DENNIS CHANG:    There you go. Welcome, everyone. This is the registration data policy implementation IRT meeting on August 12, 2020. Let's get started. Attendance will be taken by looking at the participant list. So if you are on the phone only, please identify yourselves.

All right.-Let's see. Our agenda today is as follows. Everybody can see my screen, right? We're going to take a quick look at the timeline. Rec 7 is going to be our substantive discussion, and Sebastien has joined us. He's finding a quiet place. So I'll give him a few minutes to do that.

Then we'll take a quick look at our OneDoc status map, and the items on the OneDoc, and Any Other Business you'd like to bring up. If we have time, we'll cover it.

We'll get started with a quick check on our timeline. What I was doing before you all joined, I was showing the work that we have done in the past with Alex, Alex joined us in December and he has done a thorough review of everything, and I wanted to show him all the work that we have done so that we can leverage it, such as rec analysis.

What we're going to do right now is timeline, we are here in August, and we wanted to do a public comment opening in September. That was our goal. I am aware of some discussion, and if you'll check the agenda of the GNSO council meeting of the 20th, there's discussion there. And their proposal on how they would like to see our implementation may impact us.

---

So I'll leave it at that for now, and we will pick that up when things get more clear. So this could change, of course, based on many things, but I'm just giving the IRT heads up that we may choose to not open in September and maybe delay it because we want to take on a couple of—or many more—work scope prior to that and put it in our critical path to the public comment. That's our timeline.

And Rec 7 discussion is next, and I see that Sebastien did find a quiet place, so I will turn it over to Sebastien. And Sebastien, I'm assuming that you want me to show this while we're talking, correct? Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     Correct. Thank you, Dennis. [inaudible] to put this to the floor as early as possible. There's not much else for me to say. It did take me a very long time to draft this for two reasons. First of all, for those who don't know, we did go through a—I changed employers basically in the last two weeks and became a GoDaddy registry [employee.]

DENNIS CHANG:     Sebastien, your mic is cutting off.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     [inaudible]. And second of all—I was having trouble hearing you in and out, Dennis. Am I having the same problem with you guys?

DENNIS CHANG:     Yes, you are. You're cutting in and out for me too.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     Okay. I'm very sorry. So maybe I'm going to close the window if that helps with the bandwidth.

DENNIS CHANG:        You usually sound really well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     Yeah. But there's a storm coming. I don't know if it's affecting at all. I'll speak slowly if that helps. So I just wanted to apologize for the fact that it took me two weeks longer than I thought to produce this document. The first part of it should be a surprise to nobody because I had already put that on paper before and shared it.

The second part with my recommendations shouldn't be too much of a surprise either because we discussed it with people individually and then as a group. Part of the reason it took me so long also is, Dennis, after our last discussion where I think it's fair to say, Dennis, that you clearly explained to me that you weren't in agreement with this position and that it might reflect the IRT but not ICANN stuff and the IPT, and I wanted to both fairly reflect that and try to put as clearly as possible why I thought it's still [relevant.]

I don't have much more to say than what I've written. I hope that you had time to go through it. But I'm open for questions and comments. I see that Rubens corrected a typo that I corrected myself already three times, four insofar as mistaking IPT and IRT. Thank you very much for

picking it up one last time. [inaudible] for questions, and maybe I'll have an extra comment afterwards at the end of this. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: I believe Sebastien asked if there were any questions that he could answer. I couldn't hear that last part, but I think that's what he meant. So please raise your hand if you'd like to ask questions or make comments on this document.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, then maybe if nobody is raising their hands, [inaudible] I'll make a comment myself on it. Going back through the supporting documents once again and for the nth time, I did find in the score card a clear recommendation from the board for ICANN, so the IPT and the IRT to work together in defining as clearly as possible—let me read it maybe [instead of quoting it,] but it says consistent with recommendation 27, the board directs ICANN Org to work with the Implementation Review Team to examine and transparently report on the extent to which the recommendations require modification of existing consensus policy.

