

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT call held on Wednesday, the 4th of December, 2019 at 1700 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Thank you, hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking, to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it back over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome everyone to the IRT Meeting #14. Let's see, our agenda today, we have a couple of new IRT members we would like to introduce, I hope they're on the call. Quickly address the Board resolution and GAC advice from ICANN66. I wrote emails on this so I hope it's all clear but I want to make sure we're on the same page on how to handle these resolutions or advice.

Timeline input from the IRT is very, very important and I would like to spend some time talking about it. It seems like it's hard for you to provide the inputs via email so we'll use this session. And then we are going to work on the OneDoc which is our policy language. So, that's the agenda. We'll go to the IRT members here. I don't know if Alan Wood is on the call, Alan if you are on the call, please say hello to the IRT and tell us a little bit about your affiliation.

---

*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.*

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, I don't see Alan on the call but I do see Alex.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks Dennis, it's Alex. I think several of you may know that I've stopped directly participating in the Phase II EPDP and so I have some time to assist on the IRT. So I thought I would jump into the fray and come up to speed quickly on what's been going on and do my best to help moving forward. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, you're very welcome. Alex, you were on the EPDP Phase I, were you not?

ALEX DEACON: I was, yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Excellent, we can really use your help, it's been a long and the original the EPDP Phase I team who are part of the IRT are having trouble sometimes remembering what the intent was and there's disagreement what we meant, so I hope you have a good memory, you can bring some insights and clarity to our discussion. Thank you very much and

---

---

welcome. And with that, you have a lot of homework to do, Alex, I warn you. And the way we do this is keeping track of our task lists. So, we have 76 tasks, the IRT has, so I want to hear from you where you are on, I'm just kidding.

ALEX DEACON: No pressure.

DENNIS CHANG: I want a report every day. So there's a lot of things that we went through and why don't you talk to your colleagues there at the IRT friends and see how best to go about it. There's just a ton of stuff, but I can also work with you offline to bring you up to speed on terms of processes and whatnot. So, there's my offer.

Before I get started, I want to just let you all know, I apologize for not being able to conduct the meeting last time just before Thanksgiving. The family emergency was that my mother-in-law had passed in Korea and we got an urgent call and we took the next flight out and the family got together and saw her passing away in a hospital. And after that we had a traditional Korean funeral process that takes like days and days, which is another interesting story.

So that's what I've done, and I want to thank those who reached out to me, sending me notes of condolences and well wishes and I really appreciate all of you. So, I wanted to just get that out of the way so you all know and I didn't want to write an email because the IRT emails are precious to me and I use them very sparingly, and you probably note

---

that I do most of my work with collaborative documents and this IRT implementation working process is very different than the way the EPDP works. You will see that and, Alex, I'm interested in your comments after you've experienced this, how it works for you. So let's go.

I said that we're going to talk about the GAC advice and the Board Resolution. The Board Resolution was for the Thick WHOIS Policy and you can see the Thick WHOIS Policy, there is a new spot that we published and I can quickly, the way I usually go to our, hello, is something like this. Consensus policies are all here and our Thick WHOIS, I think this is it.

So, the way we treat the Board Resolution is by adding this new spot on the Thick WHOIS Transition Policy and it is verbatim what the Board Resolution is basically saying, that IRT will do its work and contractual compliance is deferred until we finish our work. So the IRT is addressed directly in the resolution, so I thought it was very important for you all to know that this is what is expected from the IRT. It doesn't change anything that we do, it basically says we have to do our work and they're waiting for us.

The other clarity is that there's confusion on this so this is very important for all of you to know, the policy is the policy and it hasn't changed. Nothing in this direction or resolution said this is no longer the policy, it still is the policy, the only thing that is done is deferring the contractual compliance so all the work we do, as we do them, is to know that this policy exists and that's how we're treated.

---

And of course the Reg 27 work, that study is going to do the research on how this policy is affected by our registration data policy, so that work is ongoing and we're hoping to get that report to you soon. So, that's a lot of work in itself, also. The timeline is this sheet here in our workbook, it's titled Timeline, and this is something that I showed you in Montreal and I added this note here, the GAC advises the Board, too.

So GAC's advice is to the Board, so let's make that clear, it's not to the IRT, GAC does not provide advice to the IRT or GNSO, but they advise the Board, that's their role, and the Board has not met to consider this advice yet and they will probably meet I think end of January is the next Board workshop. So that's the first time they will actually look at this advice and consider it and they will take action then, and we will get direction then. But for us, it's good for us to know what's going on and what they're basically saying is we should have a realistic schedule, which we're trying to get.

Now that we have sort of announced to the community the 29th of February is no longer feasible, so the obvious question is if that's the case, what is feasible and what are we working to, and that's what we would like to, we need to provide to the community. I know that making a commitment is difficult because we don't yet know everything that we should know and we haven't completely agreed on everything, and there's possibilities that the implementation will take different courses.

But given the current situation and the baseline that we're going to have very soon here, what would be a reasonable, or maybe not

---

reasonable, I think they asked for realistic schedule to complete this work? What would be a realistic schedule?

So I'm going to open up the conversation by focusing on this blue box, that is the implementation duration box that is a six month default. So, per our policy process, we use six months for implementation duration as a default. You can change and be shorter or longer based on some rationale. So, let me hear from the IRT on this duration. Go ahead, Jody.

JODY KOLKER:

Hi, thanks Dennis. This is Jody. So based on what I've seen so far without including the policies that will be changed I think in Req 27, we still have a ton of policies to go through to determine what needs to be changed there, but just based on what we have in the current OneDoc that that we have, we're talking about changing the amount of information that's sent in for contacts to the registry from the registrar and that's based on some IETF standards, some RFCs that are basically saying here's how much information has to be included with a contact.

Now, if both the registry and the registrar has to change and this RFC has to change, I can't see this being any less than nine months. A registry will have to change, they'll have to give a three month notice to the registrars that they have to change and the registries actually have to get that work done themselves. So I guess I would love to know from a thick registry or from a registry that supports contacts is how long is it going to take them to change their systems in order to require less contact information to be transmitted.

---

From a registrar's standpoint, we're only going to have 90 days to fix this and we're going to get an implementation notice from the registries and then we have 90 days to fix it. Now it might take us longer than that and we might have to work with the registries to determine how we can get this all done. Remember, we have 2000 registrars and I'm going to guess between 20 and 40 registries that will have to do this work. I think nine months is a minimum. I would expect it to take longer than that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: So, right back to you, Jody, if nine months is minimum what would you say is a realistic duration, then?

