

---

**ICANN Transcription**  
**Transfer Policy Review PDP WG**  
**Tuesday, 02 July 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/DQBhF>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:  
<https://gns0.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 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Osvaldo Novoa (GNSO Council Liaison), John Woodworth (ISPCP), Jim Galvin (RySG), and Jody Kolker (RrSG). Jody formally assigned Christopher Patterson 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 e-mails.

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. All right, 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 multistakeholder 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. We are into our review process and hopefully down to our last few weeks here before we can get a little bit of a pause during Public Comment. Again, we've got just July and we want to be done in the next few weeks. Actually, by the end of July. So we've got a good draft of the recommendations that we're going to go through and everything. But I think over the next three or four weeks, we hope to make it through all of this and get everybody's input and updates done so that we can move into Public Comments shortly after July.

For any updates, I don't have anything big. Obviously, the big thing is probably a little more homework than normal this month, as we want to get through and review any concerns. Hopefully we don't get any, that's great. And we just have some grammar typos, whatever it is, to update, that would be awesome. But if there are any issues that come up, we want to get those addressed as quickly as possible. So we are going to look for the homework assignments to be much heavier this month than we've seen before because we want to get through these fairly quickly before the end of month.

With that said, I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups that want to bring any conversations, questions, comments forward that maybe have been offline, or anything that the working group could help answer. So I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups that have anything to bring forward. Okay, great. Well, I think then we'll go ahead and jump right into our main agenda items here. I will turn this over. Is Caitlin or Christian going to walk us through this?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Hi, Roger. This is Caitlin. I can start.

---

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: I welcome any of my colleagues to jump in, if needed. Thank you. This is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN Org for the record. At this point, we hope that everybody has seen, at least done a quick glance of the completed or I should say the comprehensive Initial Report as we're now in the serious review period for this document.

We went over the beginning part of the Initial Report last week, so I won't spend too much time on that. But you'll see that it does include the preamble, which we went over, that explains how the report is structured differently than a standard GNSO report template. But the goal is to make it more readable for users, and also keep the main body of the report shorter and provide those policy impact analyses to help the reader understand where big changes are being suggested versus maybe just a definitional change. So we could scroll down.

The table of contents, as with every table of contents, shows what the report contains and includes links so that we can easily toggle between the different and parts of the report. But if we can start with the policy recommendations and impact analysis for Group 1(a), Christian. Thank you.

So this should look similar to what we showed the group last week with the exception of now all the recommendations have been inputted into this template. So what you'll see is, first, there is the introduction to what the Group 1(a) recommendations cover. As we all know, the large part of Part 1 of the Transfer Policy with inter-registrar transfers and the security components of that. We also put a disclaimer about the ordering of the recommendations. They follow the steps of a typical inter-registrar transfer, which is denoted by that swim lane graphic that is shown a little bit further down the report. Then, of course, because it's small and you

---

need a very strong magnifying glass to actually look at that, there is a link that takes the reader to the actual graphic and you can magnify the graphic, make it larger, and it's easier to see all of the component parts of that. So if we can scroll down.

This is where we get into the Group 1(a) recommendations. This, again, should look identical to what the group saw last week, where you have the text of the recommendation, the impact rating, and the rationale for why the group is recommending that change. There's also a section if there is any implementation guidance. And then importantly, the last part of this has the hyperlinks to the relevant Charter questions and deliberations. So if we can just click on one of those, there we go.

Because the first recommendation is about terminology changes that were a result of the Wave 1 Recommendation 27 report, that hyperlink goes right to what Charter question was and explains the summary of the group's deliberations as to why they made that policy recommendation. As you can see, it's hyperlinks right back to the recommendation. So for those who are interested in reading a little bit more about the history of the recommendation or what the group may have deliberated on in getting to that recommendation, there is the option to go to those deliberations. As we mentioned last week, as we all can imagine, some of the recommendations that had substantial deliberations, those deliberations are quite long, which was increasing the body of the report to over 100 pages. So that's why we suggested to move that to an annex so that all of the deliberations and history are still there. But for anyone who would like to read it, but it's taken out of the body of reports to make it a little bit easier to read, but still maintaining that history.

So the goal for this week, recognizing that there were and some North American holidays and possibly other holidays, is to go over the recommendation text as well as the summary deliberations for Group 1(a) specifically. And as a reminder, the Group 1(a) recommendations

---

and the summary deliberations have been a product of public comment and some edits following the Public Comment period. So this particular group of recommendations and summary deliberations text has been probably the most reviewed part of the report. When you get into those summary deliberations, you'll notice there might be some yellow highlighting. The yellow highlights represent changes that the group agreed to coming out of the Public Comment review. So when you see that, that denotes changes from the first Initial Report.

