
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the registration data policy IRT meeting being held on Wednesday, the 4th of November at 1700 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Hello everyone. Welcome to our first session post-ICANN meeting. It's been a couple of weeks, I think. I hope everybody has gotten over their virtual jetlag and ready to resume the IRT work here.

The time, so clarification, I tried to do this on the e-mail, just to reiterate, we are going to resume our biweekly session starting today, so we'll have our session and then another session in November two weeks from now, and continue on until the end of the year which I believe is the 16th of December. And you can also track this here, and I

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.

think those are the session that we're planning to have. Also, we can add some sessions or maybe more changes, but at least that's the idea.

This allows us to take the thanksgiving holiday off for those of us US, and then sufficiently close the meeting before the Christmas break when ICANN would be shutting down for a week. So, that is the meeting logistics, and for today, we have on our agenda ICANN 69 debrief and feedback. I'd like to take just a moment to hear from you and everyone on the call to sort of share what you've heard, because there were a lot of sessions where the registration data policy-related topics were discussed.

So let's take a moment to share and catch up on what we've all heard and what we should be aware of together as a team. So that would be something that I think would help us to do our job more efficiently, get on the same page, then briefly look at the timeline, and third, Sarah I think was suggesting, and I hear a couple of people joining in and agreeing with adding an agenda item to talk about the RDDS definition. That's probably appropriate to do just before we go into reviewing the RedDocs because RedDocs are about replacing WHOIS with the registration data and RDDS. So that is primarily the terminology change that we're making. So, very good thing to discuss, I think.

And then Any Other Business. Any suggestions, or anybody have Any Other Business they'd like to suggest? I think we'll have time, so feel free to go ahead and suggest it. If not, we'll get right on it. So I'll open it up. ICANN 69. Anybody want to share what they heard? What does the community think about the registration data policy implementation, the work that we're doing? Do they have concerns, any suggestions?

Our session, we didn't get any inputs from the public attendees. I really didn't get much out of the non-IRT attendees. There wasn't much of a reaction there. Anybody remember anything they would like to share from ICANN 69?

Hey Sebastien. Yeah, I'm glad you raised your hand because I think probably most people are interested in what happened at the GNSO council and you as a liaison speaking about our implementation. Go ahead, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I don't have anything to share. It's a vacuum that I share. I'm very sorry to say that with the change of guard on the GNSO, my request for clarification on 27 got a bit lost, and I've been really sick for the last two weeks. Not [inaudible]. Given the current situation, I got myself tested and it's not that. I still need to find out what it is. But I haven't diligently chased your questions. So I will need to do that.

Things have settled. As you may know, the GNSO started early—normally, we have strategic plan sessions in January in LA, but given the lack of travel, we're starting early and we're starting now. So work is starting in earnest. We're not going to waste any time, but I need to chase that because I haven't obtained, in particular with Rafik, as he was departing and has left the GNSO council because he was term limited.

So yeah, reporting that I don't have anything to report.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, I'm sorry that you were unwell. That's unfortunate, but I certainly hope that you get better soon. Thank you for joining us just to let me know that you're there. That's reassuring. Anybody else? Amr.

AMR ELSADR: Hey Dennis. How's it going?

DENNIS CHANG: All righty.

AMR ELSADR: Cool. Just answering your question on whether there was anything interesting that came up during our meeting in ICANN 69 from community members who are not involved with the IRT, I actually don't remember the details, but I remember that Susan Payne made an interesting comment. I think it was on the issue of the definition of RDDS. I think I'd have to dig through the transcripts to recollect what that was, but I do remember that she made an interesting comment that we might want to revisit. Might turn out to be nothing, but just to flag that. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Do you remember which session it was?

AMR ELSADR: It was our meeting, the IRT meeting during—

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, it was IRT meeting. Okay.

AMR ELSADR: So I'll try to go through the transcripts and figure out what it was.

DENNIS CHANG: RDDS definition. Okay.

AMR ELSADR: Yeah. Might turn out to be nothing, but I thought I'd just flag it since you asked. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I am asking. Thank you. Transcript isn't ready yet for our ICANN 69 meeting. Andrea just chatted there if you notice. So Andrea, as soon as it is ready, could you send us an alert notice to the IRT? And we can look it up. Probably a lot easier than trying to listen to a 90-minute call to find it.

