
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT meeting being held on Wednesday, the 29th of May 2019 at 17:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. I will be taking attendance and we'll place that on the Wiki page as well as the [workbook]. If you're only on the audio bridge, can you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang. You may begin.

DENNISE CHANG: Welcome, everyone. Welcome to our first meeting, our kickoff meeting, for the IRT call. This is, of course, for the gTLD registration data policy implementation, and it is the implementation of the EPDP phase one consensus policy recommendations. So, let's get started.

Here is our agenda for today. We're going to do some member introductions. This is our kickoff and first meeting and I do want to take time to know all of you and I want you to know all of us, meaning IPT and IRT. I will let you know what those acronyms mean.

I also want to introduce you to your workspace and the team drive and go through the implementation process steps. I realize that some of you have not been on the IRT before and maybe unfamiliar with the steps that we need to take in implementing the policy recommendations.

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.

The four-stage timeline view of the policy, this was presented to the community at the GDD Summit and some of you have, I'm sure, seen this. It's a good document for us to get a big overview of a picture of what we're doing.

We'll take a look at our board resolution quickly and the interim consensus policy that was published and talk about the next steps. Any questions on the agenda? This is a meeting where I'd like to keep fluid and pretty informal, so feel free to interrupt me at any time.

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, I'm sorry. Before you continue, I do see a phone number with the ending of 3438, if I could please see who that person is for attendance.

MARC ANDERSON: Hello, Andrea. This is Marc Anderson. I think that's my number.

ANDREA GLANDON: Oh, great. Thank you so much, Marc.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Marc. So, what I'd like to do is introduce, do a little bit of an introduction. I'll start with myself and I would like our IPT (Implementation Progress Team) to introduce themselves and then we will go ahead and get introduction from those who are attending, representing the IRT (Implementation Review Team).

Again, my name is Dennis Chang. I'm the director for GDD programs. In this capacity, I'll be working as your program director for this implementation, and therefore accountable for building and leading this team. That is an implementation team. So, IPT and IRT.

Karen, are you there? No, I don't see Karen. Let's go to ... Who is there also attending from the IPT? Amanda?

AMANDA FESSENDEN: Hi, all. This is Amanda Fessenden from registry and registrar services.

AMANDA ROSE: Also Amanda Rose from contractual compliance.

ISABELLE COLAS: This is Isabelle Colas from GDD strategic programs.

MAURO LOZANO: Mauro Lozano from technical services.

DENNIS CHANG: Caitlin, I know you're there. Want to introduce yourself? I think everybody knows you anyway.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Hi, Dennis. This is Caitlin Tubergen from the policy support team. I helped with the phase one EPDP team. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: [Fabien]? [Fabien] is not there. Okay. I think then we've gone through the IPT list. Let's start with the IRT. From number one, is Diane present?

ANDREA GLANDON: Diane is not on the call.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Dennis. This is Theo from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth?

BETH BACON: Hi, this is Beth Bacon. I'm from the Registry Stakeholder Group and I'm with PIR.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, are you there on the call?

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. This is Marc Anderson from the Registry Stakeholder Group and Verisign. I'm also a member of the EPDP Working Group.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. That's good to know, too. Marc, you're also a member of the RDAP Pilot Working Group, right?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, that's correct. I'm also a member of the RDAP Pilot Working Group as well as co-chair of the Tech Ops Discussion Group.

DENNIS CHANG: Very good to know. Thank you. Matthew?

MATTHEW CROSSMAN: Hey. It's Matthew Crossman with the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'm also with Amazon Registry.

ANDREA GLANDON: [Amr] is an apology today.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Sarah?

ANDREA GLANDON: You forgot Mason, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Mason. Sorry.

MASON COLE: Hi. Good morning, Dennis. Mason Cole with BC and I'm with the law firm of Perkins Coie.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Sarah, go ahead. Keep going, guys.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Thank you. This is Sarah Wyld. I'm with the registrar group and I work with Tucows. My focus is on our GDPR implementation, ICANN policy, and explaining those things to our clients. I'm an alternate in the EPDP. Also a member of the RDAP Working Group, the Tech Ops Group, I think PPSAI if that's still around. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Wow. Matt? How about Liz? Benedict?

ANDREA GLANDON: Benedict is an apology for today as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. James?

