
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT meeting held on Wednesday, the 12th of June 2019 at 18:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. 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, please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. Hello, everyone. This is Dennis Chang speaking. I'm the Implementation Program Director here at ICANN Org. And it's my honor and privilege to lead this team for the implementation of the gTLD Registration Data Policy. And this is our IRT meeting, Implementation Review Team Meeting Number Two. And let's get started. So the agenda today is we're going to -- you've already had the welcome and administrative remarks. And the way we are running this meeting, there is going to be presentation from me to guide you through all the working material. But this should be interactive meeting. So please feel free to interrupt me, stop me, ask questions, and use the chat to have a conversation there as well.

With me, I have a lot of people around me on the ITT who's helping me on this site. We are going to do a quick review of our Team Roster and who has joined and we'll go through that. We go through our IRT work assignments. And I'm going to lead you through the various working documents. And we'll review our command recommendations analysis,

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.

talk about the next steps, and ICANN 65 Sessions, and any other business you might have.

This is a one hour meeting. And I intend to move through it rather quickly with there's a lot of content here and if we don't cover it all we'll continue it online or via email. But if there's anything that you want to discuss, this is a valuable moment together in a discussion forum, so please stop me and we're all together. When I say implementation team, I'm talking about IPT plus IRT. We together form a policy implementation team.

And you can see the members of the IPT, or the ICANN org, the staff members from various functional groups with their subject matter expertise. And the IRT list on the right. And these are in order of members signing up. Of course, Diane Plaut is number one. She was number one on Pre-IRT and therefore, Carrie is on as number one for the IRT. We have 16 members shown on this page. And then we continue on this page. Total, we have 30 members join now of the IRT.

Now, is at this time, I like to ask the new members the names in blue, starting with Rubens to introduce themselves and their affiliation and what they see is their role supporting this IRT. Go ahead, Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL: [inaudible] Yeah?

DENNIS CHANG: Rubens, have you joined us or not? Go ahead Rubens, you can speak. I don't hear you yet.

RUBENS KUHL: Oh, can you hear me now?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, we can.

RUBENS KUHL: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I work for NIC.br, which is a gTLD [inaudible] service provider. I'm here as GNSO Council Liaison. So I'm here to try serving everything that they are [inaudible] from the council if that happens. So I'm not here on my personal capacity. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Welcome. Yes, we do need a GNSO Council Liaison occurred the process of the policy implementation. And next, I don't think Irish is on. It is like 2 a.m. her time. Let's see if [inaudible] -- is she on? No? How about Jodie Hawker? JK, are you on? No? Susan? Can you check the rest of the list for me? Susan and Joe?

ANDREA GLANDON: Susan isn't on either.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Zoe is on.

ANDREA GLANDON: Zoe is here.

DENNIS CHANG: Zoe is on. Okay, hi, Zoe. Can you speak and introduce yourself?

ZOE BONYTHON: Hi. Yes, so my name Zoe Bonython. I'm actually the Secretariat for the registrar stakeholder group. And the reason I've joined as a member as it was the only way I was able to actually be able to join meetings because there's no audio stream to be able to observe. So I'm not going to interfere in any way. I'm just here. So that, because I follow a PDP and the IRT in order to support the registrar members and be able to communicate to the rest of the stakeholder group. So thanks for letting me in.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome Zoe, and nice to have you. Now it's good to know your role here. So the has that Zoe says the IRT members are the only one who can participate live at these meetings and have access to or the collaborative documents. The observers on this list, as you see, we have 33 of them. They are read only access to emails, and whatever we publish on the wiki is what they have access to. And then of course, all these meetings are recorded. So they can track our progress that way.

Let's get to the IRT collaboration process here. We have a Team Drive. And sometimes it's called the shared drive, team drive. Google is in the process of going through a name change, but basically, it's our drive

that we put all our collaborative documents in in one place, so you can find them at any time.