I appreciate that. Actually, the RDDS-related definition discussion is on the agenda as number three, so I will have a chance to talk about it together. Anyone else have anything from our ICANN 69 session, or 69 sessions in general? Amr, do you have something else? Go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: I do, Dennis. Thank you. Just a reminder that I asked you for a short briefing on what we agreed on during the ICANN 69 meeting. It went by rather quickly, I thought, and I just wanted to make sure that—because [inaudible] we made a bunch of agreements and wrapped up a bunch of RedDocs, and I just wanted to make sure if it was folks who didn't attend the meeting or whether it was those who did but want to recap what happened so that we can have a quick look at what it was we agreed on during that meeting and what was still outstanding. That would be great. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: I see. Yeah, I sent an e-mail out. I think I recall after ... Did I not do that? Oh, yeah, I did send an email out on the 19th of October. I think that was our [closed] ICANN 69 session, and then it had a listing of the ICANN RedDocs that we had reviewed and notes on what we agreed to.

Was that e-mail non-satisfactory? Do you remember that e-mail? And also, because of the way I work, I don't want to rely on the e-mails. Okay, thank you. Yeah, because I don't want to rely on e-mail. That's just my work habit [inaudible] e-mails. What I like to do is try to document it in places where I can find it all the time. And this is where I [track the documents.]

So this is our current status of where we are, and I think the date, if you'd notice, the 2020 10 14 IRT session, this is where we're making the date, and on the 10 23, we published it on the IRT Wiki. This is just more efficient for me to update you and make a note for myself. This is what our team is using together.

So, that was the e-mails, and if you pull back the e-mail, but you don't really need to if you missed it. I think that's okay. I think the probably better thing to do is just right now, review this, and it'll probably be better because there has been more progress after the meeting. Okay, so that is one thing. On ICANN 69, anybody else? Post-ICANN 69. Just so that from where I sit, a recollection or a reminder, I think Marc Anderson asked about status on the recommendation 12, and I wrote an e-mail on this, but just to remind you—and I think the board is still considering that and planning to have a discussion with the GNSO council on that. That's the last thing I've heard, and if anybody has more information on that ... Marc Anderson, do you want to share something on this? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hey Dennis. I think you basically answered my question there, so it's still outstanding but you said the board plans to follow up with the GNSO council. So I think my takeaway is that this is still in consultation essentially.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, that's how I see it. And unless anybody else has more insight than that, I'm basically on a waiting mode there for them to get organized and get together. I remember I was on a call, on the GNSO call, it was like 3:00 in the morning for me, I'm not sure if I was hearing things correctly, but I did remember Becky stressing the fact that she had something of a question. She didn't think it was a big deal, but rather than writing, trading letters, she preferred having a dialog. And I think

that that is underway in trying to get the two teams organized for a meeting. So that's what I know about the [12.] And of course, I know Seb was out, but from what I recall from the session on the recommendation 7 issue, the next step was for a motion to be submitted to the GNSO council, and that motion is due on the 9th of November. So I think that was the plan, a formal motion for a vote to be going into GNSO council, and then that again was another topic that I think the board was desirous of discussing with the council in some form. So I suspect that when the board and the council gets together, they'll be talking about both of those issues. That's what I know, and now you know what I know. Feel free to add to the status on those items. Those are the two items that are happening outside.

Okay. Anything else? If not, let's go here to look at our timeline. Our timeline is in our workbook. So we're in November. Can you imagine how fast the time passes? So for now, I think that we're going to have to continue to work on the policy language and the DPT and you'll probably hear more from our CPH small group, and maybe Beth, if Beth is here, she would like to speak briefly about this topic. It's probably the topic of interest for most people. But I was out last week, but I think the team met—meaning the CPH and ICANN Org team that's working on this thing called DPT or ham sandwich. Beth, would you like to say anything about this?

BETH BACON:

One of these days, Dennis, I'm just going to say no.

DENNIS CHANG: You'd never say no. I've never seen you say no.