JAMES BLADEL: Hey, everyone. James Bladel from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I am from GoDaddy and also a member of the EPDP. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi. This is Owen Smigelski with Registrar Stakeholder Group, with registrar Namecheap. Prior to joining Namecheap, I was with ICANN contractual compliance for a number of years doing registrar compliance. I am currently an alternate for EPDP phase two. I'm on the RDAP Pilot and Tech Ops as well, too.

DENNIS CHANG: Didn't know that about you. That's good to know. Gregory?

ANDREA GLANDON: Gregory is an apology for today.

DENNIS CHANG: [Wisdom]?

ANDREA GLANDON: I don't see [Wisdom] on the call.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. How about Syuzan? ICANN fellow. Welcome. Are you there, Syuzan?

SYUZAN MARUKHYAN: Yes, I'm here. Do you hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

SYUZAN MARUKHYAN: Thanks for accepting my application. I'm a new person in the group and in ICANN, too. I just got one fellowship. I was in Kobe, Japan. My interests in the research, mainly on GDPR, and also I work with the NGO sector here in Armenia. I need to learn a lot from all of you.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm sure we can learn from you, too. Thank you and welcome. Next. Let's continue.

EJIKEME EGBOUGU: Hello, everybody. This is Ejikeme Egbougu, AFRALO. I'm new to the group, from Nigeria. I work with [inaudible] technologies. Also a member of Social Media Working Group, Outreach and Engagement, and some other groups. Thank you. It's nice to be here.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Eric?

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Hi, everyone. Eric Rokobauer from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Part of the Endurance International Group, family of registrars which includes domain.com and publicdomainregistry.com. I'm happy to be joining the team.

DENNIS CHANG: Luc? No? How about Afi?

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, Luc is here.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, Luc is here. Go ahead, Luc. Luc, we can't hear you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah. I think he's trying to unmute. I do show that you are unmuted, Luc, if you want to go ahead and try and speak.

DENNIS CHANG: He is trying. Okay, let's come back to Luc and keep going. Afi?

AFI EDOH: Hello. My name is Afi Edoh. I'm from Non-Commercial User Group. I'm a member of UN MAG. I'm here to learn and to help. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome. Kristina?

KRISTINA HAKOBYAN: Hello, everyone. I'm working for a ccTLD registrar company almost for nine years. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Sherry? How about [Lena]? Berry? Roger? Okay. How about we go back to Luc and see if he can ...

LUC SEUFER: And now you can hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, we can. Thank you.

LUC SEUFER: Okay. I'm Luc Seufer. I'm working for EuroDNS. We are a member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

DENNIS CHANG: Excellent. Welcome, Luc. Did I miss anyone?

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, I see that Diane has joined now.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. Diane, welcome.

DIANE PLAUT: Hi and how are you, Dennis? I apologize.

DENNIS CHANG: No problem. We have a lot of newcomers we wanted to meet. Introduce yourself.

DIANE PLAUT: I should introduce myself?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

DIANE PLAUT: Okay, sure! Diane Plaut. I am the general counsel and privacy officer at Corsearch and had the pleasure of working as part of the EPDP for the first year in phase one and now delighted to be the very first member to the pre-IRT which Dennis will never let me live down. Now, on the IRT to help with the very important policy implementation of this important work that the group is doing.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Diane. So, what I meant by pre-IRT is – I'll give you a little bit of just a short background. You see the list that's titled Implementation Review Team (IRT) now and you can see that 1-14 are in black, in color, and 15 on are in blue. The 1-14 were the original members of the pre-IRT. And [if you] examine the recommendations – and by now you should have – there was a recommendation number 28 that asked that we get started with implementation activity prior to the board resolution. We actually did that and you'll see what we've done already. This is a kickoff meeting but it is by no means the beginning of our work. We have been working in the background and the members of this pre-IRT, 1-14, have helped us, the IP Team (the Implementation Project Team) in getting a lot of work done and having done some groundwork that we can leverage from. So, we'll talk more about that.

So, with that, I want to take a minute to tell you about what an implementation project team is. You can see that I have separated implementation project team and implementation review team (IPT and IRT) and combined together we make the policy implementation team. So, when I say implementation team, that's all of us. And we are running this one project. I am your ICANN program director in building this team and implementing this policy. And IPT is the one who designs and builds an implementation plan for the IRT review which will subsequently go to the public comment.

