
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting, held on Wednesday, the 18th 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.

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 over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome, everyone. Welcome to our meeting #16. This will be the final meeting for 2019. We have a lot to cover, so let's get to it.

First we have a new IRT member, so we'll have an introduction there. Then we're going to go over the data map, which you've had [assigned]. We haven't reviewed that, but I'll present it and explain what that is meant to do. And implementation [method] is something I just assigned this morning very briefly because I think it'll help in describing what we're trying to do in the doc map. And IRT comments: we're going to go over that again one more time, probably highlighting some of the areas that maybe didn't come through last time. We spent some time looking at timelines, specifically Sarah's input. Sarah and her team have done a lot of work in producing the task list and a high-level estimate. So we'll

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.

look at that, and then we have [inaudible] comment that are ready to resolve. Now, what I've tried to do is demonstrate how we do the work in the background. This will help you understand how we make decisions and how we resolve thing. Of course, there's comments that are tagged for team discussion, and then we'll talk about the next steps.

Next is the introduction. Let's see. Matthias? Is he here? Speak up if—

ANDREA GLANDON:

It doesn't look like he's on.

DENNIS CHANG:

Oh, he hasn't joined? Okay. As you all know, we have a new member. So our membership has grown to 38. So, when he joins, we'll have him introduce himself.

Let's get to it. The first thing is the doc map. I call it the doc map or documentation map. This is designed to facilitate your understanding of exactly what we are delivering and when we are delivering. So it's two-fold.

The first that that I wanted to show is, as we head toward the public comment, which is on the top right of the purple in color, what I call the public comment form. This is something that you're all familiar with. This is what you see when you open public comment: the document that you see. That's what we have to put together. We haven't done this yet. We have a template being formed right now. We're [inaudible], but you will review this as the IRT.

Within that are things that are not in the One Doc: the things that we don't have a policy language for but we have an implementation plan. How we'll do that is described in that public comment form.

With a public consensus policy language, the One Doc will have a couple of attachments. One is the data elements matrix. We haven't reviewed that in a while, but we'll clean that up and make it public-consumable. Then we have the draft DPA for contracted parties. So that's what we're going to go to public comment with.

Now, as you see in the orange boxes, those are IRT workbook, documents like this, the doc map, and analysis report of the 29 analysis documents, study reports, and study plan. All those are working documents that do not go to public comment. Those are for us.

Now, when we go and do the announcement with the legal notice, those two blue boxes on the bottom right – data protection agreement and documents and web pages notated as what I call [news boxes]; I'll tell you more about that – have to be completed. That's why they are in blue. So they don't go to public comment, but, when we publish the policy, they must be completed.

So that's the intent of this doc map. I hope it's helpful. Any questions on this? You see my comment on the right where I describe what the blue and orange boxes are for your reference. So I'll pause here and see if you have any questions.

Marc, go ahead. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. Thanks. I'm just wondering. One of the things you've talked a bit about is what happens in cases where there's disagreement within the IRT. You talked about the GNSO Council being the escalation [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We'll talk about that in the comment guide. That's coming up on the agenda. Let me show you. You want to talk about it now or can you hold until we get there?

MARC ANDERSON: I guess I can wait. I was just wondering how it could fit into this document map because—

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible] IRT comment guide, yeah. That's actually an interesting point. We may have to produce other documents. Let me talk about this now. It's actually [inaudible]. I believe that we will have to produce what I call baseline rationale documents. Whenever there's a particular issue that there's conflicting inputs we are receiving on, we will put together a separate document per topic. I call that the baseline rationale document. It will contain the two different interpretations, if you will, side by side, so that all members of the IRT are clear on the two different positions and which position is going into the baseline and the rationale that they're of. This particular document can be used by the GNSO Council liaison to communicate with the GNSO Council, for example, and anybody else, really, who's curious about why we have

chosen to select a baseline language as it is and what the alternatives where.

We don't have this document now, but if you have at least glanced at an e-mail that Caitlin had sent this morning, she wrote an extensive e-mail on a topic, or maybe even several topics. This is the kind of information we need to capture for our record. Just having it as an e-mail is okay if there's no conflicting inputs, but, if there is a controversy or conflict in the way we interpret this, then they really should be documented, I think, and recorded so that we can share it and remember why we made the decisions the way we did.

So that's what we're trying to do. Hopefully, when we produce the first one, it will mean more to you. But I think you understand what I'm talking about.

Let me hear from Matthew.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN:

Hey, Dennis. Hey, everyone. I just want to maybe discuss a little bit further the idea that we would publish the data protection agreement document as part of the public comment process. I think the problem there is that the data protection agreement is really just a private negotiation between ICANN and the contracted parties. So, even if we did want to put those terms out to the public for their comments, I don't think we can say that we are going to incorporate those comments into the negotiation that we're having. I think we've discussed this a bit before. I think that it's totally appropriate to put out the language in the actual policy that discusses having data protection

terms as part of the public comment, but the terms themselves I don't think should be part of what we release to the public comment period.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Yeah, we did have discussions on this before. Let me hear from ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Jody.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody.

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Dennis. Can you guys hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, we can. Thank you.