Now, this obviously is part of recommendation 27 [inaudible] in the discussions that we had over the last two months is going to the meet of discussing how that is going to change other policies. We mentioned before, because it's pretty consensual, that it will affect other policies insofar as different fields of data being collected and shared [at that level,] but not further.

I have [not put that in the report] either, one, because it wasn't thoroughly discussed, and I'm not sure that this group is ready to discuss that as such. To a certain extent as a liaison to the GNSO, if I may say so, I feel like it's a bit of a cop out. We're passing on the ball to the GNSO. That said, it's also their responsibility to [inaudible] the next steps are, and that was definitely the nature of the request when as the group we asked the GNSO council to come up with guidance here.

I see Sarah's hand is up.

SARAH WYLD:    Hi. Sébastien, thank you so much for putting all of this together. I really appreciate how clearly everything is laid out. I will say I've only read it once, so I'm going to take a second look, but it seems to be an accurate representation to my understanding of where we are, and with your proposed path forward, I definitely agree that we should do the Rec 27 thing which was recommended, and figure out how to update or how proceed here.

So I guess my question would just be, what do we do next? And maybe you said this and I wasn't able to follow because the sound was cutting out a bit. So, do we pass it back to the GNSO council and wait for their direction now, or is there more that we can do in this context? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:    Before passing the hand to Alex, yes, the idea was to have this as is, or as is with your comments, presented to the GNSO as early as possible.

Technically, I missed the deadline for our next meeting, so [inaudible] next meeting, but I can [inaudible]. So once you guys have commented and we're all in agreement with it, the idea would be to present that document as is to the GNSO. I'm following the chat and now I don't know what you heard and what you haven't heard. I'm very sorry. Maybe I should [inaudible]. I don't have an alternative at this stage. Maybe Alex, you take the mic.

ALEX DEACON: Sure. Thanks, Sebastien. Yeah, I have read this, but I think as Sarah mentioned, I still need to kind of review and digest this. Sebastien, you said something that kind of resonated with me a little while ago. You said it may be a copout, and I kind of agree that it may be a copout.

I think the phase one final report gave us all the tools we need to support both the Thick WHOIS consensus policy as defined and also the phase one recommendation 7 policy. And the tools are that they've said if there's a legal basis and DPA, then we should be able to ensure that both can exist in harmony, if you will.

So I think—not to mention the DPAs again, but until we know what the DPAs say, it's really hard to understand if we're on the right path in terms of this particular issue. In terms of the legal basis, I think the Bird & Bird memo gave us a path forward on the legal basis.

So I think, again, we have the tools to solve this here in the IRT, and we just need to agree to use them. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm still trying to resolve my sound issue. I will dial in, but I'm looking for the number. If somebody else wants to take over.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. While we wait for Sebastien to call in again with an old-fashioned phone, we can probably move to the next topic and come back to it. This is probably not—we do have another opportunity next week if we still kept our meeting time for the 19th. The GNSO council meeting is on the 20th where Sebastien said he will give a status, so I also am not completely clear on what will happen there, but [GNSO will follow] GNSO policy process. And when Sebastien comes back with the phone, please raise your hand, Sebastien, and we'll come back to you.

Let's go to—oh, I need to look at the status map. So this is a OneDoc status map that we continue to update as things change and we believe that we are in a status or state for each section. I wanted to let you know this is the IPT view, this is our view of where we are.

And just to go over it again, blue means there's no additional IRT input needed, IPT is considering and finalizing. Green means no additional IRT input is needed, no IRT objection. Yellow means no IRT input is required but some objection is noted, and orange means we do need IRT input here. And that's where we are focusing on, where we believe that IRT could help us to finish this OneDoc.

