
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT Meeting being held on Wednesday the 16th of December at 1700 UTC.

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

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in 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. Welcome to our final and the last IRT meeting of the year. We will talk about next year at the end of this meeting, about our next meeting, so we can have that in mind before we break. But for now, let's get started.

First thing I want to show you is the timeline that I've been working on. I'm not done and I'll continue to work on it, but I think it is becoming obvious that we're not going to be finishing our OneDoc in December, but also January. So probably, maybe, February.

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.

The other thing, the thing that is driving is this DPA with contracted parties and ICANN. And Beth is going to join us, but she said that she will be late in joining because of conflict. And she will tell us about that, how that's going and when we may expect the IRT and have a view of a draft.

And other things are, of course, the draft red docs that we have been looking at that are associated with the terminology update. So, you can track the timeline updates on your IRT workbook here at any time as you know.

The next item is GNSO status. Now, I don't see Sébastien on the call, but I think it's important that we are aware of what's happening there. So, as you know, the GNSO and the Board have been discussing the Rec 7.

And the last I can tell you—and I'm tracking this with the help of Berry and others who are involved in the GNSO support—is that there was a motion regarding Rec 7 that has been submitted and the Council is going to consider that motion on the 17th of December which is tomorrow.

I think it's very important because it may actually alter the way we're going about our implementation. I hope whatever is coming out of that is super clear so it does not leave it to interpretation yet again.

Now as you know, GNSO will take a vote and pick a resolution, but then it will also have to go to the Board also. Thank you, Berry, for putting it into the chat there. So, you can see I just clicked on the link that Berry provided. It talks about whereas, whereas, whereas ...

But you know what I like to do is go right to the resolution—“Resolved”—and this is what it says.

I don't think that we need to talk about it here and we won't discuss it, but I wanted you to know that it was here, that you can access it. It's public information. And tomorrow, very early in my time—it's like 4:30 in the morning—you can call in and listen to the call if you should so wish to do so.

Is there anybody in the GNSO that has joined the call right now? Is there anybody here who would like to say something about this? If not, we'll move on. Okay, so then we'll move on.

This is the meeting agenda for tomorrow, and the meeting agenda, I notice, includes a confirmation of the Council liaisons. You can see that Sébastien has been named as a Council liaison and will be confirmed.

So, I wanted to take a moment and say thank you to Sébastien. And we should all be grateful that he is continuing to be our liaison—a kind of a difficult, tricky job that he has. And he has been working really hard to keep things clear and on tempo for us.

So, thanks to Sébastien. And tomorrow morning, the whole agenda ... There are other things within the agenda, but mostly I'm really interested in what's happening with the Rec 7.

EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 items are open for public comment, too. I think I sent you an e-mail alerting you of that. That if you should so wish and have the time, it may be worthwhile for you to view those things and submit your comments.

We all know that these Priority 2 items are on their way for us to implement. And timing wise, I think, maybe after the Board gets through it and coming to us, it may be late February. Maybe March. I'm not exactly sure, but that's, I think, when we can expect to receive them.

I don't know if there's any controversy or disagreement with these Priority 2 items, and I haven't really looked into it deeply. But I intend to do so.

Okay. Thanks, Berry. You're so helpful. So here, you have until January 22nd to submit your input.

And whatever questions that you may have about the recommendations, please focus on what it means for us to implement. And if there's any confusion or things are not clear for implementation, this may be a good opportunity for us to ask the questions so that when it comes to us we won't have to debate it so much, but simply incorporate whatever before—there are only four recommendations—impact is to whatever we're doing at the moment.

And, of course, it would be desirable to for us to incorporate it into our OneDoc for the public comment as we go out for public comment on what we have already. But that is subject to timing, and we will continually evaluate the timing of these four recommendations coming to us as well as the other things that are impacting and driving the [preparation of] OneDoc readiness for public comment. So, that's the Priority 2 items.

And then the other things is Rec 12 status. I think I kind of lost track of the Rec 12 status. I think the last I heard was that the Board had a few more questions. And I don't think it's at a point of any tangible disagreement, but I think it was more about follow-up questions so that things are clear. So, that is still in work. At this point, I probably will expect that we hear back from the Board or maybe GNSO next January. Right?