JODY KOLKER: Dennis, I guess I'd like to ask you, I mean we still have all those policies to work on, yet. Are those policies going to be included with this or are those policies going to take on a life of their own after we get this report done?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so the assumption, let's make sure that we establish our baseline assumption, the policy changes are going to take on their own life and GNSO is going to deal with them in their own GNSO way. So the assumption is that we are not going to wait for those policy changes for this policy to be effective, otherwise we will never get done. So that's the only way I think we can go forward. So let's all agree, that is the baseline assumption that we work from.

JODY KOLKER: Alright, well, if I start to work backwards I'll let Roger add on to this, I want to make sure that I'm not missing something here. If an RFC has to be changed, the RFC which some registries are very, they would like to follow the RFCs religiously, if the RFCs have to be opened up and changed, we're just talking about a year for the RFCs to be updated and for everyone to actually agree on it.

I have to let Roger speak to this, that might only be six months maybe that you can get that done, but that's really ramrodding it through there. If you would look at a year for RFCs and then let's just say it's six months for registries and registrars to get that done, that's a year and a half. Now, if you try to take the RFCs out of there, then I still see this taking nine months, at least.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you for that information, that's a data point that is good to have. I think the next person who wants to speak, let's see, is Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, this is Marc. I was going to make a pretty similar point as Jody. These EPDP recommendations are pretty broad reaching, the registries and registrars will have some process changes to make, some procedural changes to make, they'll also have some system changes to make. Some of those will have to do with RDAP output and how that's handled, but just agreeing with Jody, looking at all the things that have



---

to be done, the long pole in the tent looks like it would be the Interaction between registries and registrars on contacts.

So all the things that need to be done, looking through the policy recommendations I'd say that's the one that's going to take the longest. Jody did an excellent job spelling that out. Typically the registry would have to, hopefully we'll all have agreement on what RFCs need to change, what they will change to, and the registry will have to undertake the technical work.

At that point typically the registry would put it into a test environment, what we call a T&E, typically that would be done with a 30-day notice and then following that 30 days there would be, as Jody mentioned, there's another 90-day production, 90 days is minimum required by our contracts.

So, as Jody said, there is a chance it could be longer for registrars and require more than 90 days, but 90 days is sort of the minimum for the contract. But yeah, mostly my point was just to agree with Jody. I see that being the long pole, there is certainly work there that needs to be done, some of it technical, some of it process and procedure based, but that looks to be the most challenging piece.

DENNIS CHANG:

So, summarizing from what I gather from Jody, nine months is minimum and if the RFC has to change, then it will take a lot longer, maybe more than a year. I know something about RFCs and I know that I don't think I've ever seen an RFC done in a year, either.

---

But I also know that if we can agree to use the RFC as soon as a draft is published so we don't necessarily need to have the RFC completed, as long as we all agree that is what we're going to follow, so that's really up to us and we don't have to depend on the IETF to complete their work. So I'm sort of using that logic to see what the real work is.

Marc has a good comment about the interaction, so what I gather here first you have to have an agreement, then you have to do your technical work, then you have a 30-day notice, a 90-day minimum requirement, and all that, I don't know if in summary or just say nine months or are you suggesting more like 12 months when you combine all that? What do you think, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

It's hard to say without knowing exactly what the change is going to be. At this point I think Jody's point, if we plan for a minimum of nine months, that's probably a good placeholder until we have more information. So I don't want to box it into anything but I think Jody's minimum of nine months is probably a good starting point to work from.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, so from a project manager's point of view when I hear the team say minimum of nine months, and my boss asked what is a realistic schedule, I would say 12 months, right? So I think you're sort of leading me to that 12-month schedule, but I'd like to hear from others, so let's hear from Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks Dennis, this is Roger. I'll leave alone what everybody's talked about already, but some of the other issues that I think, and I'll just throw it out now so everybody hears it, I think you're right Dennis, I think 12 months is the realistic.

But people haven't touched on the fact yet that according to the current OneDoc we have to build in consent, as well, which I don't think anybody has done yet, I don't know if they've done it, I guess I don't know if anybody's built in consent for registrants and that alone has a lot of legal things that have to come up and be decided before the technology can be even done.

So I think as the OneDoc is written now, consent is also a fairly large add to it, because everyone will have to get the legal opinions and then actually start working on it. Along with, I assume because we've gone with this assumption, I think, Req 12 with the org field, I assume we're going to do this, it hasn't been decided, at least I haven't heard, it hasn't been completely decided from the GNSO Board, but we've gone on the assumption and I think the OneDoc actually has stuff in it for Req 12, but with new org, if you're accepting new org data you also have to provide a disclosure mechanism, so that you have to inform the person that's putting data in there that it may be disclosed and they have to accept and everything else.

So again, that process is going to bring up some more legal issues and then again the technical limitation after the legal issues. And then the last thing I had was on the SRSs for the registries, most registries that

---

require thick data require admin billing or admin tech and some billing, and that will have to change as well, so it's not just the EPDP but also the policy changes for the SRS on that. So like you mentioned, Dennis, I think the realistic is 12 months for this implementation phase. Thanks

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, there is chatting going, I haven't been paying attention but I think it's probably important so let me just pause and read the chat here. "What RFCs are we talking about? Yes the EPP RFC which ccTLDs always have a variation on." "We could establish that what is RFC-dependent what would be xxx days after updated RFC is published." "Regardless of agreement, ICANN would still put registries out of compliance for not following RFCs. That's a risk I'm not willing to take."

I'm not sure if I follow that logic. We don't want to put anybody at risk, that's not the purpose of the policy, the policy is just the opposite, right? We want to make sure we establish a policy so that we are all clear on how to get compliant with the policy. So there are some nuances there about how to work this out.

So I think let's see if we can, is it possible to separate the technical implementation work versus regulatory or legal or the other type of work? I'm not sure if that's possible, but if we are embedding RFC into the schedule. then of course we are creating a dependency on IETF and I don't think that is the reasonable thing for us to do. We're trying to minimize or delete or avoid any dependencies so that we can get this policy done.

---

So, that is a going-in assumption from my perspective, unless I'm proven otherwise. I'm not going to make the IETF work a dependent criteria for this policy implementation. So maybe we can talk about that more and maybe it can be an offline discussion. But, thank you for that comment, Rubens. Let's hear from that Beth Bacon.