So, based on the comment of Alex having a—that we have a tool, we have been given the charter to do the implementation, and we will do our best and try to resolve it here at the IRT level, and we're sending it back to GNSO for guidance. I'm not sure how that will work. But

Sebastien, you're back, so let's get back to you. We were looking at this, and you were fielding questions. Were there any more questions?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:    Thank you. No, I just wanted to answer quickly to Alex. Your point is taken. I know it. We discussed it separately, and we discussed in the last meeting when Beth tried to give us an update on that DPA. I don't know that I heard consensus on the fact that that's a closed book, that the legal basis is a closed book. You know it as well as I do, you've had these discussions with all the participants at the same time. So I just wanted to say that as an answer.

I saw Sarah's hand going up and down.

SARAH WYLD:    You covered what I was going to say. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:    Okay. Thank you. Anyone else?

DENNIS CHANG:    Just to kind of reiterate your process, what is your understanding of your process? We have an IRT meeting on Wednesday, GNSO meeting on the 20th where we said that you will give them status, right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     So, because it took me that long to return this paper, I've missed a deadline last Monday to submit anything that we have to submit in writing to GNSO. So all I can give them next call is indeed a verbal update. Now, if we have this nailed down, I can give them a more definitive update than I was able last time, but I can't submit this paper this time. It will have to wait for the September meeting.

DENNIS CHANG:     Got you. So, I read this paper, and just for clarity of my understanding here too that this is our new baseline proposed language, right? And what this means is, why we did this was rationale put together here, and let me just point out the difference that we believe. I think there a difference in the IRT's understanding whether only green is going to be transferred or yellow and green is going to be transferred. So just wanted to make sure that what Becky said—and Becky joined our IRT meeting which you also quoted. She made it very clear it's green and yellow, and there is a purpose and legal reason for it. That's what the board believes, and that's what was directed by the board and our management for us to implement.

So, what you've written and what you intend to communicate with the GNSO council, is it consistent with what the board believes, or is it inconsistent with what the board believes?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:     I'm not sure [inaudible] I understand what the board believes the same way you do is consistent with what I think I understood the board said.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, this is a quote from—this is from the transcript, so we heard it very clearly. But I'm not sure. That's why I'm asking. So let's get clarity within the IRT for us to say [inaudible]. It's okay if we disagree, but I think we need to make it very clear when GNSO is being informed what we really are trying to ...

Okay, I see, "Just to be clear, I do not agree with that baseline language in the square Dennis is showing now. I'm sure no one is surprised by that. The quoted section is from the transcript, but the interpretation about yellow items is not." Okay. So I think that's—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: if I can help, I'm more than happy to. So I did put the score card in quotes, and in my report, I'm happy to put also this transcript. I unsurprisingly tend to side with Sarah here. I don't think that I've read that and understood that transcript the way you do [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Sebastien, do you want to give Laureen a chance to speak?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely. Laureen, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. And I apologize. I am finding this entire issue to be candidly impenetrable. I'm hoping that I can get some help because I just don't

understand the key points of concern and disagreement here, because my general understanding was that there was recognition that the phase one recommendations weren't intending to change the Thick WHOIS policy, but based on this paper, there seems to be some lack of clarity about whether there's a legal basis for the transfers of data required under Thick WHOIS, and then there's also a concern that if there were an explicit requirement that these elements have a legal basis before transfer can happen, that that would be a quiet repeal of the Thick WHOIS policy, and I just don't understand, A, what the concerns are, and then B, what our recommendations are other than saying to the GNSO council, maybe you can figure this out.

So I welcome people's clarity. I'm just up in the [clouds with] this. I don't understand it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:          Sarah, do you want to answer that?

SARAH WYLD:              Yeah, I would like to speak to that. Thank you. And so I'm hearing phase one policy doesn't repeal Thick WHOIS policy, and I understand that, but recommendation 27 specifically says that as part of implementing all of these recommendations, we should update the following policies and procedures. And the second one on the list is the Thick WHOIS transition policy.

