Dennis Chang:	Thank you everyone. Sorry about that. I dragged that out and I was trying to do this, and I have no idea what I'm doing. Thank goodness we have helpers around me who can help me. So, let's get started. What we are doing today is… First let me share my screen so I know what we're doing. Start share my screen. Where is my… That one. Okay, so this is the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation and it's our... I'm sorry? I'm sharing the wrong thing. Sorry. I want to share the IRT, I think this one. Yes. Okay.
	I'm sharing the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation. This is the IRT Meeting Number 7 and this is 21st of August 2019. Thank you all for joining us. Again, apologies for starting late because of my clumsiness on how to handle Zoom. And our Agenda, we will go ahead. And this meeting is recorded. And we will go ahead and look at our IRT Work Assignments and then I'd like for us to start with Rec 10, the new split version that we presented to you a couple of days ago, and we'll go through that. I think you'll like what you see.
	We are not trying to change any concepts or Policy there in terms of implementation. All we're trying to do is clarify and focus where the possible IRT disagreements are. So, it's a good way to do that and I thank you for that suggestion. And then we're going to go and talk about the other Recommendations, as many as we can today. And I want to talk a little bit about the ICANN66 Plan and let you know, I think you received an email from Andrea on our plan to have two IRT Meetings in the upcoming ICANN66. And the next steps and any other business you have.

So unlike last time, what I'd like to do is limit the discussion for each Recommendations so that we spend maybe five, maximum ten minutes, on each Recommendation and move right along. There's a lot to cover and we will park or tab those items that we can't come to quick consensus on and we'll move on and then come back to them later and then we'll have plenty of time to do that. So, let's see.

There's no changes to the IRT. On the IPT side we have a couple of new members. Erika Randall is listed twice here so we'll just delete the second Erika Randall. Then Amy Creamer has joined on IPT and she's working closely with Karen on those items like the Rec 27 right now as a Project Coordinator. And let's see. On the… Nothing here. We have a couple more observers. Volker. Volker is a EPDP Team Member and has joined as an observer to watch the implementation unfold. And Elrish used to be with IRT but has decided to switch to an observer position because she has a new job and is really overwhelmed and has a difficulty keeping up with the pace and the workload of this Implementation Review.

And we will get right on to our Agenda Items starting with our Recommendation Analysis Review Assignment. So, we are here on the 21st. So that means that the IRT is supposed to have completed up to Recommendation 21. And 22 through 26, we will not discuss it today unless there's ample time leftover and if you have any quick questions or direction thereof, we will try to go ahead and try to answer that. And obviously the next one coming is the Rec 27.

Just to give you a quick status we're in coordination with the GNSO Council Leadership Team on our Workplan and as soon as we hear back

from them, we will let the IRT know what we plan to do with Rec 27. It's a very interesting Recommendation and somewhat unique with this Policy but it's all encompassing, and I think it's a good way for us to talk about what Consensus Policy is and how it affects everything that we do, sort of a purpose for Consensus Policy. So, I look forward to discussing that with you probably in our next meeting and you'll see something from me on an email either late this week or first part of next week.

So, let's get to Rec 10. Rec 10, 11, 12, 13 and 16. We tried to combine this for efficiency but having suggestions from, I think it was Theo who kind of asked, we just have one stop for each. Maybe we should've done that. But, hindsight. But since we're here, we're not going to change it. We're not going to try to split these Recs, but what we did was based on a recommendation from I think it was Jody, yeah, thanks for the recommendation to split the implementation language into two.

Meaning that requirements for Registrars and requirements for Registries. So, what we did was we left 7.1 as a Registrar Requirement and further we said 7.1 is a 'must', 'Registrar must' requirement. And 7.2 as a Registrar 'must if requirement'. So, 'must if'. Right? 7.1 is 'must'. 7.2 is 'must if'. 7.3 is 'may'. So, these are three categories of requirements, how we think about what a Registrar needs to do.

And then we follow in the exact same manner with the Registries. Registry Operator 'must' do this, publish. And Registry Operator 'must if', if collected in this case. And Registry Operator 'may'. So, I put the new approach in a box so I didn't want to go ahead and make the changes outright because what I wanted to do is talk about it first and if

it makes sense later to combine it again for simplicity, we can do that. Or we may just want to keep it separated if that's your preference.

Remember that this language, Policy language, is the requirement for Contracted Parties to implement. So, we're here to do what makes sense for them and make it easy for the implementers, ICANN Org being a member of the implementers. Our engineers have to implement these languages as well as Registrars and Registry Operator and the backend Service Providers and of course everyone in the Community who has a part in understanding what our Policy is exactly.

So, let's get back to the top and we'll start with 7.1. Registrar must publish the following data elements. So, 7.1 has 27 elements of Registrar must publish subject to redaction requirements. I'm going to pause here and want to hear from the IRT if you have any reaction or comments on this 7.1 Section. Remember, this is a Registrar must publish, right? I'm going to highlight that. This is not a comment but just so that we are looking at it in the same way. Registrar must publish subject to redaction. Let me hear from you. Anyone want to speak? Do we have a hand? No hands? Okay, that means that… I'd like to hear somebody say, yeah, I agree. Jody, okay. Jody, thank you.

