
ICANN Transcription

Transfer Policy Review PDP WG

Tuesday, 21 May 2024 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/egATEw>

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:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 21st of May 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Prudence Malinki (RrSG) and Owen Smigelski (RrSG). And Prudence formally assigned Essie Musailov as her 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 e-mails.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. All right, seeing no hands, all members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat-only. Please remember to state your name

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.

before speaking for the transcription. 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. Not too much to give updates here. Just to recognize that we are a little more than two weeks away from everyone jumping on planes and trains and automobiles to get to ICANN80. We do have just a couple more meetings before that. So recognizing that and summer is approaching the northern hemisphere quickly. We have a lot of work to get done between now and our publication of our consolidated Initial Report. So it's a great transition, I should say, great transition time from our discussions in all of our good work to documenting all those things in getting our Initial Report moving forward. So we'll really get started on that in this meeting here. I will open up the floor to any stakeholder groups that have anything to bring forward. Any discussions, comments, questions they want for the working group. Rick's hand is up. So, Rick, I'll go to you.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Roger. I wanted to just follow up an action item that the Registries had from last meeting. It's noted there in the thing as far as Registries to reconfirm the BTAPPA Recs are acceptable. I posted a note to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting after our discussion last week and also brought it up on our call, we received no negative feedback on Rec 40 and 41 that I had posted to the Registry list and such. So we did get a couple of

comments. People made gentle notion that the language around 41 was a little bit vague, but that was the only thing that we got. We had no negative comments about what's in Rec 40 and 41. So these do still have Registry support. Thank you very much.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick, and thanks for following up on that. Really appreciate it. Okay. Any other stakeholder groups have anything you'd like to bring forward at this time? Okay, great. I think I don't have anything else, so I think we'll go ahead and jump into our agenda. I think Caitlin is going to take over here. So maybe I'll turn this over to Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger, and thank you for that update, Rick. During our last call, we focused on returning to the Group 2 recommendations. And we also allowed time to see if there were any additional concerns with the Group 1(b) recommendations on change of registrant. And at this stage, it seems like all of the recommendations are ready for inclusion in the comprehensive Initial Report which will include all of the groups' charter questions, deliberations, and policy recommendations.

So as we had mentioned over the past few weeks, support staff has been working on getting all of the updated text as well as the rationales included in the standard Initial Report template. If Christian can just give us a quick preview. So we're not going to go through all of the text of the report, obviously. But what we wanted to note is that currently we probably will have a couple

additional annexes to include in the report that will need to be updated. But the current draft stands at 121 pages. So it's a fairly sizable document, and that makes sense since there's a lot of material to cover since this report will cover all of the recommendations and charter questions that the group went over.

So as leadership and support staff talked about this, we wanted to approach it strategically in terms of how to make the report digestible for the sake of public comment. So we were thinking of potentially changing the format to make it a little bit more digestible, both in terms of the working group's review of the recommendations as well as the ultimate review by the community of what the community thinks of the recommendations. So with that being said, if we can pull up the Recommendations document. Thank you, Christian.

The document that you're currently seeing on your screen has all of the policy recommendations from the working group for all of the charter questions. What's missing in this document is the extensive deliberations that led the group to these recommendations. So what leadership talked about doing was in the main body of the report, including three things, which would be the policy recommendation, the rationale for the policy recommendation, and the policy impact rating for each recommendation, and that each recommendation would have an anchor link to an annex in the report that would go over that more detailed deliberation of the working group. For those that are interested, maybe someone who's interested in a particular rationale of a few recommendations but isn't interested in reading all of them. But it makes the report a little less daunting than

saying, “Here’s 85 pages of deliberations to read,” rather than “Here is the recommendation, the rationale, and the policy impact rating.”

Good question, Sarah. That’s new. That was something that we talked about in terms of—I think the group has 45 or 46 recommendations. Some of them are simple terminology updates. For example, changing WHOIS to RDDS or removing administrative contact from the policy. While people are welcome to make comments on those, there are some that involve more changes or more significant changes to the policy that might warrant closer scrutiny for public comment. Support staff has gone in and put in a draft policy impact rating, as well as a short sentence on why the policy impact might be low versus high versus medium. We’d like the working group to review all of those to confirm that staff’s recommendation is in line with what the working group thought. So these are all in draft form. And certainly, if you think any of these need to be adjusted, please do let us know.