BETH BACON:

Hi everyone, thanks Dennis. I think that this is a conversation that we're going to need to spend more time on certainly, how many people are on this call, 20 people on this call, the small number of those that are registries and registrars, we should probably go back and talk to all of our technical folks, like Roger and Jody, you are the technical folks.

But I think we should really take this as a homework piece simply because there's a lot of things in the temp spec that we should or already do have already implemented that are mirrored in the Phase I requirements, and yes, there are other certain things that are not, that will require some work. But I think that we should be very clear and less speculative about the work we're going to need to do as we talk about kicking this timeline out further and further, because I don't know if there's a person alive that doesn't want this done.

So I think also maybe something good to do is take the RFC thoughts and figure out some way to say we will comply with the RFCs as they change. I understand Jody, great point that some registries want to follow the letter and they want to use the RFC. I'm sure there's a way for us to work in flexibility in the language for them to evolve, because we don't have any control over the RFC timeline. ICANN doesn't, the

---

folks on this call don't, unless you participate in the IETF. So, it's out of our hands and I would be nervous with that in the timeline as a dependency.

And then also I thought, Dennis, you had mentioned that you guys were still redlining the policies. I'm also nervous about putting that in the timeline as a dependency, simply because we hadn't come to an agreement in Montreal other than ICANN still felt like you have to redline them and we said you probably don't need to redline them, that's the GNSO's job, we would just need to identify the ones and identify the parts where there might be implications.

So I think those two approaches would garner a lot different timelines, one would be a lot shorter, one would be a lot longer. So we could also decide on that and that would also be an important contribution to the timeline chat. But I do think that maybe we should take this as homework and come back with some concrete estimates.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Beth. The reason that I decided to take up the IRT meeting time for this discussion is that I did provide it as a homework and it was due, as you said, it's Task #74, and it was due in November, and I encourage you to provide input, but it hasn't been done, so I thought that this time would be well spent.

So what I want to do is gather as much as I can right now and we'll spend another maybe five minutes on this, and then we'll move to the OneDoc, because I recognize it's sort of a Catch-22, you can really do a timeline estimate if you don't have the policy, the requirement.

---

And what I am intending to do and push pretty hard to get this done is establish a baseline that we all are going to use as a baseline to do the timeline estimate and we're going to capture the assumptions along with it. So we do have a timeline based on these assumptions and this draft policy baseline is what we are going to have to do. And then as we make adjustments to the Policy language or the assumption, then of course we can adjust the timeline but we have to start somewhere.

So I know that there's three more people or maybe two more people with hands up on the timeline, so let me hear from them and I agree that I'm going to ask you to go back to your team and talk about the timeline or the implementation period and come back to me with your information and maybe we can do that online and then maybe next meeting we'll be looking at an adjusted timeline based on all of your input for maybe IRT to consider adopting it as a target timeline, or we can also decide we're not ready to have it adopted as our target timeline, so we can spend more time looking at it.

But, either way, I agree that it will require a great deal of thinking and I'm really appreciating what I'm hearing so far from all of you, so let's keep going, and I want to hear next from Alex. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks, Dennis, it's Alex. Yeah so I appreciate and understand the implementation complexities that will have to take place in this box that we're discussing here. I won't comment directly on that, I'll leave that to the experts in the room, i.e. the folks that will need to actually code and implement and test and deploy that. But I do want to make a few

---

comments in hopes that we could perhaps make a decision sooner rather than later with regard to some of the issues here.

So I just want to agree with Beth, one of the comments I wanted to make was one that I think she made, which is we have to remember that the delta between The temp spec and now is much smaller than the delta between prior to the temp spec and now. So I think we are on the path with regard to implementation with the current RFCs if you will, if that's really the sticking point, and so I think we just have to keep that in mind when we're thinking about this.

In terms of the dependencies in the RFCs it seems to me that we should be able to start now if we prioritize RFC-related work or RFC-impacted work now, we could start the long IETF update process sooner, rather than later, absolutely in parallel with the work that we're doing. And clearly the goal there is to have an internet draft which is pretty stable that people could start implementing to sooner rather than later.

And so if we were to do that, waiting for a final RFC to pop out the end may not be necessary, again I'm not 100% familiar about how this has been handled in the past. But it seems to me there are some efficiencies here that we could do in terms of prioritization to ensure that the dependencies on any changes to the RFCs are minimized and I'm hoping we could spend some time calling those out and adjusting the schedule accordingly. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Alex. Next is Theo, go ahead Theo.



THEO GEURTS: Thanks Dennis, and as a registrar I was already dealing with ccTLDs who have different requirements for certain contacts, most of them remove the contacts, it's a little bit of a funny thing to get that implemented and also we need to take care of our resellers so basically talking about a rewrite of your API, that's usually a lot of work.

So I propose two things here. I think it's best that contracted parties go back to their stakeholder groups sort of lay out two tracks, a technical track, get feedback on that, what are requirements, what do we see as an issue, and the other one you mentioned already is the legal aspect, how do we figure that out.

So the stakeholder groups respectively get their legal folks in and the technical folks in and everybody gets to shoot at it and see what we come up with for one registrar it will be easier, for another registrar it will be a complete nightmare because it will require a complete rewrite of their API, and maybe their front end also. So that's going to be a lot of work. So I think those two tracks a pretty important and I think we can pick it up at the contracted parties. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

THEO GEURTS: Oh, one more suggestion, by the way, Dennis, sorry to butt in on you. I don't think we can do that within a week, though. So if you want to talk about timelines and we want to get meaningful input from the

---

---

contracted parties, we need a little bit of time here to get that organized, set up some goals perhaps, and get as much feedback from every registrar or contracted party in the world, it's not just the North Americans and Europeans, I'm thinking more of a little bit of a broader engagement with stakeholder groups itself so we get meaningful input. So we need some time there. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, our next meeting is in two weeks. What do you think about two weeks? I think you should try to get something within two weeks. And we want to look at this again in our next IRT meeting, and hopefully then you would have done your homework and we can have more of a meaningful discussion.

So, thank you for that and we will go ahead and conclude our timeline discussion here. And please, please, I will go ahead and remind you of the task here on 74 that you already have, I'm not going to assign another task, I'm just going to send you another reminder, but please, complete your homework on 74. Roger, you have your hand raised, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Dennis, this is Roger. I just wanted to ask on the timeline piece and not get off the implementation, but after we update policy language based on comments, I guess, the mustard color one, I'm not sure what color you would call that, but it looks like at the end of August, is there a process that this has to go through to get approval from the GNSO or the Board or anybody like that?