IPT sets expectation and deadline for IRT feedback on the plan and we will share with you regular updates and relevant materials, of course. And IPT in coordination with the IRT will conduct appropriate outreach

to the community as critical milestone when we need to and public comment is one of those tools that we will use.

IPT also schedules the IRT calls and then we'll give you all the materials, so that if we need you to give us feedback at the meeting, we'll have time to examine them. And we have an IRT Wiki page where I'll show you [where things get] published.

Now, you are a member of the IRT (Implementation Review Team). Now, what are your duties? So, we operate under this IRT principles and guidelines and I provided a link there to you. It's a document that you can look up later. It looks like this. But it tells you what the IRT does, how it gets formed and what are your duties in detail. But in summary, this is it.

So, please remember – and many of you are transitioning from the EPDP team that was working on the policy development. IRT is not that. We do not make policies. What we do is we implement the recommendations that we are given and thus our remit. It's important that we keep remembering that. There's a temptation and a risk and you will see throughout that we would perhaps like to do it differently and maybe there's a better way to do this policy but that is not what we are here to do. Our mandate is simple, to implement the recommendations that we we're given and [inaudible] board resolution. That is our role here.

So, the IRT also, as opposed to the PDP Working Group where you were the one, the community team was the one, who was writing out all the policy recommendations, weighing the options, wordsmithing and

having heavy discussions on development. Your role is different here. It's actually easier in a sense because IPT does the heavy lifting. IPT does all the documentation creation, drafting and design, and the IPT will come to you and ask you to review it for consistency with the recommendation. I will probably say this 100 times before we are over. IRT is requested to look at the implementation to ensure that we are consistent with the recommendation, and that is your role here.

So, what does that mean? That means you really need good understanding of the board resolution and the final report where the recommendations are because for you to review what the IPT is doing for consistency, you will have to be very, very clear and have deep understanding of those recommendations.

So, if you're not a part of the EPDP member, I'm going to give you homework right now. You must go back and look at the final report. Review all the recommendations. And look at the board resolution because board resolved, but as we'll discuss, did not resolve fully to accept all the recommendations. There was a couple of changes that we'll have to pay attention to and design around.

Of course, you're expected to attend these meetings and actively participate, and also most of our work for the IRT will be done offline, meaning not a meeting sense but through an e-mail list that you already have. It's called irt.regdatatapolicy@ICANN.org. That is where you received your invitation for the meeting and we will work together on that list to make our progress. And of course for you to be here, you would have had to have a statement of interest file. Thank you for doing all of that very quickly.

This is the record timeline from the call of the IRT for the first meeting. Very short time. It's like we've never done it this quickly, but I think with this policy implementation, this was expected. So, get ready because we're going to move very fast and we have been asked to match the pace of the EPDP team that have delivered this recommendation in a record one-year timeline. So, our implementation team is expected to treat this as expedited implementation project.

So, we have observers who are watching us online. Here they are. They're not required to have SOIs filed but you should know that they're reading all our emails.

And here is the IRT Wiki. So it's a community Wiki space. It's under the registration data policy, and your SOIs are filed, and this is considered our home space, and it looks like this. So all of you, another homework, visit this homepage because this is your workspace for us to work together. And you'll see that we'll have a simple status, some background, and you will have our IRT meeting schedules and notes and agenda posted there. And our members and observers, and such document as call for IRT is also listed here. So we'll collect, maintain our documents here.

Okay. Now, we also have a team Drive, which is a Google Drive where we would use and store working documents. Now, this particular Drive is not accessible to non-IRT member. The Wiki page is published and everybody has access, so anybody can see those published documents, but when we have working documents, we intend to use this.

And one of the key documents that you will use is called the reg data policy IRT workbook, and it looks like this. It's a Google doc. So for the pre-IRT, you'll instantly recognize this, because this is your doc, and we are going to leverage what you've done with the IRT. And I'll get more into this later.

So let's see. Let's talk about the implementation planning accountability. Now, the implementation planning and implementation, implementing the policy recommendation, is much like building a product. So for those of you who have experience in building new things, new product that didn't exist before, it's similar in the process.

And what we have to do, of course, if we want to build a product that is basically the policy language that gets posted on the ICANN.org, think about that as our policy, [our] product. So we have to build that.

So, what do we have today? Today, we have components, if you will, and directions. We have recommendations and board resolution. We do not have a policy language. We do not have policy that we can point to and say that is the policy. What we have to do is work together to build that.