In terms of next steps, Christian, if you can just scroll a little bit so the group can get an idea. I know that he also put the link in the chat. So you’re welcome to view it on your own machine. But this goes through all of the recommendations, and again, the rationale as well as the policy impact rating. What we’d like to do as we focus on moving towards Initial Report publication and as we move towards our session at ICANN80 is for the working group to look at the policy recommendations. Again, these have been reviewed many times by the working group, but perhaps when looking at them in their entirety or together, maybe there’s things

that the working group would prefer to be adjusted. So we'd like the group to take the next weeks leading up to ICANN80 to look at the recommendations, particularly with a lens of "cannot live with," so that when we are together in Kigali, we can discuss the "cannot live with" items and see what needs to be adjusted, if anything, so that everyone's comfortable with the status of the recommendations for the publication of the Initial Report.

Once we've identified those, we will, pending the group's agreement on the structure, update the Initial Report template so that the body of the report will have a shorter explanation of the recommendations and rationales and then the annex will include all of those detailed deliberations. Then, of course, the working group would have time to review all of the text of the deliberations and provide any edits or things that might make the group uncomfortable. I will note that specifically with the Group 1(a) recommendations on the part one of the Transfer Policy, that text is pretty stable because the group went through the public comments for Group 1(a) and adjusted the text of the report accordingly. There might be something again that comes up in conjunction with the other recommendations that the group thinks need adjustment. But ultimately, we'd like the group to focus this on Group 1(a) and Group 2 and see if there are any "cannot live with" that we need to discuss in Kigali.

That's kind of the overview of what support staff was thinking. I think I'll turn it over to Roger to see if there's anything to add and to see what working group members think or if there's any additional questions.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. I think that obviously these reports get to be a little daunting. Our goal is for people to go through them and really evaluate the recommendations as a group. I think that, as Caitlin highlighted 140 pages or 120 pages, 160 pages, whatever it's going to end up at, it's going to be a lot for people to go through, not just this working group. Because this working group has gone through all these things multiple times, so thinking more about to the community reviewing it. I think it does support a much more efficient way of going through the recommendations. Again, I think if you look at this, our recommendations, rationale, and impact fit on a nice, "slim" 40-some pages. So I think this is a great way to move forward with this. But yeah, I want to see if the working group sees this as beneficial or if we need to make some tweaks before this one. We don't really want to dive into this too much without a good plan. So if anybody has any thoughts or ideas to improve it, that's great, so that we can start moving forward. As Caitlin mentioned, I think the first 27 or 28 recommendations have gone out for public comment. We reviewed the public comments and we've updated them. So a lot of those, the first half of this document is probably for this working group anyway, pretty well-documented. And as she points out, just any updates that are possible, probably related to more recent ones that may have impacted them. So just some thoughts on that. Steinar, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Hi. I just need to understand the meaning of the categorization of policy impact. Do I understand it correct that this is not reflecting

all the policies but it's more operational for stakeholders? Is that the way for me to understand it? Thank you.

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

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you for the question, Steinar. What you note is exactly correct. So the policy impact rating isn't necessarily related to other existing consensus policies, but rather when looking at the policy recommendations is does the recommendation involve a substantial change to the policy or is it a lower change? In a previous call, we went over what could be classified as a high impact versus a low impact. But it is the degree of work that would be involved in implementing that change, the change from the status quo. So, for example, one of the recommendations from Group 1(b) is to remove a mandatory notification. So that would be a high impact because that is being removed from the policy versus changing change of registrant to change of registrant data. That's a terminology change only. So that's a pretty low impact. A high impact doesn't necessarily mean that it's bad and a low impact doesn't necessarily mean it's good. It's just to serve as an indication to the reader that this is a big change from the status quo. Part of the reason we include the rationale for all of these is that the rationale explains why the working group believes that a significant change from the status quo is recommended. So again, it's not a qualitative assessment of the recommendation, it just indicates to the reader that this is a pretty big change for the