BETH BACON: I can't say to you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Beth.

BETH BACON: Yeah, so just quickly, I do want to give a shoutout, some of the ICANN folks on this call also dial into and work on the roles and responsibilities stuff, the DPA work, and I just wanted to give a shoutout. ICANN has done a bunch of work and it's been really appreciated. And we've now moved back from considering parts of our document to a full document. So I think we really are hitting a turning point and should have something to the group to discuss, I think before the end of the year. I see that our comments have been pushed to January and I think that's to be expected at this point. But I will note that—and I said this on our last call—we're working now in the small group of contracted parties and ICANN and we have a really nice substantive draft and comments and we're working on those right now, and then we will go back to our stakeholder groups when we get kind of more firm on the language in that document. And then we'll come and share it with you guys at the IRT level. And I think we're still on target for that. And just a big thanks to everyone who's been participating in the CPH side as well as ICANN folks. It's been a lot of work but it's been quite frankly a pleasure to work with everybody on the team. I think we're all trying to get to the

same place. So I do hope that when we bring it back to this group, we are able to walk through all of it with you, that you'll see all that hard work that we've put in. So we're really trying to get that done, and we know that you guys are interested and as well you should be. So we will get that to you to take a look at hopefully before end of year. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

And thanks to you, Beth, for the amazing leadership that you're providing to that team. You have a way of really building a team in a very collegial manner to work together.

BETH BACON:

It's the [bribes,] Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

It's nice to see you guys work together like that. Thank you so much. So I think based on that, we feel like we probably want to look at that before we finalize the policy language. And that's why I have the schedule sort of settled like this for now. And so I think reasonably, the earliest time we can open public comment is probably January at the earliest.

Now, we do have the Thanksgiving here, the Christmas holidays here, so there are some non-working time built in here, so that may slow things down. But that's our viewpoint. Anybody have questions on the timeline? Okay, we'll look at it again at our next meeting, and I'm trying to desperately keep us on the same page of course on our policy implementation here.

Next is the RDDS-related definition discussion. For this discussion, I would like to maybe invite Sarah on to maybe initiate the discussion. She's the one who, I think, initially suggested that we talk about this and add it to the agenda, so why don't we start there? Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Sure. Hi everyone. Thank you. As I said in the e-mail, we've seen that the term "WHOIS" in some of these redlines has been replaced in different ways, and sometimes with RDDS, sometimes with registration data, sometimes maybe it should be RDAP instead. And this plan document that I see on screen is really interesting. I'm not sure that I'm familiar with that document.

DENNIS CHANG:

This document?

SARAH WYLD:

Yeah. That's okay. So basically, we know that we can't just find and replace with RDDS. And when I was thinking about that and chatting with some of my CPH team members, it really led us to thinking about what are we actually supposed to be doing with these definitions. Are we making definitions that are applicable only to this policy or are we making changes for everything? I would think that the definitions in the different redlines we're doing should all match up, but they don't always, so maybe that's a thing to consider. And so I think basically just a general conversation about how we're doing these definition and whether it is for us to make these changes which to a certain extent I

think we all agree it is, but maybe there are some boundaries. That's what I'd like for us to discuss. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Very timely. Thank you so much. Probably we should have done that before we hit the redline, but when we got into the RedDocs, first we thought it was obvious but then we have discovered that maybe it is not so obvious. So we're taking a closer look. I'm glad we're having this discussion. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. Knowing this was on the agenda for today's meeting, I wanted to send this out ahead of time, but I got overcome by events. I'm putting into chat a link to SAC 51, and SAC 51 deals with WHOIS terminology and actually identifies this very problem that we're struggling with right now. And if you'll scroll down to page six on there, it talks about the term "WHOIS" and how it's become a loaded term. And it's using three examples here where it's saying WHOIS is used to refer to the data, it's used to refer to the protocol and it's used to refer to the service.

SAC 51, you can see it recommends a new term, domain name registration data and then domain name registration data access protocol and directory service as sort of new terms to replace WHOIS. For some reason—which I don't know the history behind—that term did not get used, and instead, RDDS became the term that was sort of adopted in contracts and policy language as a result of this. If anybody does know the history behind that, I'd be interested in it.