Jody Kolker: I hate to say this but I'm not sure that… What I'm curious about is it says, "subject to the redaction of Registration Data Requirements". Where do we list the redaction of Registration Data Requirements? Or is that listed anywhere? I mean, to me it's hard to agree to this when I don't know where that's at and maybe it's because I haven't looked at it

enough but I'm curious where it's listed, which ones are listed as redaction for the Registration Data Requirements [inaudible].

Dennis Chang: Are you looking at the chat? Implement Section, that's coming up.

Jody Kolker: Okay, got it.

Dennis Chang: Okay. Others got that? Yeah, I understand what you mean. Subject to redaction part you want to know more about it, and it's addressed in the, not this section but the following section. But, the 7.1 through 7.11 through 7.1.27 are the 27 elements that's in this category of 'must publish'. Who's next? Margie? Oh, I'm sorry, Rubens. Go ahead. Rubens, you're on lock and can't…

Rubens Kuhl: Can you hear me now, Dennis?

Dennis Chang: I can, thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Okay. When does the Policy mention that subject to redaction? It would probably avoid doubt to specify what should be displayed when it's redacted. Could be the word redacted could be thinking you have the

field but leaving it empty but when I read it in the policy, it would be better if its crystal clear what to do. [inaudible] Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Hello, what is the… Okay, thank you. I couldn't understand. Anybody want to comment on what Rubens said? Sorry.

Beth Bacon: Dennis, you've got a couple hands up.

Dennis Chang: Okay, go ahead. Who's next. Margie?

Beth Bacon: Margie was first.

Margie Milam: Hi, it's Margie. I agree with what Rubens and others were saying. I think it's too vague to say, "subject to redaction of Registration Data Requirements as specified in this Policy". I think you have to be very specific and clear so that that language cannot be misinterpreted. So, if you say, I guess, "Reference Section 8", then I think that makes it a little clearer for me but just leaving it without actual reference to what you're talking about I think leaves it open to interpretation.

Dennis Chang: Next is Beth.

Beth Bacon: Hi everyone. I agree, Rubens, that was a good point and I think that it has to be clear and it seems very strange to say, "Let's publish it. These are the publishing but let's then redact it." In Rec 10 there's a really good chart that says "Redacted, yes. Redacted, no." This makes it really complicated. I'm not sure why we wouldn't just have a section that says, "You will redact these. These will not be public. You will redact these fields." Or, and then another list of "These will be public." I think [inaudible] to make it straightforward. So, agreed. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Okay. So, we want to make it clear what subject to redaction means and where that definition is, and somebody suggested if we refer to Section 8 where that is discussed maybe that will help. Maybe we will go ahead and review Section 8 here after we are done with Section 7.1 and the redaction comes up on this 7.1 and also 7.2, 7.4, right here also. So, it's the same requirement as I believe as Recommendations was made. So, with that in mind, subject to redaction, do we have all the data elements, 27, collected in the right bucket here? Remember the three bucks. So, Beth, do you want to speak again?

Beth Bacon: Unfortunately for everyone, yes, I do. So, for this, instead of referencing 8, I'm confused and maybe the rationale can be explained by someone else who has done this in a different way or seen this in a different way, but why are we saying, "Registrar must publish" and then "Subject to redaction"?

Why would we not just have sections that say "These are the fields that will appear publicly in RDDS. These are the fields that are collected but redacted and not publicly available." So why would we not just do two lists instead of saying, "This is the list but then the list is subject to redaction."? Does that make sense? Cross-reference to another section is still confusing.

Dennis Chang: Yeah, I think I understand what you mean. So, you'd like to see the data elements that are never redacted and then see another category that says, "Data elements that is subject to redacted." Is that what you mean?

Beth Bacon: I think it makes sense. Like, these will be published. These will not. You can have a list like, these are collected, these are published, these are redacted. Does that make sense? Jody and Roger plus one'd me. I feel like I've peaked.

Dennis Chang: Okay, Sarah. Do you want to comment?

Sarah Wyld: Thank you. Yeah, I want to agree with Beth and those who agree with her but also kind of expand on that. So, I think it could be more clear and we could lay out, this is collected, this is published, this is redacted, but I don't want to split up the Registrant Dataset into some elements in

one number of the Policy and some elements in another Section of the Policy. Like, I would rather have one Section that shows the whole dataset and then which elements of it can be redacted or not redacted. Thank you.

Dennis Chang: That's a different approach. I see what you're saying. Anybody else want to comment?

Beth Bacon: Dennis, I just want to say, thank you for taking on board what we had said before, and I appreciate it. And I think it's mostly just the verbiage so maybe we can revisit that and come back to it next week.

Dennis Chang: Yeah, I'm beginning to like what Sarah, was its Sarah who suggested just now? The field. Just identify the entire field first and say, "This is the potential of every data element that's possible", and then try to identify which ones must be published unconditionally and which ones are subject to redaction, I think that's what she's suggestion. That's a whole different approach. Any more comments?

We just need to make sure that we all agree on which ones goes on to which socket right now, and we can go ahead and rewrite the language to make that clear. Yeah, the chart that we received from the EPDP here, we didn't think this was clear so that's why we were trying to write it out in a more plain language. So, when you see this, it says

"Redacted no and redacted yes", right, and then it has an asterisk on top of that and it has a disclosure logic on top of that.