JODY KOLKER: I just want to reiterate what Roger has put in the chat. I have not and Roger has not – I'm not sure anyone – really looked at the data elements matrix very thoroughly. Adding that to this report? I think that it needs to be gone through, probably in a meeting, to review it, basically. I haven't looked at it because I didn't find it useful, as Roger hasn't. So I'm not sure that including that in there without having a review of it is going to work very well. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Let's make it clear that the IRT will review everything that goes out to public comment before it goes out. So this is not meant to say that the IRT will see it for the first time when it's out for public comment. No. Everything that goes to public comment will be reviewed, included every word/language in public comment form and what we want to highlight for the public comment. If there are any instructions for the public, like that the terms of the DPAs are between the two parties and are not really subject to changes based on public comment, if you want to say that, we could say things like that, too. But, because the DPA has the purposes and some of the important information for this policy, I don't see any other way around it.

It was an early discussion when we thought maybe we didn't have to publish for public comment like we're doing it with a third-party. The DPA with a third party we put under the redline. But, with the contracted parties, we thought it had to be done. We had discussions with some of the contracted parties that are working on this draft right now, and they're in agreement that it needs to go out with the public comment.

We can talk about this more, if you like, but right now the baseline is that it's going out. You can comment on this document by clicking on it and adding your comment to it if you want to express your view further.

Sarah, you're next.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. Good morning, good afternoon, everyone. Dennis, I understand and appreciate that you're saying that we will have the opportunity to review everything that goes out for public comment, but I think Jody and Roger's point might have been ... What I think is that we should not include this matrix in what goes out for public comment. The policy stands on its own.

Also, I don't think that IRT team members should take the time to review that matrix in the level of detail that would be required to be able to approve it for going out for public comment on this time.

Really what it comes down to is that I just don't think that matrix is needed.

Also, just going back to the DPAs, I want to support what Matthew said: that the DPA between ICANN and the contracted parties, I think, does not need to be part of what goes out and actually should not be part of what goes out for comment. I would be very interested to hear more about those other CPH members that you mentioned who are working on the DPA. I'm very interested as to why they thought it should be part of the public comment package because that does surprise me. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think it would be a good idea to have the contracted parties that are working on the CPH comment at this time. Is there anybody here right now? Anybody on the call who's working on the DPA?

Matthew? [inaudible], are you?

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]: I am working on the DPA. I think it's myself and Beth who are part of this group who are also working on the DPA. I don't recall that we agreed that this would go out for public comment. My recollection was we had concerns that it would go out for public comment because, functionally speaking, what do we do with those comments? It's a private negotiation, in many respects no different than the data protection agreement negotiation with a third party. It's a private negotiation between contracted parties and ICANN, where we can't say that public comment is going to influence the actual terms that are agreed to in the final agreement.

So, yeah, that's not my recollection, but—

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible]. Yeah, I understand [inaudible]. I don't think you were in the very last meeting when this team was together, so I suggest that you circle back and get on the same page there because they have stated several times that that's the decision.

I'm going to stop that discussion here because we don't have the ... I think we will ask the team to come back and provide a rationale. This may be one of those rationale papers for the baseline decision.

I have received two inputs: that DPAs should not be public comment and that the data elements matrix should not be public comment. So I'll take those as inputs and consider it. Thank you very much.

Any more on the doc map?

If we do make a change, I will make a change to this drawing so we're all on the same page. But this is the current baseline as you would understand.

Let me show you another map. It's called the implementation methods. I just assigned this. I think looking at this way is clear for you because I know many of you are not familiar with the implementation. When we implement policies, we have choices. They do the same thing. It doesn't change the policy itself, but the way we are implementing is different.

One way, Method 1, is what I call policy language plus news box only – that's what I call it – which means that we put in all the detail about what changes to other policies [there are] in then policy language itself, like in the One Doc. In those impacted policies, we add a little notation. I call it the news box because it goes right on top of that document to say, "Hey, some of this content may be changed or impacted by the [reg] data policy. So that's one method.

2 is no policy language plus update. That is what I call a direct update method, which means that, if there is an impact to, for example, URS rules, we actually go and change the URS rules and update that document as part of the implementation. As far as the policy language is concerned, we don't have to say anything.

Method 2 is what I was going to use in things like – let me show you in our task determination map – URS and UDRP. URS and UDRP test determination is still yellow because we haven't agreed on how we're going to approach our task implementation. Here it says, "No addition policy language required." That's the current position, but, if, under

reconsideration because of comments like – let’s see – “There’s some IRT members who agree ...” So there’s conflicting input. Some IRT members don’t ... I captured Roger’s input here. He doesn’t think that we should be updating other documents as part of this implementation.

Very quickly – I’m sorry I’m going maybe a little too fast here – I wanted to let you know there’s different ways we implement policies. I will be talking about Method 1 or Method 2 in the future. So have a look at this later and we’ll come back to it. When we come back to it, I think we’ll be in a position to resolve 23 and 24 to green. Then we can make further progress.

Next is the IRT comment guide. I want to point out a couple of things. This is – let’s see. There’s a question: What happens if there’s disagreement? We heard that. Of course, there are disagreements right now. I call that conflicting inputs they we’re receiving. How do we resolve them?

There’s 1 and 2. 1 is that we continue to discuss and reach an agreement. That’s what we’re doing today. We are here today. So this is what we’re doing. We’re continuing to discuss. We haven’t given up on any one of them. They’re all there for us to try and resolve within the IRT and not go further to escalation or proceed to public comment. We haven’t done that yet.

The way we do that is we highlight those areas where we do not have an agreement and we prioritize them to discuss it here in the meeting or online and to facilitate that maybe in a better way. Here’s the rationale for baseline language. This is what I’m referring to when I saw

what I say. Oops. That doesn't really highlight very well. We're going to create these documents so that we can look at it together here at the meeting and later.