But anyway, that's maybe neither here nor there. My point in raising this was that what we're struggling with right now is basically exactly the issue that the Security and Stability Advisory Committee raised in SAC 51. And so I recommend—it's a 12-page document—everybody in this group should read this so that it really just sort of helps put a little context and background behind the challenges that we're having in moving from WHOIS or replacing this WHOIS term that really is a loaded term and what it means is not always clear and sometimes depends on the context.

So sorry if that was a little longwinded and sorry for not sending this out before today's call, but I did want to bring this up for everybody in this group.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you so much. This was September 2011. Who is next? Alex.

ALEX DEACON:

Hi everyone. Yeah, so I think this document is important and interesting, and I'll definitely reacquaint myself with it. I think I just want to pop up a level and state that it's important for us to all agree on what the definition of RDDS is before we start doing this copy and paste exercise throughout other policies. It seems to me to be a terrible idea to do that without a concrete understanding and agreement about exactly what that term means and what the scope of that term is and what it includes and what it does not include.

So it seems to be an important next step for us to try to tackle that and agree, and then I suggest once we do that, we'll have to go back and re-review all of these redline documents with this new understanding. To make changes prior to that, I think, I just very dangerous. So that's my kind of meta concern about the process. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Alex. Amr. Oh, Amr, before you take the floor, I note from Brian that he needs to step away. He wrote something very important. He says that there's work going on with WHOIS to RDAP and there may be similar activity, similar struggle, so we may want to align effort there.

Unfortunately Brian's not available, but if anybody else wants to address that as well, that would be good. Go ahead, Amr.

AMR ELSADR:

Thanks, Dennis. I think I agree with everything that's been said so far, whether it was Sarah, Mark or Alex, so I'll plus one everything they just said. I do also want to add, when going through some of the changes we've been making, I noticed that we're also making changes to the titles of policies of previous consensus policies.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. What do you think about that?

AMR ELSADR: Yeah, I'm not sure that's necessary, really. These policies are well known to the parties involved, and if you think of them kind of in the sense of a proper noun, which I know they're not exactly, but you know, they're names of consensus policies. So as changes to policies happen over years and changes in terminology happen as well to reflect the evolution of these policies, I'm not sure these old policies need to be retitled. I think that might actually add confusion instead of clarity in the follow up of our work. So I just wanted to throw that thought out there and see what members of the IRT thought. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I'd like to hear more about that. Beth.

BETH BACON: Thanks. So I agree. I'll give another plus one to Alex and Amr and Marc. I just want to be clear. Thank you to Sarah for teeing this up. We had discussed this on our side and kind of, as we were going through the docs that ICANN has already proposed some edits to, and I think that it was—I certainly don't want anyone to take this as the contracted parties are saying we don't want to do this exercise and that we don't need to fill it out. I think this still needs to be done, but we just need to be really careful about understanding what each particular use of the term is in that particular context of the policy, and then make sure that we're using that correct term. And I think that the SSAC report is helpful context for us. So Marc, thanks for bringing that up.

But I think we all still agree and I hope we all agree that we do need to do this exercise, but we just need to be a little more conscious of it's not just cut and paste. And I think that that has [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think we all agree. It's always harder than it seems [inaudible]. Okay, so we all agree. Alex, did you have something else?

AMR ELSADR: I meant to say "Isn't it nice when we all agree?" Not, "Isn't nice." Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: You know, it's remarkable that I read your chat exactly as you said it, not the way it's written. I translated it in my head. It's amazing.

ALEX DEACON: It was actually an old hand, but I guess I'll take this opportunity to ask the question of how do we—if this conversation is happening and whatever discussions are going on contract-wise, how do we coordinate them? I assume we have to coordinate them, right? And if so, what's the process to do that? I don't know for sure.

BETH BACON: Dennis, can I jump in? I think [inaudible] unclear.

DENNIS CHANG: Please do.

BETH BACON: So Alex, I didn't mean that we were doing contract—I meant the contracted parties just like the folks that are on this call, we were just coordinating and making sure we actually did our homework, as was assigned by Dennis. I didn't mean that we were doing contract things.