Transfer Policy versus this isn't really that big of a change. So I hope that makes sense.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Okay. Any other questions or comments? Again, I know this is the first time everyone's seen it. But it'll be helpful if we can figure it out rather quickly if this is acceptable format, so that we can get moving forward and make some progress even before ICANN80 so that we're ready at ICANN80 to start talking about some of the maybe can't live withs. Or if we don't end up with too many of those, some ones that probably need some wording changes. That'll be our goal at 80 is to run through those can't live withs and anything that needs some changes. It's great that if we find some grammar or anything like that as well, but we're going not going to focus on that as much as we are going to focus on the can't live withs and the ones that need to be updated. Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger. One important thing that I neglected to mention is that in this document, the ordering of the recommendations is the order from the comprehensive Initial Report. That order is based on the order of the charter questions. So you'll note that in reviewing this, some of the recommendations that have been added in maybe don't make logical sense in terms of their ordering. This doesn't necessarily have to be the order that we use for the Initial Report. For example, we had talked about looking at the swim lane chart of how a transfer takes place and the steps along that swim lane and ordering the recommendations

in that way. So this isn't the final order, and it probably makes sense to reorder the recommendations, but just for the sake of the previous drafts and the numbering that we've been working on as a working group, we left it intact to not cause any confusion. But you'll notice, for example, that in one of the early recommendations, there's a reference to the Transfer Authorization Code or the TAC, but the TAC isn't discussed until later in the recommendations. So the average reader would look at that and say, "What is a TAC? What is that?" That's a new term that hasn't been defined because defined later in the recommendations. But that's only due to the fact of the charter question order rather than the logical flow of the recommendation. So I just wanted to note that we will likely reorder the recommendations to make it more readable and logical. So I hope that makes sense.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. And yeah, that's a good call out to that. Again, the group here is really looking at the details of the recommendations. Once we get everything cleaned up and agreed upon, the order will make sense to realign with a reader's expectation, I would say so. But yeah, as you're going through, think about those too and recognize, "Hey, this should probably be bumped up before this," or whatever it is. Jothan, please go ahead. If you're speaking—

JOTHAN FRAKES:

I'm hunting for my mute button. Sorry. Can you hear me?

ROGER CARNEY: No problem.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I wanted to just compliment staff. I really appreciate the policy impact highlights on this. As I talk with other registrars who have questions with me, that is super helpful to note that. I understand that that really took some time. It's definitely appreciated. Because then folks will focus in on the high impact areas. So I just wanted to pay a compliment. Just in my fast review of this, it looks like those are just perfectly labeled. When you get to the low/high, where there were kind of identifying a duality, I even like the context around why is it low and high. So I just wanted to pay a compliment to staff on adding that to this document. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Jothan. Okay. Any other comments? Again, I think this will help us go through this in a pretty efficient manner. But if anybody has any ideas on improving, they obviously will want to know that as well. Okay, no other comments. Again, as you can see—and Caitlin mentioned this—we want the working group to go through this and pull out those can't live withs before ICANN80, June 3rd on here, it says. So we want everybody to work through this as your stakeholder groups and say yes. We're concerned about the ones that people are having problems with, either can't live with or ones that maybe need some updated language. So those will be the important ones that we want to use our face-to-face time at 80 to work through and get resolution on those. So

over the next couple of weeks, that's the homework for the group is to go through each of those. Again, most likely those first 27 or 28, I can't remember what it is, Group 1 ones that have already been out for public comment, and we've already responded to public comment, will probably be a fairly quick read. It'll be that next 20 that we want to focus on, the change of registrant data ones and the bulk one. So hopefully, it's a fairly easy read for this group even though we know when we go to Public Comment, it will be a long read for those people. Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Roger. Rick Wilhelm, Registries. Just a brief one. I like the policy impact and the rationale and the structure. So just seconding Jothan on that one. I did want to comment briefly. I think we might want to be careful about renumbering the recommendations, especially if they're currently numbered or if they're sequenced based on the order of the questions. Because if people are trying to trace these things to prior documents—and I haven't given this a lot of thought. I wouldn't even call this a strong opinion loosely held. Maybe it's a weak opinion loosely held. Instead of renumbering the recommendations, if people are previously trying to trace these to prior documents, we might instead propose a suggested reading order or something like that at the top of the document instead of renumbering them. Because people might have references to other documents and renumbering them could cause other issues. I do that just as someone who goes back and forth between documents and traces numbers and things like that. But again, I haven't thought about it as much as I possibly could have. So that's just a gentle

thing. Because once we renumber things, that's kind of irrevocable, whereas the suggested reading order or something else is a less permanent thing. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for that, Rick. As you noted and as many people that work through documents like this, revisioning is kind of a tricky thing to get into and how best to do it. I appreciate the idea that you presented there. It's something definitely to look at. It's maybe keeping a different scale or something. Something to think about for everyone as they go through it.