So from my perspective, the issue that we're trying to address here is the question of which data elements do we require in this policy to be

transferred to their registry, and which ones are optional depending on each registry indicating their legal basis for their transfer.

And the problem is that the EPDP policy—phase one—says only the ones that have a new specifically determined legal basis are transferred. The Thick WHOIS policy says transfer all of them. Those two things are in conflict, and Rec 27 says we have to update the Thick WHOIS policy to match the new policy.

So I'm open to bringing that back to the council because clearly, this is a complicated and contentious issue, and it's important. We want to get it right. But I think really, what we should be doing is figuring out what changes need to happen to the Thick WHOIS policy or how to create this policy so that it does allow that necessary flexibility to make sure that each data element being transferred has a specific lawful basis. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:    Thank you, Sarah. I tend to concur with Sarah that we need to take it indeed back to the GNSO council. In all fairness, and to remain neutral, I'm not sure if we need to instruct the GNSO council simply to go and change existing policy, but at least to provide guidance as to in which direction to go, if indeed [thoroughly] change existing policy or if adapting this to existing policy. Trying to be neutral here, but it's definitely the way I will present it to the GNSO council.

Again, I will present what this group tells me to present, so please, tell me wrong if I am. But yes, indeed, existing policy may need to be reviewed thoroughly to adapt if the GNSO so chooses, and vice versa.

Just to make it clear, I haven't discussed this with the entire council as we had all agreed that we would review what we transmit to the council together before transmitting it together to the council, but I certainly do understand from a council management point of view that there are no sacred cows and that the questions need to be asked clearly and reviewed thoroughly in either direction, and then for the council to decide, yes indeed.

By the way, Stephanie, I've seen your comments also. Thank you for those. I don't know if you want to voice them to have them on the record or just keep them in the chat. Getting a lot of silence. Am I getting through at least on the phone this time?

DENNIS CHANG:          Yeah, we hear you clearly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:      Okay. So my next question to you is, how long do you guys need to review and comment this if you want to? Are we giving each other a week, or less? I definitely want to have this in a version that is final enough for me to be able to explain its content to the GNSO on our next call, but apart from that, you have all the time that you need.

DENNIS CHANG:          Next call is next Wednesday, Sarah.

**EN**

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:       So before then, and then I'll have time to wrap it before the GNSO. Is that okay with everybody? Then I guess it is. Okay, Dennis, then I think we can proceed with the next item if there's no more discussion.

DENNIS CHANG:          Yeah. So when you do your update, Sebastien, it would be good if you can address the transcript comments from Becky where she says that—this is the part, that a quiet repeal of the Thick WHOIS by leaving it up to registry to decide whether they want to be thick. I think that's the part that was important factor to us in our proposing the policy baseline.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:       I understand that.

DENNIS CHANG:          Yeah, good.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:       And I can underline it, I can get the quote back. No problem.

DENNIS CHANG:          Excellent. So what we'll do is we'll go ahead and assign a deadline for comments for IRT to say that you're all going to be reviewed by—what's Monday? 15? So please review it and provide [inaudible] support by commenting on it. Thank you very much. Oh, Beth, there's a question that we received on the e-mail from Alex and others on the DPA, and I

think they wanted some status on the DPA. Okay, good to know. Thank you, Berry.

"Circulate Becky's input to the IRT so we can consider it?" Yes. So Becky's input is a part of the transcript that is in the IRT meeting on April 22nd, and let me show you how to get that. I can circulate it for your convenience. But just in case, if you wanted to, April 22nd, and we have our meeting, April 22nd, when you go to our meeting record, you will see the attendee list but also the chat, reporting and the transcript. This is how we find our records. Oh, Sarah, thank you. And I'll send it out as an e-mail so that you'll have it there.

Next was ... And the particular part that I found was useful was page six and eight, and this is where the words come from that I thought was pertinent to our direction. So if this is OneDoc that I'm looking at and the box is where we have the new language and the rationale why we don't need or we shouldn't have the appropriate legal basis language or the data processing agreement.

