
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 7th of January 2025.

For today's call, we have apologies from Rick Wilhelm (RySG) and Jody Kolker (RrSG). Jody formally assigned Christopher Patterson to be his alternate for today's call and 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, seeing no hands, observers will remain as an attendee and will have view chat only. Members and alternates are promoted to panelists.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription, and please note all chat sessions are being archived. Participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. Over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Happy new year. Welcome to 2025. It should be another great year. Just a few comments before we jump into our agenda. It looks like we're maybe a week or a month or so away from being done in our report to Council, but I think we've done a lot of

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.

great work in the past few years, and we've got one more month, a few more sessions, to make sure that we wrap up the final report so we can get it to Council early February, the first week or so in February, is our goal. It's what our project plan has us heading towards. So I think we're on that. We just have to spend the next few weeks making sure we button everything up.

Along that, before break, staff had sent out an e-mail with today's agenda and some action items. It looks like a few people have already started, which is great. Basically, the ask is to go through the recommendations and make sure anybody comments, any can't live withs, to make sure we can discuss them, any comments or markings of items that people can't live with, which I hope are pretty limited by now. I think we've gone over everything multiple times now. But if there are some, we need to have those recorded in the workbook by next Monday, because next Tuesday we will go through those and make sure we can get them all answered and hopefully get to a good agreement on those, if there are any. Again, I don't know if there are any, but if anybody finds anything, let's talk about them. Get them marked in the next week, by Monday, and then we can talk about them next week.

I think it's about it for going over any comments before we get started. So maybe I will turn this over to Caitlin to jump into our first agenda item. Caitlin?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Roger, and happy new year all. this is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN Org. Our first agenda item is to review the proposed updates to

Recommendation 35. And since we're just coming back from break, a reminder on what we're talking about with this recommendation. This is the bulk transfer recommendation set, and this is about the fees associated with that.

Support staff had an action item following our last call. We talked about one of the new comments received was from ICANN Org with a suggestion about updating this recommendation slightly. And the concern which had been expressed previously was that in some of these bulk transfers, there's a lot of registries that are implicated, sometimes not having many names involved, and so there's an administrative issue or concern with having a lot of registries involved with not a lot of names, and that maybe the threshold could be the same with the slight adjustment. In other words, keep the threshold at 50,000 names. And instead of it being a cumulative number across all registries, it would be per registry, which is what it is today, but that it would have a update for registry families because that was, I think, a concern that the group discussed as they were going through this recommendation. So the threshold would be triggered if there was a registry with 50,000 names or a registry family that had TLDs that equated to greater than 50,000 names.

So we talked about that during the last meeting. There were no objections expressed with that idea, other than the text needed to be updated so that folks could have a look to see what that would look like. The yellow highlighted text shows what those updates would look like. Essentially, you'll see it says 50,000 names per registry or registry family, and then again, greater than 50,000 names with a couple of examples that highlight what that would look like.

In example one, if the first registry transfers 55,000 names and the second registry transfers 5000 names, and there's 60,000 names total, Registry A may charge 50,000 but Registry B would not charge a fee unless they're part of a family. And then if Registry A transfers 40,000, Registry B transfers 20,000, there would not be a fee as neither registry meets that threshold. And then lastly, if Registry A transfers 40,000, Registry B transfers 20,000, totaling 60,000 and they're part of the same family, that family could charge the fee.

So hopefully those examples make that idea clear. We didn't see any comments on this, but we just wanted to reserve some time during the meeting to see if the working group is okay with this language, or if there's something that could make it more clear, we are open to feedback.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. And again, I think this was a great comment by ICANN that I think this really helps clean this up, and it's probably closer to the intent that I think everybody was hoping for and I think this wording helps out. My only suggestion is in the Implementation Guidance, I think maybe add Registry A may charge up to 50,000. I don't think that they have to charge 50,000 if they don't want to. Just a suggestion of the "up to," but just any other comments from anyone else? Rich, please go ahead.

RICH BROWN:

Hi. Am I coming through all right?

ROGER CARNEY: You sound good, Rich.