Your job as the IRT is to make sure that, when you make comments, they're not of the non-objectionable type of comments. This is where you say, "You forgot a comma. Add a comma." This is where you say, "I believe this baseline language is misaligned with the recommendation, and here's why." These are the comments that we need to receive.

When we receive your rationale, for interpreting it in one way, we're going to capture those and collect it and produce a document for all of us to do further analysis/discussion [inaudible] recall why we made the decision that we did as a team to go to public comment with one set of interpretation versus another.

So [inaudible] and receive your questions. Let's not go any further if we still have questions on this because it's very important that we are working with the same process.

Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Sorry I'm talking so much today. I just want to confirm how you'd like to collect this input. Are you looking for all the IRT members to just do another run-through of the One Doc and note areas of either disagreement or where we find that it's misaligned? Is that how you want to track that? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Exactly because the way we are doing it is – maybe it would be more clear when we go through it again – we’re going to be resolving comments top to bottom, top to bottom. It’s an iterative process. As we resolve comments, there’s going to be language that changes because of suggestions you make. We’re rephrasing. We’re reorganizing. So you have to look at it again. If there’s a particular requirement that you’re concerned about and it has comments right now, you want to make sure that that comment includes the rationale of why the baseline language is not acceptable, why it’s misaligned with the recommendation. Once that comment is clear, you want to come back and take another look at the revised language and see if it’s acceptable to you.

If it’s still misaligned, you want to highlight that for us. If that continues to happen, what we’ll do is we’re going to create a rationale paper – rationale for baseline – where we try to capture the rationale on both sides of the interpretation. It could be extensive, like tech contact data. We have so much input on the tech contact data. It can get overwhelming. It’s hard to work through all the previous e-mails. There’s multiple trails, multiple conversations.

So what we, I think – staff – can do – we need to do it for ourselves – is collect those and see if we can organize them in a fashion where we can see both sides of the argument. In the background, that’s what I have been doing to make decisions on which baseline language to use, which comments to accept, and which language we’re going to resolve and try to maybe make better.

So, yes. The answer to your question is a clear, definite, yes-please: highlight in One Doc.

The rationale paper is not one paper. It's going to be topical. So we'll have one paper on tech data and one paper on something else. I know that tech data is a conflicting input. We already know that. Unless we resolve it and everybody comes to an agreement, I think we'll have to produce a paper. We haven't done it yet, but, if you're reading Caitlin's e-mail on the way we interpret the [optional], you're seeing the first glimpse of that paper. So we're going to take that e-mail and turn it into a baseline rationale paper so you understand why the baseline language was written that way. If there's counterargument for a different interpretation, we will capture that also, side by side. So you haven't seen it yet. We haven't done it yet.

The answer to your question is that it's not going to be huge-huge, but it could be extensive. It's based on specific topics and specific requirements, let's say. For each requirement where there's a dispute and we can't easily resolve it here, then we'll have to produce a paper. That's what we're planning to do.

Does that make sense?

Any more comments or questions?

I'm glad you asked the question. Thank you for the question because sometimes I keep going, assuming everybody is on the same page. So just pull me back and get me back to explaining things because I've done this for a long time and I understand that some of this is new to

you. So I'll have to keep talking to you about the processes, as well as the content.

Okay. Well, this document is here. You can look at it at any time and ask questions in the future, too. So I will leave it here and we'll go back to our agenda.

Let's look at our timeline. I asked for input to our timeline here. There are, in some timelines ... I don't know if Roger is here, but I think maybe it's Roger who put in these [tasks]. Thank you for that. But, for example, here is a task that has one word. I said it would be nice if we can have more description because I don't know what this means – whether it means it's a process or to build a system that takes the time. So these are questions that I had.

Thanks to Sarah and her team, we now have an extensive document. We call that ... where did it go? It's killing me. I call it Sarah's input, but I understand there are some CPH members ... I know it's not the entire CPH, but it seems like some of the registry operators and members got together and put this together. So, first, a huge thanks. I think it's best if Sarah takes us through the document because it's rather complex and long. We can maybe listen to her introduction and ask questions. May I turn it over to you, Sarah?

SARAH WYLD:

Yeah, absolutely. Thank you. Hope you can hear me okay.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I hear you great.

SARAH WYLD:

Super. I do want to thank the members of our team that worked on this together. I will mention again that it as not just me or it wasn't even primarily me. It was a team effort, so I greatly appreciate all of the other members.

This is a work in progress. It is open to input and certainly not in stone. Instead, it is intended as a starting point for the discussion. I will mention that it was shared with the Registrar and Registry Stakeholder Groups – the full groups – at the same time as it was shared with the IRT. We are still receiving feedback and expecting more feedback from the stakeholder group members on it.

Ultimately what I think is important to understand is that there is a huge amount of work to be done to into compliance with this new policy – thank you for making the text size bigger – and I really think that ... Well, I'll get to that.

The introduction outlines what we've done here. I went through the One Doc and just noted each of the different action items or things that mean work to be done and then, as a team, we went through to figure out changes need to happen. Are there changes to EPP standards? Does the registrar need to do something? Does the registry? What about if there's a reseller or other third parties like the escrow provider?

From there, then we looked at each item and thought about the size of work – small, medium, large. Nothing was small. We ended up with a lot of large and extra-large pieces of work to do.