ALEX DEACON: Okay. Got it. Yeah, I was just reading what Brian mentioned in the chat. He knows that some work is being done, just wanted to make sure that we're all coordinates in all these discussions I guess is the bottom line.

BETH BACON: Yes, Alex, I 100% agree and I think that this is one of those things where it behooves all of us to get it right. So maybe we do just need to dedicate some time and when we do go through the redlines that ICANN staff has already kindly done, we can just look at those comments and make sure that we agree as a group that that is the correct term, which sounds tedious and exciting.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think we're going to have to give ourselves homework to look at this SAC 51 report, so I'm going to add that to your task list, if you don't mind, so we don't lose it. And I don't know the history, but I'm going to be asking around. I want you to all ask around too why it is that we adopted these definitions and using these names and the acronyms. I'm curious. There may have been good reason, but if there isn't, we have

an opportunity to adopt it going forward. I would like to if there's no reason not to.

Anybody have anything else? And with this document, when I said here's the impact policy procedure, the RedDoc plan, this is the document I shared with you in the beginning about what our recommendation was and what the GNSO council's consent agenda was and how we're looking at it, and what our plans are updating it and then here is how we're using it in the IPT that RDDS means protocol, registration data means the data, is in line, I think, with what's here, but I'm going to have to study it in more detail. And it actually has three different names, which I think make sense too. Data is not a protocol, protocol is not data. Service certainly is different than data and protocol. So maybe it's that three terminology. I'm sure that a bunch of SSAC obviously have thought a lot about this before producing this kind of report. This is 2011. Alex, go ahead.

ALEX DEACON:

Sorry, I lost my train of thought. I just saw you kind of trying to define these things on the fly in that other document, and I agree we should leverage the SAC 51, but I just want to remind people that there is a definition of RDDS in the phase one final report. Whether it's correct or not is, I guess, to be discussed and debated, but there is one there and it does match the definition that is in the phase one, in our OneDoc. But either way, without getting into a debate as to how these things should be defined, I think it's important for us to look at the history to read this SAC 51 report and come to an agreement on what these things should mean. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Do you recall discussing the definition of RDDS and why the phase one EPDP team did not use this acronym and this name? Do you recall?

ALEX DEACON: I don't recall. It seems so long ago. Others may though.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Beth, you have your hand up.

BETH BACON: Honestly, I just wanted to agree with Alex because I was going to say the same thing. I think the SSAC report is very helpful. It can provide a lot of background and help us think about the context with which these terms are used in the policies, but we can't unilaterally just start using definitions that haven't been adapted. And there is, as Alex said, an RDDS definition in the report. So I think, yes, read it, think about it and then just keep it in your brain as we go through these documents. And that way, we can make sure that when we have discussions, we're all thinking about not just cutting and pasting but what is the text in that consensus policy actually talking about? Is it talking about domain name registration data? Is it talking about domain name registration data access protocol? Is it talking about domain name registration directory service? And then we can pick the correct one as corresponds to what we have in the final report for phase one. Does that make sense? Mostly ,that was a really longwinded plus one Alex.

DENNIS CHANG: It does, thank you. Yeah, and plus one Beth. Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I'll just add to the pluses. I think Beth is spot on there. It's useful context. But I don't know why domain name registration data, DNRD was not adopted. RDDS was. And so that's become the new term going forward, and for quite some time. So trying to reverse course and use DNRD instead of RDDS would only add to community confusion. So I certainly wasn't suggesting yet another term. I think Beth was spot on there in suggesting how we should look at this.

To the question on the RDDS definition from the phase one report, Alex and Amr both said they have no recollection of discussing it. I don't think we ever did. I don't remember it either. I think the glossary was something that staff put together for us to help our discussion and make sure we're using terms with a common understanding of what they mean. But that's just a glossary as part of the final report and not part of a recommendation. So I don't think anybody should be reading that and coming to the conclusion that the working group discussed it and agreed that that is the definition for it.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that. That is an important distinction. Okay, so we're going to take a homework on SAC 51 and we'll probably pick up this discussion either online or our next meeting. Meanwhile ... What do you guys think? Do you think that we should still go ahead and look at it?

