been said about the recommendation text or recommendations, then we can share the initial report, the consolidated initial report to the working group. And we'll go through all of that text, including the now annexed charter questions and answers. So you know, which has a lot more detail with regard to some of the rationale as well as just other materials that related for the initial report. So the group can take a look at that holistically and get all that looking good before we publish it for public comment. So that that's the general plan for after ICANN 80, assuming that there's not more items we need to discuss things left kind of on undone or unsaid from 80. So that's the plan.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Christian. Yeah. And just to tag on to that, obviously, we'll meet next Tuesday and then the following Tuesday will be off just as typical, let everybody get back home and do what they need to be done. So our first meeting, I think is going to be on the 25th. And I know that Berry would like to be done with the initial report by the end of July, which gives us five meetings. I think that this group can get that done. So I think that that's a good goal to go for. And I know Berry will beat me over the head if we go much more into August than that. But I

think that we have five meetings after I can't 80 until the end of July. And again, I think that's a great goal to try to hit getting this report hammered out. Again, half of the report, the first 27, I think, excuse me, recommendations we've already gone through. Obviously, we updated a couple here and there. And we've got a couple here to update. But I don't think those will be big. So I'm hoping that we can get it done by the end of July. But that'll be our goal once we get back. I'll turn it over. Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Roger. So I'm not the one that would be doing the beating if we were to move into August or beyond August. It's the GNSO Council as the sponsors of this work that will do any beating. That said, not to rehash what I stated on our previous call, but it's really up to the working group. The true carrot on the stick here is to wrap this up in July. Because typically, community members, many people take the month of August off for holiday season. And we know that even if we have to go into August, that participation is usually thin. And that's not a good situation to be trying to deliver for public comment.

So yeah, that is the timeline. We'll work with staff to get meetings scheduled for every week in the month of July. So expect to see those soon. And then we'll just have to play by ear once we move over to the month of August or get close to it.

The second reason I raised my hand is on the-- well, I guess in light of that, you'll notice that I sent a link out to the project package that is also being conveyed over to the GNSO Council so they have a status of

where we're at and when they can expect the initial report. I ask that you look through that closely, especially some of the more details with respect to participation and some of those items.

Lastly, just real quick, I want to share my screen. I also sent another email in regards to a possible reorder of the group 1A recommendations. I know that what you're seeing on your screens is very, very small, but it's more kind of conceptual in nature. So the proposal here is when staff compiled all three groups into the initial report, the core of the body of the report, excluding annexes and all of that other stuff, was well over 100 pages. I think it was close to 140, somewhere in there. And we need to think about the audience of who's going to be consuming this report, which is hopefully going to be a lot more people outside of this working group. And we need to do everything that we can to streamline the core substance of the proposed policy changes and make it easily digestible.

So one of the ideas that we came up with is to break tradition of previous policy development reports. There was typically a standard structure. Here's the charter question. Here's how the group deliberated the charter question, the summary of it. Here's the recommendation, and here's the rationale. What we've learned, especially given a lot of the deliberations around these particular topics, the charter question and the working group deliberations are individual pages by themselves before you even get to the recommendation, which I don't think is going to be fit for purpose given the amount of change that is being proposed to this particular policy.

So the concept here is for all three groups, not just group 1A. Group 1A is only the reordering, but the general structure is going to be kind of a here's the recommendation title, the recommendation text, a brief indicator about the impact, and maybe any associated statement on the impact, as well as the rationale for every recommendation.

So when we took a look at that, we suspect that we can condense the core part of the charter to probably somewhere around 50 pages, which is still a lot, but we need to maintain the transparency aspect of everything. The new component to this proposed structure is that there will be embedded links within the document. So take, for example, what used to be recommendation 6 here, terminology updates of WHOIS, there would be the impact statement, blah, blah, blah. Somewhere in this section will be a link to annex 4, recommendation 1 that will have the charter question and the group deliberations, and down in that annex will be a link that takes you back up to this specific recommendation. So you basically bounce forward and bounce back, almost kind of the concept with my wormholes over here on the swim lanes.

So finally, the reason why I raised my hand here is we don't need to make this decision right away. And I understand that the working group is familiar with the recommendation numbers as they were, or are, noting that the recommendation text has already changed some based off of coming out of the public comment for the original group 1 or phase 1 recommendations.

So the idea here is to order these in an order that matches the swim lane. You'll notice in my email that I put some several disclaimers about

the particular swim lane, but still, at least from my perspective, seems like it's a very useful way to really grasp what the group is trying to propose for the overall transfer process.

And so why we went this direction is because we lost the context to the charter question, it didn't make any sense that the very first recommendation was something about in the middle way over here of the transfer process.