RICH BROWN: Thank you. So there seems to be one example left out, because, remember, we're trying to make a price ceiling of 50k universal. What if one registry has 50,000 domains and another registry is 50,000 domains, they are not in the same family? Then it's 100k because now we're violating the price ceiling, which was the goal of all of this, was to try to keep it at a 50k instead of running up the bill as we add more registries. Anyway, just my thought there. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rich. Yeah, our wording in the recommendation does cover that, but, yeah, it may be good to have an example that shows two registries transferring even a million names, whatever it is, and they have to somehow apportion that 50,000. So maybe another example would be useful. Others' thoughts on that would be great. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I do have a separate topic. I wanted to see Jim Galvin, if he was responding to Rich. Jim, are you responding to Rich?

JIM GALVIN: No. That's okay, Jothan, go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Okay, great. So my separate comment is that I think we probably want to define registry families here or make sure that it's clear that we're talking about common operation and not necessarily common ownership. And I'll give an example. Jim, your hand went down, you may want to put it back up. I'll give it a specific example.

Dot Vegas is a top-level domain, and they selected Identity Digital's—I don't know what it's called—common platform or whatever. So there's a difference between .vegas having separate registry operator than the use of Identity Digital's RSP. And so the example would be—I'll just pick a few of the many Identity Digital top-level domains. Let's say that I've got 50,000 .blue, 50,000 .pink, 50,000 .info, and then 50,000 .vegas domain names. Would that all be considered in the same family, or would .vegas be considered a separate entity? Because it's not the same registry operator. It's a different registry operator but it's common RSP, and it seems that since they're all on the same provisioning platform, that should probably stretch to fit family. I just want to make sure that we're clearly defining that. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for that explanation, Jothan. I wasn't sure about your chat how that worked out, but that was a good explanation. I tend to agree with you. I think the intent was that those would be treated as a family, but it definitely needs to be clarified, I think. And I'd look to others for thoughts on that. But let me go to Jim first. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Roger. Jim Galvin, Registries for the record. Two questions, one related to what Jothan was just asking about. The way I would frame the question is the distinction between operators or owners, and if that's what we mean by registry family, we have to be really clear about that. And, Chris, I don't remember that clarity from the prior discussion, which I was actually not part of, so I had to go listen to that. But that's one question.

The second point is example one. I have to check on example one. I actually don't remember it that way, and perhaps if others do, it'd be great to get some additional clarity here. But I also just want to put on the record here that I want to take a moment to be able to check back with Rick and others about this. But did we really mean to say that only registry or registry families that hit the \$50,000 trigger get any money? I mean, it strikes me that I thought the model was that as long as the 50,000 is hit somewhere by somebody, then everybody gets to share on a prorated basis with the fee. I'm happy to be told to be wrong here, but that's what I thought I understood and I certainly do want to check that. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for that, Jim. I'll get back to the other one and hopefully answer this one first. In today's world, if a registry does this, they each get to charge 50,000 if they go over 50. But if a registry actually only has 49,000, it doesn't get to charge a fee at all. What we talked about and how we got to the original language here, you're right, Jim, I think that we were talking about everyone that was involved would get some apportionment. But then ICANN came back in Public Comment and said,

“Well, that gets kind of messy, and does that really fit what everybody was wanting to do? And that if a registry is only involved in 10,000 names, should they get any money?” Because if they were in today’s world, they wouldn’t get it unless they were lumped into a move, which that wouldn’t have happened, so they wouldn’t have gotten anything. So, I think what ICANN Org said was, “Can we simplify it? And people that don’t have 50,000 wouldn’t get apportionment of that, but any of those over would, and it would simplify the math and probably eliminate a lot of complications driving who gets what.” So to your point, Jim, this first example is new from Public Comments, and I think it’s appropriate if you and Rick and the Registries talk about it, because this is slightly different than what we came up with. Maybe the intent was there and somebody thought that, but ICANN Org came back and said, “Does this make it cleaner?” and that’s what the example is for. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Roger. So what I’m hearing is that, actually, that example aligns better with the world today. That’s what I’m hearing. And let me just take that on board for right now and I’ll check with Rick and we’ll come back next time. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Jim. Again, I think it also simplifies what we were getting into, and that the math, it makes it a little easier. If 10 registries were involved that didn’t hit the 50,000, none of them did, then we don’t have to try to split that money up 15 different ways, or whatever it is. I

think that it kind of does both. Again, to your question, we were not this specific when we created the language, and I think that this actually helped clarify. But just my thoughts. Catherine, please go ahead.