Let's look at the summary section for a minute because there's a couple important points in here. Thank you. I think we all have to recognize – we all do recognize – that there are providers involved in our industry of many different types. There are huge companies. There are tiny companies. Not everyone can or should dedicate all available resources to doing this work. So we should expect that some of this work needs to be done in series rather than in parallel, as Dennis already said in an e-mail about this same topic.

I think, because there is such a variety of models, I don't think we can accurately estimate how long this work will take for any one party to do. Something that takes one company two weeks could take another company two months. It depends on the different systems people have, the different amounts of resources. So that makes it very, very difficult and I think probably not reasonably possible to estimate the actual amount [of time] to do this work. I think it's going to make more than six months, which is, I understand, the standard buffer period. I think it's going to take a year. Even for a large company like mine, I think it's going to take a year.

So that's my overall summary. Do you want to scroll down a bit and I can just talk about how the rest of the information is set up? This is just a summary where I counted up stuff, so we can scroll past that for now. The main table – yeah, keep scrolling down to the required work section for me. Thank you. So it's a table. For each task, I put the section number from then One Doc, and then we looked at, does it need an EPP standards change? So changing what data is transferred to the registry does require a change to the EPP system. I'm not super expert in that,

but I know other members here are. Does the registrar need to do things? Registry? Reseller? And then general scope and size.

That's all I have to say to introduce this. Happy to discuss, answer questions, etc.

Berry, I don't know. Maybe Roger could speak to that, or Jody.

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry. What's the question?

SARA WYLD: Berry is asking in chat, "The one that is marked with EPP change – does it equate to an RFC change also?" I think probably yes, but I'm not certain.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. If there's any change in EPP standards – the original five or six or whatever it was – it would be an RFC change, like we discussed before in my comment that Dennis brought up earlier. But, even if we're not waiting for the standard to finalize, which I believe could be a year or more, we would still have to create an RFC Internet draft to get that process going so that people can refer to what the standard will look like or at least what it potentially will look like down the road.

So anything to the main EPP, yes. I don't think anything on this list we're talking about – any registry extensions or anything. So, to me, whatever is marked yes on here would be an RFC change as well. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else?

Alex?

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Dennis. Hi, everyone. I guess I'd be curious to understand, maybe to put this in a little bit of perspective, how this scoping – I really appreciate that you laid it out like this. I think it makes it really clear. I also appreciate that you attempted to put a timeline to it, given the capabilities of all the registrars that exist on then planet. Can you compare this work -- this may be apples and oranges – that you've outlined here with the work that you guys had done to comply with the temp spec? Is it the same order of magnitude? Is it larger? Is it smaller? Was the work to implement the temp spec on the path towards this or was it divergent? I guess I'm just trying to understand how this fits into the big picture. This may be a conversation that we could have off-list or elsewhere, but it would be helpful to me to help me wrap my head around this to understand how it compares to the work that you guys have previously done. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. That is a really good question. It's something we were thinking about as well. I would say that it is more work than we needed to do [inaudible]. It's a larger scope of work overall. The individual work items to me seem a bit more complex than the temp spec work did. But I do think, as you said, the temp spec work helped lead towards doing this work. I think a big part of that is in terms of how we think about making these changes and think about what's required in a different way that we used to, rather than completing the coding or whatever. So it's a step on the path, but I think there is a lot to be done. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody?

JODY KOLKER: I'm just going to echo what Sarah had said. We did do some work for the temp spec, but this is way more work. It is much more work. In the magnitude of what we need to do – the amount of data that's collected that gets sense and what's getting transferred between the registrars and registries – I just see this as a huge amount of work for us to complete. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: The scope of the work is huge. I think we received that input. The first question that I had was, with everything here, can I assume they're new work and that nothing on here has already been done? Is that a good assumption to make? That this is all new work to do be done?

Go ahead, Jody.

JODY KOLKER:

Thanks, Dennis. Most of this is new work that needs to be completed. I think that some registrars have done a [consent], but a lot of registrars haven't yet. So I think it depends on what the registrars actually completed, but most of this work that I see on here is extra work that needs to be completed by at least our registrar. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

For us to put together a timeline to present externally, I think it would be awkward to show the work that should have already been done as new work. So let's see if we can make this clear.

Now that that task is identified, we can go about this two ways. Typically what you want to do is identify potential critical-path ones and scope those first.

So the question for you, as you were doing this small, medium, large, and extra-large ... Typically, when I do these T-shirt size things, I think in terms of weeks, months, years, and decades. But I'm probably not thinking the same way you are. We are not thinking about decades when we say extra-large. So can you give us a sense of time duration that you had in mind when you were scoping small, medium, large, and extra-large?

SARAH WYLD: Dennis, we really did not set it out in that level of detail because what those sizes mean to different companies can be so different. So mostly what we did was, if the work only affects one of the groups on the list or one of the columns of who needs to do work, then it could be medium, whereas, if the standard needs to change, and registrars and registries and resellers – everybody needs to do work – that is extra-large. That's more how we estimated it.

DENNIS CHANG: Ah, I see. You're thinking in scope and the volume of work.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm thinking in terms of timeline because, to me, if we had 1,000 people doing one week of work, it's still one week in terms of timeline. Of course, if we only had one entity had to do the work and if it takes a month and [inaudible] in the timeline in the critical path.

Of course, where I'm trying to get to is to the timeline that we should have for our implementation. So that's where I really need your help.

The next step on this input is to define the scoping and sizing in terms of timeline and then whether it's in the critical path or not. So it's lining the task up in a critical-path fashion.

Does that make sense?

Anybody want to speak to that?