Marc, you have your hand up. Do you have a question, or can you add to this? Maybe you know more about this than I do. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I assure you, I do not know more about this than you or probably anybody else. I wish I did.

I saw the letter. And thank you, Berry, for putting the link in chat. I saw the letter from Maarten to Council. I guess my takeaway from this is, I know the board initially had some concerns about Rec 12 and that it could potentially have some unintended consequences.

And I understand GNSO Council voted on and approved basically a supplemental amendment to Rec 12, updating it in a way that they thought would address the Board's concerns. But I guess, in reading this letter, it sounds like those changes did not fully address the Board's concern.

And so, reading this letter, I understand that the Board still has concerns, but I'm not sure it's totally clear to me exactly what those concerns are or how to address them. And I don't know if anybody else

has any better insight into this or thoughts on what a path forward would be. It's sort of a shame that Sébastien isn't on the call. I think it's definitely a shame because this will be for GNSO Council to sort out next.

But I raised my hand more because I wanted to hear if anybody else maybe understands this and has thoughts on what the outstanding concern is and what a path forward would be.

I'm not sure this is our problem to solve, but eventually we'll have to implement it. So, we certainly need to understand it and make sure what is being implemented ultimately addresses those concerns.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Well said, Marc. Certainly, it's not for us to solve, but we do have to be prepared to implement whatever comes down. And that's what I am interested in. How big of a change would it be, one way or the other, on what we're doing?

Does anybody have comments? Anyone?

Okay. Berry has put up all the necessary links for you to study if you should wish to do so.

But if there is no other comment, we'll proceed with our agenda.

The next agenda is on RDAP. You saw the e-mail from Roger wishing to discuss RDAP with the IRT, and I want to provide him the forum to tell us what's going on on the RDAP. And if there are any concerns, then the IRT has to be aware of things.

So, I will turn it over to you, Roger, if you like. Are you ready?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Yes, I'm ready.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. I think this came up a few meetings ago, and I know it has come up several times throughout our work about how to handle blank fields and redacted data both.

There are several RDAP Working Group members on this call anyway, but I wanted to bring forward the discussion that was had last week about it and, I think, maybe start the discussion with the idea that RDAP is a low-level technical protocol that client applications will use to get data from a data store somewhere—registry or registrar.

But the RDAP protocol is ... Think of it as IP for a web browser. The IP provides the data to the web browser but doesn't display it. So, RDAP isn't a display or data storage technology. It is just a data transfer technology. So, it's just getting data from one place and putting it to another place. The client applications will be responsible for displaying the data that RDAP provides.

So, I think that this is where the RDAP Working Group wanted to make a clear understanding of RDAP is just providing the data. The client will be

responsible for displaying the data. So, when we talk about that in the sense of blank fields, RDAP's response to a blank field would be ...

Say Organization was blank. It wouldn't actually not provide the tag "Organization" at all. It would just provide whatever data actually exists. So that, if you think about it as key value pairs as we have in WHOIS for a long time—Organization and then the value of the organization—RDAP wouldn't supply either one of them if it was blank just to make sure that it was clear that there was no data there.

There are multiple reasons for it, technology wise. You want to limit your payload as much as you can, size wise and things like that. So, if it's blank you just don't send it.

The clients should expect that behavior, and most clients will actually expect that in the sense that if they received the key of Organization with a value of "blank," they probably would assume there's an error happening somewhere. Again, technology wise, that's how you would expect it to come across.

Hopefully, I'm explaining this so that people understand that when we're looking at the OneDoc or anything else, we don't want to state "RDAP should display this" or "RDAP should provide a blank" or "RDAP should provide 'redacted.'"

Those decisions will be made by the client or—I mean, not even a decision made by the client, but actually executed by the client so that the decision will be in policy somewhere saying, "Hey, if Organization does not have data, just show 'Organization' and no value to it."

And again, taking that down the technology extreme, when, say, a phone number is blank. Phone number comes with a set of expectations that there's a specific format for it. So, if you pass back a blank that's actually an invalid format for a phone number ...

