ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT Meeting, being held on Wednesday, the 9th of September, at 17:00 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 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. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to our IRT meeting on this fine, warm day for us. So, today we have a very light agenda but it's an important agenda item because it's going to impact the work that we're doing today and possibly the timeline. So, I want to make sure that we address this. And what that is, is the GNSO consent agenda item 3.2, which I will show you. And Sebastien, our GNSO Council Liaison is going to speak to that.

But first, let's look at the timeline. We are looking at our workbook and our timeline is here. And note that I have made a slight change. And that is to say that we're going to continue to work on OneDoc until the

end of September and probably open public comment—push that out to October—mid- to late October, probably. And then, what that does is it gives us a couple of months for the public comment. But then, it allows two months to do a public comment and finalize a policy.

Now, having this being in December, one of the two months, this probably is very tight and may not be a good planning. So, I think what I will likely do is push out this publication date to, maybe, March, which will affect this effective date to push out to September 2022, keeping our 18-month implementation time period. So, wanted to let you know that that's what I'm thinking, in terms of our schedule. That's all I wanted to say and I will continue to share this with you, as I have been, so we are all on the same page in timing of our work.

So, our main agenda is the GNSO consent agenda item 3.2. And this is the consent agenda, right here, 3.2. And I will ask Sebastien to come on now and address the IRT. Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yep. So, Dennis reached out to me last week to see if I could speak to this consent agenda, which was voted on not very long ago—well, consented, I guess—in the GNSO meeting two weeks ago—so, the end of August GNSO meeting.

And so, the resolution, or the decision that was taken, as is written on the screen, is to basically ask the IRT—and this is what I'm doing now— to start preparing—following Recommendation 27, to start preparing a report on all the changes that will be necessary to existing policy in

order to adapt to the policy that we are coming up with now—the set of policies that we're coming up with now.

Now, this came as a result of work that was done by, mainly, the GNSO leadership and the GNSO staff—the ICANN staff attached to it. To my knowledge, this is not the result of a working committee within the GNSO. But the recommendation still stands. And so, basically … I don't know if you had time to look at it but it follows in … Sorry. I'm not being very clear. It follows the recommendation on the possible next steps. And this is document prepared by the GNSO staff.

But more explicitly, out of all the possibilities that were offered, one being for the existing IRT to start working on a draft and then see what comes out of it. The other one would be to start a different IRT that would work specifically on Recommendation 27 and one also launching a new PDP on that work. The decision was taken to go on a first round within the IRT here, to go and define what the moving pieces are for Recommendation 27.

Now, to be clear, because that's, in itself, a monumental task … To be clear what is—to my understanding and happy to debate if somebody has a different view … But to my understanding, the task here is not to ask you to go and resolve the whole set of existing policies against this but to mark where issues might exist between existing policy and this one and where, particularly, definition issues are or exist, to help identify and raise these issues and help proceeding forward. Sorry. It's been a long day here and I'm not very coherent.

The paper that has been prepared by staff … I believe that if you click on the possible next steps, you'll get to the paper, which is, I was going to say, about 27 pages long. But I see that it's 28 pages long. So, it proposes a few outcomes. Again, as I've just discussed, the one that was chosen is first to request the IRT to go through this process.

And if you'd go down, please. And then, they have gone through—yeah, exactly, the table—the whole set of consensus policy and tried to identify where matches or mismatches may happen with the work that is being currently done and with the Phase 1 report and trying to identify where these problems are.

Now, obviously, the staff has done a great job and been as exhaustive as I can identify it. But it's for the IRT to confirm that these are all the moving pieces and that there's no other moving piece that is needed and then, afterwards, taking the possible next steps and guided but also, potentially, any other steps that the IRT sees fit to go back to the GNSO and propose outcome as the IRT sees fit.

I see Berry's hand lifted. If you want to intervene, Berry, and help me on this, it would be absolutely grand because I'm pretty sure that you had much to do behind this and probably have more and more interesting things to say about it. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Sebastien. Just to put a little bit more precision about what's happening here, ultimately, ICANN, the community, has been dealing in an unprecedented position, in that we've never had the implementation of a consensus policy impact such a wide range of other existing

policies. And ultimately, the document that's being shared on the screen here was an initial approach about how to handle all of these possible impacts.