DENNIS CHANG: No.

ROGER CARNEY: So as soon as we're done with this language we can make it enforceable?

DENNIS CHANG: So, it's up to us. This is the team, we are the team that is actually going to approve this policy based on the public comment that we will receive, and I'm sure we will receive a lot of it, and we'll have to go through and it will take us a while because we're going to hear things that we haven't heard before because this it will be the first time that the public sees it.

So we will have different thoughts and it could change a lot of things and based on that we could actually change the timeline as well, but we have to go out to public comment with a timeline so they can all see what the policy effective date that we're proposing is very important for them. And after we get, it's up to us to be satisfied when we have a good policy language and we're the ones who will be publishing it.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, thank you.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Now of course we have a GNSO Council liaison, you guys all have your stakeholder group and you will be communicating so it should not come as a surprise to anyone. So let's just make that clear. But process wise there's no extra step. Thank you. Okay, let's go look at our OneDoc.

BETH BACON: Dennis, one last question because, you know, we all like talking about timelines so much. So, are we going to put any rough estimate dates around the open public comment and policy announcement that might help us walk back a little bit? Do you guys have any feelings about how long that's going to take?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I was kind of using this right here, 03/01/2020 is what I was using as a policy publication Public Comment open date. I don't know whether I talked to you about this, but I've been thinking, and thinking, and thinking, what should be our goal. And everything of course depends on when we open public comment, that's our first milestone.

And I know that it's difficult but from where I stand I think that it's very important for us to open the public comment before our ICANN meeting. I know we're going to have IRT meetings because there's lots of work to do, but it really would be good to have a public comment open so that people see the draft language and see our policy implementation plan, so when we have our IRT meetings we may get some more fruitful questions that we clarify to the public before they go ahead and submit all their public comments to us.

---

And then of course 02/29/2020 date is so important to everyone, to the community, I know that they will be disappointed that we didn't make that, but I think for them to see a draft policy that they can consider would help them a lot. So that's what you see when I have this in the yellow box at the end of February, what I'm proposing to you is that we go for a completion of the draft policy language and the draft DPAs and any red lines of the existing doc that we may need.

I know that we haven't decided this but I am working in parallel with our team to submit a proposal to the IRT that I think this is the right thing to do. But either way, that is not the pacing item. If we don't have to do something it doesn't extend the timeline but just in case we are preparing and we're doing things so that timeline can be kept, even if we have the URS red line as a requirement. Does that make sense?

BETH BACON:

Yeah, that's super helpful, I just wanted to clarify if this was kind of a guesstimate on the February March or if it was the target, and I think it's helpful to know that it's the target. As much as I enjoy being chum in the water at an ICANN meeting, I do think it's helpful to have people have the opportunity for them to ask questions and actually go to an IRT meeting before they submit their comments. So, I think that's reasonable, so let's see how that goes.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, think about it, we'll talk about it more at our next meeting. So this workbook is super helpful, I use it for a lot of stuff, but one of the things that I do use it for is dates and calculating the days. As you can

---

see, if I use March 1st as the open date, 54 days later which I get by adding 40 minimum days plus seven days, plus seven days, because I recognize we have an ICANN meeting in the midst of that here in March and then we have a TDD summit in the midst of that in May. So, I'm trying to kind of consider both of those things.

But we can adjust it and we can adjust the exact date but conceptually our first goal is to go for a public comment opening in February. So I want all of us to be aligned in trying to make that goal. Does anybody have a strong objection or see a reason why we can't do this? This would be a good time for you to talk. If not, we'll talk about it next time. So do your homework and we'll get together in a couple of weeks and have a more detailed discussion then.

Let's go to OneDoc. So, OneDoc you probably noticed, those of you who have been making comments that I've been doing a lot of work and going through and trying to resolve comments and respond to you and some things I accepted, some things I rejected, just because I reject your comment or your suggestion, that does not mean that I did not incorporate your suggestion. There are cases where I have added the language that you were suggesting but in a different section.

So, to do that, I have to reject your suggestion and that may not be terribly obvious to you but I've been trying to reply to your suggestion as I do my update. So what am I doing is trying to establish a clean baseline language. We need a clean baseline language so that we can use it for a reference to do timeline, number one, because when you tell your engineer I want an estimate, they're going to say, where the requirement, and you have to give them a requirement and it's only fair

---

---

that you give them a clean set of language, so that's the first thing we're trying to achieve.

The other thing that I'm trying to achieve now is to identify where those IRT splits are, in other words unresolved requirement items. We are getting to a point where I want to stop talking about the file, the language, the spelling, the grammar, efficiencies of the language. So right now my focus is getting clarity on the requirements and the IRT's objection or agreement on the way the requirement is stated. That's where the focus is.

So, like I wrote my email yesterday to try to communicate that earlier to you, we're going to switch off the suggestion mode so you are not able to, let me tell you about it, let's go to, things like this, right now Jody or somebody has deleted this, I will turn this feature off so you cannot actually do the red line, but you can only do comment and make a suggestion. I suggest that you delete the section, is what you can comment on, but this will not be permissible like this edition, like this edition that you're doing, this will no longer be permissible from tomorrow.

So with that in mind, I want to focus on those items that you wanted to discuss with the IRT. So let's pick our first one, I'm not necessarily going to go in order because we have limited time. So as you can see we've cleaned it up quite a bit and the scope and definition I've accepted probably almost all of your comments and there really doesn't need to be a discussion.

---

And then some of the comments I have not, oh, here is an important one. Whenever there is a "may, must" language change, that's a critical requirement change so this is the kind of thing that I'm looking for. If you're looking for a change that says "must" have to change to "may," that's a requirement change and if you feel that is the way that we have to be compliant with the recommendation this is what we need to know.

So, Sarah here has changed the "must" with a "may" and that's a requirement change and I see Amanda's comment here, that we added "where applicable" to indicate that the agreement between each of these parties might not be necessary, so it says can you please explain your suggestion to change "must" to "may." So, is Sarah on? Sarah, would you mind?

SARAH WYLD:

Yes, thank you, hi, this is Sarah. I am here. I think for that particular change the "where applicable" does resolve my concern. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent, thank you for the suggestion and that's excellent.

SARAH WYLD:

Dennis, did you want to change that from "must" to "may?"