One thing that I do want to maybe ask you—and let's have a little discussion on this—the name, the title of the policy. We kind of went ahead and treated it like a terminology change and we made a change, but I want to talk about this a little bit. Should we make the change in a different way? Because I just thought, as soon as I heard you, immediately, my mind went to keep the original title of the policy but add “also known as” or “now known as,” so add another title to the original title. I thought that would be a better way to handle it. I want to hear from you. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Hi Dennis. I think it's funny that that's the first thing you thought of, because I think that's sort of what—we were going through these and that sort of tipped it in our minds. We're like, “Wait a minute. What are we doing?” I'm not speaking for the contracted parties group. I'm not comfortable with changing the titles of consensus policies, but I'm certainly open to discussion. I think that consensus policies are what they are and people know what they deal with, and quite frankly, if we're not sure what we mean by registration data directory services, unless it's an apples to apples definition of what's in the consensus policy and what RDDS is defined as, as an authoritative, universal ICANN definition, then I don't know that we should change the title. We can still feel free to do the correct terminology that's meant within the policy if required, but I would not change the title.

But we also discussed a little bit about where we are changing the terminology. We're changing it to RDDS because of the requirement of the recommendations. However, it may not be defined in the consensus

policy that we're changing it in, so all of a sudden registration data or RDDS is showing up as a capitalized term that's not actually defined in the consensus policy. It's defined in the gTLD registration data consensus policy. I think that we need to square that as well.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a good point, actually. What do you think about the idea of keeping the original policy name and adding to that title the RDDS, if you will? What do you think about that idea?

BETH BACON: So, have WHOIS RDDS?

DENNIS CHANG: No, so it would be additional WHOIS information policy, (registration data directory services information policy.)

BETH BACON: I'ma give that a hard maybe. I'll think about it. Is that fair?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, please do. I'm thinking about the future when two years from now when WHOIS is no more. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Again, I think it's premature to even decide whether we update the names of these policies with terms until, again, we agree what these

terms are. And at a higher level, I'm struggling to justify our continued time and effort to kind of go through the remaining RedDocs as we know we're going to have to go through them, all again once we agree to definitions. So we're kind of in a bind here. And I say that as someone who wants to make sure that we publish our work sooner rather than later. But my argument is basically saying we've got more work to do and it's going to be further delayed. So it's kind a ...

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. You're feeling the same anxiety that I'm feeling right now. I'm like, oh my gosh I've got all these people, the team's time is so precious, should I be continuing to review it? Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I raised my hand in response to your question about the title. But I'll just say Alex makes a good point, so throw that out there. On the title, I have to admit in turn on if the title of policies should be changed. I think Amr and Beth made some really good points when it came to—I'm talking about not changing them. So I think those are real good points. I find no faults in those arguments. I think we could make the argument the other way, the term WHOIS itself carries a lot of baggage, and as we're finding out ourselves, it can be an ambiguous term. So I would kind of like to see it go away myself, but I think as Amr and Beth have pointed out, changing the title of these policies actually add to confusion rather than remove it.

So I don't know that that's helpful feedback, but rather than stay silent, I wanted to just say that there's probably an argument to be made either

way and then it's not ... I have a hard time deciding how I feel about it. One thing, though, that did come to mind is that one of the ICANN reviews is around WHOIS, and the first time that review happened, it was the WHOIS review team. And the second time it occurred, it was renamed to the RDDS review team. And they sort of went through the same issue with that, deciding, does renaming it add confusion, does it clarify? And I believe they called it the RDDS review team or the RDDS formally WHOIS review team, and even though they're formally the RDDS review team, a lot of people still refer to it as WHOIS review team. So that's maybe an example we can look to where another group had to tackle this same issue.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Interesting. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Dennis. So I think that we are all in kind of aggressive agreement here that this is an issue we need to discuss and figure out a path forward on before we consider all of these documents that everyone has worked so hard on. So, can I shift us a little bit from discussing the definitions or discussing whether we change them in the titles or in the bodies or looking at the specific documents, but shift us to kind of how we're going to solution this problem? I think that what we should focus on in our next steps is reviewing the SAC 51—or I can't remember, whatever, the SSAC report that Marc shared, whatever number it is. Review that for homework and context, and then also, let's go back and

look at exactly how things are defined within the gTLD phase one final report.