As Christian noted in the e-mail where he sent out the Initial Report, there are three types of highlighting in the report. There is also light blue highlighting. That's what we use to denote any changes as a result of the most recent review of the recommendations and impact analysis. Then if you see a bright pink highlight, that's just an internal note that we need to check the reference. For example, we know that the recommendation numbers have changed. Some of the annex numbers have changed as a result of combining everything and reordering the recommendations. We just want to make sure that all of the references are correct. So if you see a pink highlight, those will eventually all be checked, and that highlighting will be removed. We just wanted to reinforce what Christian's note to the group side about particular highlighting.

Another thing to note, you'll see that there are line numbers for this report. We have found through reviewing other reports that when you get a lot of editors and a lot of groups reviewing, it's very helpful to have line numbers, and for the group to note whatever line number they have a particular issue with. So when it comes to updating the master copy of the Initial Report, it makes it a lot easier than trying to make edits for support staff. So that's why we have the line numbers. I believe the working group did request a Word version of the report, and Christian provided that. But noting that beginning in Annex 6, the line numbers differ slightly. So when you're referencing line numbers in the Google Doc, we ask that you confirm the line numbers in the PDF document that

---

---

we sent, just to make everything clear to what we would eventually be making edits to on the master copy. That just helps in terms of chain of custody.

So that's the general review of the report. I guess we can open it up now to see if anybody has any questions on the homework assignment or any other questions or observations of the report that they'd like to bring to leadership and support staff's attention.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Caitlin. Any questions on this? Again, we kind of showcased it last week a bit. But now that the whole thing is put together in there, some slight changes to it, we want to make sure everybody understands and is good with the homework assignment here. A lot of work staff went through a lot of work to get this in this order here. So hopefully, it helps everybody speed through this and can get to the conclusion.

As Caitlin mentioned, obviously, I think this first section, this Group 1(a) that we have worked through multiple times here, should hopefully provide us a good opportunity to walk through this and understand it well, the format of the document and everything, so that we can make sure that we have any questions done. The last talked about Group 1(b) and 2, but obviously, we had multiple chances to go through those as well. But we want to make sure everybody's comfortable here and knows what to do as far as the next step here. Again, the homework this month will be the important part, everyone making sure that their stakeholder groups are comfortable with what is in here before we can take all this to Public Comment. So please let us know.

Any questions, comments from anyone? Thanks, Jothan. Yeah, it was it was a lot of work for staff to do this and to get it into a good format so that it's very usable. Okay. I'm not seeing any comments or questions on that. Hopefully, it's pretty straightforward. Let's go ahead and jump into

---

our next agenda item. I think that'll take us through the main part of the homework. Christian, are you taking us through this part? Or is Caitlin doing that as well?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER:

Sure. We've pretty much gotten through. We're not going to read through the entire Group 1(a) recommendations. As you said, we should be familiar with it. But this is the homework that the plan is for by next week, that the group if they could go through the Group 1(a) items, which pretty much takes up these numbers right here, these page numbers indicated on the Google Doc, and just to note if there's any cannot live with items. We also have tables here for the can't live with, preferred change or grammatical edits as people identify them if they wish. We can go over any items that people have identified during our next meeting on next Tuesday is the plan. So please do go through it. And if you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please do indicate them along with the relevant line number, that'd be great.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Christian. I think this is the important part. If you have things, put it in as early as you can so that it can start to be looked at by everyone, but also the grammar stuff and everything, staff will work on in the background and just get those updated if they come in early enough. But to Christian's point, we want to have everyone's cannot live with things in here. So that next week's meeting, that's the plan, is we'll go through all Group 1(a) can't live with or needs an update to it to make it correct. Again, that's the goal for next week. So if you run into something, drop it in this sheet as soon as you find it. That way, everyone can start looking at it and start to think about it. But again, that'll be our goal next week is to go through all these items here in the first two sections here that cannot live with and the needed updates one. Any questions on what we're trying to do in the next week? Okay, great.

---

I think, Christian, that was all for today. So I think we'll give everyone the time back, and everyone could get started on their homework, actually. Take the next hour or so and do that. So that'd be awesome. Christian, is that all we had today?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Yes. That's all we have for today. Just as a note, our subsequent weeks there will be more homework assignments to go through more and more chunks of the report. So just encouraging the group to try and get these done as quickly as possible before the next meetings, because otherwise, the review pages are just going to add up.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. That's a good point. Thanks, Christian. Again, I'm not expecting a whole lot here for the Group 1(a) because we've gone through this multiple times and a public comment on it, and gone through it after that. So I'm not expecting a lot here. But the hope is that we can get through 1(a) next week, and then everyone can work on the next section the following week so that we set this pace of, hopefully, in the next three weeks, we cover all this and anything leftover we can cover in the last couple of weeks and get cleaned up. But that's the big goal, stepping through these groupings over the next two to three weeks so that we can get everything down and then do our final clean-up over the last couple of weeks.

Okay, any questions, comments before we let everyone go back and spend the next hour and 10 minutes, hopefully, on this document? Great. Thanks, everyone. We'll talk to you next week. And hopefully, we see comments coming in during the week. Thanks, everybody. Bye.



---

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Roger. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting has concluded. Have a good rest of your day. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**