JULIE BISLAND: All right, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 28th of January 2025. For today's call, we have apologies from Zak Muscovitch, BC. 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.

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, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. And over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Before we jump in, I just want to thank everybody and thank Rick for dropping a note to everyone this morning about some cleanup items in the document. Really appreciate and we'll go over some of those today as well. But really, I want to make sure everyone had received the consensus call that went out last week. Hopefully everybody had a chance to get that. And if they didn't, please let me know. Let staff know. But we are running consensus call through Friday this week. And we'll be closing it the end of day Friday and getting the report off to council next week. So a great job, again, a few years it's taken us to get here. But I think it's been a great few years,

actually. And we've been really productive getting there. So thank you to everyone for participating and getting us over the line. Well, good. So, yeah, I just want to thank everybody. It's been a great few years, and I've really enjoyed participating. I think it's been a really productive and collaborative group. So thank you all. And next week, our report will be going to council. Other than that, I really don't have anything to talk about. So I think we can jump into our agenda and go through any updates that we need to do. And again, thanks to Rick for dropping a note this morning with quite a few different updates. And to Rick's point, I think that none of the things he's suggesting are intent changes. So I think that if people agree with him, it'll be fairly easy to change. So I think that I didn't get through all of them, but I got through most of the ones he sent this morning. And they made sense, the ones I got to. But we can go through those as well. Caitlin, are you taking us through any updates we've done last week? Or were there any that we've done, I guess? Or was Rick's the first one here?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. So we went through some of the changes during our last call and highlighted them in the update that we sent to the group and didn't receive any objections. So I think we can just start going through the registry comments. So if one of our registry.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Roger. Is Rick on? Maybe Rick can run us through some of these.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, I'm here.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Rick. If you want to run us through. And again, I ran through them and they seemed to make sense. So I think we can run through these fairly quick. So yeah, thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Yeah, there we go. Oh, okay. Well, let me stretch the window because somebody's reading my mind about the side by side thing. Okay. So I, as I said in my note, I did not get through the whole document with like the proverbial fine tooth comb. But so what I did get through, I did do a good job, I think. So come up with some a few of them here. 284 where we're headed to. There's some text here where it says replace a 60 day post creation lock, parenthetical or period other than 30 days with quote such a period. I think that it one we're unnecessarily calling out 60 day post creation lock. Some people might have a 45 day post lock, some people might have a 75 day. And then we redundantly put that in there about a period other than 30 days. And so I think we should just say such a period. And then you can see in the thus the sentence would read pursuant to this recommendation, such a period that pursuant to this recommendation, comma, as such a period would no longer be permitted under the transfer policy. I think it's just tighter. And I don't think it changes the meaning.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, thanks for that, Rick. I completely agree with you. I think that people know that there's 60 day locks out there, but we don't know if there's other ones that are [inaudible]. So I think cleaning that up and making it more succinct is better. So anyone have any issues with this update? Okay, I think we can move on, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. In 552, there's some text in there. Here we're talking about resetting the TAC to null. I went and I was looking at this term, resetting the TAC to null, which is a computery techie sort of term. And I went over into 9154, and when we wrote that RFC, we used a little bit cleaner language. So rather than try and adjust the language because we use set the TAC to null in a couple of spots, I just updated this and suggesting pointing to 9154, 4.4 and 5.2 for more information, because that's where it talks in more specificity about what this means. So I think that that would be something that would be a useful upgrade. I hope that's helpful.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Yeah. And I think anything we can give more specifics on, especially for the IRT, would be great. I took a look at 9154 and I think you're pointing to the right area. So I think that's good to update that. But I'll open it up to anyone have any issues with these changes. Okay, good. I think we can update with those and again, the specificity will help out later on.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, very good. Down to line 747. We've got words in here that say must provide such records to ICANN upon reasonable notice. And I'm suggesting that we replace that with is responsible for its own requirements contained therein as they may change from time to time. So the reason is that the current data retention specs do require a registrar to provide such notice. But the future data retention specs might provide some leniency or might provide conditions or something like that. And by my read, we're inadvertently and unintentionally coupling this document that we see here on the right of the screen with this contents of the data retention specification as it's currently written. And so therefore, let's uncouple them. And so therefore, making this linkage looser, but still require the linkage, but just make it looser so that we don't get stuck. If the data retention spec changes that we have to come back or some other future versions of we have to come back and re-couple. So that we don't get stuck. If the data retention spec changes that we have to come back or some other future versions of, we have to come back and edit line 784 in some ridiculous fashion and force an update into this document. So that's my recommendation there. Now, someone, staff, somebody else might have a better version of is responsible for its own compliance, blah, blah, blah. But I do feel pretty strongly that we should decouple these somehow. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Yeah. And again, leaving in the fact that we're pointing to the retention specification, I think is important, but to your point on the second part, I think removing the specifics that are in that is probably a good idea. I think removing the specifics that are in that is probably a good idea, so I'm good with your wording here, but if