---

DENNIS CHANG: No. I pressed the wrong button. Thanks for watching out for me. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks Dennis, this is Marc. I don't want to nit pick here, but if you're using "must" and then saying where applicable, you're really watering down the meaning of "must." I don't want to nit pick how you're writing it, but I think the "must" where applicable isn't "must," and so "must" loses meaning as you're writing this.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand, Marc, the requirement language choices are, so let me explain. Requirement language choices are this, "must," "must, if", and "may," so you can kind of think about it as those three categories. As soon as you say "may," then it becomes optional, it's not a requirement that you have to do something. You give the implementers to do whatever they want to do, that's "may." So we have to be very clear when we say "may" because the engineers when they come across the word, "may," they're going to say oh., I guess it's up to me if I want to do this or not.

"Must" is a key word that they look for, so as I said, "must" means you've got to do it no matter what, no condition, no question, we all have to do it. "Must, if" is a conditional requirement that if the condition is satisfied then you do this, that's typical programming logic too, that some requirements are conditional, some are not, and that's the differentiation that we're trying to create and you will see that

---

throughout and that's the way we are attempting to communicate to all of you.

So, if you would follow me in using that interpretation of "must," "must, if", and "may," because between the choice of "must" and "may" we're saying that this is a "must" and it cannot be "may." So if it is a "must" then is it always a "must?" No, it's a "must, if" that there is a conditional condition that needs to be satisfied, and this term, this is what you're asking and I think Sarah is confused, is unclear, so let me try to explain.

Okay, I should change it to "must," and then so the credit registrar must enter into the processing term, this was a recommendation that we have to do this and then "where applicable" is a term that I think we added for a reason and then the term includes the legal basis for processing.

So, this is a key element of the requirement that we have to come together on. You have not seen this, but there is a document called Data Processing Terms and there's a subset of a small group of contracted parties is working together and working with the ICANN Org folks in parallel trying to get this term document done. Maybe this is a good time for someone from that team to talk about what it is, what is envisioned, and how it's going to be done and how that's going to help this policy. Go ahead, Beth. Beth is on the team, right? Go ahead Beth.

BETH BACON:

I can't believe you don't feel my presence enough that you're not sure that I'm on that team, Dennis, it hurts me.

DENNIS CHANG: I think you're leading the team.

BETH BACON: Alright, so I just actually had my hand up for another thing but I'm happy to talk about this just for a second. I'm going to start with saying that I'm sure I might light people's hair on fire, I'm not even sure we need this introductory paragraph, because the data processing entering into data processing terms, agreements, whatever want to call it, is already required by Recommendation 28, and you have to enter into data processing terms with ICANN and then registries and registrars already have required data processing terms that we've already entered into. We have them as an addendum to the RAA.

So the process for this right now is that we are trying to nail down a time to follow up from our Montreal meetings with ICANN, we're having a little trouble getting us all together. ICANN actually has a homework assignment to propose to the contracted parties two to three ways that we can operationalize an actual data processing terms and whether that's as a separate amendment to the contract, if it's part of the consensus policy, how do we make this part of the contract, because we have to do that.

But there's a lot of different ways that we could go about it. So that's kind of a sticky wicket on that one. But for this particular paragraph, we are already required to do this, it's going to be part of consensus policy in the recommendations, so I'm not sure why we're doing this paragraph other than I know that we did it to make folks feel more

---

comfortable that there are going to be data processing terms, but there are going to be data processing terms.

With regards to the terms include the legal basis I think if we keep the previous sentence but get rid of that sentence I think that's fine because it's 100% redundant because all data processing terms would have to have the legal bases and we just went through EPP Phase I where we described the purposes and the legal bases for transfer and collection.

So putting that in there seems super redundant to me. If you guys have questions and want to talk more about the data processing terms we can, but that's just where we are now, we're just kind of figuring out what's the best way to operationalize that requirement of the recommendation and then we just sort of have to write them.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Beth, I hope that was helpful to everyone The sentence I understand it is redundant, but we added that on purpose because the IRT members desire to see that the legal basis in many different sections and we know that it's going to be in the DPA, but it's not clear because it doesn't actually say that, so we thought that by adding this sentence it will be clear to everyone.

And I'm going to give you another approach here. As we head towards public comment I would rather have more language than less language if it's going to make it clear because I am positive if we don't have the legal basis word in this section somebody is going to comment that the legal basis must appear somewhere. So that's the reason.

---

Sarah and Marc, is that understandable now what that sentence means? I know that you're looking for the legal basis in the policy language and this is basically telling you don't look for it because it's in the DPA. Who's next, Sara?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you, yes, hi, this is Sarah. Honestly my question about that specific sentence was just more related to the syntax and grammar like it was a weirdly phrased sentence to me. This discussion has been very helpful I think I would be comfortable with not having this Section 5, as long as we have it in the appropriate sections lower down in the document, so in the sections about collecting data or transferring data, especially the part where we've been talking in the comments about transfer from registrar to registry, it needs to say there that that transfer is dependent on the legal basis and DPA in place. So I think that's the more appropriate place for it. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for that input. Any other comments? Beth, did you want to speak again?

BETH BACON:

Sarah did it better than I could have. I liked it very much. I think that as long as we have it somewhere, that's fine. I just think we don't have to have it everywhere. At some point we're going to have to trust each other a teeny and realize that we do have this Requirement 28, you

---

have to have the agreements, this is dead in the water if we don't have agreements.

DENNIS CHANG: Right, right, yeah, understood. Thank you so much. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks Dennis, this is Marc. I agree with the points Beth and Sarah made, I don't want to belabor the point. I think this structure of this sentence is just sort of confusing to me, the terms include legal basis for processing detail the registration data like it's referring to a document that doesn't exist yet. As Beth stated this is a document that's in progress and being worked on.

So I'm not sure, I have no idea what this sentence is trying to accomplish. Is it trying to make a statement of fact about a document that doesn't exist yet, or is it trying to create a requirement? I don't know what it's trying to accomplish and maybe I think Beth's and Sarah's previous points cover my concerns. But my concern is really I don't know what the sentence means.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, it is pointing to a document that you haven't seen and that's part of the problem, and I'm thinking that when you see this document maybe it will be clear to you then. But where is the legal basis in this whole policy is in this document that we're pointing to. So, that is the intent of the sentence and that's what we were trying to communicate.