And I was talking about DPA, and as we said, the DPA is captured as section five and we call it DPT now because Bet hand the team is calling DPT. So it's following along with the terminology.

Is Beth available to speak to the status? If she is, that'll be good. There's some good progress there, right, Beth?

BETH BACON:            Sure, Dennis. Yeah, we've been meeting and we moved on to a new draft of the data protection terms, and our working with ICANN to see if

we can take that draft and move forward with it and flesh it out even a little bit more. We've taken a broad approach, more high-level approach in an effort to make all parties more comfortable with the data protection terms. There were concerns with regards to some of the specificity and responsibilities of each party. So we're trying to find ways forward on those issues, and I think that we are making good progress.

I do hope that we—right now, there's folks out on—it's August. [inaudible] So we probably will not have —I think we're waiting for edits on that draft, and it'll probably be another week or so until everyone is back and able to review, and I begrudge no one their vacation, especially this year. Take some time off, clear your head. So I will happily give an update and provide more next steps as we have them with regards to the DPA.

DENNIS CHANG:    [inaudible] appreciate that. Thank you, Beth. And in regards to the other DPAs, DPTs with a third-party like escrow service providers and others, from the ICANN side, what we decided to do in managing our work is to focus all our energy on the DPT with the contracted parties house first, and that'll be sort of the basis from which we will draw the other DPTs. So the other DPTs, we have [not] started. We're working with the contracted parties to get that done first. I hope that answers your question.

So let's go—Laureen, I'm glad you're here because I saved this agenda item for you, 10.3.5. Last time, we ran out of time or you had to leave, I can't remember. But I sort of introduced the topic but we didn't have

**EN**

sufficient time to discuss it, so we agreed that we would come back to it.

10.3.5, and this is your comment. Go ahead, Laureen. Do you want to talk about this?

LAUREEN KAPIN:    Sure. And in the interim, it also looks like there have been some proposed edits. Are those yours, Dennis? Or I couldn't tell who the source of that was.

DENNIS CHANG:    I certainly did the suggested deletion, but I think I was reacting to the comments that I was receiving from the IRT for [your consideration.]

LAUREEN KAPIN:    Got it. Okay, and that's fine. I just wasn't sure. And I think I actually did discuss this last time, but for folks who weren't there—and also, it's been a long time—I'm happy to go over it.

My main concern was that the language as it was written was not consistent with recommendation 12, and recommendation 12—as I've put this in the chat—allowed the organization field to be published if the publication was acknowledged or confirmed by the registrant via a process that could be determined by each registrar. And in the absence of that confirmation, that it could be redacted at the option of the registrar.

So here, I think some of the proposed changes do help remedy my concerns. Particularly, we've gotten rid of this vague language, "Confirms the accuracy of the value," and instead we have, "If the registered name holder agrees to publication, the registrar must publish."

I still think there's a bit of an inconsistency here because we have, "If the registered name holder does not agree, registrar must redact," which is a little different form the recommendation where it states if the registered name holder does not confirm.

And here I think what's absent from this implementation recommendation is what happens in between the explicit consent to publication and the explicit objection to publication. And that scenario is, of course, the no response scenario. So I don't object to the language that's here. Well, I guess I do object to it.

I think what we need are the three scenarios addressed. The registrant can consent, the registrant can object, and that's a little different. They can explicitly object. And in the event that there is no communication, then it's at the election of the registrar. That seems to me to be the three scenarios that are covered in the phase one recommendations. And I think the nitty gritty of this is what process the registrar uses to determine what's going to happen.

DENNIS CHANG:                    I think I'm following you. Let me give the floor to Sarah.

**EN**

SARAH WYLD:          Yeah. Hi. Those are some really good points, and I think we just have—I thought this recommendation is still waiting on hearing back from the board about the potential option to delete the data rather than just redacting it. So I would like for us to discuss, when do we hear back from the board? Are we going to try to finalize this before we hear from them? That doesn't seem to make much sense.