Again, I think that you'll see Caitlin's point once you start reading through, and it's like, "Oh yeah." Obviously, the TAC one, it was a fairly obvious one. But as you go through, you'll notice, "That probably sounds better if it was read first than two recommendations lower. It just makes things flow a little better." So yeah. Give Rick's idea, his quick thought anyway on it, maybe there's a couple of ways to present it.

Okay. Any other comments here on this? I'm not hearing any opposition to this setup here. So I think it's good to move forward with this. And again, the big homework I have this for everyone is to spend the next couple of weeks going through this and point out those that can't live with and those that you want to see some language updated on before we go to Public Comment. So I think those are the two big things we're looking for in the next two weeks. Again, we'll dive into those in details come ICANN80. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Hi. Yes. Thank you. I note the date of June 3rd for the cannot live with. I note the date of June 3rd on here, and I wanted to ask is that just they're planting a flag in the ground with a bias for action? Or is it driven by some other deliverable date? And the context of why I'm asking is, is there room for additional time? We have a very large U.S. holiday coming up this coming weekend. So I don't know that we necessarily have two weeks on this. It might be beneficial if we could slide that by one or two more weeks, if possible. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Jothan. It really is a flag just because that allows staff to prepare for ICANN80, so we wanted to be able to discuss these items at ICANN80 when we're all in the same room and can be more productive. So it was purposely picked as a cut-off date so that we could have a reasonable level of knowledge going into ICANN80 meeting, which is I think our meeting is less than a week after that meeting. So it was just so staff could prepare for ICANN80 with any of the documentation we needed to work through these can't live withs and possible updates. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'm trying to fight back and show some restraint on using the word ambitious here. But we have the participant registrars here in this group. There's a significant amount of impact to registrars on this, as with registries and the general public, of course. But this

definitely has a significant impact to many of the registrars that will have to adjust their business processes. This has quite a lot in it to review in a very, very abbreviated amount of time to provide that feedback. I might be just trying to push for a little bit more management reserve on this. But it's with the bias of ensuring everybody can get their feedback in. And that cannot live with period is typically so much more effective than the comment period for such things. Even if we delivered this, let's say we got everybody all of the feedback on the cannot live withs, does that even give people ample time with travel in order to review it and use it at ICANN80? My objective here in these sort of questions is would there be a possibility for additional cannot live withs that we might discover in a less abbreviated time that would come post ICANN80? That this has sort of a steel gate to it, right? Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Yes. Thanks. The last time we can do this, it's not going to be... The purpose is to prepare for ICANN80. So if we get to ICANN80 and someone didn't have something marked but comes up with it after the fact of discussions, it's still going to get discussed in this group. We're looking for those items. And again, the first 27, I think, are going to be fairly straightforward. I'm hoping that there's no issues with those, again, because we've already gotten through it and we've reviewed it multiple times. So it'll be that last 20 recommendations, really. But if you only make it through 10 recommendations and you found one or two, whatever it is, that you can't live with or that you want updated, that's great, because then we can spend that time at 80 to look at it. Now, if at 80 you

find something else in the one that you didn't get to look at, we're still going to talk about that post 80. Again, I think the homework is to take a good look at this and identify those that you know that you can't live with so that we can start working through them. The work is not going to probably be done completely at ICANN80. So again, we'll have hopefully about eight weeks after, six weeks after ICANN80 that will iron out all the details here and get to a spot where we're all comfortable with it and it can be published. So it's one of those where it's that first step into the process. So hopefully that helps. Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you. To build on what Roger said, first, most of these recommendations shouldn't be a surprise to any of the representatives here. Granted, this is the first time that they've been included in a full doc. But each of the groups, the 1(a), 1(b), and 2, we reviewed several times. We've gone through several readings. And they haven't changed a whole lot over the course of the last several months. But I understand where you're coming from, Jothan, and for the others that are concerned about this timeframe. So there's probably a likelihood that there's four or five "can't live with" set pop up here, assuming that the groups can at least try to identify the major ones to help us prepare for ICANN80. Because that's our next to last opportunity to try to hash these out face to face, where we do have a November ICANN meeting but by that time, based on the project schedule, will be just coming out of Public Comment. So it's even going to be hard to know or forecast whether a session in Istanbul would

be worthy of having or not. So I'll set my lecture kind of stuff to the side.