So, what we're trying to do is make this chart clear for the implementers. I think this was probably very clear for the Policy Developers when they were discussing probably taking a very long time but for the implementation, we want to make sure that it's instantly clear when they look at it and that's our purpose. Yeah, so if the suggestion is instead of the language as such, we should present it in a chart form, we could try that too. We did create an extensively detailed data analysis matrix if you remember and I thought that this was not really appropriate for the implementers as a Policy language.

I'm having a really slow internet. So, let that spin for a while. But, if you remember the data elements that we gave you, it's like 60… Oh, here. I'm offline. I can't be offline. That's really weird. Anyway, we can… Let's think about that.

So, our second action for us, the Staff, to think about presenting this in a form of a chart that consists of all elements and all buckets, categories. I think that is the way the chart needs to work otherwise we're going to have multiple charts which basically turns into multiple lists like we have again. Anymore comments on the way we should present Policy language? Okay. Thank you. We'll keep going then.

So, 1 through 27 is the data elements that we believe fit into this category of Registrar must publish subject to redaction. And then the 1.1.7, we highlighted it because you will note that this one here is different than the 7.4 where the Registry has the same requirements

but a different data element. Okay? So, this is a 'must publish' category for both the Registrar in 7.1 and Registry Operator in 7.4. The same 27 data elements except the Expiration Date. So, let me ask the Registries and Registrars and those members of the EPDP Team, is this what you meant? Comments? Roger said yes.

Can I hear from the Registry Operator? How about our EPDP Team? You know that this means that when Registry displays and Registrar displays, we're going to have different looking data in terms of Expiration Date. I don't know if that's what the EPDP Team meant to do but it seems like that's the way it's shaping out to be. And if this is not the way the Recommendation was written and not in perfect alignment, then we may have to explain this during public comment, but I do want to get confirmation from the Registry Operator here is that this is what you meant that when the Registry Operator displays these, the Registrar Expiration Date is not found in the publication. Is that acceptable?

Beth Bacon: Dennis, I was going to type my answer, but I just don't feel like it. Can I get in que?

Dennis Chang: Yeah, please talk.

Beth Bacon: Okay. So, I think that's fine from a Registry, just having the Registry Expiry Date since we will still obviously have the Registrar and you can essentially go find it. But I would like to say that it's a tentative yes and I

EN

think we should just flag for the EPDP Team that maybe we made a little drafting boo-boo and that this is going to be the way it is and make sure that that's okay because I think this is one, we discussed this on the last call. It took us a little while to figure out what had gone horribly awry and I think it's the fact that we in a hundred and some 88 pages of report, we made one tiny boo-boo. So, yeah. I think this is fine for now but let's flag it as, let's just flag it for the EPDP Team and make sure that they know that this is something that has happened.

Dennis Chang: Okay, so this is important for the IRT. If there's any kind of expectation that the IRT is going to recount to the EPDP Team for consultation or coordination, that is not the case. IRT stands alone and IRT is made up of the members of the EPDP Team or the Policy Development Team. Remember, typically what happens is the Policy Development Team is dissolved and they are no longer available while the IRT is in session. So that's why it's critically important for those members in the IRT who have been participating in the EPD during Phase 1 to speak up now. So, it's either yes, this is what we meant or no, this is not what we meant. I'd like to hear from them clearly. Beth do you want to talk?

Beth Bacon: Yeah, sure. To be honest, I think that it's a mistake. The EPDP probably did not mean to not have the Registry display the Registrar date because that is how it's done now and vice versa. It's something that's just generated when we get the information. So I will say that I think we're fine with it just being this way but again, I'm going to, since we

can't go back to the EPDP, I will ask others on this call who were on the EPDP to echo the fact that yeah, we screwed that up a little bit and it was a detail, but I also would like to flag this as something that I'm going to go back and check internally just with my Registry peeps and make sure that it's okay with them. That there's no reason that it would cause an issue with us. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Brian King.

Brian King: Hey, Dennis. Thanks. This is Brian King. I was an alternate on the first Phase and I was on all the calls. I don't recall there being conversation about the difference between Registry versus Registrar expiry date. I would flag that it could be confusing if there are multiple dates, but I realize that's probably just the world that we live in and how this works, so I think I'd echo Beth's last suggestion as let me go back and talk to our engineers about it. If we have any kind of real or perceived concerns about this and I can follow up. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Yeah, I appreciate it. It is of a concern for me because if I'm the general public and a Registrant and I do my query and I see an expiration date and depending on the way I do my query I got a different date, that is not desirable. But if that's what the Recommendation was meant to do, then we have an obligation to implement it exactly like that or we offer the course now and then go and explain why we're doing it differently

EN

than the Recommendation. Is there a hand up? Brian again? You want to talk?

Brian King: Nope. Old hand. Sorry.

Dennis Chang: Betty. Go ahead Betty. Betty, you're up. We can't hear you.

Betty Fausta: Oh, sorry. Excuse me. I just heard Jody speak about as a [inaudible] for different dates. She can explain how we can manage [inaudible]?

Dennis Chang: Go ahead, Jody.