And here's the link. So if you press, click on the link, you will get to the drive itself, right. And I'm actually going through it with you so you can find it. So in this drive, you will have various documents. And the first thing that I want to show you in the drive is this thing called IRT workbook. This is a key document that you will be needing an accent thing every time you are working on an IRT assignments. And in this work document, you have various tabs about your instruction, your task list, recommendation analysis, meeting tracker where your attendance are taken, as you will see and track. So if you're not going to be able to attend the meeting, please send us an apology. So we know in advance. And IRT roles are here. And all the references that you might need in terms of links are listed here for your convenience.

Let's see. And then the other key documents that are we going through is implementation plan, consensus policy language, and FAQ. So let's see what they are look like. So again, the links are here. So if you go to the implementation plan, and if you click the link, you will find that document.

Now this document, as you will note in parentheses, right after the title says, "Not yet assigned for IRT review." So our working method with the IPT is that we are working to create these documents. And you can observe and track our progress, as you will. But when it there comes a time when we need you to and we're ready for your review, we will make specific assignments as such. And at that time, it is your job then

to go ahead and review the section but you're free to review anything at any time that we're doing.

The reason that we are doing all these things in parallel, of course, is because we are doing this implementation in an expedited manner. It is our intention and as the recommendations from the EPDP team, and our executive management here has directed us to go ahead and get started as early as possible and move through it as quick as possible, because we are working with an effective date, policy effective date that are given to us, that is given to us. So that is our job to try and put together a plan that meets that date. We don't have that plan yet, because we are in the first stage of the implementation. And that's called the Policy Recommendation Analysis.

The other documents we have is called FAQ. And if you'll notice -- let's see, that's a cue. This is the link right? There you go. So IRT FAQ rich Data Policy is what we call them here, I see Roger on it. This one has been assigned. So I will try to make it clear like this when things are assigned to you which we're trying to know point that out so that you can see when he was assigned, and when your review is due.

So this one was assigned 10 June 2019 that was Monday, couple of days ago, and is still on the 17th. You have a week to review this. Of course you will need a week is a short, simple sentence and paragraph. But what I wanted to do is sort of give you an expectation that anytime we assign something you have about a week to complete your assignment. I think that would be a reasonable expectation, especially when we are not assigning things that are that is massive, or, you know, difficult for you to get through in an hour or two.

And FAQ is started right now. And we are going to add to these things. As you get questions, as we get questions, anybody has questions, and they are repeated in nature, we will add them here. And any kind of possible confusion that we might have in terms of the IRT or the implementation is something we want to capture. So we can look back and get everybody on the same page.

In this particular, this particular one, let's see. I won't talk about this yet. But it's basically we we're trying to say, "Hey, let's focus on the implementation work." And we can't be waiting for anything from the console or the board on anything. So that is a basic question and answer.

The other thing that we have is the Email Archive. Let's see. So this is the Email Archive. So those of you who are new, newly joined to the IRT, this is where you will find all the prior emails since the beginning of the IRT. And when you click on these things, for example, this is June, this is May, and this you will see all the message that had gone out -- let me see probably this one. So if you see this email that says Rec three, Rec four, Rec two, Rec five, these are our assignments review, right?

So you can see exactly what the email was. But it's our intention that you do not have to depend on the email that has gone out in the past, because the way we are designing this -- oops -- is that we are capturing the assignments in here call IRT Task Lists and Checklist. Was that makes sense? So far no question? Okay.

Now, this is the Wiki page, and Implementation Planning Activity. We went through in the kickoff meeting. The first two items are

highlighted. That's what we're doing right now. And here's the next step. But before we go to the next step, let's go back to here and go through all our IRT test checklist.

We have 15 assignments for the IRT, and we'll walk through them quickly, and you may stop me. Raise your hand if you have any questions about these assignments. The recommendation analysis will look at any detail by going through the going to direct analysis page here, but I'm simply trying to go through the assignments list so that you'll know what assignments were is expected for you to do.

So the first two, three, four, five; first five items here we're due on Friday and unless the IRT members voiced some concerns or request for more time, I am simply going to assume that all the IRT members are completing their assignments, as they will sign on the due date. So if that's not the case, please let us know. And I see some comments with this one so we'll look at that together. The first one is review the EPDP phase one and write a final report. So --

ANDREA GLANDON: Beth put her hands up.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, go ahead, who?