someone has better wording, great, but I think to your point, I think it makes sense to remove the specifics out of there and just point to the document so that that document is a living document and will probably change, so no need to come in and, as you said, I don't remember how you said it, but it won't be us. It'll be someone similar to us doing that change. So, but anyone have any issues with updating that second part of the sentence there? Okay, yeah, and if anyone has any better wording or different wording to the point, you know, please feel free to provide staff that or staff comes up with something. Again, I think the point is just removing the specific call out and just leaving it as a pointer to the specification. So, okay, Rick, I think we can go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. 936 to 939. Here, I'm less specific. I said there needs to be some clarification to 18.1 and 18.2. Initially, these seem to be redundant or somewhat overlapping, so if you read these just in isolation right next to each other, the registrar must be able to demonstrate that it received a specific request to remove the 720 hour from the registered name holder, and then the registrar must ensure the request to remove the restriction was requested by the registered name holder. Now, maybe my registrar muscles have just atrophied in the many years it's been since I've been a registrar, but this, to me, seemed like they're saying almost the same thing, but not quite. And, like, we've gradually edited ourselves where 18.1 and 18.2 are somewhat redundant or somewhat overlapping, and Caitlin has her hand up.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and before Caitlin jumps in, the only thing I would say, Rick, on this is I think you're right. I think they do, and maybe we need to clarify it a bit. I think that the point is 18.2 is that there was a request, and 18.1 is you have to be able to show that there was a request, I think, but Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. Support staff had a quick review of the concern here and agrees that it appears redundant, and so the suggestion could be to remove 18.2 entirely, but if there's a concern about ensuring that the request is from the registered name holder, we could just add language to 18.1 that the registrar must be able to demonstrate that it received a specific request to remove this 720-hour restriction and that the request came from the registered name holder or something like that. But I think even without 18.2, at least from a support staff perspective, 18.1 provides the language needed to ensure that both the request, there was a clear request to remove, and it came from the entity that's allowed to give that request.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Yeah, and again, I think you're right. I think, and Rick was probably right, because we probably edited these down to where these are at, and we ended up causing a little confusion there, because 18.1, if you can demonstrate it, then it did happen, so 18.2 must have already happened. So I think that point is pretty good. Thoughts on that? And again, I think, to Rick's point, it probably is clear if 18.2 is removed, and that's not what he was suggesting. He just

	wanted to highlight this, but I think that that does make sense. Any comments or concerns about that? Rich, please go ahead.
RICH BROWN:	Yeah, I'm trying to piece this together here, so forgive me if I'm a little awkward in my response here, but so 18.1 and 18.2, there are two points that are trying to be said here. One, we want, obviously, it must come from the registered name holder, which is 18.2, and 18.1 is, it must be specific. Now, I know I said domain and chat, but it could be specific to the transfer or the case or whatever, so I think there could be a vagueness there, of course, but like I mentioned in chat, you can't just have a request, you can't just have a request. You can't request from somebody that says, yeah, remove me from the 720-hour restriction from all my domains, and then later when you have to defend it as a registrar, you know, or it gets looked into, well, how do we know, like, maybe one domain had a 720-hour removed from it, but it wasn't registered to that person at the time they made that original request, so maybe this one shouldn't. You see the point? So I think we're just trying to make sure that the request is specific to the issue at hand and that it is coming from the actual domain owner, and I think that's the reason for the separate 0.1 and 0.2. Thank you.
ROGER CARNEY:	Great. Thanks, Rich. Rick's call out here of these are very similar, and does it add confusion? I think that's the important part. You know, we don't want to add any confusion if we don't need to, and I do think that, as Caitlin said, 18.1 does cover 18.2, obviously, by being able to

demonstrate that it actually happened already, so I'm okay with the idea of removing 18.2, and if anyone just objects to that, let me know. Again, I think that 18.1 is covering that. Okay, Steinar, interesting. In chat. Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I was not thinking about this before we started discussing this specific, but my understanding of the idea behind here is that this is not a request for future automatic removal of the restriction for an after transfer, locking after a transfer, a successful transfer. This is a case-by-case thing, isn't it?