And likewise, when you're talking about passing back "redacted." "Redacted" in characters does not fit phone numbers, so you can't really do that as well.

So, again, I think that when we look at OneDoc and other places, we have to keep in mind that the client will be responsible for certain things and we need to state, "The client needs to do this to be compliant with policy." But we want to extract that from RDAP protocol because the RDAP protocol won't be passing back blanks.

So, hopefully that's clear. I'm willing to take any questions from anyone. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Alex, go ahead.

ALEX DEACON:

Yes, thank. Hi, everyone. Unfortunately, I missed the last RDAP call, but clearly creating an RDAP client profile versus a protocol profile is not in scope of the IRT. So, did the RDAP Working Group decide that the definition of an RDAP client profile is out of their scope also?

ROGER CARNEY: Correct. The RDAP Working Group would not be responsible for a client. The client is going to be directed by policy not by technology, so the RDAP Working Group said they are not responsible for a client definition.

ROGER CARNEY: All right. That seems problematic to me, but okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. I thought Roger's explanation was very clear and very complete. Thank you. It did raise a question in my mind that I hadn't been thinking about which is, how do you indicate that a phone number has been redacted since the format assumes that the phone numbers are all numeric, and "redacted" is characters? So, that's something we need to think about.

But hopefully, Roger's point is clear to the IRT. We should be very clear about what's being transmitted to the client and what it means, how it should be interpreted by the client at the other end. But we shouldn't say things like "RDAP displays..." because RDAP is a transport and it doesn't display anything.

So, I thought it was a great explanation. Hopefully, everybody else found it valuable, too. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Mark. Along the idea of the “redacted,” the RDAP Working Group has talked about this. I don’t know if they’ve actually come to a final conclusion or not. They’ve talked about several options of how to handle a redacted scenario. Again, it has been talked about in the RDAP Working Group. I just don’t remember if it was confirmed how that was going to be handled. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Mark and Roger. I agree with everything both of them said.

Roger, to your last point on “redacted,” I think your recollection is correct. It has been concerned, but I don’t think everybody has come to agreement on how to handle “redacted.” For what it’s worth, I favor having a ...

Mark gave a great example with phone number, right? Putting “redacted” in the phone number field returns a value that would fail validation. So, that’s problematic there.

So, what I favor is having a redacted value in the RDAP response that returns any fields that were redacted that would be easily read and parsed by a client. That’s my personal preference.

I think Roger is correct, though, that the RDAP group did not come to any agreement on what would make sense there.

I actually raised my hand, though ... Alex raised questions about the client, and I think it's worth noting that ICANN Org itself currently has a web client for RDAP. I think there's another group discussing RA and RAA amendments that are considering in there that ICANN would continue to provide that client. That ICANN would have the authoritative client on RDAP responses.

I'm hesitating a little bit because it's tricky commenting on ongoing discussions. Right? So, this is an ongoing discussion, and one that I'm to a part of so I just have secondhand knowledge of what's going on in that discussion.

But I understand secondhand that ICANN has the client—I think it's lookup.icann.org—and that they will continue to operate that as, certainly, the official RDAP client if you will.

As far as the display, and we're talking about any display requirements, I think we're probably talking about what ICANN Org needs to implement at lookup.icann.org based on the information passed to them via the RDAP protocol.

Hopefully, that was helpful and didn't muddy the waters.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Marc. And to your point on the redacted part, that's my preference as well, but it's using a field to return that with the fields listed in it.

But getting back to the client versus RDAP itself, I think we need to—and maybe I even messed it up—I think we need to keep in mind a “client” is not an RDAP client. A “client” is a client application that uses RDAP to obtain some information.

That client may use some other protocol to get other information. I don’t know. Maybe there’s a client that pulls in trademark information as well from the USPTO. I have no idea. But I think we do a disservice if we say “an RDAP client.” This is a registration client.

And again, that’s why I say this is why policy shouldn’t dictate what the client needs to do. RDAP is a technology, and that’s dictated by technology. So, maybe that helps. And again, maybe I messed that up before as well. I think we need to stop using “RDAP client” because that’s not what it is. It’s a client that uses RDAP. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent point. Thank you for that, Roger.

