
JULIE BISLAND:

For the transcript, this is Julie Bisland. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group Call taking place on Tuesday, the 21st of January, 2025. For today's call, we have apologies from Catherine Paletta, RrSG, and Alan Barrett, Board liaison. Catherine formally assigned Essie Musailov, RrSG, 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 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.

Seeing none, 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. With that, I will turn it over to our Chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Just a couple of updates before we jump into our agenda. We do have one more meeting scheduled next week before our final report goes out to Council, I think. And we're in real good shape. I think we're going to do a consensus call here shortly. I think that no surprise, we have consensus on our recommendation. But we will make that formal and we'll send that to the list so that everyone has a chance, not just who participates on the

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.

calls, but everyone on the list has a chance to pine in for that and make sure that everyone agrees with the consensus calls of each of the recommendations.

And again, just for, I suppose, a refresher for everyone, you can take a look at the charter. And I think in Section 6 of our charter, which is on our wiki, you can-- Oh, thank you. Section 6 talks about the consensus call and getting what the process there is. And you can even go over to the GNSO Consensus Playbook as well there. There's a link. But we'll do that. And there'll be a 10-day window for that. We'll be sending that to the list shortly. And if anyone has any comments or issues with any of the consensus calls that we make on the recommendations, please post a list and we can get those addressed.

Other than that, I think we are okay to move into our agenda which Christian just posted. Thanks, Christian. And we'll jump into a discussion on Rec 35. And again, this was just open for comments from the registries. So, if Jim or Rick wants to jump on and see how Rec 35-- I think we were in good shape and Jim was making sure there's agreement or if there was any edits that needed to be made. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Roger. Jim Galvin, Registry Stakeholder Group of the record. Since I opened up this question, it seems only fair I should close it too. But yeah, no, thank you for the option to have this discussion. I think we raised a really important question here. Just given the change in our overall registration infrastructure, this addition of a new entity with

registry service providers and the opportunity to consider the fee impact, what that means to us.

But no, the registries are fine. There's been no particular objection or overall concern, certainly no consensus to change anything that's there, which is kind of where we figured we would land, but it did seem important to want to ask the question and make sure that we had covered any interests that might not be obvious to us, Rick and I, as the folks who are sitting here in the room. So, no one had any problems or concerns, so the Rec is good to go as is. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for that, Jim. Yeah, and I agree, I think it was important just because we all know the reality of how things happen in the world and the interactions between all the groups, the ROs, the RSPs, and the like, it's important to get down and make sure we've got it right. I appreciate that, Jim and Rick, for taking that through the registry group. And I think maybe I'll turn this to Caitlin real quick. I think there were a couple of minor edits to 35 and 38, possibly, just to make sure everybody's aware of them and is okay with them. Caitlin, do you want to take this?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Sure. Thank you, Roger, and thank you, Jim and Rick. We were hesitant to make any additional changes until there was agreement from the group on what the updated Recommendation 35 could look like. But what we were thinking of is because the working group took ICANN Org's concerns on board and adjusted the recommendation slightly,

that we would update the policy impact rating of recommendations 35 through 38, I believe, from high to medium noting that the medium policy impact rating denotes that there's a substantive change to the policy.

And here there would be some additional coordination involved and also the ability for affiliated registries to potentially meet that domain name threshold where that didn't exist before. So, the medium impact rating would note this change. But because the threshold is staying the same as the currently existing threshold on the policy, it's no longer a high impact rating because it involves less coordination between registries, registrars, and ICANN Org. And then because these recommendations are considered together in a sense, they're all related to this calculation of the fee and the distribution of the fee.

If we can go down to Recommendation 38, I think it's 38, yes. So, this is about ICANN's notice to the affected registry operators. So here we just made clear that affected registry operators are the registry operators who transfer greater than 50,000 names. And we have some proposed implementation guidance for the group to consider. This is essentially that in the event that affiliated registries meet that threshold and propose to charge a fee, that they would notify ICANN of their intent or that they meet that threshold that if there are other TLDs that have the 50,000 threshold that the fee can be split among the affected registries.

But that would avoid the situation where Org is sending a notification to every potential registry that's not an affiliate. I hope that makes sense. We're happy to talk about the language and give the group some time

to think about it this week, but that's the general idea behind that. But I see there's a hand raised from Rick. So, I will cede the floor.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you. Rick Wilhelm, registries. All of that sounds good, Caitlin, and no disagreement with anything you brought. While I was sort of reading here in real time, this is just a friendly amendment to have either you or Christian or somebody else on the team go find a box full of the word voluntary, and liberally sprinkle it, sort of like the salt bay, in and about the descriptions, I'm smiling, the descriptions of these recommendations. Because we need to make sure that everybody that's reading these words in and around these recommendations realizes that we're talking about voluntary portfolio transfers, because it's a big policy and it's easy to get lost.

And I know that everybody here within earshot knows that we're talking about voluntary, but the reader will quickly forget. And just like as an example, we see there Recommendation 38, blah, blah, blah, in blue right at the top of the screen. That would be a great spot to stick the word voluntary there right before the word full, as just as one example. And I'm sure that as we're doing this, Christian has already found about three or four others that he's like, hmm, yeah. So that would be my only suggestion at this time to just grab a box of the word voluntary and sprinkle it like crazy. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks for that, Rick. Good suggestion. And again, as we go into our consensus call, Steph and I have talked and we completely agree

that minor edits to these, I think we're going to allow as we go. So, if anyone has a tweak that says, hey, add this word in here just to make it more extensive. And like that, Rick, sprinkle these voluntaries in here, I think makes sense.

And during that consensus call, we're going to allow for those things. As long as we're not changing, obviously, the intent or major wording, we're going to allow those edits. If someone's misspelled somewhere or comma somewhere, I know Sarah's really good at those things for us, but anything else like that, over the next couple of weeks that we have this still, we will be making those minor changes. Okay, great. Caitlin, was there anything else on this that we wanted to cover?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

That was all. And thank you, Rick, that was a helpful comment, and we'll make sure to include that since in an earlier recommendation, it's clear that for involuntary situations, there isn't a fee, but for voluntary situations, there potentially could be. So that was the extent of the updates. Like I said, it was just something small, but that we will likely downgrade these to medium impact and explain why there's a medium impact here for folks that are reading this for the first time. But we will make sure that's all highlighted for the group to review and send an updated version of the report so that all of you who would still like the opportunity to go through and make some proposed textual edits are still able to do that. That was all for these recommendations, Roger. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Okay. I think we're going to have a really good quick call today then. Was there any other edits we wanted to talk about? I think that was it on that, right, for now? Okay. And I think, again, like I said, if we find things, if anybody sees something over the next two weeks before we pass this off at Council, please let us know. We can make those updates if it makes sense. But again, consensus call will be going out shortly. We'll post it to list so everyone has access to it and can see what designations we've got for each recommendation. And if anyone has any comments or disagrees or can post back the list and then we can handle that and get it corrected if need be.

But again, I think we've spent several years here doing this. And I think we've all gotten to a really good spot even in the last couple of weeks of making some changes that really help us get to the consensus. I think that we have on all of this. I appreciate everybody's work. And we're right next to the end here, so it's great that we're closing this out cleanly.

Anything else, staff, that we need to cover? Caitlin, Christian, nothing. Okay, great. Well, then I am going to give everyone a great hour back of their day. Thanks, Caitlin. So, I appreciate it. And again, we've a lot of work into this. So, I think the last couple of weeks here we'll be in good shape and look forward to seeing the consensus call hit the mailing list here shortly. Okay. I think we can call this the end of the call. Thanks, everybody.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]