ROGER CARNEY: And I wouldn't say it's necessarily case-by-case, but I would say you're right. It's not for future things, but if there's two domains that are locked today and the registrant calls in and says, hey, can you remove these two, then that, to me, makes sense. But it's not next month they transfer another one and it's locked. It doesn't cover that one at all.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: And then in this line in my thinking as well. Yes, thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, great. Thanks, Steinar. Okay. Again, if no one's opposed, I think taking 18.2 out does clean it up and it's more succinct. So, Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. In recognition of Rich's concern, one thing that we could do if there is that concern that this doesn't encompass a broad request to remove the restriction from all domains in a portfolio, so we could consider adding a footnote to specific in 18.1 and just say specific means related to the domain name or domain name specifically noted in the request. It is not meant to be a bulk request for all of a registrant's domains or something like that.

RICK WILHELM: I think that we could solve Rich's concern just by sticking the word domain name in 18.1 somewhere. The registrar must be able to demonstrate that it received a specific request to remove the 720-hour – the restriction from the – like in the back half of the sentence, a specific domain name received from the registered name holder or something like that. It's hard for me to edit the sentence in real time with my yap. But I think that I would probably prefer the clarification come in the clearly normative text rather than a footnote. So I think that I would kind of suggest that as an option. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Good, good. Thanks, Rick, for that. And Jody seemed to agree. Yeah, I think we can come up with the wording there of sticking in domain and still including the registered name holder. So I think let's drop 18-2 and get in domain into 18-1. And we'll massage that wording, depending on where that falls. Yeah, Caitlin, maybe your text in the chat, maybe the restriction on a specific domain from the registered name holder. But

we can do that. But we'll get that cleaned up. And again, we'll basically combine 18-1 and 18-2 to make one succinct statement. OK. Rick, do you want to take us through the next one?

RICK WILHELM: The registrar must maintain, similar to that in REC 3-279 about this REC 18. OK. Let me scroll up a little bit. Suggest adding text similar to that in REC 3-279 to 285 to this REC 18. Oh, OK, yeah. So here's what I did. I had two views on the document. And this REC 3, transfer restriction after initial, so this is about making sure that we keep these things the same, about making sure that the locks are all 30 days, right? So 279 to 285 is this block that we've highlighted here. Down here at 968, what we're doing here is we want these all to be standardized, right? And down here, if you look, OK, you see that, and then you go down to 968. Here, we're talking about standardizing, but we don't have to scroll up just a little bit, scroll up. Maybe I've got my lines wrong. Oh, here it is. Must restrict for 720 hours. And then this is, don't we want all of these things standard at 720 hours here, right? So we, in other words, this in REC 18, all of the transfer restrictions for inter-registrar transfers have to be 720 hours. And we don't have anything in REC 18 that says, hey, if you've got anything that's not 720 hours, you've got to shove that to be 720 hours. Does that kind of make sense?

ROGER CARNEY: OK, yeah. And the only reason I can think we didn't do it, and maybe it was an oversight, is we knew that there were other ones on a create,

and we probably didn't think about there being other ones on a transfer.

RICK WILHELM: Correct. And I sort of zoomed out and had two views of the document, two windows open on the document, and I was kind of going through where we were standardizing restrictions. And here, I had transfer restriction after inter-registrar transfers, transfer restrictions after initial registration, and making sure that they kind of rhymed, if you will. Right. And this is when I ran across that. So here, and so on the right-hand side, I say here in REC 18, we talk about standardizing the time frame in the policy impact and the implementation guidance. That's what it is. Go down to policy impact and implementation guidance a little bit lower. Policy impact, just a little bit farther down. And implementation guidance, we talk about standardizing them here somewhere. Post-transfer restriction is reduced from an inconsistently applied 60 days to a consistently applied 30 days. So what I'm saying is that since we talk about policy impact of being there, then we ought to throw up into the top thing the same language that we had about everybody lined up on 30 days. That's sort of the suggestion. And I think it's an oversight, as you can see in the last sentence of the block on the right. We don't do it in the recommendation text, which seems like an oversight. I think it's just a miss on our part.