ANDREA GLANDON: Beth.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, you have your hands up? Go ahead. I don't see your hands but I can see --

BETH BACON: Thank you very much. So thank you also for pulling all this together, it's so easy to follow. I really appreciate it. It's just it's nice to have a clear list of what we're supposed to be doing and when. The question is, if you do make some comments in any of the documents that are on our test checklist. Should you also make sure to come to this the workbook and say, "Hey, we've made edits." Just to flag it for you guys. So you don't accidentally just like see that no one made a comment in the checklist we were just on. Like if we forgot to put it there. We don't want to get over lunch because basically, I'm asking where is the authoritative we have questions, is it in the document or just make sure we definitely flag it in that in that list?

DENNIS CHANG: It's in the document. So we're trying to make it easy for you. So you do not have to repeat any comments anywhere. And when I say for example, this is an IRT five, review documents that we said, please comment so just question directly on this document. So I'm looking for your comment here, and I don't see anything. So I'm not responding. There's no need to respond. But if you do, at any time, let's get right to the content.

The tracking list we have is so that you know what was assigned and when is due. And feel free if you like to add comments like this; I don't mind this at all. So if you're going to do one thing, put it in the document directly. We won't lose it. It's a collaborative document that way everybody sees it.

BETH BACON: Okay, great. Thanks Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: And they know --

BETH BACON: We'll put on this together. That's awesome. Thank you so much. We -- I mean, we all appreciate it. It's super easy.

DENNIS CHANG: And I actually appreciate the IRT here. Here is a Marc Anderson, adding the link to the recommendation. This is something that I probably didn't even think of doing and it was really nice for Marc to come in and add these two links. So one for the final report EPDP phase one.

Okay, we are assuming every IRT has a member has now by now by Friday have completed this action item. And when we say recommendations such and such you all know what they are and where to find the source top, source information. And of course, the more resolution is important because more resolution. And Marc has

provided a link for the resolution and the resolution refers to a score card. And both of those documents links are provided for you right there.

So this is a, what I would say is a really good demonstration of working as a team. I know you're used to sending an email to the staff to say, "Hey, please put a link there." What I'm going to ask you now is that, "If you have the link, and you know where it's supposed to go, please add it because this is your document, this is the IRT workbook."

So it's a total different way of working while we try to make it easy for the IR to do the job. We're not IRT support team, as you have been so conditioned by our policy team; they do a great job supporting you. But IPS, is not to support the IRT for -- you're going to have a lot of work, and we are going to give you work because you will have a lot of work because we give you work. But please don't -- let's make sure that we know our role very clearly.

Now, having said that, the IPT is busy doing IPT work. But Andrea and I, two of us personally, we're respond to any request you do. So please use the two of us as your contact. And I know that you know you have been that doing that already. And I'm totally okay with it. I just want to make sure that the IPT who's working daily here can focus on their work.

Okay, let's go to -- so now that we have completed our recommendations, final report review and how know what our more resolution is and know what's on the scorecard. You will have to review this document is called the IRT Principles and Guideline. And what that

document tells you is basically, what your role is. And now that we know what your role is, everybody knows. And you know, where the Wiki space is because you've been there, right?

To access the wiki space as an IRT team, and please know that this is an IRC wiki, the community wiki, which you have not only have access, but full edit control. You can edit things in this wiki space; this is your working space.

The working space for the wiki is designed so that we communicate with the public. So this is sort of our window, and portal for the public to let them know that anyone know what we're doing. They don't have the access to Google Drive or they may not have access to all our documents, but this is what we want to present to them to demonstrate and share our progress.

Next, this is a link to the Team Drive just in case you forget. And this is the material. Let's see, this is all, okay. So this is an ongoing task and I don't have a due date here because I know that people will join us. We have five people joined us since last meeting, and probably by next meeting, will have more. So whoever joins, it's their responsibility to come up to speed on their own by reviewing all prior work.