The main reason I raised my hand is thinking about the larger timescale here. Back in February and March, we were ambitiously hoping to be able to go to Public Comment this month because we're doing an extended Public Comment duration because it's going to be a full report. Recall that the original concept was to break apart 1(a) and 1(b) and ship those off, but we had to course correct there. Now our original milestone date is August 21st, to be specific, and in some ways, I'm kind of concerned that we may even miss that because we only have opportunities for about six or seven more meetings after ICANN80. That in mind, we also know that a lot of people like to take off for the month of August. So the carrot kind of stick thing here is that if this group chooses, we can take a more aggressive path to try to get to a Public Comment sometime in July, which would free up the months of August and a good chunk of September as well. But it's on the groups that are participating here to ultimately determine what pace we're at.

I'm going to conclude here that because this is such a massive report, I'm anticipating that we're going to get a lot of comments back, especially the way I see it, there's a few recommendations where—I'm not going to use a consensus level—but there's not adequate agreement on them at this stage that I suspect that we're going to hear those same kinds of issues in the Public Comment. That is pretty much going to force this group to have to redeliberate and try to find new modifications to these recommendations in an attempt to get to a final report. Ultimately,

if that forecast rings true, then we're probably going to be missing our committed to overall deliverable date, which was trying to wrap this up by February of next year.

So the takeaway message here is this is go time for this group. And I don't believe any of us want to be on this any longer than we need to be. It's these final months that are going to be the most active and require the most participation to get us across those finish lines or hit those milestone dates, else we are going to have to go back to the Council and requesting more time and those kinds of things. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Berry. Thanks for walking through that and keeping the project timeline in perspective for everyone. As Berry said, even if we hit going to Public Comment period in August, I'm guessing even if it's extended, there will be people asking for more time. Again, it's one of those balancing acts of trying to get through not just our work here, but time-wise—every time we've done this in the middle of the summer or middle of August, people always ask for more time because, as Berry pointed out, a lot of holidays happen during that time. Generally, any Public Comment periods during that time have been extended. Just something to think about, again, as we move forward. I think the big push over the next two weeks is to get those easily identifiable things that we can talk face to face on and need to because it generally makes things a little easier to walk through. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

I think I'll build on what Berry said. I think we absolutely have spent quite a long time I think blueprinting this. Many of the people that I go to seek, the registrars who are not participating in this, trying to be inclusive, really, they come back and say, "Come back to me when it's closer. Come back to me when it's closer." It's sort of a bug and a feature in our ICANN multistakeholder process that this has taken this period of time, but there's quite a lot to go through. I think we're getting closer to pouring the concrete to use an analogy versus working on a blueprint to where this is where they're going to wake up and start giving us feedback. Or at least we're at the point where this draft Recommendations for Initial Report is going to be the catalyst for action where folks have been sort of otherwise not paying as much attention to this. Because it's not really real until it starts to get into a bit more of a formed thing. So as a result, to give them just two weeks right now for the cannot live withs a yes, understand we as a group have been looking at this, we as participants who have been I think waiting in this pool for three years doing laps and etc., we get it to people who haven't had a toe in the water that are going to start to give us some feedback. So there's a lot of work involved in getting them to do this, especially across a holiday weekend. That was my only kind of micro concern. It's very tactical, it's not strategic. And I think there's a lot of strategic considerations that are very important that Berry's given that you've given also, Roger, on timing. If there's a breathing week that we could have or if there's an opportunity for some of these can't live withs to come after that deadline, even if they may or may not make it into the material discussed at ICANN80, I think we should anticipate we're going to see some of that. I'm not trying to let people turn their homework

in late, so much as to say that we need to leave room for humanity to creep in as far as how people are participating in the group that aren't direct participants or even alternates. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Jothan. Again, one of the important things is even if everyone got their homework done and we're comfortable with it in two weeks, that doesn't mean we're going to be able to get through all of it at ICANN80. So it's one of those where we're not expecting to have everything resolved when we leave ICANN80. We do anticipate continuing to work on these issues post ICANN80. We just want to start those and get those high level ones that the face to face will help get those working, and at least get that discussion started even if they don't get solved there. Thanks for that, Jothan.