Specifically because I think this is an important thing where we've kind of been playing whack-a-mole with problems. We've given ourselves a recommendation, so we took this action, then we realized that that action kind of caused another problem or, oh, now we might need to do this. I think we need to remember that this is one consensus policy on one issue. It's a very far reaching issue and it's very comprehensive.

And we do have recommendations saying that we will make the corresponding changes where required. But I think we need to remember to stay scoped and targeted in the implementation of consensus policy or recommendations into consensus policy. It's just kind of a fundamental ICANN thing. So maybe, Dennis, I'm just asking you, what are the next steps? Because I don't want to keep us swirling around with looking at individual items right now. I'm trying to figure out, as Alex was saying, how can we work together to get to ...

DENNIS CHANG:

So this is my proposal, and let me see what you think of it. We have, the length of this call is right now it's let's say 10 in my time so we have another half an hour. I'm going to conclude this meeting right now and give everybody a homework to read this document for the next 30 minutes and digest it, and then maybe convene an online discussion on the definition and see if we can come to terms in defining the terms in an agreeable form.

And after that, we can go ahead and resume the review of the RedDocs. Now, I think it would require us to go back, after we agree on the terms, I think it would require us to go back and take another look on the things that we have completed here and see if that needs to be changed again. But I think that's what we have to do. What do you guys think?

The first step in the update plan should have been to agree on the terms, and I apologize, I missed that. I didn't realize it was such a complex issue. Terminology update was a simpler thing, and I was more focused on whether it's terminology versus the policy change. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Dennis. I think we were all in that same boat, that we were thinking, Okay, our focus was on operationalizing that particular recommendation, and I don't think we all realized quite how sticky it was going to get. So I think that was all of us. My question is, other than reviewing things, what's the action for us? Should we be prepared for the next meeting to pull together some sort of agreement in that document, a new step one, or what would you like? What do you think will move us forward here? Because I don't want us to get tied up on this, and I don't think we will, but it sounds like we're all on the same page and I think this is a good faith effort on all of our parts. What are we getting to?

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, yeah. So what we have to do is to define the terms. That's our first job, I think. And before we define the terms, we have to read this and

we have to go back and read the terminology in the recommendation in the final report, and come together and write them down. Whether or not we use this definition is something that we will have to decide, and only after that, I think we can go ahead and resume the review of the RedDocs. So that's my recommendation going forward.

So step one, let me just ... We're still reviewing [all] policies, so let me just ...

BETH BACON:

Can I be nitpicky and ask that we call them working definitions? Because I think based on our previous discussion, we all agreed that there is currently a definition in the phase one report, but what we're trying to do is kind of get an agreement on what we're talking about when we're implementing that recommendation and that definition that's in the report. So, can we call them working definitions, because I'm pedantic and a hair splitter?

DENNIS CHANG:

No problem.

BETH BACON:

Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

So let's do that. This is perhaps very important work that we have to do. And I don't know who else should be doing this job but this team, the

implementation team for the registration data policies. So let's do it. And once we do it, we're going to try to write it down here. Right now, this is what I'm thinking. But let's do it and write it down like this, and this is a good sort of reference point. And then after we write them down, we agree—if we agree, and we should, I think. There shouldn't be a controversy. It's the definition that we will know what it means when we say it. And then after that, we will go back and look at all the RedDocs again one more time. What do you guys think?

So I'm trying to let you go so that you can read and ponder and think. The title change, yes or no? That's a decision to be made, and I want to think about that some more too. Any other inputs? Okay, no more inputs. So let's conclude. I feel like a teacher, I'm getting nervous that as soon as I close the meeting, you're all going to go and do something else. Let's all read this document and then try to come to terms as quickly as possible. And we'll see. We have to set the baseline so we can move.

I am going to conclude this meeting. Andrea, you may stop the recording, and I'll see you online.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]