Let's see. So this is an interesting one. So we have -- I asked you, we discussed it on our last meeting, "Our schedule is really tight. And we are trying to meet that effective date. We don't quite know how long it's going to take because we have to look at our recommendation and analyze them and see what our requirements are. So we asked the

team, “Is there a possibility to shorten this six month typical implementation time?”

The six month is sort of a default that we always use without asking if we don't get any feedback. And we like to do that. And I've been doing they're consistently on all my policy implementation. But this time, it looks like we have to look at that because this is not an ordinary time.

So as the SW on six, seven made a comment or depends on the scope changes cannot confirm this, I will totally valid. This is exactly what we felt. And RC 2019, 605 implementation timer depend on the scope of change. The IRT identifies this may be the typical six month it may be more, it may be less. Right now, it is impossible to say.

Again, IPT agrees with you. This is exactly what we were feeling. So it's good to know that at least two IRT has voice or agreement. And may we're depend, really depend on the scope of what [inaudible] is the same? Not sure is possible to make a determination on how long the mobilization duration need to be until what it needs to be implement.

Well, yeah. Okay. So we have three IRT member voicing exactly the same concern as the IPT. While we're doing this, the pressure is going to come, right, we all know that. They are all going to want to know, and let's just expect it and agree on how we're going to respond to this. We're all going to be as, are you going to meet the February 2020 date, right? And my honest answer around the table here at the IPT is of, I don't know. Right? And how can you or when we're you know? And my, my response there is that we have to first assess the scope, right?

To our policy, we have to do at these, right? Or analyze our recommendation and look at the requirements.

And we have to look at what our tasks are, we have to estimate our tasks, we have to look at our critical path. And we have to determine our schedule, and we have to build our implementation plan. And so there's a lot of work here. And we're doing it. And we're doing it in a expeditious manner as possible but until then, we really don't know.

But at this time, I'd like to turn it over to the IRT members, especially those IRT members who were part of the EPDP team. There was there when, when this February 29, 2020, deadline was composed. And if they had thought about a possible method of implementing this policy by that time, is there anyone who would like to share some insight?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Rubens, you want to talk about this? I know you wrote a chat. And I think it's important what you have to say.

ANDREA GLANDON: Marc raised his hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc raised his hand. Marc, speak.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. This is Marc Anderson, can you hear me, okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, great. So from EPDP working remember perspective. On the driver for the day, you know, there was a, there's a lot of concern when we were deliberating on having the bridging mechanism, because the bridging mechanism maintained, that, you know, in essence, maintains the temporary specification. Intel the policy be implemented. And, you know, we knew, just from a timing perspective it wouldn't be possible to have the temporary specific, or the new policy drafted and published and implemented by May 25, when the temporary specification expired. As much as, as many people would have liked us to have been done and had the phase one recommendation implemented by then it just wasn't practical.

So, we knew we needed a purging mechanism. But we also knew that was a good deal of resistance to maintaining the temporary specification longer than was necessary. And so the idea around recommending a date was provide some comfort to people that did not want the temporary specifications last longer than is necessary, and give a date to drive towards when the temporary specification would no longer be in effect.

We had originally proposed I think an end of the year date, you know, a December 31th, 2019 maybe. It was pointed out that end of the year holidays, and all would be a horrible time and so there was a proposal to push it out to the end of February, which is how we ended up in with that the in the recommendations.

So that's a little bit of background. On your question itself Dennis, you asked specifically, do we give any consideration to how we would achieve that date? And the answer that question is no. You know, so, we didn't know that there was a considerable amount of implementation work that would need to be done. And I think we all decided that that was, how to get there would be left up to the implementation team. And that, you know we knew that day would be a target. And I think we should try and, you know, to the extent we can make that target, but understand that the reality itself of you know, coming up with an implementation plan, getting the policy completed, published, and then the technical implementation in particular completed by that time, just may be insurmountable.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for the insight and the background Marc. Is there anyone else would like to speak on this topic? Rubens, I see you raise your hand, I can see.