It looks like people are chatting, so let me see if I can make sense. "I just don't think we can [inaudible]." There's no – let's see. How can I say it? No one expects accurate estimates. What the community expects is a timeline that is reasonable. Now, GAC had asked for a realistic one. So we use those words: "realistic timeline," or, "reasonable timeline" – something that we will tell the community, "This is what we're working to" with so they can look at that and plan around it, too. So that's where we're trying to get to.

Does that make sense – what I just said?

Yeah, Mar[c]. I read your comment. In a business, if you're investing, yeah, you do want accurate estimates from the implementers because that's how you're going to budget things. In our case, the word "accurate," I think, is intimidating. So we'll start with something called "reasonable."

Now, what I see here is that it's possibly more than a year in a summary. So this is how we should be thinking about. What would be realistic?

Roger, could you comment?

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Dennis. Yeah. Just coming back to what's in chat, I think everybody is fairly familiar with this T-shirting process. I think that, as Mar[c] mentioned, we would take this to our developers and we would get estimates from them. But the problem with this is it's not one

company doing this. It's 2,000 companies that are doing this. You're going to get more than 2,000 estimates back.

So I think, to your point, Dennis, you have to realize that. You can't say that the first item is going to take six weeks even if that's the longest haul you can think of because, unless you go out and query the 2,000 companies, you're not going to know. So I think the best thing is looking at a broader stance and saying it's realistically going to take most people a year and, probably for some people, 18 months.

DENNIS CHANG:

So 18 months? How would you communicate to the likes of GAC, if you will? Do we just say, "Hey, based on your request to the IRT, we are telling you 18 months is a realistic schedule"? Is that how you'd communicate that? Or would you say at least twelve months, recognizing that, yeah, we can't go and query 2,000 implementers? The IRT members are gathered here to represent that spectrum of implementers, so we can only go by what your input is. So that's the service that you provide. So, if it's more than twelve, possibly 18, we could go 15 months. That's the kind of thing that we can do. "How did you get to 15 months?" Then you have some rationale to justify the 15 months as a realistic schedule. That's how we have to go about this.

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah. I think that this document shows you how we got to that number. If you look at the chart, it shows you the amount of work that needs to be done. Again, I think that you're asking us as a community to come up with a number that those people on this call are not on. That's what

we're saying: we have to take that up and say it's going to be 18 months.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for your input. Marc Anderson?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I think, to the point Sarah made earlier that there are many different sizes and types of organizations involved in this, I would suggest we don't try and say this will take 18 exactly months or this will take exactly nine months. I think, Dennis, you suggested we go through the dependencies and look at how long each of those will take. That represents the short end or the best case scenario. Then we know that, for some organizations in some circumstances, it's going to take longer. That should lead us to a window.

So, rather than trying to communicate that it'll take X number of months, I think we should try and provide a window and then just spitball. I'm just throwing out numbers here, but we should be able to target a window where we can communicate that we expect that this can be implemented between 12 and 15 months, for example.

So I think we have to take into account the differing types of organizations and their sizes and, rather than target an exact of months, target a window that we're going to try and have all of the implementers land in.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Mark Sv?

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. Naïve question here. We'd always take about the different capabilities of all the different parties. That's why we can't estimate how long it'll take – the long tail – to get their work done. I get that. What's the expectation for the large players, though? Somebody like GoDaddy has massive resources. We know that they've already built, say, a private system for law enforcement already. And they were able to do that fairly quickly. Not to put them on the spot. I'm just using them as an example. Also, these large, well-capitalized entities are holding most of the data, too. So getting this clarified for them is the most critical thing.

So what are the reasonable expectations to someone outside of the contracted party house for when the larger organizations will have this work done, seeing that they have much more technical capability and they have much better capitalization and that they're not small operators with a server under their desk? It seems odd that their performance would be defined by the performance of the least capable members of the community. So is there any way to incentivize them? I don't know how this has ever been done. Is there some benefit that ICANN org could provide to them to get the work done earlier? Because, otherwise, it seems like we'll just staff to get it done in 15 months, 18 months, 24 months, or whatever number comes up. We know that they could do it faster. Probably they will do it faster. But how do we set those expectations and those understandings?

Sorry if that's a naïve question. I just really don't know how this works.
Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Well, I'll try to answer your question, Mark, but I doubt that it's a naïve question on your side. I think you're probably fully aware of what it takes to produce anything. You've come from the development ranks, and I don't appreciate the fact that you're saying that it's a naïve question.

First of all, GoDaddy has a large plane that is flying right now. In order to keep the plane flying, we have lots of things that are on the [plates] – operational, etc. We will put things as we can to do it as quickly as possible. Some of these things will have to be serialized. I think you have to realize that. You have the registries that are making changes, and the registrars will have to make changes. So we'll have to put all those things together to figure out when we're going to get those things done.

So we do not have an unlimited set of resources. That is complete and utter nonsense. We have the same issues that every registrar has and we have competing priorities we need to have done. This will just be another priority that's added. As you full know, Mark, I'm sure roadmaps have already been laid out a year ahead of time in order to determine what we're going to be working on. So every registrar in the world is going to have that same problem. It's not like we have people

sitting along on the sidelines and we have employed as backup programmers waiting to [inaudible].

So we have to take this back to our development team and we have to look at this to determine how fast we can get this done and where we can [work this out]. Thanks.