In terms of what happens in that in-between time, we, I think, should always take a privacy by default approach. And so my suggestion would be that the assumption is to redact the data and only to publish it once that publication has been confirmed by the domain owner. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:        Thank you, Sarah. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:      Thanks, Dennis. I was going to overlap a little bit with Sarah. I know this particular recommendation was subject to some back-and-forth between the board and council. The board had some specific concerns about this. And last I heard, council had responded to the board with sort of a proposed path forward. But I guess I'm not sure I've heard any update past that. I don't know if the board accepted council's suggested path forward or if those discussions are still ongoing. I don't know if anybody else knows the status of that and maybe if not, we can ask for an update on where that is, because I think there is some important overlap here, and so it would be good to know where those discussions are.

DENNIS CHANG:              Yeah. I don't know of the status there, and I wasn't really tracking the board activity there. And what we've said is that we agreed to do this at the end because there may be changes, but we will continue to make progress because we certainly don't want to stop and wait and not do the job. So Laureen, Marc, and Sarah. I'm seeing some comments that this section may be helped by looking at other sections that we have updated also. So please bear that in mind. We are going to go to other section, and we can always come back to it. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:            Yes. And I was going to just speak to that point and give a thank you to Amanda. When I look at the language in section seven, which seems to be a good explication of this process, that language does then seem to not quite jive with the current language in section ten. And what I would say is I think we need to, as you suggest, look at them together and then make sure they're consistent. Because the language as it's proposed in 7.6 basically provides for information to be given to the registrant when they populate the registrant organization field, and that information is not explicitly put here, and we may want to do that. But that information would basically let he registrant know the consequences of putting information in the organization field and let them know that it's going to be published and assume agreement with that. That is different from the scenario that is now suggested in section ten.

**EN**

So again, my overarching point is I think we need to make sure these are consistent. I certainly would favor making the language of section ten consistent with this implementation that's proposed in 7.6.

DENNIS CHANG:          Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:        Thanks, Dennis. So back to the board-council discussions on this one, you said you hadn't been tracking it.

DENNIS CHANG:          No.

MARC ANDERSON:        But this is ... Can we change that? I don't know ...

DENNIS CHANG:          You want me to check it?

MARC ANDERSON:        Yeah, I don't know if—Sebastien's our council liaison, maybe we can ask him to take that back to council to ask for an update. I don't know if we have a board liaison or the ability to also ask the board for a status on that, but maybe we could do that. It would be good to know where that is. It's been a while since I saw council respond to the board, and I haven't ... I don't know, this may have just gotten lost in the shuffle.

COVID-19 caused a lot of [things to be dropped] and maybe they just need a reminder.

DENNIS CHANG: [Sebastien. I don't know. Yeah.]

MARC ANDERSON: Or maybe they [haven't discussed it] and nobody noticed. So maybe we should be following up on that.

DENNIS CHANG: I see Sebastien is volunteering. Thank you, Sebastien. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yes, a few things on this one. So I do need to confirm that we cannot finalize this language without having that input from the board as to whether the data in that field for preexisting domains can be deleted. I think that has a real effect on how we implement this. So thank you to those who will be involved in getting that input.

Going back to what Laureen was saying, the section seven new language maps to the implementation advice in recommendation 12, which is specific to new domains being registered after the policy comes into effect. So it makes sense to me that that would be there in the collection section of our OneDoc, but I don't think that it should or needs to be consistent with section 10, which is about redaction and about—so if we have a different requirement for new domains versus

preexisting domains, we need to be very clear about that in the policy. And of course, ideally, we don't have different requirements.

So that brought my mind back to looking at the implementation advice to recommendation 12. And you know what it says? It says that if the name holder confirms the data and agrees to the complication, the data in the org field would be published. And it says after the implementation phasing period, the org field will no longer be redacted unless the registered name holder has not agreed to publication.