CATHERINE PALETTA:

This is Catherine Paletta from the Registrars. I'm thinking about how we define the registry family, which I think Roger you said that you were thinking that would include basically operationally, so same RSP. I'm thinking about how that works if the one registry wants to waive the fee and another doesn't. So we can take Jothan's Vegas example, he already threw it out there. If Identity Digital combined with some of our TLDs and combined with some RSP TLDs is over 50,000 and ID says, "Actually, we don't want to charge the fee," and the RSP customer says, "I do want to charge the fee," is that something that RSPs have to work out on their own, and this policy is not going to get into that? Which I think is a valid option if we just say that's not our problem and they have to work it out. But throwing that out there this question.

ROGER CARNEY:

Catherine, I think maybe, I don't know if you did it on purpose, and I touched on another issue that—maybe Jothan can think about as well as—when we look at it being ownership and operational, the operational probably has a much bigger chance of going over 50,000 if you look at it versus ownership. So if you do make a family that is ownership and operational, however you define that, that 50,000 may come into play more often just because you're spreading that number out across a lot more. So I think that we do need to be careful on how

we define it and does it solve what we're looking to solve. So just some thoughts there. Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Catherine touched upon something interesting there and that raises an interesting point. If I can go down to calculate what basically the amount would be that a registry could charge based on the number of registries involved in the bulk transfer, for example, and then a couple opt out of receiving those funds, would that then increase the share of the other TLDs for the same work? That hardly seems justifiable. So I would think that once ICANN has attributed to the share to a registry and the registry opts out, that part is just forfeited, but it's not clear what happens. So you might add a note to that effect.

ROGER CARNEY:

That's right, Volker. Actually, I think we've got that written somewhere that that the fee doesn't go up if someone volunteers not to take a fee. That's in one of our recommendations, that if someone backs out, then everyone else doesn't get their share as well. They're still at the original one. I think that's somewhere and maybe staff can tell us. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Roger. Catherine's question brought some clarity to my mind here on the fact that there are three decision points here that are happening. I think we probably want to consider, if we want clarity on all three points, one decision point is the trigger at which the fee is eligible

and we're pretty clear about, well, I think we're moving in a direction of that's operations. So it's 50,000 to one particular registry operator, regardless of the TLDs affected, I think. So, just sort of playing whatever it is. A second decision is who gets to decide if you want to take the fee. Is it the registry owner or the registry operator? So it's a different registry family in that case. And then three becomes who decides how to apportion that, whether ICANN is directly involved or the operators got to work it out with the owner. So registry family is not the same thing in all these cases, and I think we need to find some clarity on those three questions. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jim. Yeah, and I think you're right. I think Jothan bringing this up does really pinpoint the fact that we have to be clear on what we mean by registry families. I do lean toward Catherine's suggestion that the decision point, Jim, that you made, the second one, is it the RSP that decides? Is it the RO that decides? I think that we as a policy probably don't need to make that decision. They have a working relationship between them that they should make that decision and bring that forward, but that's just my thought. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Great discussion. Thank you for walking this dog with me because I thought it was one of those out there kind of ideas, but I think it does really have some real world effect. If you look across the current marketplace and how people are provisioning domains, there are a lot of different scenarios. People are operating the full stack where they're

the actual registry operator and they provide the SRS platform and everything end to end, and then there's others who take advantage of part of those scenarios. You even see it manifest that way in the SubPro for the next round. So having clarity on this is going to be very, very important.

And to kind of dive deeper, because I thought Catherine really attacked a really good point here is you may have the RSP affiliated part of the family offer to waive the fees and you may have the other party—let's use a scenario where—I don't even remember all the different TLDs I pulled. Maybe it was .blue and .pink and .info and .vegas, right? So let's say that there's 12.5k names in each of those, Identity Digital decides to waive theirs but .vegas decides not to. It would seem the case where perhaps the reasonable thing to do would be to pre-apportion and then decide about waiving or something like that. I don't want to proclaim an outcome, but it might be a helpful step or a suggestion towards how that would manifest. And that way, you don't have the situation where, for example, .vegas would say, "Hey, I want the whole 50k. If you're not going to take it, I'll take it because we're entitled to it." I see I have triggered the hand of Paletta, so I will shut up and take my response. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jothan. And before I jump to Catherine, I was just sitting here thinking the reason this exists is for—and we went down this path and couldn't get to great spots. We came back. But the reason we talked about this was for cost recovery. So looking at it, I mean, really, we're talking about operational anyway, that the reason this existed originally

was so that the work that had to be done to make this happen would have the chance of recovery. So when you look at the model, does the RO have a lot of cost in that? The RSP definitely has cost in it. So I think when you get down to that, start thinking about that as well as to the reason this even exists to begin with. Catherine, please go ahead.