MARK SVANCAREK: Dennis, can I come back?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: My naivety is not regarding how software is developed or what your capabilities are. It was regarding how we create incentives so that you can move faster because I do feel like this could be a race to the bottom. I know you don't have people just sitting around. We all know how this works. But, since this is all opportunity cost, you can certainly apply them to other things and everybody could be waiting just because we've said everybody can wait for 15 months. So I'm not asking about how you allocate your resources. I'm asking about how we incentivize so that you can apply your resources in one way versus another way. I'm sorry if that's an offensive question, but I think it's a legitimate question.

So I am asking, is there any way to incentivize so that it does make business sense for you to apply those resources in a certain way or not?

If the answer is no, then the answer is no. So I'm sorry that I offended you, but I am admittedly concerned about the idea that the smallest players get to define the resource allocation of the largest players. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I just wanted to add on to what Jody was saying and maybe add a little flavor so Mark can understand, too. I agree with Mark that I think some people are going to be able to get this done earlier, but every business has other concerns that they're going to run into. We've got thousands of resellers that we're going to have to work with and get to make changes on their systems as well. So it's not just that GoDaddy can make all these implementations on GoDaddy proper, but we have to have all of our resellers do their work as well. It's another variable that we have to take a look at.

As far as incentivizing, it's probably a fair question, Mark. I don't know how you would do that, but it's a fair question. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody again?

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Dennis. I think that's up to ICANN to decide if they want to incentivize and how they would incentivize. I would have to be up to registrar to consider the cost of opportunity, making sure that this plane that they have flying still continues to fly and whether it's worth it to put in extra work to readjust anything. [You need] programmers to work on it. I think that that's something that every registrar has to do. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Susan?

Sorry, Susan. We can't hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Susan, it looks like you're unmuted, so you should be able to speak. Check your—

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Can you hear me now?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There you go. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Thanks for unmuting me. I'm always confused on Zoom. I'm just wondering – I would love not to see what is going on right now with the temp spec. There are some registrars – not the registrars on the phone

and on these call – working towards of all of this, and I know that must get irritating at times to hear. But there’s a substantial numbers of registrars that do not respond to any requests right now for then temp spec. They comply with the temp spec in some ways in [re-adapting], but in actual responding to data requests at all, there’s a number of registrars out there that do not do that.

So what I’m concerned with with the implementation of this is that those registrars will not pay attention to this. At the end of the implementation period – whatever we decide on – they will not have paid any attention and will not have started the implementation.

So it seems like we need to put in place (or ICANN does) a process where there’s a check-in. I don’t registrars disclosing exactly what they’re doing, but, “Have you started this work? Do you understand it? Do you have questions about implementation? Give us your timeline once this is all lined out.” Because, otherwise, we’re not going to be talking 12 or 15 months. We’re going to be talking about four years or something for implementation across the whole ecosphere.

So I think we need to add something here that requires ongoing implementation. In that process, when a registrant, be it large or small, has an implementation problem and delay and can explain that briefly to ICANN, then we don’t have as many compliance issues. But to just say, “The window should be this, and we hope you all do it,” has not worked in the past. I really see this as a critical issue not working here.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Susan. Brian?

BRIAN KING:

Thanks, Dennis. I think there's some good [ideas] I heard from Susan [inaudible] contracted parties are a great idea to help. It may be worth looking at this from two different perspectives. One is the things that don't impact the day-to-day, like registration or renewal of a domain name and differentiating that from the other requirements under the – I keep wanting to call it the temp spec – registration data policy [inaudible].

The point that [inaudible] [the redline] [inaudible] great point there where we need to define a window and we need to make sure that we have the right deadline and that we have a reasonable timeline for contracted parties to make the technical changes if they need. These aren't all technical changes that are required here. When you have a deadline, everyone will be financially incentivized to meet that deadline. The biggest registries will do this anyway and they'll do it on time, and so will the biggest registrars. If there's a deadline after this day, old-style EPP commands won't get you a domain name. If you don't take the new style of EPP commands, your registry won't be able to issue a domain name. Those are the kind of deadlines that get folks in compliance in time. I think windows are helpful and assistance is helpful, too. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for your inputs. A couple of things to really clarify. As you know, when we publish our policy and when we publish our public comment, we need to specify the policy effective date. So, when you talk about the windows, the whole implementation time period of 15

months is then window because we're going to go out with a policy that's [fair]. "You shall implement this policy." We have, remember, the rainbow bridge. This is our rainbow bridge. So, "You shall implement the policy in whole or part during this rainbow bridge period," which is the implementation period. So the whole thing is a window. Some are going to be ready in months. Others are going to be ready in a year. That's all by design.

So what we're trying to do is set this policy effective date so that we can clearly communicate what the expectation is in the public comment and then we shall receive feedback. That's what I'm trying to establish. Are we going to set it as a 12-month or 15-month? That's the decision. Whatever we set, we have to provide a rationale for that implementation time period because, per our process, if we are going to go out with a six-month default, there's nothing we do. We just go. But, if it's going to deviate from then six-month default window, we need to provide rationale. That's what we must put together. So that's where I really need your help.

The other thing about Susan's comments is our part of the implementation process. We will do a lot of work. We have a team of account management people/engagement managers whose job it is to go out and engage with the contracted parties and provide useful material to help them implement this. So that is part of the implementation plan that we are putting together.

I'd like to hear from Brian. Is that you next?