So first step in this activity studying those board resolution, and all the recommendations. It's a lot. There's many resolutions, and 29 recommendations, and each recommendation has subparts to it. So there's a lot to do in terms of analyzing. And what happens is when we analyze those recommendations, what we're trying to do is gather the requirements for implementation.

Not all recommendations are requirements for implementation, and you will see as we go, there are many requirements that do not call for implementation. But we have to make sure that that is the case, and that's where the IPT does the analysis and bring to you, and you'll have to review and tell us that, yeah, what we have done is in line with the recommendation.

So once we understand the requirements, we make task list. So, what are the tasks? There's many tasks a policy implementation requires, and one of those tasks is the policy language. I'm going to call it policy language, because I want to clarify that when you say policy, some people think of policy in terms of recommendation, and others in terms of the policy that is published.

When I say policy language, I'm talking about the consensus policy that is published at the ICANN.org that is used as a contractual requirement for contracted parties to implement and adhere to, and complied with. That's what I mean. So policy language is just one, although it's the major product of this task, and we'll need to make a complete list of tasks. And then we have to estimate those tasks. For each task that we uncover, how long will it take? Who's going to do them? Does it cost money?

So far, I think there's potential that we may have to look for funding for this project in terms of studies. But we can talk about that later. And critical path analysis is when you stack up all the tasks that have dependencies, and try to stretch them out, lay them out from beginning to the end, the shortest path from beginning to the end is called critical path. And the idea here in terms of project management is we want to

try to do as many things in parallel so that we can get to the end as quick as possible. And I think you are familiar with that, with the EPDP team creating subteams and subcommittees and working groups doing work in parallel. So we'll do that too, and once we've done that, then we will know what the implementation schedule is.

We have a very interesting case here where we typically go from one through six to find out what our schedule is, but we have a unique situation where we were given a deadline, and we'll talk about that more, because this is something that we have to deal with, and we work together to see what we can do.

And when we have our schedule defined or the task defined, what we do is we write out an implementation plan, and the implementation plan is what we publish to say this is what we're going to do, and also, this is what we're not going to do to make it perfectly clear. And also, of course, how we're going to do them and when. And that goes out for public comment.

And we conduct that public comment as minimum 40 days, and depending on what comes within the 40 days, sometimes we make it longer. If the ICANN meeting happens in those 40 days, of course, we make it 47 days for example. And if the holidays happen in the 40 days, we make it longer. Just make sure that we give everybody, the public, adequate time for full consideration and comment.

After that public comment is done, we do analysis. We go over every single comment, and we'll build a summary report, but we do do analysis, and IRT is involved in this phase also. And we'll have to make

some decisions on how to respond to the interest that we get, and we'll publish a report for those public comment, and then with the given inputs, we likely revise our implementation plan, which means that the policy language can be adjusted and do get adjusted, and it could actually have an impact on even the effective date. So that's another careful consideration, number 11, when we revise our implementation plan or finalize it. And we go for publication of the policy in that we publish number 13 [inaudible] the policy publication is the issue of the legal notice that corresponds to the publication of that policy.

And this doesn't stop, of course, after we announce that new policies are there for you to implement and you need to do it by a certain date. We actually have to do that work. So we continue to do the implementation activities, working with the IRT all the way through the effective date.

That is the implementation planning activities that you look forward to doing with us today. Questions about this? Is this new to you, or everybody knows this already?

Okay, I don't see any question. Just let me know if you do anytime. We'll continue. So let's look at the board resolution now. So 15th of May, the board resolved, and they called it consideration of GNSO EPDP recommendations for the temporary specification for gTLD registration data.

This had 11 resolutions. I have not seen that number of resolutions come out on a single policy, but hats the resolution, 151502 to 151512, and then 27 of the 29 recommendations were adopted without change.

So that was [inaudible] the work that we had been doing to look at the recommendation did not alter.

The two recommendations did have a change. Recommendation number one about purpose number two, and recommendation number 12 for organization field deletion. And when we look at our recommendation, we'll have to keep this in mind and track them to make sure that we're in line with the EPDP recommendation, but on top of that, the board resolution overrides any recommendation, and I will alert you to that and make it very clear to you when we come to that.

The board also gave us a score card, and they put it into three buckets, adopted as is, adopted with some comments, so [number B] is something that we'll pay a little more attention to to see how those comments –while recommendation is not changed but may have an impact on how we are going to implement them. and C is that recommendation 1 and 12 not adopted as [inaudible].