---

Let's close this Section 5, and we're going to move on. Marc, go ahead, you don't want to move on.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I'm sorry, I just want to make sure I understand that correctly. Are you saying the legal basis is the data processing terms?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. It's in there, in that document, that's where they belong and that's where you can find them. If you're looking for it, you won't find it on this policy. There was a suggestion at one time we were debating whether we should include the legal basis in this policy language document and we decided no, it doesn't belong here, it should be in the DPA, the terms document. Again, I know, I understand, we're trying to have a conversation about a document that we haven't seen so I don't think it's a fruitful discussion, so I ask you to wait until its produced to you.

MARC ANDERSON: So Dennis, if that's what you're trying to say in this sentence, you're saying the legal bases aren't captured here in the policy, they're captured in the data processing terms, can we just say that? That's understandable. The sentence as it's written now, I don't understand it.

DENNIS CHANG: The English language, I understand, okay, let me take that input and I think you're asking me to rephrase it so that it's basically clear with the

---

same meaning. I understand your request. Okay, are going to 9.32, 9.32 is the section that we want to talk about because I think that's where we have requests from Sarah to discuss with the team.

Okay, so let's make sure that we understand where we are; 9 is the publication section, and 9.1 is the minimum data requirement, and 9.2 is additional, and 9.3 is redaction, and redaction has been included in the publication now and under the redaction we are talking about where registrar redacts the value of the data elements listed in the section above, registrar must provide an opportunity to provide a consent to publish. So what is the discussion that you're requesting to have, Sarah? Go ahead, do you want to speak? Or Roger, maybe?

SARAH WYLD: I would defer to Roger on this please.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Roger? No comment? Okay, Roger said, sorry, I did not hear. Okay, Roger, I don't know if you are looking at the document, is Roger on the document? Yeah, you are. You see that I'm looking at 9.32, and here Sarah wanted to have a discussion on your comment. Odontoid you see it?

JODY KOLKER: This is Jody, Roger is having problems with his internet right now.



---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I got you, okay.

JODY KOLKER: But I think I can fill in what he was trying to say here. On the temp spec and also I believe in the recommendations it says registrar must provide the opportunity as soon as commercially feasible, and that's been taken away, or reasonable, I should say. And what he was asking was why can't we put that back in here?

DENNIS CHANG: Well the reason is simple, we are right now working on implementation and we will take that into account what commercially reasonable is and that's what the timeline is for. That's why we are having that discussion of nine months or 12 months, so you will have to tell us what's reasonable and that word is taken out of the language because by the time when this become a policy and it's effective it's a requirement that you have to do this, period, that's the intent. That's why that language was removed. Does that make sense?

JODY KOLKER: It does make sense Dennis, and then that's something that we have to really put into that timeline then, is to consider how long it's going to take all registrars to do that.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh yeah, that's why I keep hammering on you guys to make sure that you think about everything when you're considering the duration of the

---

implementation. Sarah, does that makes sense now? Okay, let's continue. So the next item Jody, did you delete this whole section?

JODY KOLKER:

This is Jody, again. I didn't delete it, somebody must have, obviously. No, I just added the question of adding this in here, it's a "may", whether it's in here or not, it wasn't something that is in the recommendations at all, so I don't feel comfortable adding it in here.

If we are going to add this in here, we can put any number of "mays" in here, like registrars may offer hosting, registrars may offer the admin contact, registrars may offer to have a billing contact, registrars may offer to have the contact of your mother in law if you want to, or your mom or anything else. So we could we could fill this whole document with a bunch of mays.

DENNIS CHANG:

That's a good point, I understand your point. This is a good point. The reason that this was added was because I think it was Marc, I don't know if you recall, he was proposing that this technical data is very important in the operation and he wanted to make it clear that there is no policy here that prohibits from doing this That's why I think he suggested adding it and I personally don't mind adding it especially for the public comment purposes, but I take your point. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD:

Yes thank you, this is Sarah. I just want to support Jody's suggestion here. If our job is to implement the recommendations the tech contact

---

consent is not part of the recommendation so we should not add it in here. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. So Sarah, I don't know if you were involved in that discussion with Marc when he went through an extensive effort to provide us right now where he did say that the tech data is needed and we can do this and recommendation does not prohibit us from having this data. So let's listen to Alex next.

ALEX DEACON:

Yeah, thanks. I just re-read Req 6 and I agree that it doesn't explicitly say or mention tech contact, but it doesn't rule out that it can't be made or consent can't be given as part of consent to publish redacted contact information, I think the technical contacts which are allowed, they're optional but they are allowed, should fall underneath that that little part of the sentence, redacted contact information.

If I remember, the conversations that we had in the policy setting way back when, I thought we spent a lot of time on tech contact, we pared it down, there was a lot of discussion about the usefulness for some organizations to continue to use tech contact, and it was my assumption that we made it optional to allow for those organizations to enter it. And if that's the case, they should have the ability to have it published under their consent. So, I would be wary if we decided to not cover this in in some means, in some way. It seems to me that it would leave out an important part of what was discussed in the policy settings. Thanks.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that, Alex. Really helpful. And so, let's see. Anybody else on this? No?

Okay, thank you for that input and then we are... okay, so we're going to move on.

ANDREA GLANDON: 10.2.

DENNIS CHANG: 10.2 is the next section that [CROSSTALK] This one here? Flag for discussion as a team. Okay, Sarah. You want to talk about this one? Maybe you should introduce the topic. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Sure. I mean, I'd be happy to, but I'm not the one who had a concern with the original language. I don't --

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

SARAH WYLD: If Lauren's on the call, I'm happy to let her talk first, and then I can speak my mind after, if that's preferable.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's fine. Lauren, are you there? [AUDIO BREAK]

SARAH WYLD: Okay, so in that case, I'll just jump back in for one moment. This is Sarah, again. I think the current language is just fine. Publicly accessible section is clear enough, and I don't think anything else is needed there. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I agree. So, let's then move on. Oh, is this a problem? Somebody who is... Oh, I'm sorry?

ANDREA GLANDON: Lauren is there.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, Lauren is here. Go ahead, Lauren.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I seem to have been on mute. Can people hear me now?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, we can.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, so what my question was, and I'm well aware that Sarah doesn't have a problem with the language, but I do, and what is meant by publicly accessible. And the reason I raised the issue is that I have been informed, and I have also done some rudimentary due diligence myself. Publicly accessible is unclear to me. And I think what we really want to get to is something that is easy to find.

And when law enforcement currently is trying to find out, basically even how they're supposed to make these WHOIS requests, it is not always clear on register our website how to do so, where to do so, where you can click. And you may have some hard-to-find path 10 pages down, link to link to link, that is literally publicly accessible, but in practical terms is useless because it's hard to find.