BRIAN KING: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I'm glad Roger is behind me in the queue. Roger, if you can hang tight there and keep me accurate on this. I just wanted to note that, when we're making changes to EPP, I think we may require a window because -- say, Mark Monitor makes the required tomorrow and we start sending EPP [create] commands to registries with these stumpy little contacts that don't have name/address/postal code and all that information in them. Most registries, I think, or all registries, today aren't going to be ready to receive a different looking [EPP] command. So we can't do that work. We can get ready. We can build it [in depth]. But we can't deploy that to a production environment until the registry is ready to receive commands and do business that way. So that's what I think I'm talking about with the window. Roger is going to know better than I will. He probably wants to say something else anyway. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Thanks, Brian. Yeah, I agree with you. I think that's right. I think we've done this previously, Dennis. Maybe go back and look at some of the other stuff where we've created a window for certain reasons. Brian is right. One of these would be this idea where, if there's EPP changes that have to be required, they have to be synched up between the contracted parties. Some registries may decide that they're going to float that. For a time period, they can do both. For some time period, maybe they won't do it. So I think you have to be decided.

Along with the issues on the technical side, I think there's maybe even some contractual things that have to happen. I think that ICANN has to come up with agreements before we can actually start implementing some of it anyway. We can start doing the work, but we can't implement until ICANN produces their agreements with the contracted parties and all that as well. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Let's stop the timeline discussion here. Think more about it, but, like I said, please keep thinking about it with one deadline. Having multiple deadlines can be confusing. We don't necessarily need to complicate this policy implementation further with multiple deadlines and conditional deadlines. So let's see if we can make one deadline of the policy effective date and pick a date that we are willing to go to public comment with. So please keep in mind that we're going to go seek public comment with this effective date. That's what we're doing with the rationale that we put together. So, based on that comment that comes back, we may change it, too. So keep that in mind.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is let's see what work we can do now. For example, I wrote here in Line 7, "Internal draft for EPP extension." There's no reason that we need to wait until that policy is completed and make an announcement here. We can maybe start that earlier so that we have a document that we've all looked it before we even make the announcement. So, if we can do something like have a specification document that we can work from, it may reduce the time. Maybe you may feel more comfortable with the timeline that we produce for public comment.

Thank you so much. We'll need to continue working on the timeline. We'll see what we can do about [it]. In terms of responding to the GAC here, my intention is to just let them know that we are working on it as part of normal process that we should have a timeline and we are trying to get to a timeline. Also, I think it wouldn't be fair if we're not producing a timeline for a long time. So hopefully we can get there together. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is the One Doc. Let's see ... Timeline input ... Here we go. So let's get to the One Doc. What I wanted to do was first resolve some comments that you can see the process that I use when we are resolving comments.

For example, I will take on this one. This was one of Sarah's comments that she deleted word "and" in. I think it's okay. I agree with the resolution. So we are going to resolve this. This is the kind of thing I would not typically come to the IRT about. We'll just go ahead and resolve it.

Can you do that right now as a demonstration? Isabella will resolve this comment on the "and." So that's gone, right? This deletion right here?

Yeah. As I said, we are keeping track of it on the IRT document we call the One Doc Tracker right here. So that's resolved. So you see how that's gone.

Then this one we have not resolved. I'm not sure whether I have looked at this more carefully, so we'll leave it for now.

The next one here is Roger's comment. For this one, when I say +1, I agree with you. So, Isabella, go ahead and resolve that.

Here's another one. This is another of Roger's comments. I said I agree with Roger here. I wanted to say, "Please see the additional changes," so I added the generated in this form. So let me hear from Roger. If Roger responded to me here as a reply right here to say, "I'm okay with it," then I would go ahead and resolve it, and the IRT would not see it, of course. We don't have to discuss it as a team.

Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Dennis. I just wanted to go back. I'm not sure we want to do this online because I'm not sure you're getting done what you want done. Back on 3.5, you agreed with me but you didn't make the change and you resolved it.

DENNIS CHANG:

You're right. I should—

ROGER CARNEY:

That's why we probably shouldn't do it online. I think you got down what we want to do. I just think we're trying to rush it a little, though. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible] will provide,” right? Yeah, this was what you wanted to delete. Yeah, you’re right. I resolved it without changing it. Thanks for catching that. Yeah, you’re right. I’m trying to rush a little bit because I see our time just going down. We only have 15 minutes left.

So here’s a collected – I’m just showing you so that you can see. Roger, what you should do is, if you agree with my change, reply here and say, “That’s acceptable,” and I will probably resolve that and collect it. So this is a kind of thing that I’m doing.

Let’s see. Is there another one? There’s lots of these comments that I’m going to resolve. You will see my comments that I am – like this one. Let’s see. Jody, you have a comment? What do you want to talk about?

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Dennis. I think what Sarah is trying to say – I think what we’re all wondering about – is that making these, I want to say, grammar changes is fine. I think we can all understand how that’s being done. What we’re trying to understand is, when there’s a disagreement between several groups, where one group says, “This needs to be included,” and another group says, “This should not be included,” how is the IPT deciding what goes into the document then? Because, one side is going to have their information in there and the other side said it shouldn’t be in there. So how is the decision made on whether to include that requirement or not include the requirement? That’s what we’re asking. How’s that decision made?

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that question. We're getting back to the process question. The decision is made based on the discussion here at the IPT. So you can look to me to make that decision. I will adopt one baseline versus another. This is why I am pointing to this process document here. When we have a disagreement, and if you feel strongly about a position that I didn't adopt as a baseline and you feel that this misaligns with the recommendation, then I would like you to highlight that. We'll have to come back to you with the rationale paper on why that baseline was chosen. But, if you do not come back to me, I'm going to assume that you're okay with the baseline as is.