Jody Kolker: Thanks Dennis. So, Betty, this is probably a shock but I'm a guy. It happens a lot. But we have to have a consistent labeling and display, and I think Roger can speak to this a little bit more as he's spent a lot of time on that Working Group, where in the WHOIS, the Registry displays their date as the Registry Expiration Date and the Registrars display their date as the Registrar Expiration Date. These dates are not always in sync because Registries typically honor renew a domain name on the day that the domain expires or around that time.

The Registrars do not update their expiration date until the Registrant has actually paid the Registrar for that extension of the expiration date. So, during the timeframe that the Registry has updated their date, they have auto renewed the date in their system and the time that the Registrant has actually renewed the domain name at the Registrar, those two dates will not match. I'm happy to answer any more questions if you have them, Betty. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Marc Anderson, you're up.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Dennis. Can you hear me okay?

Dennis Chang: Yes Marc.

Marc Anderson: Great. So, I spoke on this on our previous call and I'll just repeat what I said in the last call. This is existing behavior. So, the Registry displays the Registry Expiration Date. The Registrar displays the Registration Expiration Date. That's how that behaves. Today if you go to any Registry or Registrar or WHOIS that is the result you will see. So, any confusion you may then have [inaudible] confusion that currently exists. Making a change to this is simply not a topic we discussed or considered [inaudible] respond. With that said this is simply a drafting error and a [inaudible] little details we had to deal with [inaudible].

Dennis Chang:	Sorry Marc. It's really, really difficult to understand you. It sounds like you're under water.
Marc Anderson:	Sorry Dennis. I'll just wrap up by saying how it is, how you have it listed is how it should be.
Dennis Chang:	Okay, so you're saying the way we have it listed is fine for now and you're agreeing with our approach to go forward like Beth suggested? We'll tag it and some of the people are going to check back to their home office implementers and come back but until then we'll keep it now. But please keep this in mind that we are going with two different displays for publication dates on the query as we have it today. Okay, so that's 7.4 and 7.1 which is the must carry, must publish. So, let's go to 7.2 which is a 'must if' category. This is our 'Registrar must if collected' category. And I see that Sarah made a comment and Rubens agreed here, you see. And I actually agree with you, so I'd like to just delete this part like delete this like this. Oh, I'm not connected. I'm still… Very strange. I'm reconnecting. So, okay I can do this later but this subject to redaction, what I'd like to do is delete it and if there's any objection from you let me hear you. If there isn't consider this highlighted part, deleted as Sarah, Rubens and I agreed, the three of us agreed to delete. Can you delete this? Yeah, no you can just delete it. Oh, no. Okay guys. I'm having technical difficulty

EN

as you can see so I'm going to stop sharing and try to recoup. But I hope you're in the shared doc, this is why the shared doc is good to have.

And the next section that we have is the 'may' category. Right, do you? Can you? Oh, okay. Share button here. So, in the 'may' category, can you see the data elements that are listed in the 'may' category? Can somebody… Oh. Thank you. I'm seeing I think Isabelle sharing, is it? Okay, that looks good. I can see this. Okay. Now, you can go to 'may'. Okay, you are at the 'may'. 7.3 Registry Expiration Date for Registrar now, right. Registrar may publish the Registry Expiration Date if they so choose and the reseller if they so choose.

Do you agree with this? Oh, go ahead Margie. Okay, you put it down. I'm assuming that you're all in agreement. There's no confusion here with these two so what this does is if the Registrar wants to, they can display both the Registrar Expiration Date and Registry Expiration Date so that'll be fine if the Registrar wants to do it. And the reseller is optional for them to publish also. So, let's go to 7. Margie, did you want to speak?

Margie Milam: Yeah, I did. I'm sorry. I wasn't able to jump in earlier. Aren't there other fields that are 'mays' in the Policy? Like, I thought, for example the Org field is a 'may' at the Registrar's option if they've confirmed the data?

Dennis Chang: The Org field is a 'may' you say?

Margie Milam:	Yeah, I think if you pull up the Recommendation it says that the Registrar, I mean I don't have it off the top of my head, but it basically says that the Registrar can confirm the data and publish so it's not a requirement, but I believe it's a 'may'.
Dennis Chang:	I'm sorry. My computer is pretty much dead. I can't access anything. Can somebody look at the Recommendation and confirm?
Sarah Wyld:	So, I have a hand up if I may?
Dennis Chang:	Yeah, please.
Sarah Wyld:	Thank you. This is Sarah. Margie, that's a really good point and so I definitely agree that we need to consider if other fields should be 'may', but I think when I look at the Rec for the Org field which is Rec 12 it talks about redaction, right, and so I would consider the Org field to go along with the redaction requirements in Section 8 of the new Policy rather than as a 'may' here. But I could be wrong.
Margie Milam:	Yeah, can we someone pull up in the room the Recommendation so we can all look at it? Yeah, my recollection was that is that it's optional and so that's why I think since it's optional it should probably go here and

EN

then I can't remember if there were others that were optional as well. I guess we'll have to work through it during this IRT.

Dennis Chang: Okay. We're pulling it up. Do you guys see the chat? And also, the Recommendation language is up here on the EPDP as well.