CATHERINE PALETTA:

Thanks. This was not directly in response to Jothan, but I think he made some very good points. I do wonder to kind of push back on what you were just saying, Roger. ICANN operates with registries and registrars. It doesn't operate with RSPs, right? Is this going to be operationally workable for ICANN? I think would generally know who the RSPs are for each TLD because you list them probably as your technical contacts and all this kind of stuff. But I don't know... Because there's not a formal kind of accreditation or like official thing. Now we can see what's happening for the next round. But I wonder, does this make sense, and is this operationally viable for ICANN to be focusing on RSPs instead of the registry operators with whom they actually have the contracts? Because I think I'm sympathetic to all of these points, but I think if I'm thinking about it as like in ICANN world, I want to be talking about registries and registrars and the people that hold the contracts. And I don't necessarily want to get into who's the registry service provider and who's actually doing the work, though I'm with you, Roger, that this should be cost recovery. I wonder if bringing this RSP piece in is making it messier than it should be. Just some random thoughts. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Catherine. That's a really good point. The contract is not with the RSP. Obviously, it is a part of a contract, because ICANN does know every RSP of every RO, because it has to be identified in their contracts as well, right? So I think that ICANN does know every RO's RSP, and if they change, that has to be communicated. Now, it doesn't have to be approved or anything, but it does have to be communicated. So I think that that link is there always. But to your point, when you look at a contract, does that muddy that water? Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Roger. Listen, on behalf of Registries here, since I'm representing Registries, I'm going to have to take this question back and take some time to talk to others and ask about it.

I like Catherine's point. That was an excellent point about distinguishing between the different points of control. In general, I think we want to stick with registries and registrars, and not introduce a registry family. The problem here, though, if this is about cost recovery, you can't escape talking about registry operators. They're the ones who are really responsible or accountable for that cost. And then you say, well, registry operators and owners have a relationship. Well, they've got kind of standing contracts. And clearly this issue is not covered yet, and it's not there, and we're all going to have to work towards it.

I mean, I realize none of this happens very often. We're sort of covering interesting cases and all of that. But I would hope that the plan is for all of this to last a long time, and we're getting into this detail for clarity, we should take some time to think about it and get it right. I think at this

point it's only fair. In fact, it's more than fair. I think it's responsible for registries to take an opportunity and think about this amongst ourselves here, about operators versus owners, and how we really feel about what's going on here and what to do. I'm not expecting any fundamental problems. I mean, don't get me wrong. I think we're all really aligned here on the overall principle, but I think the details of how this is going to work need some discussion. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jim. I will ask that we are on a tight timeline to get all this done and wrapped up. As you point out, I think we are in agreement here. I think that we all like what this says. We just need to get to that detail. I think registry family still works, no matter how you end up drawing that line. Because an owner can own multiple ones, and to me, those would still be part of a family if that happens. So I would think that that would work.

Jim, I would suggest probably tackling this, as Catherine mentioned, from the contract standpoint, and is there something that the RO or RSP's contract needs to specifically call out in this instance? Again, I'm just throwing out ideas. I'll let you guys decide those things. It is the RO's decision because it is their contract, but obviously, they can't blindly make a decision without their operator as well. Is that just a clause in the RSP/RO contract? And again, I'm just throwing out ideas for you guys to talk about. But again, I think it's important that we get to this solution fairly quickly. We're not going to change 35 much at all. We're just going to add to it and make sure that we understand what family means and who the decision is. So I think that 35 is in good shape. I do think we

need to add another example, but I think 35 is in good shape. We just need to get to that detail of what a family means. But it's going to be important, time-wise, that we do that fairly quickly. I'll go to Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