ROGER CARNEY: And again, I think you're right. I think we did. Again, when we talked about it, we knew on creates that there were some differences. And on

post-transfer, we didn't talk about the possibility of there being differences because the transfer spec was kind of persistent there. But you're right. I mean, it's possible. And as you said here in the policy impact, we talk about it being standard. So I don't see there an issue with replicating that. But I'll open that up to the floor to see if anybody has any issues about replicating that text from recommendation three down. Because again, as Rick explained, I always thought these two should fairly mirror themselves as well. So not that they would have to be exact, obviously, but that they would be fairly close mirrors of themselves. So OK, let's look at that. And I can work with staff to see what we can do on pulling that in here. OK, Rick, let's go ahead and move on.

RICK WILHELM: I think all the rest of these are grammatical. And you can kind of see some of these will bring a smile to Caitlin's face. Some of them will make her shake her head. But I think that all the rest of these are kind of squarely in the grammatical.

ROGER CARNEY: OK. Yeah, and we don't need to go step by step through those. I don't think so. Yeah. OK, maybe I'll turn this back to staff to see if they want clarifications on anything, as they're the ones who'll be updating everything. And maybe they don't know yet. But staff, anything we need?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Roger, I'm just going to pause for a moment to see if any of my colleagues had any follow-up questions.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER: Nothing for me. I would just throw the recommendation three up here, just because it's a little bit of a formatting suggestion to start with, to get rid of the 3.1 and just make it like the paragraph, kind of like a similar format as the other recommendations. So just given that that was a little bit of a larger change from the other ones, I just thought I'd throw it on the screen.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, no, that makes sense, Christian. OK, I think that we're in good shape. And again, thanks, Rick, for getting through a good chunk of this. Again, the more we can clean this up, the better the IRT will be, and better for council and the board as well. So I think that's great.

RICK WILHELM: One question, what's the window open on? Because like I said, I'm about 1,000 lines in. Is the window still open on this stuff? Like, what's your thought on that?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and I'll let staff speak to it specifically. Technically, the consensus call is open until Friday. So we'll have until Friday where we can make it. Technically, the consensus call is open until Friday. So we'll have until Friday where we can make some updates. And if that drips to Monday, I

think that's okay, but I'll let staff actually cut it off because they have to get this to council before their next meeting. So they do have a timeline on when their last edits can happen. Caitlin or Christian, do we know when that last edit can occur?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. I think what I would say, and I invite others to pipe in, is in terms of any sort of grammatical edits, we always welcome those. And ideally, we could receive those by Friday. If some bleed over into Monday, that is okay. Anything that would be more substantive that would require working group review, it's a little too late for those. Just because we're going to be turning the report in next week, and it wouldn't be fair to the working group if things that were more substantive were added without the chance to review. So by all means, if folks want to put on their reading glasses and provide additional grammatical edits or formatting things, we welcome all of those. But yeah, I think the substantive edits, especially to recommendation text, that door has closed.

ROGER CARNEY: Good. Yep. I agree. Thanks, Caitlin. Okay. All right. I think we're in a good spot. Again, if anybody sees any grammatical things, let's get them updated this week so we can get as clean of a report off as possible. But yeah, thanks for that. And Rick, thanks for getting through all these updates as well. Appreciate that. I will open it up to the floor if anyone has any comments, questions, concerns. I think, again, as I started the meeting out, really appreciate everybody's hard work on this. The group

has been great to work with, and I think we've produced a very good result out of this. So congratulations to everyone. And now off to council with it. So I think everyone here, including staff, who does a lot of behind the works to get everything that we're trying to spew out all these calls, and they make sense out of it. So thank staff for that as well. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: I'm just going to maybe ask perhaps an obvious question here, but is this the last meeting of this working group?

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you, Owen. It is the last meeting of this group.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: I was looking for the confetti or explosion emoji, but all I had was the hand raise that was going up. But wow. Awesome. A lot of work. Thanks, everyone.

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. Again, yes. Thanks, everyone, for all the work. And it's great. And again, we work together well to produce a very good result. So I think kudos to everyone on the group. Okay. If nothing else, thank you all, and we will talk to everyone in the future on other things. Look for this to hit council, and hopefully they get it voted, I think at 82 is the goal. Great. Thanks, everybody.

JULIE BISLAND: I added the reaction. Sorry.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Julie.

JULIE BISLAND: Take care, everyone. Have a good rest of your day.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Perfect, Julie. Thanks. You're welcome. Take care, everyone. Have a good rest of your day. Perfect, Julie. Thanks. You're welcome.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]