Margie Milam: Sure. If I can read along. So, it says, "The Org field will be published if that publication is acknowledged or confirmed by the Registrant via a process determined by the Registrar and then if the registration holder does not confirm the publication the Org field can be redacted, or the field content deleted." So, that's why I think it's a 'may', but it's a 'may' as long as those steps are followed and so somewhere, you'd have to footnote the requirements that refer back to those requirements.

Sarah Wyld: So, I have a question and I don't see any other hands so I'm just going to jump in with my question. If the Org field becomes a 'may', then should the other fields which are also subject to redaction also be a 'may'? And if so then I think we're back to what were talking about earlier which is how we're indicating in the Policy which fields are collected and published and redacted, right? So, I just don't see the difference with the Org field versus the other redaction fields.

Margie Milam:	Sure, let's give an example. So, say the telephone number. There's nothing I think in the Policy that gives the option on that other than I guess consent at some point. So, that's why I think if the Policy has some caveat on it then you'd think you'd throw it into the 'may' category. If it's something that the Policy doesn't give any additional Policy requirements then it becomes a redaction so it would be the individual name, the email address, the telephone number, that sort of thing.
Dennis Chang:	Is there anybody on the… Margie? She just spoke. Betty? Okay, so this is the way the Policy language is written. When you say 'may', and you say, "Registrar may", you start with 'Registrar may', that means that you are giving Registrar the choice of doing anything they want. For example, they can publish it, or they cannot publish it. I don't think that is the intent of the Policy. Say Registrar chooses not to publish anything and if you put it into the 'may' category then you won't have anything displayed, published. That cannot be the Policy language. What do you guys think?
Margie Milam:	If I can respond Dennis, I think you're right. If it's here it has to have the caveats that are written in the Policy Recommendation so maybe, it's a separate category. Maybe there's some that are not 'may' or not musts but something in between. I don't know.

Dennis Chang:	Yeah, Margie.

Margie Milam:	I'm not [inaudible] on how to do it. I just think we need to recognize that there's a different at least in the Org field.

Dennis Chang:	Absolutely. So, Margie, the categories that Policy language say we use is this. Must, may, or must if. So those are the three key words, key terms, we use to define what you need to do.

Margie Milam:	Okay. Then that's probably a 'must if' and then you just create the caveat or whatever, the 'if". And you cap the conditions in that Recommendation.

Dennis Chang:	Yeah, I can see it that way. Must if not redacted, right? Or something like that. You must publish…

Margie Milam:	You must publish if the Registrant confirms its details, or whatever. I mean, you just kind of have to look back at that Recommendation. We don't need to take the time here to do that but maybe on another call and track the conditions that were referenced in that Recommendation.

Dennis Chang:	Yeah, I think this may be a reason why, I think it was Sarah who suggested first, that we should maybe identify all the possible fields first as data elements and then proceed to define which must be published, which must be published condition to redactions, which is subject to redaction, and which may be published. So, maybe that's the way that we should it then. I think that maybe [inaudible].
Beth Bacon:	Dennis, you have a couple hands up.
Dennis Chang:	Go ahead.
Beth Bacon:	Sarah, do you want to go first?
Sarah Wyld:	Why, thank you so much Beth. I appreciate that. I just want to verbalize a couple things I put in the chat so that they're fully on the transcript. I do not see publication or redaction of the Org field as being substantially different than any other fields that are to be redacted. They seem to be basically the same although I know there is this extra confirmation step, but I don't think we need to separate out the Org field and have a separate section in Policy and I don't think it needs to be treated substantially differently. We do have a separate part in this Policy already for that confirmation piece of the Org field contents. Thank you. Beth, do you want to go next?

Dennis Chang: Beth, you want to go next?

Beth Bacon: Sure. Yeah, a large plus one to Sarah. She said it very well. I am confused as to why this is coming up again. 12 is pretty clear. We are still waiting for some things from Council with regards to 12 so I don't think we should be making up new categories at this point. Do you need to walk through 12? Maybe we set aside some time [inaudible] but we've got what we've got in the Recommendation and I don't think that it's a whole new category and I don't think it's all that different. There are very few caveats as to publish and when it won't, so I think we need to just focus on what's in the Recommendation. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Agreed. Okay, so let's then proceed. I think we talked about the three buckets. Must, must if, and may. And maybe there's a better way, a more clear way, to present this with the redaction in mind. And, we will go ahead and take a shot at that and give you a yet an alternative to presentation on the publication. Move on.

The Rec I post, I remind you, Rec 12 we decided to postpone our discussion until the end. That was our earlier decision. So, let's move on to the Section below, 8. Yes, yes. Yeah, just so we will resolve 7.5 comment, same resolution as before. Just delete that. And also 7.5.2, we will accept Rubens suggestion to add the element. This was a discussion we had prior and we're just adding the word elements to

	make it more clear. Okay? So, let's continue and we're at redaction of the Registration Data Field. Marc, do you have a hand up?
Marc Anderson:	I do. Can you hear me okay now, Dennis?
Dennis Chang:	It's a little better.
Marc Anderson:	Okay, I'll just try speaking loudly. So, on the publication of DNSSEC element of DNSSEC, I don't think element is appropriate. Elements makes sense for collection because there are actually three different elements you collect. On publication, though, the requirement is different. On publication, it's just whether it's a signed or an unsigned delegation, I believe. So, I'm not sure Rubens' [inaudible] makes sense for publication but I do agree that that clarification makes sense on collection.
Dennis Chang:	That's a really good point, Marc. I had forgotten that. Rubens, what do you think? I don't think... The elements in this case could be actually confusing to put the word there. Let's not add the word elements here. Rubens, can you comment? I think Marc has a really good point. Otherwise, people may think, "Oh my gosh, I have to publish all the elements here." That is not the intent of the Policy at all. Rubens here still? He didn't go away? Oh, maybe he's not here anymore. Rubens if

you're on mute, can you talk? Yeah, maybe he stepped away so we're going to take the elements out for now. Let's just take it out. [inaudible]