[Just a level setting] for all of us, RDAP is not mentioned in our policy at all. So, I don’t know if there’s an impression that that was the case, but nowhere in this policy language can you find “RDAP” because we intentionally designed this policy language to avoid tying it to any specific technology. So, that’s one point.

The other point, of course, is what Roger is making. When we say “RDAP” we’re talking about the protocol, but the “client” is just an app just like any other app that anybody can produce and make, and it’s up

to them how that app is used to display whatever they want to display.
Please do continue to clarify if I'm getting this wrong.

And I'm glad to read some of the chats that things are getting clear, so
this is a very good discussion for us.

I will turn it over to Mark. Go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. I guess I have a couple of comments.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. You have your hands down.

MARK SVANCAREK: No. I just put my hand down when I began talking.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

MARK SVANCAREK: Is it okay? May I continue?

DENNIS CHANG: So, I want to ...

MARK SVANCAREK: Wait. Can you not hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: First of all, [let's kind of]—

ANDREA GLANDON: I don't think he can hear you, Mark. [inaudible].

MARK SVANCAREK: [Okay.]

DENNIS CHANG: —verify or validate if there's any disagreement here from what we heard. Is there any ...? I think I read that there was concern. Hello?

ROGER CARNEY: Hi, Dennis. Dennis?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah. He can't hear us. I am trying to send him some messages.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay, thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Mark, go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: Oh, okay. Can you hear me now?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I can.

MARK SVANCAREK: Let's see if I can rerail my train of thought.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, please.

MARK SVANCAREK: So, regarding so-called "RDAP clients," I do think it's meaningful to have some sort of a name for the things. There is some client application that is consuming the data. Our policy is requiring that some data be transmitted, and there is something at the other end that will consume it and process it on behalf of people who need to consume the data by whatever means. And it would be nice to have some sort of a shorthand that explains that.

I get Roger's point that it doesn't really matter what the transport is, but since it is meaningful for us to discuss in this IRT—because we do have RDAP and this is an implementation—the implementation should probably specify how things are transmitted over RDAP, it being one of the protocols.

So, I guess I don't care if you call it "RDAP client" or not but considering how it works with RDAP does seem like it's an important consideration for the IRT whether or not the word "RDAP" appears in the policy at all.

Another comment. I'm not sure if it was Marc A. who made it. I do think I like the idea that the ICANN client is the definitive client, but rather than make people reverse engineer the thing, their implementation should be documented. And so, how they deal with missing fields or fields that contain space characters or something like that ought to be defined so that everybody can have the same expectations of what data means.

And there was a third point I had, but I lost it. So, maybe I'll come back to it, or maybe not. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

I'm looking at the OneDoc in Section 10, Publication of Domain Name Registration Data. If we use Roger's example, Registrant Organization (10.1.16). Looking at that one.

Reading this, it says, "In responses to RDDS queries, registrar and registry operator must public the following data elements," and it lists Registrant Organization.

And then it goes on to say, at the end, "For data elements where no data has been collected or generated, the value may be left blank."

So, I think I read the intent of that to be that whether there is a value in the Organization field or not, the RDDS response must include the Registrant Organization field.

And Roger outlined that in a proper RDAP response, if there's no value in the Registrant Organization field, then the RDAP response would not include that field at all.

And so, I guess my concern is, is that a problem? Would that be a problem for Compliance? If Compliance looked at an RDAP implementation and found that the RDAP response was not including the Registrant Organization in cases where there's no value in that field, would Compliance be okay with that or would they come back to the registry and say, "No. Even if there is no value at all, you still have to include the field in your response"?

I think that's my concern with the language as it is now, and I think that gets back to the reason why Roger was raising this.

DENNIS CHANG: Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. My response to that, Marc, is 10 is about publication and RDAP is not about publication. So, to me, 10 is laying out basically what Alex is talking about. 10 is laying out more of what the client should be, not what the RDAP response is. And I think this is the point of trying to clarify the difference between the two.