I'll go brief. In listening to and absorbing the point made about this having to be with contracts, I think that is the wise spot to pick. I just note that the definition of families, it really varies. There's some diversity in implementation in how this would work. Ultimately, when I'm suggesting RSP, there's going to be often some DBA or process that has to get kicked off on an operation, on a database at a company, and so in the cost recovery lens, that was the place where it would seem to me that that would all happen in one place. However, there's likely scenarios of partnerships in RSPs where it's a separate platform, and so I don't know if there's a brush that paints all walls with this very well. So I'm willing to back away from this and not jump up and down about it, but I do think it's going to be an area that could cause us some grief later if we leave it too ambiguous or too flexible. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Jothan. And thanks, Jim. By next week would be great. If it drips over, let us know. But again, I think we're in agreement on 35 and I think the intent here is to get to that, and really the only missing piece is to drill down into detail. And again, this is really going to help the IRT that takes this over if we can nail this solid. Otherwise, they're going to go through the same process and it may end up not the intent that we wanted. So if we can get there, I think that that's great. Again, just

getting detail on what that registry family, where those decisions are being made.

Okay. Any other comments here? Okay, great. Again, I think this is a great update and a great conversation today on it. I think we're well ahead of... We're letting the IRT get off the hook here by drilling into these, so I think that's great. I think we can probably jump to our next agenda item. Caitlin, are you taking this one?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Roger. Yeah.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: For Recommendation 35, support staff can also draft a fourth example to address Rich's point or concern about that \$50,000 cap and making sure it's clear that if multiple registries have over 50,000 names, they would split or apportion that fee. Because the current examples, I guess, don't make that clear. So we'll go ahead and add that, and then we appreciate the further discussion about what registry family means to account for the discussion about if there is a registry family and all of their names add up to more than 50,000, then there would be a fee and recognition of that administrative work. But I think that was, as you said, Roger, a good discussion and important to clarify that for the sake of the Implementation Review Team.

So if we could go back to the agenda. Our third agenda item is to discuss the Public Comment Review Tool notes and responses. So Christian is pulling up the Public Comment Review Tool. This was just a quick note to let you know that since we've covered all of the public comments now, support staff has gone in the Public Comment Review Tool and included the working group's discussion and notes and then also the response to each public comment.

For example, you'll see we discussed all of these individually. A good example here is that there was a public comment, for example, about how the use of days could be ambiguous in some instances, so that, for the sake of clarity, hours should be used, and the working group agreed with that. So across the report, references to days are now included as hours, so that will be more precise. So you'll see that the working group discussed it and made adjustments. In some cases, the working group discussed it, did not make an adjustment, or had already considered that comment, or disagreed with the comment for whatever reason, but it's all been captured here. This has been captured all along, and so we had mentioned to the working group to regularly check these tools and review and to ensure that the working group's discussion and comments are captured correctly.

Support staff has been using these discussions and responses to update the text of the initial report as we move into the final report. Since there's been some updated rationale, particularly when the working group agreed with a comment, or if the commenter specifically requested more rationale or didn't agree with the working group and wanted it to defend its rationale, sometimes there were additional updates made based on that. But this is just a reminder that this has

been complete and that if you would like to go through and make sure that the working group's comments are captured correctly, you are welcome to do that. It is in the form of a Google Sheet, so you have the ability to make comments on this or to raise them during the meetings. Are there any questions or do any of my colleagues have anything else to add about the Public Comment Review Tool?

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. I did go through this as we were going through them, so I'll go back now that we're done and I'll review them as well. So I encourage everyone to go back and review and make sure that it says and you agree with what it says. Again, why we made these changes, if we made them. Or even agree with why we send a comment back saying we already handled this. So I think it's important to go through these. It should be fairly quick exercise to do that. I encourage everyone to do that. Thanks.

Any other comments on this? Otherwise, everyone will go through these before we get back together next week and have any comments they needed in the worksheet. Okay, great. Anything else, Caitlin, on this item?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

I don't think so. I don't see any hands raised. So we could go back to the agenda. For agenda item four—yeah, Christian, if you can go ahead and click on that document. The working group should have received a message from Christian shortly before the break. And as Roger noted at the top of the call, some of you have already started working on this, but

essentially, we are now in our final push to the final report. As Roger said, that's currently due the first week of February to the GNSO Council, so we have a few remaining weeks. This week, we'll be dedicated to reviewing the final text of the recommendations. As Roger noted, we've been going through these all along and discussing them, and so the recommendation should be more or less final, with the exception of Recommendation 35 where I know we have some last-minute things for Recommendation 35 to shore up. But in this document, it should look familiar in terms of the format. It's how we've been reviewing documents all along. But what we're looking for here is we've taken the final recommendation text which is the text that was in the red boxes that was adjusted based on Public Comment, and Christian has helpfully included all of them here so that it's all in one document. We're asking working group members to review this with their groups to ensure that the recommendations are okay. If there are any issues or something that the group absolutely cannot live with, we're asking those recommendations to be included in this top table of the cannot live with. It will look familiar in the sense that we ask groups to acknowledge which group has an issue, which recommendation presents an issue, and then, of course, the proposed update that the group could live with. There's also a table below if there are grammatical issues or non-substantive edits that the group would like to see changed in the recommendations to note those in this table. But really, we want to focus on the top table so that we can spend our next meeting going over any of the cannot live with recommendations to adjust those.