Rubens Kuhl: Can you hear me now?

Dennis Chang: Yes, I can.

Rubens Kuhl: So, actually DNSSEC elements, that DNSSEC is not a single attribute. It's a series of attributes. That's why I'd be putting that element back. Because it's not, even if you display a single attribute which is not what you've seen in their profile, the [inaudible] profile foresees displaying the actual elements. The question about collection and publication of all the elements, not just one.

Dennis Chang: [inaudible] point. [inaudible] but not for publication.

Rubens Kuhl: The point is that we have that profile for this publication of all elements, not just a DNSSEC true or false. So, the good [inaudible] profile gTLD profile already makes for publishing a series of elements, not just one attribute which is different from WHOIS. In the WHOIS Policy, it's just again a true or false indication but they have that profile which is going

to affect in five days, already specifies displaying of all the elements. Not just a single element.

Sarah Wyld: Can I jump in for a moment?

Dennis Chang: Yes, please.

Sarah Wyld: Thank you. And Rubens, [inaudible].

Dennis Chang: Sarah, go ahead. Sarah, you're up.

Sarah Wyld: Thank you very much. Okay, thank you. I don't think that's quite accurate. As a Registrar, I'm obligated to indicate if DNSSEC is signed or unsigned and I'm obligated to support that service, but I'm not obligated to offer it which means I don't necessarily have to offer and thus publish in my registration data, the DNSSEC elements. So, there's a difference between signed and unsigned and the specific element, and we should not get passed signed and unsigned for Registrars. I can't speak to what Registries do. If collected… So, then Rubens, if we're being so specific about whether it's if collected, then maybe there needs to be a separate thing that requires me to publish if it's signed or

EN

unsigned because I'm not quite sure that that data is collected data, but I do need to indicate that in my response.

Dennis Chang: This is a fairly significant difference in interpretation on the Recommendation and does anybody else have comments? We may have to park this one, too. Let's park this and move on. The way we interpret this Recommendation has consequences that has a heavy impact to the implementers. Marc Anderson has a comment. Go ahead, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Dennis. I will just say I think you're right we should maybe park this and circle back to it offline or come back to it after we've all had a chance to look into this more. But similar to some of previous comments, I'll just say at no point did the EPDP Phase 1 talk about changes to the DNSSEC fields, either data collected, or data displayed, right? So, on this one I believe the intent is 100 percent to maintain the existing status quo. So, it's in none of the Recommendations from the Phase 1 Report were intended to have any changes to the existing or any other requirements that currently exist.

Dennis Chang: That's a good comment from the intention of the EPDP Team and that's what I thought. And Rubens, do you disagree with the intention of EPDP Team? Oh, I'm sorry. Did Sarah have her hand up first? No, go ahead. Okay, no one. Rubens, you're up.

Rubens Kuhl:	Thanks Dennis. Regarding intention, I don't think that the EPDP actually has any intention to one direction or the other. I don't think they actually considered this minutia because most people when look at WHOIS output only saw a single line and that made most people think that this in fact gives a Boolean value, which is not true but that is how people usually see that in the WHOIS. So, I don't think we can count on affecting interpretation. It is to do things one or another way. Thanks.
Dennis Chang:	Thank you Rubens. Sarah, you can… Rubens, you need to mute again. Thank you. Sarah, quick comment and I think we really do need to move on and park this one as and tag it as an IRT Split Item. Go ahead.
Sarah Wyld:	Thank you. I do agree that we should consider this one further. My suggestion is that we think about making it a bit more flexible, some options, so that the Registrar or Registry must display the DNSSEC Status or element as applicable. And I think that satisfies the RDAC Requirements also.
Dennis Chang:	That's a good suggestion. Let's consider that. Thank you very much. And we will go ahead and move on to the next section. Isabelle, if you will? So, this is the Redaction Section and let's see if there's any comments here. Any comments here? I think that I've already replied to this and Jody, this is I think a prior comment so can I resolve this comment? Let's resolve this comment for Roger. Rubens, you have your hand up. Oh,

okay, you have your hand down. Okay, so I think that we don't have to do it now if you can't guys. Let's move on.

Go down to 8.2 and .2 is where must redact and the RNH has provided, right, unless RNH has provided so this is the 7 data elements, and this brings in the Recommendation 11 with the Registrant Data. I see no comments from the IRT. And 8.X was something that we provided as an alternative solution where I think the Tech ID, Tech Name, and Tech Phone was very confusing and someone suggested that maybe we treat these three data elements in a separate category, and this was our attempt.