So that was my comment here about publicly accessible. It's not enough to be accessible. It has to be actually practically clear and conspicuous so that someone wanting to make this request actually knows where to go to do so. So, that's the issue I'm raising.

DENNIS CHANG:

I understand now. Thank you for that explanation. Yes, we've had similar experience where we had to chase the trail of links 10 times to get to, finally, an information. It is publicly accessible, but pretty hard to find, and you're suggesting that we establish a policy that is easier. Make it a little more easier to find, so it's not hidden unintentionally, if that's the case.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Right. Right.

DENNIS CHANG:

So, I'm going to take your input, and we'll -- go ahead. Okay. Sarah has a comment. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yes, I'm definitely sympathetic to those concerns. I think it's very important that this information is genuinely, reasonably available. Yes. I would mention a couple of things. So, in the GDPR specifically, there are requirements around -- you can't have things be buried. Things have to be explicit. Things have to be clear. So, that's something that we can point to as a requirement that we will have to follow to make this less of a concern, hopefully.

But also, of course, we should look back at what the recommendation says, And I believe what it says is "accessible." I'm wary about nitpicking. Like I think this is just getting too specific, but we could look at changing it to something like "clearly displayed in a reasonably, available place." I think that's basically the same as publicly accessible, but maybe a bit more clear.

And my final thing I just want to add is that there are very similar texts already in several different consensus policies that we could look at aligning with. So, for example, the expired registration recovery policy uses the words "reasonably available or clearly displayed on the registrar's website."

---

And then, the registry agreement, for example, has just things like "provide a link on the primary website" or "publish on its website." So, I think there is precedent that this type of language is already applicable or is already sufficient. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Lauren?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Am I off mute? There we go.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, you are. Go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so, I appreciate Sarah's input there, especially when she's talking about something that's clearly and reasonably available. And I think that would definitely be a vast improvement, and I'm certainly willing to look at language that is currently in existence.

My concern is a very practical one, that people just need to be able to find it and shouldn't have to be going on a search. And I'm not assuming any bad intent here. I think, likely, it's an omission. But if it is, it's one that needs to be remedied. So, happy to look at other language that's been used that would ensure that something is clearly made available in a way that people can easily find it.



---

DENNIS CHANG: Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thank you. Susan Kawaguchi, for the record. Obviously, I'm in agreement with lowering -- there's a lot of policies and a lot of requirements that are hard to enforce right now, and I think this is not clear just being publicly accessible, and Laureen has given examples where it's been very, very hard. I mean, there are requirements right now that other things are accessible, but unless you know the secret codes, you can't find them. And I'm not sure that there's any bad intent, either.

But when you spend 15-20 minutes on a website, and these are not registrars that show up at ICANN that I have this problem with. But when I am looking for language or information on a registrar's website and it takes me 15-20 minutes and then I give up, that's not helpful. But going to ICANN compliance and saying, "Hey, they're not in compliance here," and then they send a secret link to ICANN compliance and say, "Oh no, they are right here. Here it is."

We want to make sure that anyone can find this, especially law enforcement, obviously, but also that that is maintained and it always works. Because you see links to things right now that don't work on some registrar website. This probably wouldn't apply to the larger registrars, but it definitely applies to smaller registrars that don't deal with the public that much. So, I think we need to make this a little bit more well-defined so that when there is a compliance action surrounding this, compliance has clear instructions on what's required.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Susan. I'll take the action to go ahead and work some language in on our next position. We take your point. And let's move on to -- oh, Diane has a comment. Can you?

DIANE PLAUT: Sure. Hi, Dennis, how are you?

DENNIS CHANG: All right, how are you?

DIANE PLAUT: Doing well. I wanted to say that both Lori and Susan's points are really poignant and important because this is a very standard legal guideline. The FTC has a standard called "clear and conspicuous." And this is a legal definition that's well recognized and would be very well suited for this situation so that there is no lack of clarity around what the standard is, or what compliance has to concern itself with. We could easily use the terminology "clear and conspicuous" and have a footnote that says, "as defined by the FTC."

And this was developed because of these exact issues in web advertisement and in disclosure standards in relation to social media platforms and web platforms specifically. So, this legal standard is defined and is important. And as it's broken down by the FTC, it involves the placement and proximity where this would be located.

---

So, it's placed in a place where consumers can see it, it's prominent, that it's not a distraction or buried, that it's repetition in the fact that it always comes up on the website and in the same place all of the time, that there's a sufficient opportunity to view it, and that the language is simple and straightforward. So, this is a legal standard, and so that I think that this is the absolute most appropriate language to use in this context. I'm happy to --

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you very much.

DIANE PLAUT: Legal definitions needed in relation to making it a footnote If we write clear and commercially visible and clear and conspicuous.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Diane. That was very helpful. So, I captured a note. We'll work on that, and let's move to our next topic. Oh, Beth? Do you have a hand up? You want to talk about this?

BETH BACON: I sure do.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

---

BETH BACON:

All right, thank you guys very much. Diane, I agree that clear and conspicuous is very well understood. I also think it's very analogous to the requirements of GDPR where things cannot be buried. They must be prominent, I think, is the word that's permanently located or clearly located. But I think if we can find a marriage of that, I don't think that we would have a problem with just saying it's accessible.

I think we're splitting a lot of hairs, and I know that it's a problem for a smaller group of registrars, just from what Laureen and folks are saying. But I think if we can find a marriage of these two types of languages, then sure. I'm not comfortable putting a footnote to an FTC definition in a consensus policy. I don't think that we should tie this to that sort of enforcement, perhaps, or even just saying that we're mixing our enforcements.

This is for GDPR right now. This is what the impetus was, understanding there's FTC as the enforcement for privacy in the US. I wouldn't be comfortable with a footnote. I don't have a problem with necessarily the language. Thanks, guys. But Diane, I 100% get your point, and I agree that it makes sense.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, yeah. That's a good comment, Beth. Yeah, I was thinking along the same way you were. So, let's move on to our next topic, which is section --

ANDREA GLANDON:

10.

---

DENNIS CHANG: 10.

ANDREA GLANDON: 10.5.

DENNIS CHANG: 10.5.

ANDREA GLANDON: [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Where? Identify by... Oh, this one. Okay, this is a comment. Let's see. Sarah added this phrase and Laureen was asking about this and -- let's see. Did you want to discuss it?