RDAP does not need to send back the key Organization if it's blank. But if you're going to publish it, you need to show Organization and show it as blank. And those are two different things. RDAP does not need to be tied to 10. The application should be tied to 10. Does that make sense?

MARC ANDERSON: It makes sense to me. I agree with you, but when I read the language, it says, “In response to RDDS queries, registries and registrars must publish the following data elements” and so my ...

I agree with you, but I’m not sure that that language is completely clear. My question is, would ICANN Compliance agree with you as well?

DENNIS CHANG: Mark Svancarek?

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay. I’m putting my hand down now. My question is similar to Marc Anderson. I was just coming at it from a different direction. It does seem to me that the IRT must define how these things would be interpreted by a client, but I don’t see how ...

The consensus policy. How does the consensus policy define what a client does? I don’t see how it does. It seems like that’s something outside of the policy. All that’s within the policy is saying when such a thing is being transmitted for the purpose of publishing it, here are the following options which are intended to be interpreted by a client as blah, blah, blah.”

I know it sounds pedantic, but this really is coming down to matters of being pedantic, namely what would ICANN Compliance—how would they interpret this and attempt to enforce it?

So, I don’t see how this can be about the client because it seems to me that the client is outside of the scope of the policy and outside of the

scope of the IRT. I think it's the IRT's role to define, "If you are implementing such a thing, this is how you do it so that a theoretical client would interpret it correctly."

Does that make sense? I hope that it makes sense. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think I'm following you. The consensus policy is a requirement for registrar and registry operators, and if the client—as we say, the client app maker—is not a registry or registry operator, then we don't have any requirements to follow this. I think.

So, I think that's the point that you're making. But I do see what Marc Anderson is talking about. And I also see Roger's point.

So, does anybody have any further comments? I see chats going on the side.

Just so that you all know that including any language that refers to RDAP is a major change in the strategic direction of this policy language. So, that is a very difficult thing to do for me because I'm not at all convinced that that is something that we should be doing, something like an RDAP client requirement or something like that in the policy language. But I can be considerate if there are some things I can't understand.

"If Section 10 is going to be a 'client profile', then we have much work to do." That's what Alex said on the chat.

Marc Anderson, go ahead. Help me out here.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I want to give a plus-plus one to not including any mention of RDAP in the OneDoc. I think that's something we discussed early in the IRT, is that the OneDoc should be technology agnostic. And I think you've done a good job with that so far. I would not suggest a change of course to get into anything RDAP specific.

I think my takeaway from what Roger said, and maybe my ask, would be to look at Rec 10 and make sure that Rec 10 is worded in a way that gives RDAP implementors enough flexibility to make sure to avoid an obligation to return a blank field where no data exists unnecessarily.

That would not be a good RDAP implementation, and has the potential to cause problems with clients, some of whom, as Mark Svancarek pointed out, might look at a field with blank value as an error scenario.

So, I think there's a way to thread that needle. I think there's a way to make sure Rec 10 is worded in a way that it's not putting unintended obligations on an RDAP implementor. And I don't think you need to rejigger the OneDoc to include RDAP-specific requirements.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for that. As I am considering what you just told me, I'm constantly trying to translate it into a potential change to our OneDoc, specifically requirements to [registrar] and registry operators here as you read. But it's not easy. It's not clear to me how that could be done.

And I think Roger agrees with you also, Marc, on keeping the RDAP out of the discussion.

Marc Anderson, do you want to try again? Go ahead again?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, thanks. I think you made a fair point. And I don't have suggestions off the top of my head, but maybe that's a homework item then?

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible]. Man, I was hoping we wouldn't have homework during the Christmas break.

MARC ANDERSON: Maybe the homework could be assigned after the Christmas break. I don't think the RDAP Working Group is meeting again until January the 13th or 14th or something like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, good. Yeah, so I just want to make sure that I understood why this was brought up at this moment.

And getting back to the main point of this discussion. If I understand this correctly, that right now with the way the protocol is designed, if there's no value, it responds with nothing. Right? It doesn't say, "Here is the key that you asked for and you can see that, if you look at the value, it's a zero." It doesn't say that.