By and large, what most of these have resulted in is a change or a redline of these existing policies to better understand what these potential impacts are. And most of them are terminology updates—so, for example, removing the term "WHOIS" and replacing it with "RDS" or "RDDS," however appropriate. Where, as part of one of the Phase 1 recommendations that an existing consensus policy like the transfer policy would—that formally called out the use of the administrative contact—obviously, that here needs to be removed and those kinds of things.

So, ultimately, the task ahead of this particular IRT … And staff has already started on redlining of these existing consensus policies. The general process will be that the redlines will be reviewed by this particular working group to help ensure that staff is making the appropriate redlines where applicable, based on the Phase 1 recommendations. As long as this IRT signs off on those redline changes, they will follow the typical course of going through public comment and the natural process by how these would be amended.

In this entire process … And should there be concerns about the redlines being made that perhaps this would require additional policy development, then in that case, this IRT would inform the Council of those potential policy impacts. But by and large, based on the work that we've already started on, ultimately, the redlines will be presented to this group. And as of now, we're not seeing any potential true policy

discussions that need to occur. But of course, this particular IRT will get the first bite at the apple, in terms of keeping us honest with those redlines and going from there.

I think hindsight is 20/20 the Rec 27 report, or the Rec 27 recommendation, instructed Org to develop this report. And because it was so large, there was a question about who would be responsible for handling these impacts. Naturally, it would be part of this particular IRT to review through those impacts. So, it just took us a little bit of while to get there.

And what was happening at the Council level … If you're not aware, there's this larger discussion about prioritization of work and those kinds of things. So, there was some further analysis done with everything else going on, about how best to handle these. Ultimately, the conclusion was that IRT or IPT staff, as well as the IRT, would be reviewing through these redlines, make them available for review, get sign-off from the IRT, go through public comment, and get them updated or amended as possible. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank, Berry. If I may, Marc and Amr, I'll give you the word in a second. I just wanted to … Just because of the work that we've done before, if somebody can scroll to page 12. Scroll up to page 12. Too far. There. So, obviously related to the discussion that we were having about Rec 7, at the time of this report, there was no answer from us on that or how it would impact something like that. So, here there is something. Some of the conversation on Rec 7, we're trying to point to saying, "We'll deal

with this when we deal with 27." Here, there is sort of a chicken and an egg. I'll give the word to Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. Can you hear me okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely.

MARC ANDERSON: Great. Thanks. So, I guess two questions. So, the first one, in looking at the resolution—or I guess in looking at the proposal that's being projected in Zoom right now—it looks like, depending on the policy, different groups maybe asked to look at the changes.

For example, there's the transfer policy. It's suggested on that one that the new transfer PDP that's being scoped and, I guess, hasn't actually been chartered yet but is under Council consideration to be chartered, would be asked to take that up. But based on what I just heard, it sounds like this group would be given the first pass to consider all the changes or look at all the changes being proposed as a result of Rec 27. So, I just wanted to, I guess, confirm which it is so I'm clear on how each of these different policies will be considered.

And then, the other question … I'll just ask them both. My other question was, I guess, on how the work will be done and what is being expected of this IRT. And what I think I heard is that staff is going to propose—that staff will be doing all the work, basically. Put work in air

quotes there, I guess. But staff will be doing all the work of proposing redlines to the existing policies, based on their reading and understanding of the Phase 1 final report. And then, this IRT will be asked to review and sign off on those proposed redlines. I think that's what I heard and understand but I just wanted to make sure I have that correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, I'll give the mic to Berry. Just a second. I don't know who's driving this but going back and forth makes it a bit difficult. I think, on the first question, there are multiple levels of changes. What's particularly asked of the IRT in the first phase is reviewing those policies. It's not reviewing, maybe, the intent of the policy or the background of the policy but highlighting where … In the example of the transfer policy where, because of decisions that were taken in Phase 1, we would have, for example, to change the dataset and highlight that in the transfer policy. As it exists, the dataset will need to change and that sort of stuff.

The second part of your question … If the air quotes was for something that I said … No. I think I wanted to say that staff took a first stab at it, in order to review all the policies and etc. and give us this report and give the GNSO this report, which then is handed to the IRT. It's not the IRT's job to just rubber stamp it. It's definitely to go item-per-item and verify that it is as exhaustive as it needs to be and represents accurately what the intent of Phase 1 is, just like any other work that the IRT does. Berry, did you want to comment?