So to kind of conclude here, the first three recommendations that would be reordered are recommendations that don't have specific context or impact to the interregistrar transfer process. It's terminology updates and other definitions of what's being removed, such as the admin contact and the transfer contact.

Then recommendation 3, which is really the first recommendation in the swim lane, talks about the post-registration restriction after a new registration. And that does seem a little bit out of context, it's not directly connected to what used to be or what is recommendation 19 now, but technically it really occurs outside of the transfer process when it is initiated. So it made sense to still follow along from a swim lane ordering to go ahead and get it out of the way. But then you jump down into what would be proposed recommendation 4, currently recommendation 7, is where we first talk about the auth info code and now that we're calling it the transfer authorization code. And that was the very key thing about the current ordering, recommendation 1 starts to talk about what the TAC is and we haven't even given them a recommendation that we're actually changing the terminology, let alone the technical structure of it all.

So moving over into recommendations 4 and 5 is changing the name of the TAC and here's the TAC definition. And when you start the process to initiate that inter-registrar transfer is, bam, recommendations 4 and 5, this is what the TAC means.

We get down into recommendation 6 and there's the preliminary recommendation is talking about the SLA for TAC provision, which pretty much matches current state today that the TAC must be delivered within five calendar days and that's the very next recommendation.

So the final-final here is very much how the swim lanes work, moving left to right and top down is trying to replicate this within the ordering of the recommendations for group 1A. So I'll stop there. Any questions or comments? And if not, then please ask them online or if you don't like this proposal at all, we can stick with the status quo and move forward from there. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Berry. Yeah. And as I read through this, to me, it seems to make—to read a lot easier and I wasn't searching for this piece here and 10 more recs getting another piece of it. So to me, it read a lot smoother, much more digestible. But to that point and to Berry's point, make sure everyone takes a read at this and they agree with that too, is that it is more readable than what we had it originally. Again, it used to mimic the charter questions themselves and our answers to those, but this is more, to me, an easier read than trying to tease out each one of those charter questions and points that we discussed.

BERRY COBB:

Just to also note that what is new in this version of the swim lane is what I should also qualify. This version of the swim lane is based on the proposed reordering numbering. If the group chooses not to do this reordering, then I'll go back and change, to match whatever is going to be in the initial report. But assuming we go forward with this, what is now recommendation 18 in regards to the transfer restriction after the inter-registrar transfer. So this whole section right here is new, and I'd ask that the group pay close attention to this to see that it matches what the group has come up with. And again, note that the recommendation text in this Word document is already outdated from what you see. It's really conceptual about the ordering, so don't pay close attention to the substance of the text. Conceptually, think about how this works in your mind.

And one other kind of, I guess, kind of new addition to this is to make this work, it almost breaks a cardinal rule in process diagramming. You know, you really try to avoid parallel processes, but you'll notice that there is this double black bar down at the bottom here, and this is to signal that really both of these paths are occurring in parallel, and in some cases, almost instantaneously. But they still resolve or result in the same outcome that once you get done with this stuff, you're jumping back to the very beginning of the swim lane where the registered name holder is using the domain. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Berry. Yeah, and again, I want everybody to take a read of this, and maybe we'll spend 10 minutes, 15 minutes at 80 just to hear any questions or comments or suggestions on any changes or if they like it or not. And again, I don't want to spend a lot of time at 80 on this, but it's important so that we get the numbering that we want correct and so we can move into the initial report. And yes, Berry, I do blame you for every time council hits us on the head, so sorry about that.

And also, talking about the five meetings that we have after until the end of July, one of the other ideas is after the first week or two, probably first couple weeks that we get back in our meeting, if we see some slow progress, maybe we can double up the last couple weeks and maybe go to two meetings a week in the last couple weeks of July if we need to. I don't think we will. I think, again, I think we'll be able to get through this in those five meetings. But just a heads up that that might be a possibility as well. Okay. Is that all we needed, Christian? That was the end of our agenda, right?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

Yeah, that's it.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay, great. Okay. So, again, thanks, everyone, for the discussion today. We pulled these in today. We'll get into more detail next week on them. And hopefully that goes smooth. With a couple of those that have some language updates for clarity, that will be great to go over as well next week. And then as Christian mentioned, we'll do the roll call through the high impact ones, the ten or so items that we've marked as high impact.

And, again, I want to touch on this last thing just briefly next week as well and make sure everybody's agreeable to the renumbering or have suggestions otherwise. But take a look at those renumbering and the swim lane together. And I think that will make a good meeting next week in Rwanda. Any other comments or anything? I think we can give everyone some time back today. So maybe those that are leaving can start their packing early.

Okay. Again, thanks, everyone. Good call today. We'll see everybody next week in Kigali. Thanks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]