As we move to the final report, support staff has already been working on that behind the scenes and including that final recommendation text

in the report. Obviously, if those need to be adjusted, based on our discussion next week, we will adjust that in the final report, but we've also been going through and when something has been adjusted, including an additional rationale.

In the text of the draft final report, everything that has been changed from initial to final will be highlighted so that the group can clearly see what has been changed. Also, in terms of the recommendation text that those tables that we were using that connect to the Public Comment Review Tool where it shows the comments, under construction recommendation and the final text kind of shows that chain of custody in terms of yes. For example, what we're going through today, you'll see the green box shows the final report language. It shows how we got there by going through the yellow table above where things have been highlighted and changed from what was in the initial report. And then the red box has links to the comments that were received on particular pieces of text in that recommendation.

So that was a very long monologue, but I wanted to hopefully be encouraging that we're almost there, and that this week, we really would like folks to focus on the recommendation text in this document and flag anything that causes major issues for your group so that we can discuss those at our next meeting. We'll also at our next meeting discuss the consensus call process because we are almost at the stage where the chair will be determining levels of consensus on these recommendations, which is another reason why it's really important to highlight any recommendations that your group cannot live with or has major concerns with as they're currently written.

Roger, did you have anything to add or any observations, or did any working group members have any questions about this document or what we're looking for homework this week?

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Again, as Caitlin mentioned, we've used this document. So please jump in and add to this, if you need to. As I mentioned when we started, I don't think we have anything that's glaring. We had a great discussion, the 20-minute discussion on what family is, but again, I think that we all agree on 35, and it was good. We just had a little detail there. So I think that that's good. I don't expect there to be much here, but I do encourage everyone to go through and make sure that they're with this. As I read through the recommendations and think about consensus, I think that this group has done a really good job and talk things through well enough that we do have really high-level consensus on these items. I can only think of a couple that where I don't think full consensus was achieved and maybe only consensus was achieved. As I read through them, I don't even see ones that deviate too much from a true consensus call. So again, I encourage everyone to go in here because maybe I'm missing something, and I think that if we see comments pop in here, we can hopefully get them addressed. And if not, that clarifies that job of calling consensus on each of the recommendations that we'll be doing shortly. So please take the time and jump in here and have this done before next Monday, so that you know next week we can go through those items and get them clarified, and again, get them notified. If we can't solve them and they're just a deviation, that's fine, but yeah, I think that it's really important now that we're down to the last few weeks of this.

That's all I had. I don't know if any members have any comments, questions, I suppose, on this.

Okay, great. I think it's pretty clear. Hopefully, I think the 47 recommendations or whatever we have that we've spent multiple sessions detailing and discussing those each as we've finalized them. So I think that we've gotten a lot of the discussion past us and the group has done a great job talking through those and understanding them. I don't expect anything too heavy here, but we will definitely examine anything that pops up. Okay. Caitlin, are we done with our agenda then?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

We are done with our agenda, unless there's any other business.

ROGER CARNEY:

Nice. 2025 starting out efficient. All right, yeah, anybody have anything else to bring up? Again, Jim, we'll look for you to talk with the Registries and come back hopefully before next week. If not, just let us know next week where you guys are standing and where you're at. But I think 35 is good. I think we just had to drill down to that detail on what family really is.

Okay, great. Nothing else from anybody. I'm going to give everybody almost 45 minutes back today. All right. Good job, team. Again, I think the two big things for the next week before Monday, obviously the can't live withs, get those in there and reviewed. And the Public Comment Review Tool, make sure you read through those. And you probably have been as it's been going, but make sure you read through them and make

sure you agree with them and add any comments if anything needs to be clarified. Other than that, I think we will talk to everybody next Tuesday. Thanks, everybody.

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you, Roger. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting has concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]