So that's another document that you will need to review on your own. Everything here that I showed you is online with this link here, board material resolution.

Okay. I just click these things so that – there are some new people here, so I want you to know those links are live links, and when you click on, you can go exactly where I got all these materials from. This is not the IPT, but I'm basically summarizing and presenting what was already published.

So what else happened? Well, the board passed the resolution [number 15 on] 17th of May 2019. We published an interim registration data

policy, which was effective 20 May 2019, requiring contracted parties to implement. And that's because temp spec, which the contracted parties had been performing to, expired on 20 May, and we needed a vehicle to carry on those same requirements until we have time to fully analyze all those recommendations, build our requirements and build our policy language, the steps that I went through just before.

Let me show you this – if you're new to this, this will make sense to you. I've shown this slide at the GDD summit at a couple of sessions there, and I have updated now the dates. Before, we had TBD dates for the board resolution, if you recall. Now we have dates because they all passed. Right?

So stage zero, temp spec, the far left, blue, is what I said is the phase where board resolution happens and the interim policy is published. The reason that we had to do the interim policy is because of this 20 May expiration of the temp spec. We needed a vehicle, a bridging mechanism, to carry us through the time when we had time to build our implementation plan and execute to it per the recommendation. So obviously, we did not have enough time, so this is the way we have bridged that gap.

So we have two bridges, actually. The first bridge is the blue bridge, we call it stage one. Stage one is the consensus policy, and this is the interim policy that we just published. So we are living under that policy right now. We do have a consensus policy, and it's called interim consensus policy. And that's the requirement that the contracted parties need to perform to here in stage one.

While we're in stage one, we have to do this implementation planning, because, and finalize the policy. These are three simple steps that I laid out that is summary of the detailed 13-step process that I showed you before.

So where are we? We are right here right now. We're in the implementation planning phase, beginning of this blue bridge. When we are done and finalize the policy language and publish it, we will publish it here, and date is TBD, [as you see.] We have not formulated our schedule yet.

Where we go is go into stage two, which is a [polish publish. We announce our polish policy and publish them,] and we have a policy implementation period here, all the way to 29 February 2020. This is the recommendation number 28, policy effective date.

Now, it's our job, and expectation of the community, that we meet that date. What that means is we have to do stage one and stage two by this date, 29 February 2020. So that is our deadline that we have to pay attention to.

The second bridge – and you will hear this from me and others – is called rainbow bridge. During that time of policy implementation, the contracted parties have the option to implement elements from temp spec and recommendations too, so we might have a variety of situations of where contracted parties are in terms of recommendation. They may gradually transition, all at once, or small bits at a time. And they're on pace. That was the recommendation, and that's exactly what we are implementing today.

Questions on the rainbow bridge? Okay. Let's go to implementation timeline discussion. The important thing, everybody wants to know when is it going to be done. Well, we kind of know already. We were given the date. So recommendation 28 said the effective date for the gTLD [registrant] data policy shall be February 29, 2020.

So then what people would want to know is, can we actually do this? So let's look at it. We have a typical six-month policy change cycle, and what it means is that effective date will be at least six months after the announcement. In special cases, exceptions apply. What that means is that stage two is typically six months. But special cases, we can change that, and we'll talk about that.

40-day public comment period and the summary analysis report that follows that comment period, that public comment comes before, right? It's here. So this is public comment 40 days, and this is the weeks following that. So if you stack up the six months and two months, where are we? It means that we would have already had to have an implementation by now. Well, we haven't had a chance to work together on it, so we don't.

So, what are we going to do to make this schedule possible to still meet the February 29 2020 date? Suggestions? Let me hear from you. Any ideas from the IRT? Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON.

I was going to let James go.

DENNIS CHANG: James, go.

JAMES BLADEL: No, I was waiting for Beth.

DENNIS CHANG: You guys are too polite.

BETH BACON: You're the worst. So just to be clear, what are the actual due dates for our policy, and which parts of the policies? Is it to announce on the 29th and then we get six months grace period to implement as contracted parties, or we have to finish it all by August? In which case I'm going to throw up.

DENNIS CHANG: Let me ask you guys. Those of you who were on the EPDP team, what did you have in mind? James, do you want to talk?