RUBENS KUHL:

Thank you for raise your hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL: What dimension to chat is that what we are implementing here is actually a differential between to inspect and the adopting implementation notice and phase one. So the baseline for this policy is a scenario where think spec is already implemented, and are that is already implemented, which is due August 26, so just a few weeks from now, actually.

And after that, whatever comes in from phase one, is actually the implementation requirements, and implementation expertise, how different to use phase one from OpenStack. And from OpenStack plus other people communication office and get might be less or more. But the actual baseline is not what tools use it to be surely few years ago, is already a new baseline that you rise up when adopted, implemented and [inaudible]. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a good point, RDAP -- so the implementation team is guided to also RDAP implemented when we were thinking about our implementation. Now, say that phase one of the RDAP.

Now, I know that, because we're coordinating with the RDAP Working Group, they are actually working on the second RDAP, for the policy implementation, as recommended. So were we are continue to coordinate with them. Now, go ahead and the other thing that was Beth. Was it Beth? Beth, go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON:

Oh, sorry, I was struggling with my mute button. I just wanted to flag for just a question. So the items from phase one that were [inaudible] to phase two, are those anticipated to be incorporated in this consensus policy? Or is that going to be something that is out of an IRT based on the phase two results? It's a genuine question. I really don't know how we would handle that because I think that would certainly impact our ability to meet a deadline.

DENNIS CHANG:

That's excellent question. We asked the same thing here. And for now, I want to capture that as a FAQ number two, it's the really important question. And so we all agree on the answer. When I looked at it, I said, "You know, this is a typical project management, scope management technique, right? You have to establish a scope and draw a very clear, bright line around it was in scope and without a scope. Otherwise, it's an evolving scope that we can never complete."

And how do we decide that that's our work, actually. IPT we'll look at it, analyze it, and turn it into a requirement. And really have it review with the IRT and IRT will tell us, we got it right, or we got it wrong. And we will be doing that shortly here, where we say things like, requirement number two EPDP team committed, blah, blah, blah, in phase two, blah, blah, blah, as soon as we saw that, we said, "Okay, that's not our job." And as my email had indicated to you, we see that as, quote, and quote. And these are my words, "Note to self."

In the final report, for the EPDP team to conveniently pick up doing the face to policy development, and which I believe they're doing right now. So this is where the IRT members have to confirm. Our analysis is accurate, and you agree with us and you support our action. And those actions could be, do nothing. And but we do want to make it very, very clear that if there is a recommendation, and we're not doing anything that we have your buy in, and we all agree. So what I would like to do is if you can formulate your question, I think about it Beth. I'm going to give you your special homework.

BETH BACON:

Well, if that's the case, I take my question back.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Can I ask a question? Hey Dennis, this is Russ Weinstein from ICANN. I was wondering, being [inaudible] on the EPDP team, have you guys talked about it in the phase two discussions about how those carryover items from phase one manifest themselves? Are you guys tackling them intermittently like to come out with recommendations one at a time or falling together in the phase two policy recommendation?

BETH BACON:

I will admit that I've not been on every single call because I've [inaudible] which I'm quite happy about actually. They've gotten quite that far. I think that it's I mean, they're kind of plugging through definitions and the meet of the work. So I don't think that they're quite to that. But if someone else call has insights because Amr is on the on

the team and a couple others. I think, also, Berry and Caitlin are still supporting, so maybe they have a better vision to that. But I don't think they're quite there yet.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody? Amr, do you want to speak? Or Marc Anderson, you had your hand raised?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, this is Marc. I'll jump into to that. Yeah, I agree with Beth, we're not we're not really at that phase. But that said, I don't think our intent is to sort of, you know, piecemeal our recommendations. We do have two tracks that we're tackling with the main track focused on, policy recommendations for access to nonpublic registration data. But for carry over items or items that may change, modify or impact phase one recommendations, we're just getting those discussions underway, and it's a little bit early to say definitively how we're going to handle those.