BERRY COBB:	Yes. Thank you. So, yes. Second question, absolutely. Staff is doing the heavy lifting here. This IRT will review those redline edits to make sure that those edits are in-tune or intent with the EPDP's Phase 1 recommendations—essentially to keep us honest. And then, of course, there will be the public comment so that the wider community can keep it honest as well.

In relation to the first one—your first question, Marc—this will come out in further detail as we drill down into each of the individual affected policies. But, for example, for the transfer policy, it has been on the Council's radar to do a review of the transfer policy for a while, based on work from the TechOps group and so on and so forth. And staff is currently in the process of documenting or preparing the initial issue report, by which these items listed here from the Wave 1 Rec 27 report are being folded into that issue report.

Unfortunately, in reality, it will be an easy 18 months, if not longer, before any possible recommendations come out of that PDP. And so, in the interim, this group will still be on the hook to review redline impacts of the transfer policy, based on the Phase 1 recommendations. So, there's almost two tracks. The first is redline of the existing transfer policy, the TDRP etc., to make sure it's in line with Phase 1. There are some possible policy implications based on the Phase 1 results. That is included in the issue report and will be deliberated by that future PDP.

A secondary example is there is the URS. There is the rules and procedures that have some small impacts. This group, our staff will be preparing a redline of the rules and procedures on those. But there are some possible small policy implications, based on the impact of the

Phase 1 report. And the Council took a previous decision to pass those possible policy impacts to the in-flight RPM Phase 1 Working Group that's on that now. And they are discussing those. That group plans to deliver its final report the latter part of the year—possibly October or November timeframe.

And so, in essence, there's really two paths going on there as well. The current working group will look at that to see if there are any policy implications. But it still could be a while before those make it back to an IRT that GDS would be standing up and standing up an IRT for that. So, just in case, we're also doing a redline of the URS rules and procedures, just so that we cover all bases. But at the end of the day, all of these redlines will be reviewed by this IRT and going to public comment.

And then, the final thing I'll say is if, again, there are any possible policy implications in doing these redlines, as determined by this IRT, we have the path, per the CPIF documents, to send these back over to the GNSO Council. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Berry. Amr, do you want to say something?

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Sebastien. And thanks, Berry. I think Berry answered one of two questions I had, which was on the URS and UDRP and trying map out how we would handle some of this stuff, considering that there's an ongoing review of these being done, which is still at a policy development stage.

But my second question is when this is referred to a Wave 1, is there a second wave coming up? And I'm asking because … Also, we're referring to these as existing consensus policies. And in the technical sense, that means that these policies have been adopted by the ICANN Board and have already gone through the IRT phase and consensus policy language has been created.

But because I see a bunch of different policies—not necessarily consensus policies just yet—that are not in this document. And I'm thinking … And they still have their own ongoing IRTs, I believe, like the PPSAI translation and transliteration of contact information. So, those aren't included in this document. I'm just wondering where in this process are those going to be addressed. Or is this part of a subsequent wave that we're going to address at some later stage? Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Berry, do you want to help me on this?

BERRY COBB: I will but I'll defer to Dennis as the authority. Staff is working on those. And announcements in regards to what you just asked, Amr, will be coming in your time. But there is still a fair amount of work to be done. And I'm not exactly sure how it's going to be presented. But there are additional procedures that could be affected by this. I believe there's possible aspects as it relates to the RAA or the agreements that might be impacted by this.

EN

So, there is additional work that's coming down the pipeline. And it's not clear yet exactly how those will be handled. Most likely, some of that will be handled here, with this IRT. Or it may make better sense that it be handled with some of the other IRTs. So, we'll get back to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And, Dennis, I think that Berry was deferring to you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Sebastien. So, there are a lot of works going on right now with IPT, and the Extended Implementation Team, and ICANN Org. And what we are all trying to do is get clarity on what is the impact of this Registration Data Policy when we implement it. And you all know about the policies that it impacts. But there are a whole bunch of procedures that are not considered policy but the procedures are impacted as well. And also, of course, the contracts, like RA and RAA. In all cases, it's incumbent open the staff to understand them fully and present them to you to see if you can double check our work, that we've done it accurately.