JAMES BLADEL: Yeah. I think we need to spend a little bit more time on this schedule, Dennis. Thanks for highlighting this. Look, part of this is like there's no way for us to do this without eating into that six-month grace period between adopted IRT policy and implementation enforcement date. That is a relatively new convention. That's something that I remember Cyrus and I were talking about in maybe 2013 or a little earlier.

So we're going to have to trade off some of that in order to get to February, and I think it's going to cause a lot of issues with contracted parties, because no one has really planned for this in their particular roadmaps. I think the only good news is as long as we can continue to operate under the status quo, under the artist formerly known as the temporary spec, as long as that could sit there as a cover against any compliance enforcement while we work on a permanent solution, I think that should help make this more acceptable. But I think we need to dig into this calendar issue a little bit deeper. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, I agree. To me, this is the most important thing for us to kind of frame our work together. So, anybody else have comments now? Let me tell you about the six-month convention. This is a typical default model, and of course, it's up to us, this implementation team, to revise that. We could cut it to three months if we think that implementation can be done in three months. And from what I hear from the technical folks – and I don't know what you've heard – the changes technically for that, going from the temporary specification to the recommendations model, is not that big. But I think that's what I'd like you to all go back and check on. If everybody was counting on the six-month and we're considering less, let's quickly find out what is doable and possible.

Any other comment, James? [You want to speak a bit?]

JAMES BLADEL:

Sorry, old hand. New system. I'll take it down.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Yeah, because [do you] all agree that we should not try to shorten the 40-day public comment period? For policy of this importance and magnitude, I think that's really not an option, right? And of course, we do have to do our careful analysis and report and summary report after that. That is not something we can avoid either.

So the recommendations from IRT, what shall we do as a next step to go forward? Hold on, I see Luc. "Coding requires some planning ahead." Okay, Theo says, "Coding requires planning ahead, and then there are actions where we can't go back." "Admin-C is gone. [inaudible]." What's admin-C, Luc? What does that mean? Educate me here, I'm not familiar with –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dennis, he's been chatting. I don't know if he can get on. Admin-C is one of the data elements in WHOIS.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Oh, the admin. I see. I know what he means now. Yeah, deletion of admin data. Yeah. Anybody else? Beth, do you want to speak?

BETH BACON: Dennis, can I get in the queue?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, you're up.

BETH BACON: Okay. So I think that what might be helpful is instead of – this slide here is kind of here are the end dates and some of the impacting things. I think [inaudible] broken down timeline with the dates, and not a chart but a list, just like “January 3rd, we need to do this,” I think would be really helpful and I think we can edit that as opposed to just thinking about, “Oh, we have a 40-day public comment period. When might that be?”

So if that’s an ask we can make of IRT folks, [inaudible] maybe start with where we are now, and then in your opinion, in your experience as IRT staff, what are the tasks we need to do, and what dates would you suggest we finish those issues by? And then we can go back and look at it as a list of dates as opposed to six months in advance of whatever this date might be. I think it’ll just be more concrete. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Are you talking about maybe putting dates to these steps? Is that what you're thinking?

BETH BACON: Yeah, putting dates to these steps, and also taking into account, do we want to have a six-month grace period, or after the publishing of the policy, or do we want to try and get it all done by August? Those are the options I think we can talk about. But yeah, I think that you should have actual dates for actual tasks, and then we can edit them.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

BETH BACON: Is that [inaudible]?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I understand the approach. So put some tentative dates down for discussion with the IRT and see what would be reasonable. I think that's what you mean.

BETH BACON: Yeah, I think that would be great.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, break this down like you can see that policy publish date, if you give six months, we already know what that date is, 29 August 2019, right? So from then on, we back off the public comment date and back off the finalizing policy date, and see where we end up. I think that's what you mean. Or should we put in some natural flow from beginning to the end and see where we end up? That's another way to do it. There are some various approaches.

BETH BACON: So I think we need to pick an end date. For now, do February 29 2020, and that will be the effective date, and then back it up to where we are now and space those tasks out that you have listed out that are issues

we need to cover. And then if we look at that and we think, “Well, this is just kind of insane. We might not be able to do it.”

DENNIS CHANG: I agree. I've already done that homework for you, and I can tell you right now, yeah, that's not going to yield us any time to build an implementation plan.

BETH BACON: Okay, so maybe if you've done that, can we maybe just look at the dates and see? And then we can talk about the [implementation plan] and where we're going to need more time and where we can take time from one place and put it into another task.