Does that make sense?

JODY KOLKER: No really, Dennis. I guess I'd like to know the rationale on why it was included. I think we're giving you enough rationale on why we think it isn't supposed to be included. So why doesn't the IPT give us a rationale on why it is included? We would request a document from you saying why it should be included.

DENNIS CHANG: Exactly. I guess I'm trying to say that but maybe it's not coming across clearly. The rationale document that I am talking about will have two columns. One is the baseline rationale. On the right side, there'll be a counterargument for an alternate interpretation rationale. So I'm trying to capture both rationale. And why it's adopted as a baseline will be provided. That's what I'm trying to say.

So I think I'm saying I'm going to provide what you're suggesting.

JODY KOLKER: Okay. Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's look at another one here. Let's look at this an example. This is a good one. Jody, this is your comment. Let's look at this one. Here we're talking about the retention of the registration data. You make a really good point. I was thinking about this, and I actually thought about exactly the same thing that you did. As an engineer, I want to know what the retention [deck] requirement is. If there's a requirement that I must delete, I want to see that as a requirement. But I didn't find that, just like you didn't. So here's what I'm saying. I did not see a requirement for "must delete" or "must not retain longer than 18 months (or 15 months)." So here I'm in agreement that we should delete this.

Here's another comment on the same topic. We should delete this. If I do not receive a conflicting input for my comment here, then I'm going to resolve it. I don't know if I need to provide a rationale document for the baseline. But, if there is a conflicting input and if there is a request for the rationale document, then what I'd like you to do is provide to me the counter-rationale for me of why 15 months is not an acceptable retention period.

Does that make sense? Jody, does it make sense to you?

JODY KOLKER: Yes, that makes sense to me, Dennis. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. So this is a good time for the IRT members here at then meeting. Am I right? Do you agree what there is no “must delete” requirement, nor a “must not retain longer than” requirement here? Are you in agreement with Jody and I to delete this phrase “plus three months to implement the deletion”? If we just delete this, then it just simply becomes a 15-month retention. I think it’s a nice, clean requirement. So we can resolve it and move on.

Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I do agree. Honestly, I want to think about that one just a little bit more, but I typically agree with Jody on this kind of question anyways.

I just wanted to flag or mention for the transcript the things that I had put in the chat, which is thank you so much. I really like this process of doing a rationale document. I think that’ll be super helpful. We, the CPH IRT members, will certainly need to go through and review the One Doc to flag areas of disagreement, but I do expect that that will happen in the new year, rather than in the next three days. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Thank you for your comment, Sarah. I’m going to leave this comment here so you can come back to me with “I agree” or “I

disagree” and not resolve this comment because you said you want to think about it a little more. I think that’s fair. So let’s leave that.

Here’s another one: registry operator. This one is something I am asking you if there is a conflicting input here about. I am not receiving any inputs. I would like to receive some input from the IRT before I resolve this. This is a case where Marc Anderson is pointing out that the recommendation does not state that the registry operator has a retention requirement.

However, what I’ve observed in other areas of the requirement language, is that there are some hints, I would say, that talk about the registry operator having the same waiver requirement. And it talks about CPH as if registry operator has a retention requirement.

So this is the kind of confusing recommendation language that I had to work with. Thank you, Roger. We have Roger in agreement. I’d like to make sure there’s no one who’s disagreeing with me here and Marc Anderson because I am about to accept this deletion and make forever this policy so that the retention requirement only applies to registrars and registry operators [that] do not have any retention requirements at all. This is a fairly significant requirement going forward. So I want to make sure there’s no disagreement from anyone on the team here.

So I think that those are good cases studies for letting you know and observe how we do our work.

I don’t want to go into another content. We only have five minutes left. What I really want to do is make sure that we’re all on the same page as to the process that we go through so there’s no concern on your part

that there are things being done that you do not understand or you don't agree with.

Now, obviously, when we have our baseline language, not everyone is going to be happy with the way it is, but at least you'll have rationale for why it is the way it is. And you'll have a chance to comment on that baseline language during the public comment also. But we do have to make progress, so we're going to make some decisions along the way. If you ever have any concerns about a decision that we're making, you can always come to me and we will provide you with the rationale. But, at the same time, if you disagree with me, I'm going to ask you for rationale. So it's fair.

Any more questions on the process? I hope that was helpful.

If not, I'm going to stop here. We'll continue online. To celebrate, can you accept Marc Anderson's comment? Just so they can see exactly this one. I didn't hear anyone asking.

Okay, thank you. This is the same comment, right? So we can delete that one, too. So we'll resolve this. Can you resolve that?

Okay, that's all for the [content]. What I wanted to – before we break – remind you of is that we have a shutdown between the 24th of December and the 1st of January. If I don't reply to you, you know why. But likely I will. I think I'll be online and around. I'm not going up to the mountains or anything like some people are here.

I wanted to thank you again for all the work that you have done this year on this policy implementation. It is a humongous task, and it's the

most significant and far-reaching policy implementation that I've seen at ICANN. I know that we can't do this without you guys. So I'm just reminding all of us that we are the implementation team. This is the team that I certainly rely on here at ICANN. But also you. I appreciate all of your support. I wanted to just wish you happy holidays and a prosperous new year. Until we talk again next year – our next year's meeting is on the 15th of January – there'll be activities online, but probably no other meetings.

Any final remarks?

Thank you, all. Goodbye. Merry Christmas. Happy New Year.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]