So, it's our intention to go through everything, basically. So, yes. This is Wave 1 for now. But Wave 1.5 is coming as a report. And Wave 2 is coming also. And until all waves are completed with rec 27, we couldn't say that rec 27 is completed. So, there's more coming your way that we're going to ask you to review.

The important point here today is a big change in the way we have been working with the IRT. IPT was always going to do this. But it's the IRT's

work that's been changed. And let me explain why, using this document here that we've used before.

If you recall, some time ago, we said that there are implementation methods. This was in December last year, where we were discussing. And I presented to you … There were two methods, method one and method two. And we had lengthy discussions, I think, over a couple of IRT sessions. And we were trying it decide shall we use method one or two?

Now, what is method one? Method one is we don't actually touch any of the documents. It's called the no-redline doc. That means we leave all other documents alone. Don't touch them. And we include all things that we have to do in the one doc as an appendix, like the way we did with Temp Spec, for example. That's an example, right?

And for each of the documents that are impacted, we'll just simply note a box on top that says, "The content of this page has been superseded in whole or in part by the Registration Data Policy. So, see Registration Data Policy for the specification of the modified or new requirement." That's what we were going to put on top of each of the affected documents so that the implementers or the reviewers would have to first take a look at, for example, the URS document, and see this box, and then have to go back to the policy, and see what's changed, and then figure out how to implement them. That was method one.

Method two was we actually do the redlining in the document so that the reviewers and the implementers will see exactly what the change is

without having to look at the policy language in the Registration Data Policy. That was method two, the redline doc version.

And we had … At ICANN, the IRT made a decision that we are going to use method one. And we're going to use method one for everything. That was a decision that we made. I don't know if it's coming back to you. But it was a fairly important decision. Now, what it does is it made the job a lot easier for us. Method one is easier. Method two is a lot more work and a lot harder. And well, okay. So, maybe that's the way to go. And we were going along.

And here, what's happening specifically is that GNSO Council is asking … They don't know about our method one and two but what they're asking is for us to use method two. They are asking for drafted redline documents for public comment. And they are asking the IRT to review them as part of their work scope.

So, this is a change. And I just want to make sure that there's no IRT member who is missing this important point because it's a reversal in the IRT decision. And staff is okay with this decision. It's something that we would have had to have done anyway. And we think that it will be easier for the implementers and the reviewers if they had the redline documents on-hand. And it could help us overall.

So, we're fine with doing the work and sharing the documents with the IRT. But it does present an increased work scope for IRT. And this is what we're talking about when Sebastien is presenting the consensus item 3.2. It is a Council vote and it's a consent agenda item. And that is official, now. And he is communicating that to the IRT. I hope I made

that clear, in terms of real work and the task upon us. But I'll turn it back to Sebastien. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Any other questions from the IRT on this? I see no hands raised. From my point of view … And thank you very much, Berry and Dennis, for stepping in and helping me here. But I have said what I needed to say. If there are any things that need to be passed back to the GNSO, you know where to find me. I'm very happy to do so. But yep. That's a wrap for me. Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sebastien. So, before we conclude this topic, to make it more tangible, I'll just show you an example of what we're talking about. This is exactly … This is what we were talking about. We have shown you this before. And this is the kind of thing that we're talking about. Actually, this was to be updated. Was this the redline version? But what we are asking is that we are going to make redline changes and present them to you of the effective changes, which IRT did not have to do before but now you're going to be asked to do. And it's going to come your way. Let us prepare better and present to you.

So, these are the redlines. You've seen this before. And we took it off the IRT's scope before but now it's coming back. So, that's the expectation. And it will be not an insignificant amount of work. But we're going to go ahead and issue them to you using our task list. So, you will see them getting added. And of course, you'll have adequate time. We'll provide you adequate time for review.

And that's the key main agenda. And next week, maybe we'll start sharing some documents and lists with you. But until then … I see Amr has a hand up. Amr, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR:

Thanks, Dennis. And apologies for the late question. But I'm trying to think back to what was explained to us earlier on the call. And if I recall correctly, there was a mention of a possibility that other existing IRTs might undertake some of the review work.

As has been explained to us, this is kind of like … There are two steps here. First is … Actually, it's three steps, I guess, because staff would take the first stab at producing the redline box, describing method two. And then, there would be an IRT review, which would be step two. And then, step three would be the public comment for the broader community.