That the Registrant and Registrar must redact these elements unless RNH has provided consent to publish and the RNH has designated the same person for the Tech Contact as the RNH. And this comes about because I know the Recommendation did not address Tech Contact in terms of consent of, but I think that this is fairly important for the Technical Community to have this contact, be able to publish it and no who to contact directly, so this is something that they're requesting us to facilitate. Do you have any objections, 8.X? If the RNH and the Tech Contact are the same person, can they publish it? Not ready to sign off. Tech Contact publicly is not the… Yeah, exactly. Sarah, you're absolutely right.

So, we may not be able to do this at all and then in that case we cannot accommodate the request from the Technical Team because that was not in the Recommendations and we'll just have to go along with whatever the Recommendation says. And absolutely agree with Sarah that we cannot. So, we have concerns about this language. Okay. So, we

try. So, I think that the next version we will see is that we are going to not have this consent of publication on Tech Fields at all.

So, we're going to stay true to the Recommendation language and that's the direction we'll go. Keep moving to 8.4. So, Registrar must display email address of Registrant and Tech Email. Any comments on the 8.4? No? Okay, so Sarah made a comment here which where did this comment does belong, the comment that was… Oh, in 8.3. Now we're back to 8.3. Yes, I would prefer sticking to the Rec. Okay, thank you Sarah. I am encouraged by your words to go implement true to the Recommendation language. 8.3, if such element contains… Oh, Brian, go ahead. Can Brian, do you want to speak?

Brian King: Yes, thanks Dennis. This is Brian. Looking at the 8.4 language, I don't think that's what we decided. I'd love to, well part with my IPC hat on, I think we'd love to have the link to the webform in that field, but my technical guys will kill me. I think for constituency, if that field is going to be an email address, it should be an email address. And not like an email address or a URL. I don't think that we decided that that field would contain a link to the webform. I mean, we'd love to have that, but I don't think that's how we agreed that that would be structured. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong please. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Do you see the Recommendation language that Sarah just posted?

Brian King:	Hey, Dennis. This is Brian. Yes, I do. And I think that that's exactly right. The Registrar has to provide that, but I think we envision that being provided in general and not necessarily provided in this field. I'd love to hear from the more technical folks here, but I can see all kinds of problems if that field contains different types of data. Thanks.
Dennis Chang:	Sarah, did you want to speak?
Sarah Wyld:	Thank you. Yes. I think I understand, Brian, what you're saying. I just don't quite agree with your interpretation. I think that based on my reading of Rec 13, we need to give this option of putting a URL for a webform in that field. I understand it might destruct some field validation because it would be in URL format rather than email format, but that is my recollection of the intent of the Recommendation was that it could be a URL to a webform.
	There's also data privacy issues if we use an email address that passes right through to domain owner. There could be concerns with how that might result in disclosure of their data through some, for example, a bounce back of a message that would have sent them. So, I think we need to allow the option of having a URL. Thank you.
Dennis Chang:	Brian, do you want to speak again?

Brian King:	Yeah, I'd love to, thanks. And I think we may just be thinking different things and don't get me wrong, I'd love to have that link. I think that will be a vast improvement over today's state. So, can we do that in the end of the WHOIS output or in some different place? I didn't recall, and I sincerely don't think that we agreed that that would go into that field. I remember talking about our RDAP Profile with our engineers and one of the advantages was that we'd have consistency in the types of data that was in each of these fields. I know we have some technical experts on the line here, oh I see one of them with their hands up, that could speak to the value of doing that. So, yeah, I'd love to have that, and I think should be used as output, but not in that field. Thanks.
Dennis Chang:	Yeah, I want to go ask Jody to speak but you should know that people are already doing that so it's not something new or difficult to do, I thought. Go ahead Jody.
Jody Kolker:	So, I'll have somebody correct me if I'm wrong, I'll look for Roger on this. But we talked at length about this in the RDAP Working Group and basically what we came up with is that we would have a different type that was in the email that would display either an email address or it would display a URL, and I believe we are registering that in IANA Registry so that we could use it in the RDAP Profile. I guess I'm looking for Roger to pipe into the chat if he could, if I was right or not. Thanks.

Dennis Chang:	Roger, are you there listening? You want to type into the chat or speak up?
Roger Carney:	Hi Dennis. It's Roger.
Dennis Chang:	Go ahead.
Roger Carney:	I think that's correct. I do remember us having those discussions and I don't remember if that field got registered in IANA yet or not but I for some reason, I'll go out and look to make sure it is, but I'm pretty sure we added that so that it can be sent back so that like Brian's asking, you actually know what it is. You're either going to get an email address or you're going to get a URL and you know which one to process and how. So, I'll just confirm that that's in the IANA Database. Thanks.
Dennis Chang:	Thank you. Please confirm and Brian, do you want to talk again?
Brian King:	Yeah, thanks Dennis. That's why I left my hand up. I appreciate that. This is Brian. If that's the case, then I would be happy to be mistaken so if those guys could please confirm that. I recall those conversations going the other way, but I wasn't involved. I heard that from a friend. So, if those guys could please confirm, that will be great, and I think we

wouldn't have the same concern that I do have now pending that confirmation. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Thank you. Marc, you have.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, this is Marc. I guess I think Brian raises a fair concern, right? If you're excepting an email field and get a URL, that's not great behavior but I guess maybe I'll just end my comment there and then Roger following up with what's in RDAC so hopefully that's been addressed in RDAC and we can move on with that.