DENNIS CHANG: Sure. I think I understand what you're asking. But you do see the challenges. I think you can do it without looking at specific days, you can see that eight months of backup up from that date is going to land you right here. And we can do that.

Let me ask you this question. I think I heard a suggestion that somebody used the word “grace period.” We announce the policy on 29 February 2020, and then implement after that for six months as a grace period. Is that something that you were thinking about too as an option?

BETH BACON: I think, yeah, and that's part of if we see the dates and we see if we need more time, then we'll know if we need to have that – exercise that as an option and figure out how to do that before we get going. [If we] look at the timeline and we're like, "Oh, this is totally fine, we'll be able to do this," then we won't need to do that. But that's why I think tasks and dates as a draft would be really helpful for us instead of just talking in the abstract.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Understood. Any other comments? So you do see the – I think it's obvious to you the challenge we have with the schedule. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Yes. Hi. Thank you. From the EPDP's recommendations, I know that we are working to develop a new gTLD registration data policy, but there are also other existing policies that were recommended to be reviewed and updated, for example the transfer policy.

So my question is, does this IRT team – will we work on those other existing policies to update them as well? And if so, how does that tie into these timeframes? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. That is one of the recommendations that we will be reviewing together. For now, I guess I'll tell you that we don't know, and based on how the recommendation is worded and how we will work the schedule, it could be that we work on those, but at the same time, there

is a [talk] that there is maybe another set of folks who want to look at all the existing policies and review them as another community activity.

In either case, the implementation plan will be communicated to you, and what we intended to do with that recommendation for your concurrence.

Now, I have five minutes left, so what I would like to do is look at the next steps. So yeah, IPT will build an implementation plan and share it as we make progress, and I think the first ask that we received from that is to see if we can put some dates down in a manner where you can view individual tasks to see how they stack up. And we can do that. Then we will share with you. That's our first step.

The implementation plan, of course, after your review, will go to the public comment, and the next IRT meeting is on Wednesday, 12 June 2019, and following that will be an ICANN 65 session on the 26th of June, and we'll have a public meeting at that time working together.

Now let's talk logistics a little bit. This time that we're holding – and I'm looking at my clock, this is 10:56 PT for me. There's a suggestion from our team members to see if we can push this meeting back one hour. In other words, consider that this meeting being – what is it, 17:00 UTC right now, Andrea?

ANDREA GLANDON:

That's correct: it's 17:00 UTC now, and we'd like to move it to 18:00 UTC.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. What does the IRT think about that time? Does that work better for you? Is it acceptable to you? We'd like to know for our future meetings, because we want to go ahead and schedule out probably the rest of the year.

Okay. Sarah suggests that we use green, red button to vote. Okay. Everybody vote. Moving IRT meeting time to 18:00. Yes or no? Yes, green, no, red.

Does everybody know how to vote? You see those buttons –

SARAH WYLD: Right above the chat, you should have a yes, a no, go slower, go faster. You can click there.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc cannot vote because he's on the phone only.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, right.

MARC ANDERSON: I'm in Zoom too. I've put up a coffee cup because I'm fine with either option.

SARAH WYLD:

Oh, yes, I do see that. You're right, Marc.

DENNIS CHANG:

Coffee cup means vote with either. Okay. I don't want coffee, I want green. I'm looking for green. And looking out for reds. I don't see any reds. So we're going to take a decision then. We're going to change our IRT meeting time to start at 18:00, starting with our June 12 2019. Without any objections, it will be done so. So Andrea will take care of the logistics there, revising our meetings, and then schedule out certainly the next two meetings, but probably the rest of the year.

So this is the pace that we're going to go, the meetings every two weeks. But more online conversation, and you will see me invite you to comment on things. And one more time, what you will see – and everybody needs to get familiar with this working tool, this workbook, because I'm going to ask you to comment here, and I'm going to be building, adding a page with dates, and you'll see me populate this field, this sheet with the dates that you want to look at. And [I'll lay out this scenario,] if we went from now to the need, what would it be? And give what I think is a reasonable time to see where we end up, and we can work from there.

But I do have a request for you, and that is to go ahead and find out the possibility of reducing the six months and what will be acceptable as a reasonable time. Is three months an acceptable implementation period? [inaudible] do a really good job in communicating with our community.

That's all I have for you. Questions? It's 11:00. Okay. No questions? Then I'll say goodbye, and I'll talk to you online. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you, everyone. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]