Okay. Anything else on this? I think we can move on to our next agenda item then.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

I think our last agenda item is AOB.

ROGER CARNEY:

Oh, are we there already? Excellent. Okay. Anything else then? I think we went through our agenda efficiently. We touched on each one of them as we started talking about it. So, great.

Okay. To Jothan's point, I think that where we're standing today and just everybody seeing this document for the first time now. I

think Jothan's point is well taken, and I know it's not just a U.S. holiday, I know it's a holiday weekend across multiple countries across the globe. But as Berry says, this is kind of our crunch time. And as Jonathan pointed out, maybe we're starting to pour that concrete now. So I think that we're going to have to work expeditiously here from this point out so that we can get done and we can actually float that concrete by the time July hits so that we're ready. Again, I think that we'll spend the next couple of weeks doing that, and we'll get some things identified, and we'll get a good plan in place for ICANN80 to go with that. So if there's nothing else, I think we'll—Jothan, go ahead, please.

JOTHAN FRAKES: We have a meeting next week. And then June 11th, we have our meeting at ICANN80, is that correct as far as time goes?

ROGER CARNEY: Actually, we have one scheduled next week, one on the 4th, and then on the 11th. We still have one that week prior to ICANN80.

JOTHAN FRAKES: And then I wanted to compliment—this is for the Meetings team and for this group. I'm sure there was some coordination. But I noticed that the Transfer Policy Review meeting at ICANN80 is not happening against the Registrar or Registry meetings, which is really I'm very grateful for. People may not be conflicted out of it, but I do note that it appears that the IPC, BC, NCSG are having meetings during that time that might be in conflict. So it's my hope

we'll still get participation from those groups so we can hear their feedback as well. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks for looking at that, Jothan. Okay. Any other comments from anyone? Kind of going in the lines with Jothan's concern, the homework is a big assignment. As you notice, we're wrapping up here early. I think maybe we can propose, see what the working group thinks of maybe canceling next week's session so that everybody can use that time for review and for homework time, and then still plan to meet June 4th so we can get back together and get ready for ICANN80. Any concerns about canceling next week's and giving everyone that time back so that they can work? Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Given the holiday, I think there's quite a lot of people who are taking extended weekends or doing work. So I think we might have had lighter attendance and typical anyway so that I second that idea. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Jothan. Any concerns about that? The homework assignment is big and important for us to get through. So I think taking a week off from our call—again, I think the focus here is right here. So we're not going to be changing focus. I think it might be better just to give everybody that time to work on their homework assignment. So if anybody has any issues with that, though... Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I just want to think through timing-wise, will the June 4th meeting provide an opportunity to review the materials that would come in under this current can't live with document request? So we would be going through that before it would get included in things that would be used that ICANN80. So is that our opportunity to kind of discuss those things?

ROGER CARNEY: I think that's the perfect thing to look at at that meeting. It's not necessarily to drill into those things, but get them set up so that everybody's aware of what we will be talking about and what those items are. Again, as Jothan pointed out, it's not going to be the last time people get a shot at this. But it is this efficient process that we're looking for to get things moving forward so that we can discuss them and get them worked out as soon as we can. If we can hit a July time for it, I know that Berry's a little more half empty here than I am. But if we can hit a July time period for Public Comment, that'd be great. Because then the holidays don't affect our meeting times and we'll get everyone into the reading mode by the time August hits around. The next two months is going to be a lot of work for us. As Jothan pointed out, I think that the June 4th meeting, two weeks from now, would be a preparation kind of, okay, these are the four things that came in, these are the eight things that came in, whatever it is. Let's work these in and maybe that we can group them together and work them at ICANN80. I don't expect that June 4th to be a detailed working meeting but maybe more of a prep meeting for ICANN80, unless we have the time and then we can actually drill into them.

Very true, Berry. Okay. Let's go ahead and plan to skip next week's meeting then. Then we'll meet back up on June 4th to see where everybody stands on the homework and see if we can get some organization going for the ICANN80 meeting.

Thanks, Julie. Okay. If there's nothing else, I will let everyone go 40 minutes early and they can start diving into their homework. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]