But also keep in mind the results of those discussions could be new policy recommendations, or it could be no policy recommended, or nothing changes, right. And so I think we can't -- I think our task in this hierarchy is to let the recommendations there in front of us. And we can't really be looking over our shoulder to see what [inaudible] going to do.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone else in line? Okay, then. Oh, Amr, hey. Amr go ahead. We love to hear from you.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Dennis. This is Amr. Yeah, just confirming that my understanding is the same as Marc's, so I agree with everything you just said, but question I put in the chat it was whether the question Beth posed as it was that captured accurately in the on the Google Sheet that we're looking at now? Is it about punting on questions to the internet? Each of the [inaudible].

BETH BACON: Yeah, it does.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

AMR ELSADR: Good, yeah.

BETH BACON: It's a good catch, Amr. It's a little bit different. I can always go in and just tweak it.

AMR ELSADR: Alright, thanks. We should --

BETH BACON: Since Dennis made it clear that's my homework, you know.

AMR ELSADR: All right, thanks.

BETH BACON: Well, thanks Amr.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thanks Amr. Good catch. So you are already looking at what's happening that's really good. So this is a collaborative document. So Beth will ask the question, and we will all try to answer it. And I am expecting that we stay consistent. Just like question number one here, you know, there's a discussion going on with the DNS of Council now on the two recommendations. They were not fully adopted, what are we going to do with them? Should we wait for them? Should we tract them? No. Answer is no, no, no, we're not going to do anything. This team has to be focused on implementation of the given recommendations that are adopted by the board period; we have way too much work already on our place to be worried about what could happen and that's our direction. So I hope you all agree with that.

So while Beth is doing her homework, we're going to move on to our IRT test list. And we're going to continue with our number one, number eight. Test number eight, is the first time that I'm assigning a recommendation analysis for your review. And is recommendation number one, test you yesterday. Number -- and then I gave you another homework. So, one, two, three, four; four recommendations review were assigned to you and that was due yesterday. So I assume

that you have already done that. And we're going to go through it right now to make sure that there isn't any lingering questions or concerns with those.

And then I have added two more. And one is the RFC -- RFC, that's redundant. So let me to -- anyway, RFC 2119, which is about the keywords the terms that we use, when we turn recommendations into requirements such as must, must not, may, may not. So everybody has to know what those means. And we have to all agree the exact same definition. And we have a convenient vehicle called RFC from ITF that we have in using for those of you who work policy implementation with me before are already familiar. So we are going to be very, very keen about making it very clear to all parties involved. So when the enforcement time comes, that there is no debate about interpretation of a requirement.

Oh, so here is a assignment number 13. Let's see how many of you have done your assignment number 13? We're going to go check right now. Uh-huh. Okay, maybe this is one the first time that it wasn't clear. And the reason that I assigned this to you to the IRT, instead of taking time for back and forth is for IRT member to fill in their initial here, okay, column C.

So, everybody, we're filling their initials. And this is particularly important because there was a one initial that I couldn't recognize. But also your see that if I did one and two. I would -ops, so Amr got A.E, so then means he has to come up with a different initial. No exact same initial are allowed. The whoever grabs the first initial gets to win. You

get to keep that and the slower folks have to come up with a different initial, that's the rule.

Okay, so there was -- let me see, there was somebody else. So here, Mason Cole, and Matthew Crossman, you're in competition. Go. Okay, so while you do that I'm going to keep moving. And we have two more recommendations that I review or two assignments. One is the recommendation number five, and the other one was to review the FAQ by 17. These are due 17. So you do have additional days to complete your work. And you've already seen the FAQ. And there is a link, this part; this one is linked to you. So you will see how to get there.

And now that I think about maybe we should put in links for the like recommendation number five analyses. We have a wreck five document, then maybe we should add. So I'm done with the cast checklist review, any questions on your assignment? Amr, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR:

Thank Dennis, this is Amr. And I was just going to propose that we not use initials and use our full names in the Google Doc. You see, Luke's already mentioned, you know, having a last period. I'm worried if we continue to use initial, we might end up with some sort of dispute resolution process or procedure. So why not just you know we got full names?