So, I'm just wondering, again, because I think it was mentioned in step two that the reviews might not necessarily be done via this IRT but through other IRTs. I just wanted confirmation on that—whether that is something that is even currently being considered. And I'm also wondering how that would work in practical terms. Would members of this IRT be expected to join other IRTs in order to bridge the gap between what's in existing consensus policies and what the Registration Data policy might include? So, I'm just trying to understand what the thinking is behind this. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:	That's a good question. Berry, do you want to take that one?
BERRY COBB:	This is Berry. Just as I put in the chat, we don't know yet. Staff is still working on those. And we'll get back to you, as I noted earlier.
DENNIS CHANG:	Oh. Okay.
BERRY COBB:	I would just note that the Wave 1 report and those impacted policies, there are no existing IRTs for them. The possible next steps document is really somewhat outdated. Really, it was a question of whether it was going to be this EPDP IRT that handles these or should we spin up a separate IRT to handle those? But in terms of the remaining work or the future wave reports, we don't know yet. But we'll get back to you as soon as we do. Thank you.
DENNIS CHANG:	So, one thing I can say … And this is what I'm going to do so that we can all expect the same thing. URS is a good example. And we will go ahead and redline the URS documents like that and present it to you. But anything that is not obvious—we call it "terminology updates"—to make it consistent with the Registration Data Policy, we're not going to touch that. And of course, there is another Right Protection, RPM Working Group, going on, looking at the URS. So, we'll leave it for them to do.

So, it is a judgement call that we will make first cut. But we are going to go ahead and present to you what we believe should happen. And then, you can tell us if we're going about it the right way. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I realize that this is new for all of us and we're all trying to figure out what this means. But this is helpful so I appreciate Dennis, Berry taking the time to explain this and lay this out to us. I'm wondering … So, I guess … You haven't explicitly said so I'll just ask. Currently, in the OneDoc, we have Appendixes A, B, and C for URS, UDRP, and transfer policies. So, will those stay in the OneDoc or will you pulling them out and using the method two, redline doc approach, as you previously discussed and as you're planning to do for the other policies.

DENNIS CHANG: What an excellent question, Marc. I have been thinking about that all day, what I should do. And we haven't decided. So, I want to be consistent one way or the other. If we're going to make changes in other doc, should we have an appendix—all the appendixes. And if we're going to make the documents in the other places, should we not have any appendixes here and just mention that impacted policies have been updated or something like that? That is a design point. And we have yet to design that. But we would love to hear from you, if you think that one way versus another is easier for the implementers and reviewers.

MARC ANDERSON:	Thanks, Dennis. So, this is maybe a quick reaction, without having had a chance to think this through a lot. But it's a 28-page document from Council with a number of policies. And I'd be hesitant … If they all go into the OneDoc, then that sort of creates a bigger, larger … Sarah's saying, "Yeah. That would be unwieldy." I'll just steal Sarah's words. So, with this many policies and procedures involved, it might not be a great idea to tie that many things together in one place.

And related to that … And again, I just want to caveat that I'm just absorbing this and reacting on the fly. But Sarah said a little bit earlier in chat, "I was assuming that timing for those other policy changes is separate from our OneDoc timeline." But I think that's a good question to ask. I think maybe we don't want this new task from the GNSO Council to necessarily delay our existing work and that they should have separate timelines.

And along those lines, Dennis, you mentioned you'll be adding tasks for the IRT. And it might be useful to separate out these—track these Rec 27 tasks separately from the other OneDoc tasks. I think … I don't know. Again, let me just caveat. I'm reacting on the fly a little bit here. But I'm concerned that these are two different and distinct tasks. And intermingling the two might get confusing and unwieldy. Just, again, take that as my initial, knee-jerk reaction to what you've explained to us.

DENNIS CHANG:	Yes. Thanks, Marc. What you're talking about is what I call project design. And one of the important things a project manager has to do is

identify clear dependencies and clear scope—in-scope and out-of-scope items. So, we are going to do that. And we're going to make sure that it's visible to you so you can review our work. Anything else?

If not, we will go ahead and conclude our meeting for today. And we'll catch up tomorrow and show you some of our early work. And it may be premature or not ready for prime time, as you might say. But I think we should share whatever we have done next week. So, I'll see you all next week, then.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]