Dennis Chang: Okay, Marc. Thanks. Let's move on then. The 8.3 as we see, we're looking at Sarah made a couple of comments. She suggests if such element contains personal data, I think does everybody agree that we can delete that? We agree with Sarah? Can we accept her suggestion? Yeah, if you don't have a consent, you don't have a consent, right? Nobody should be trying to judge whether it's a personal data or not. So, let's continue. Let's go ahead and accept that. Thank you, Sarah.

Next one is 8.5 or Rec 6, this is Registrar must. I'm not going to read this. I don't see any comments so I'm going to move on to 8.6. 8.6 we have a comment. Disagree again. This is where, oh… I remember this. Oh, this is Rec 12. We decided to table this one. Thank you for reminding me. Okay, so this is we'll move on to Rec 13 in Section 9. Go ahead.

Section 9 what we're talking about is the logged file. So, there may be some confusion or misunderstanding on expectations of I think the logged file is trying to capture whether there was communications or not so that we know that there is proper notice and confirmation and things like that, but there may be so assumed expectation. Does anybody want to talk about the locked file that people are already doing and what this means? And like I said, I don't to intend to publish a list of elements of what must go into and what is comprehensive and what must not go into locked file. I don't intend to do that at all. But if there's any comments here, I'd like to hear them. Brian, go ahead.

Brian King: Yeah, thanks Dennis. This is Brian. So, my question here is more for a sanity check. Does the Policy require that that be applicable to the Tech Contact, as well? If we could go back up and sorry if I should know this. Something tells me that this was really a requirement for the Registrant Contact and not necessarily Tech, but I could be wrong. But we're doing this now. We have logged files. I won't speak for the Registrar Stakeholder Group, but I can answer any questions or try to answer any questions that you guys have about that. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Anyone want to comment on the Tech Email Address motion? I think Margie has her hand up.

Margie Milam: Hi. I wasn't commenting on that but I was commenting on your statement that you don't anticipate listing what elements should be collected in the log files, and it seems to me that it would be useful to have some consistency there and perhaps we could turn to our Registrar folks here on the call to let us know like what kinds of fields do they collect and have that basically be that. But I do think it makes it a little grave and difficult to enforce is there's no specificity on what the log files should contain.

Dennis Chang: Sarah, go ahead.

Sarah Wyld: Thank you. Yes. I am satisfied that under Recommendation 13 we must pass through a communication to the Tech Contact even if they're different than the Registrant Contact. I do now however think that there is a requirement also under Rec 13 which is the communication pass through, to log Tech Contact pass through of communication. It does make sense that we might need to do so but there also could be that the privacy concerns around it so I would emphasize what I said in the comment on the document that this should be a may rather than a must. And regarding what goes into the logs, I think we do have some guidance in that Recommendation as to what they should and should not contain, so I would agree that it would be good to list more specifically what those logs should look like. Thank you.

Dennis Chang: Brian, go ahead.

Brian King: Hey, thanks Dennis. If I could respond to Sarah with thanks for clarifying that and for the sanity check there, I appreciate it. And again, I don't speak for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I appreciate Dennis's point that we should try to avoid prescribing requirements that weren't in the Policy. I recall that this was a difficult conversation to have internally when we implemented this because our guys wanted to know, okay, what do we log? And I had to tell them, well, the Policy says what you don't log. And so, I think I can just read the compliance, I can read the audit question now like show me the log, show me the ip address or whatever the ICANN Compliance is going to say or ask for when they audit this. I think it might be good to keep them to a set list of things if we can do that within the Policy parameters. Thanks.

Dennis Chang: Okay, thanks for your suggestion. There's a couple of chats going on the same subject. It's getting close to the end time, so I want to try to conclude this session but do mention the remind you of the ICANN66 Session we have requested, and it has not been confirmed, that we are asking for two Sessions this time and it's on Succession Days so Wednesday and Thursday. They're both 90 minute Sessions so please put that on your calendar as a tentative date and we'll confirm as soon as the Events Committee confirms of the Schedule.

As for the rest of the Recommendation, there were a lot of Recommendations that as a result of our online dialogue that resulted

in what I would call a non-Policy Language Recommendations so these we do not need to discuss it in this meeting but what we will do is start documenting it in terms of a Implementation Plan and share that with you so that you know exactly what we're doing with them. And a good one to start that conversation will be the Rec 27 for example. And you will see what our Work Plan is there, too. Before we leave, any further comments from the team? Roger, go ahead.

Roger Carney: Hi Dennis, it's Roger. I just don't want any homework, so I just wanted to point everybody to my comment in the chat that RFC 8605 added the Contact URLs to be used for webforms to the vCard's which it's build into RGAP.

Dennis Chang: Thank you. So, no homework for you. Quick on that. We really appreciate it. Okay everyone. Until next time, I'll see you online. Thank you for joining today. Goodbye.

Beth Bacon: Thanks everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]