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, there's a proposal, how does everybody feel about that? The thing that I was looking at was this the initially. So let's before you

answer the question, here, you see the initials that people are using on column E, and then column G that's why, but if you like to use full name, I'm perfectly okay with it. And maybe it's even preferable. So it's just more space on our documents. But let's make a decision. Who's, if you agree with Amr just go ahead and check mark, saying agree or disagree. Thumbs up is a good thing to use to. Yes? Everybody agree. So you have another homework. Thanks Amr. You can thank Amr for this one. Go back and change your all of initial to your name on these documents. You still -- are still thumbs still up?

ANDREA GLANDON: Check marks.

DENNIS CHANG: Check marks? Okay. Is it good? Are we done with that?

BETH BACON: Hey, Dennis, this is Beth. I have a question if I couldn't get in the queue.

DENNIS CHANG: Mm-hmm.

BETH BACON: So if we, you know, hypothetically, not that anyone would in this group would ever miss a deadline because that's just -- but if perhaps that were to happen at one, one time or another. Let's say we wanted to go in and add to the wreck analysis sheet, are they going to be locked after

that those documents be locked after the deadline? Or can we add some more comments, we have comments?

DENNIS CHANG:

You can add comments at any time you want. But please know that after the deadline, we may not pay too much attention to it, because we've already moved on to a different recommendation. And but I will go back and look at it myself and bring the [inaudible] attention to them. And I'm not -- this is the way the implementation will work, right. Our first job is create an implementation plan to share with the public comments. So think in those terms? What do you want to share with the public to let them know what our plan is, right? We'll have to have some sort of a baseline on their plan. The second thing is the actual publication of the policy and announcement and legal notice, right?

All the way up to then things change. And I expect to change. So feel comfortable with that. It's okay for us to change our mind now, next week, before the public comment. And after the public comments, certainly, there will be some changes, right? So feel comfortable, so do your best to meet the date. And if you do need extra time, I want you to tell us like write it in here with your full name that this particular assignment requires another more time and propose we request two more weeks or something like that, write on here. And then I'll change it and will adapt to it, right.

And or you can make that comment in the Google Doc, the actual documentation also, if you like, because I figure that may be more

complete, convenient for you. But either way, let us know and we'll adopt.

So this particular one IRT recommendation five analysis is I think going to take a lot of work for you but you do have to put in a lot of time. I'm just warning you, this is a time consuming one. And this is the heart of the policy itself. We are going to order data elements and registration data elements and deciding, what the requirements are for each one of them? So does that answer your question?

BETH BACON: Sure, thanks you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, we're going to continue, we have nine minutes left, and there's a lot I want to share with you while we're together. Recommendation Analysis. I want to talk about the process here rather than the content so that everybody has the same understanding, right? You see that column one, A, is just the number of the recommendation. And column B is the recommendation itself, the language, exact language, copy and paste from the recommendation, but as you will note that the red line crossed out is because of the board resolution. And we did this for you. So you can save time, but you do need to review that, to tell us whether we did it correctly.

I see that Roger Carney has done his homework already replaced the initial, good Roger. And the second column, or the third column C, is the recommendations themselves, meaning that we believe from this

recommendation that turns into requirement. So before we were to look at this recommendations, see what the requirement is, this is what the IPT would say, right?

And then the D, Board Action. Board action is copy and paste from the scorecard. So you don't really need a scorecard. It is conveniently provided for you for every recommendation to make it easier for you. And column E is very important, because this will tell you what the IPT is going to do about this recommendation. And this is an interesting one. And we'll have to have further discussion.

The whole idea here is purpose of this, we call them purposes, right, is important does it belong in the implementation plan or not? Does it belong in the policy language or not? Where does it belong? Does it belong here? Or does it belong in a different document like DPA? It's a decision, it's a design, it is something we need to talk about. And our original proposal is we put it in the policy language, but then we're getting comments here, you will see on the G, in the G that maybe that that you don't agree with IPT direction and we want to consider this, because I think that it is up to a design and so an important decision.