So I do think that we need to be very clear that for any domain name, new or preexisting, redaction is applicable to the org field. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:          Thank you, Sarah. And it's probably a really good time to go look at our implementation notes. This is note C, because this is why we moved it. 7.6 has been moved up [to 7.6,] and that used to be part of the implementation note and you were advising us that that is more of a requirement so we so we should take it up there. And we did. So that's what was done.

And in terms of updating this, and this part C is what we essentially tried to move up to 7.6 [inaudible]. That's what we were trying to do. And this one and this one, A and B, sort of switched the order to make it more readable. So we wanted to share this with you as an update to the implementation notes, and I'll wait for your comment on this.

SARAH WYLD:         Sorry, Dennis, do you mean you're waiting for our comments right this minute, or do you want us to read it and come back later?

DENNIS CHANG:       Either way. I was hoping that you might have read it, because it was on the agenda, but of course, you can come back to it later. And I guess now I'm seeing that interrelationship with [three parts] and it's probably more difficult to just review one section. They do relate and go together. And as Laureen suggested, look for consistency, but [deliberately,] there's design that it is not the same requirement in each section of collection and publication. So that needs to be considered as well.

So I see that IRT is asking for more time for review this, and that's fine with me. Okay.

SARAH WYLD:         Dennis, just to be clear, we're asking for more time specifically because we need that board input so that we have all the information so that we can then come to a conclusion, I think. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:       I see. That's different than what I was thinking, but thank you for clarifying that. Our approach has been that we implement what is required as of today. But we will go ahead, and Sebastien, through his channel, will find out where we are. And we'll have to decide how long it is that we have to wait. But that's our decision too. So we'll see.

So we just looked at the CPH comment in section note C, and moved on to section 7.6. Let's look at section 13. We added a few words there for clarity. So these words were added because there was the understanding that inter-registrar change was [one thing] but inter-registrant change of the transfer, yes, caused another case.

[The board, Sebastien wants to] ask the GNSO because it's a GNSO and [board] discussion. Right? Yeah. And I will ask [the board.] So we'll ask from both sides and see how [that's gone.] And we'll report back to the IRT.

So 13. I think it adds a bit of clarity and I don't think it changes the requirement. I think this should be okay. Any comments on this? No? Okay, we'll move on to 3.11.8. This is new language we added. I think Roger may have suggested [inaudible] do something to address the abusive cases. So new creation. I haven't seen any comments from the IRT. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:     Sorry, Dennis, I'm lagging a little bit. Can you go back to the previous one?

DENNIS CHANG:     Okay. That was the retention, 13. Sarah, what do you like, the 13 or 11.8? Thank you.

| | |
|---|---|
| MARC ANDERSON: | Okay. Thanks. Sorry. I just wasn't—you moved before I could follow what we're talking about. So I'm caught up now. Thank you. Sorry for being slow. |
| DENNIS CHANG: | Yeah. It's okay. No, it's quite fine. We talked about it last time, and we raised it as a possible loophole we wanted to close for the registrars, and we think that we accomplished that by adding these words to make clarity. |
| | And now we're going to 11.8, and this is a new language that Sarah likes, and let's see if anybody would object to adding this new paragraph. Alex is good with it. It's not something we needed, but I thought we agree with [you, it's] kind of a nice addition because abuse is such a big topic right now. Thank you for your support of the new language, and we'll move on. |
| | Let's talk about the RDDS definition at 3.6. We sort of expanded this definition to more narrowly define, so instead, it instead of just refers to the services required, we defined it more. And I think it's an improvement. What do you guys think? |
| ALEX DEACON: | Dennis, I think it's a start. And I was noodling on sending this update. I could do that to the list. But I think we can either split this into two—I think we need to clean it up a bit but split it into two sentences. It says operators of top-level domains are required to provide, and I think it would be helpful to describe who they're providing this information to, |

put a period, and then continue on with the new sentence there pursuant to applicable blah-blah. And I could noodle on that and send that to the list and see if people are okay with that.