Okay, Sarah. Oh, I see your comments, Sarah. Let's discuss that at next call. I see Sarah's flagging to discuss this one. So, you want to talk or kick it off, Sarah? This discussion? Or Laureen?

SARA WYLD: Sure, thank you.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Okay, thank you. This isn't included. This is suggested to be included because I think it's really important to recognize that not every law enforcement agent will be able to identify appropriately what is an urgent request. I have an example, actually, which is that we're getting a lot of emails from somebody who claims to be a law enforcement agent from Nigeria, requiring that we take down some domain names. And we are not able to verify his status as a law enforcement agent.

So, part of why I think this is important, is just to indicate that the ability to make such an urgent request is limited to a law enforcement agent that we can verify and that we can understand does have some level of control over us, or some jurisdiction.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's see who -- Diane has a hands up. [AUDIO BREAK]

Did you want to speak, Diane? Or Lauren?

DIANE PLAUT: No, sorry. It was an old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Lauren.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yes. So, my first comment was that this restriction wasn't in the policy. And while I understand you may be getting these requests and that you have an obligation to make sure that they're bonafide requests, I don't think we need this restriction in order for you to engage in that inquiry, particularly because we have this language about a reasonable request for lawful disclosure, which has some other identifying characteristics.

But I think my main point is that you're adding a limitation here that wasn't included in the original recommendation, and that you very well may get requests outside of the jurisdiction, but that doesn't mean that you aren't going to be able to verify that they're legitimate requests. So, those are my observations here.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Lauren. We have a couple of minutes left, so I want to go ahead and ask a question. Are there any burning issues that you do want to talk about? Because from here, I sort of want to take charge and move strongly toward a baseline with our team here. I think this is most important that the IPC, the team that's surrounding me right now, understands all of your input. So, your role as an IRT is to provide your input, and we're going to use your input to adjust the baseline.

But a baseline will be set to a clear language without any confusion as much as we can. Not everybody will like it, I have to guarantee that, because there are going to be a disagreement on some of the IRT. Remember, one IRT could disagree. One IRT member can still disagree, even though everybody else agrees. So, if you do see a disagreement, if you do see a misalignment is what I called it, right? Misalignment of the

---

policy-based language to the recommendation, that is the important thing.

From here, I would like you to think in those terms. When you see a baseline language, ask yourself, "Is this misaligned with a recommendation?" And you must point that out to us very clearly to everyone, so we know that your interpretation is different than the other IRT's interpretation. If you agree with the baseline, you don't have to say anything, of course. But if you do note the misalignment with a recommendation, please note them using comments only.

No more suggestions or suggested changes are acceptable. You can make your suggested change using the comments, saying, "I suggest changing this language to this language." You can do that, and that's acceptable. But we will have a clean baseline that we're going to work with from now on, and we're going to highlight those areas of where we have an IRT split. That's what I'm going to use, the word IRT split. So, where are the IRT split areas? Do we have a dozen of them, or do we have three of them? We need to know that first.

And then, next meeting, I want to really have a substantive discussion on trying to resolve those disagreements or misalignments or IRT split ones. So, try to get the IRT to all agree on one interpretation and one set of language. And just to tell you that it is possible that we may not be able to resolve all of it. And it's also possible that we will be able to resolve all of it if we spend more time, right, and how much time do we spend to try and resolve an item. But if we cannot, and if it's obvious to all the IRT that we cannot resolve an issue or disagreement, then we have to escalate.



---

That escalation point is GNSO, of course. And the way that works is that the IRT agrees that this topic cannot be resolved within the IRT and, therefore, we want to escalate. And I will work with GNSO liaisons to determine how we'll do that. So, that's the process. So, thank you for your participation. Don't forget your homework on the timeline and the policy language to change. You have... Let's see. Somebody wants to speak. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Yeah. Sorry, my hands up for a while. So, I appreciate very much that you're trying to move us along to a clean document, but there is an enormous amount of comments and questions. We discussed two or three issues on this call, and I don't think, resolved any of them. So, I'm concerned that we haven't gone through this and made any resolution quite yet. And I'm not saying we shouldn't move along.

What I maybe am suggesting is, I mean, certainly you guys will make note of all of the outstanding questions, but how are you going to determine... Like, we just talked for three minutes about this one section, 10.5. We didn't come to a resolution simply because we ran out of time. But how are you going to decide which language you put in there? And then, we're going to have to just talk about it again when we have a cleaner version.

So, what I'm maybe suggesting is, I don't think that we should have more meetings all the time, but maybe we have one more meeting, maybe in our interim week, on the current red line and we continue to make some work and maybe try and resolve this in comments amongst

---

ourselves as well. You know, we don't always have to just say, "No, no, no." We can actually come to a resolution, but maybe we do one more meeting to go through this document, just because there's a lot of red. It looks like a clown is bleeding.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I hear you. The proposal is on the table, but Beth, yeah, we're running out of time. So, proposal is on the table. I'm good with having one more meeting next week, same time. Any objections? [AUDIO BREAK]

No objections. Okay. Decision made. Thank you for the suggestion, Beth. We are going to do that, and then, Andrea, if you wouldn't mind, please call on an extra session next week and an interim... I'm sorry?

ANDREA GLANDON: I think there's a conflict.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: With what?

ANDREA GLANDON: I think the [inaudible]

---

DENNIS CHANG: Beth is the leader of the... So, Beth?

BETH BACON: How about we just schedule it?

DENNIS CHANG: You proposed it, I accepted it, and so let's go.

BETH BACON: Wait, wait, wait wait. Wait. Wait. So, we do --

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I'm waiting. I'm waiting.

BETH BACON: Would folks object to just doing a one-hour meeting, like an hour before this?

DENNIS CHANG: I'm sorry?

BETH BACON: We'd do it before the meeting, and we'd do it a little earlier.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, you're proposing a different time.

BETH BACON: We can't cancel the other one because that's doing the roles and responsibilities, and we need the data protection terms. We don't want to cancel that one.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah. Just do a Doodle poll.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I think somebody's suggesting that we do a Doodle poll.

BETH BACON: Okay. Sorry, I'm a lot of work.

DENNIS CHANG? Yeah. Okay, guys, we're going to do a Doodle poll and see what we can do. And Beth, make sure that you let me know what you cannot do because you're an important part of the...

BETH BACON: You guys can probably just make it through without me. Probably.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you all. We'll try to have another meeting convene next week for everyone. 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]