So we're not going to do it now. But it's THE number one is subject to change based on your review, and analysis. And we will go ahead and have a further discussion on this. So let's look at two and three are similar in nature that what we have determined in terms of requirement is that there's no action for the IPT here. And I see that we have several support from -- so when you have no reaction required, if you agree with the IPT, all you have to do is add your name on the column and there's no need for you to make further comments. The comments are,

what we want to provide is for you to the boys any additional information. But what we're looking for, the IPT is looking for his column as to see if we have enough of a IRT support so that we can move out with our implementation.

Number four, is about the accuracy. This is an interesting one, IPT action. Here we are saying that it is, there's no requirements that we can figure out as to as to the policy language, but I think maybe it should be mentioned, there's an implementation notes. And we see comments; thank you for your comments will review it.

And number five, here requirements are exhausted, it is complicated. So we created a separate document for you to go ahead and -- the hyperlink working for you? Yeah, okay, hopefully, yeah, it works. So the hyperlink seems to be linked to the drive. But here in the drive, you can find the direct file review. This is the document where we go through analysis of the recommendation five, part one, part two, and three is the way we have presented to you. We are saying that part one, will go to the consensus policy language. Part two, you're going to the consensus apology language as an implementation node. And part three, was the sort of an issue statement and the alternatives that we consider that we selected our plan on. And this is something that you'll need to look at and give us your feedback on.

I see that there has not been any comments here so may have not looked at it. But is this is important that you click on this link called data elements matrix. This is the IPT's exhausted work. And it took us a very long time to go through every data elements in every situation in terms of collection, and decide what needs to be done. And we have created

a column for IRT comments for IRT use in column J. Questions about rec five assignment?

ANDREA GLANDON: Beth.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Hey, guys, sorry to keep jumping in. So hold on one second. [Inaudible] cough into the microphone. And I apologize, everyone, for my gross voice. So for the recommendation that assignments, is it the understanding that we will have -- so we would just put the time on the next call, or we'll discuss it? I mean, well, not now because we have two minutes left.

So after the deadline we have, so basically there's a deadline and then the next call we'll talk about those comments because I think that it would be nice if we could talk about those items from the deadline on the 11th. And I don't know that, I'm not sure if we ever went through those. And we want to -- so maybe -- here's my question. Basically, we're putting comments in by deadlines. But then I think that there is some need for us to discuss those, I imagine. And I understand, if you prefer to wait to the deadline to then discuss items for rec five? Basically, that's my question. [CROSSTALK]

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I understand. Yeah, so let me let me say it this way. This is an expedited mode of implementation. And therefore, if you have any thoughts about discussing anything, please voice them right away in terms of email, or collaborative documents. So I hope we can resolve a lot of these things online by emails, right, and we collaborate documents only. We will go through every single one of them on our next meeting, which is going to be ICANN session. We have a 90 minute session and we'll have more time to do that. And but there will be in public just for the, you know.

So that's the expectation if you -- don't wait for the meetings to do anything. Okay. If we have to wait for the meetings, then we will decide to wait for the meetings. But please don't wait for the meetings. Please go ahead and make your comments here. Make your -- add your comments in here. Does that make sense?

BETH BACON: Yeah, so I think, definitely makes sense. And I don't think anyone is going to be waiting to submit comments and will [inaudible] comments by the deadlines and things. But I will I'm going to call out, Matt. I think Matt made one comment that was legitimately just we need to discuss this. So by the time -- [CROSSTALK]. Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, so do that. Do just like Matt. Make the comment that says we need to actually have a discussion on this. And then we will know. And then we'll put it on the agenda.

BETH BACON: All right, super thank you guys very much.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Beth. So that's the end of our meeting. We are going to go ahead and conclude. But before I conclude, just so that you know, we are going to have our ICANN 65 session does the next time we meet. And until then we're going to continue our work assignments to you. But I do want to get some feedback on whether we're going too fast or too slow. So you can tell me later, because I want to let everyone go on time. Meeting is adjourned unless you have final questions bring them up now.

No raise hands? Nope. Thank you everyone. I'll see you online.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, guys.

DENNIS CHANG: In Marrakech. Bye-bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]