DENNIS CHANG:           Yeah. Please go. We welcome your input. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:          Thanks. On this one, I think one thing I want to say is putting definitions in in a policy, it should be clear if these are definitions intended to apply to this policy, this document, or if you're saying by policy, this is the definition of registration data directory services, which for example if RDDS is defined in the RA and the RAA, which I believe it is, then by policy we're changing the contractual definition.

So I'm not going to say now is that a good thing or a bad thing, I'm just looking at that, it's not clear what the intent is. So if we're intending that to be the definition in this document for this policy, we should say so, or if this is intended to be the definition by policy that applies everywhere, then we should say so so there's a clear understanding of the intent.

DENNIS CHANG:           What would be people's or IRT members' impression or perception, understanding, if you saw definition stated in the consensus policy to begin with? What would your default understanding be? Let me ask that question. Alex, you want to talk to that?

ALEX DEACON: Sorry, no, old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I was looking—so within the working group, I think we specifically state that the definitions that we put in the policy res were intended just to apply to that document, to those recommendations. So we were not trying to define terms as a matter of policy. We just wanted to make sure there's a common understanding of the terms we were using within that document.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: So that may be helpful context for you.

DENNIS CHANG: It is. Yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: Sarah is saying, "I think it's important for definitions to be consistent across our policies and contracts." And that's a good point. But if we are

**EN**

... I think RDS is defined in other places, right? I think it's in the RA and I think it's in the RAA. I think in the RAA, registration data directory services is referred to just as collective WHOIS and web-based WHOIS services.

So I think there may be some unintended consequences if we're suddenly changing it or creating a term that has meaning beyond this document. So I would be very cautious about doing that.

DENNIS CHANG:      Yeah. I'm with you on that, Marc. That's a difficult thing to do. But we'll take your inputs. Yeah, that is the issue. As things develop in other agreement documents, the definitions may change and it's difficult to keep them all in sync. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:      Thanks, Dennis. Couldn't we just say RDDS is as defined in the applicable registry agreements? Just take out all the green text, and that way the baseline, you would go back to the agreements. Because again, as Marc said, it's a collective of items. So couldn't we just say it's as defined in the agreements? [Let meg noodle on it.

DENNIS CHANG:      Yeah. Let's see. Okay, well, let's noodle on this. It's not just RDDS. Now it's sort of bringing up how we treat the definitions and consensus policy documents. And you're sort of making me think this is maybe different than [I used to think.] "It is an undefined term, but for the purposes of this document refers to etc." Yeah. Maybe there's a

different way to handle this. Thank you. Thanks for your input. Keep them coming. You know you can make comments like Sarah was doing here. She is maybe voting to remove this part. Yeah.

Okay. There's conversation going on in the chat. Stephanie is a new member, by the way. Hey, Stephanie, you have to say hello. Everybody who joins is supposed to introduce themselves to the team. So this is your opportunity. Let me hear you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:     Hi everybody. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I am the current head of NCSG, outgoing in a few days, couple of months, and I will be on council this year and I'm a recent fugitive from the EPDP.

DENNIS CHANG:          Fugitive.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:     [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG:          I'm glad you survived. There are a few of the IRT members on the same boat.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:     And they have the scars to prove it.

| | |
|---|---|
| DENNIS CHANG: | That's right. Welcome. Oh, that reminds me, for those of you—I don't usually remind the members here, but please do keep your statement of interest updated as changes do happen. Thank you so much. That is the last thing I had on my agenda. Was there anything else that IRT would like to discuss while we're together? |
| | And from here, you can see when our next scheduled meeting is. This is the 8/19, it's our next scheduled meeting. That's next week. Well, if there's no more comments or inputs for us, we will conclude our meeting right here. Thank you so much for supporting this implementation, and I'll see you next week at the same time. Bye now. |

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**