When I say something like "Registrant Name," for example, if there's nothing there, I get nothing. I think that's what you're saying. And whether or not that meets the intent of the policy is in question because right now the language seems to say that if there's no value, you may leave the value blank, but you still have to respond. Right?

Did I get that right?

We talked about unintended obligation, so furthermore I think what I'm hearing is that if you had to respond to inquiry when there's no value, then it would cause work for the implementor. And I think that's what you're trying to avoid.

So, is it important that you respond in the way that we expect you to respond? I think is the crux of the matter here.

I'm going to turn it over to Berry. Berry's got his hand up. Go ahead.

BERRY COB:

Thank you, Dennis. I guess this is something just for the group to chew on as mental homework since we're not going to have actual homework. And I do invite Alex, Marc, Brian, and Mark Svancarek to correct me if I'm wrong because, ultimately, what Section 10 or Recommendation 10 (or whatever the Rec number) was about was defining what the minimum public data set was going to be.

And if I recall the deliberations correctly, picking up on Marc's earlier example, if the Registrant Organization value was not supplied by the registered name holder, that consumers of domain name registration data would want to still see that there was no value there so that they could quickly understand that it was intentionally left blank.

Based on what Roger has explained to us about what the RDAP protocol does or not or is capable of or not, is good information and good insight. But my understanding of the intent behind what is now Section 10 is

that there was a consistent display or publication of this minimum public data set.

And I think what Sarah had put in the chat wouldn't meet the intent of the policy. If there was no value, then it shouldn't be passed along. Now I understand that this might be a complication technically to implement, but again, the intent here was that this minimum public data set would be consistently displayed no matter where an Internet user decided to do a query.

Whether that's lookup.icann.org or if they went to the registry and did a query, they were going to consistently see the string of data elements and whether a value existed or was redacted, or no value at all.

And I'm far from an RDAP expert and I'm not educated enough to determine if it's possible that the RDAP profile can do this or not, or if it's a mechanism on the client, but as I understand—and certainly this introductory paragraph under 10.1 and the text after the 10.1 stuff can be edited—but from my interpretation of what we're seeing here in the draft OneDoc is matching what the intent was from the Phase 1 Working Group.

Thank you.

Oh, wait. I just want to add, because I think something else that needs to be pondered about is, we have an existing policy out there—Consistent Labeling and Display. And my interpretation, based on what we did in Phase 1, was to not change the intent of what Consistent Labeling and Display is about; thus, how we came to this minimum public data set and the structure that is listed here. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Berry. Just letting everyone know what Berry just said is the same understanding that I have and, of course, we're discussing if we had gotten that wrong.

Alex, you're next.

ALEX DEACON: Yes, thanks. I've always assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that there will always exist multiple "clients" that display registration data to end users. Right?

And if this is the case, we need to define the behavior of these clients that display registration data to end users. Right? This is needed for the consistency that Berry just mentioned. I think that's important.

And it would also answer all of the questions that we've been talking about as to what should be displayed to a user based on whatever gets returned and the protocol that returns this registration data. I know we don't want to use "RDAP," but that's fine. Either way, my argument still stands.

Now, if lookup.icann.org is the single and only client that displays registration data to end users in the whole world, then our job is a bit easier because then we only need to ensure that that one single global service displays the data per policy. But if not, we have more work to do.

DENNIS CHANG: Next, Mark Svancarek.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thank you. Building on what Alex said, and I'm going to revise something that I said earlier because I was thinking that lookup.icann.org was perhaps the only ...

I was thinking that perhaps Contracted Parties would be allowed to outsource their publication to that service, meaning that there would be no web clients that were created by Contracted Parties. But if Contracted Parties are in fact continuing to create their own web services, then I guess some of that does fall under the scope of the IRT.

My point is just that since this is an implementation process and we are defining implementations, there may be places where we have to specify things related to a protocol. So, if we want to say that clients should interpret the lack of a key value pair as "data does not exist," then that has to be specified in our implementation so that's what is actually transmitted.

And that would be a protocol-specific thing. Right? The WHOIS protocol would protocol would treat that differently than the RDAP protocol, potentially.

I don't know. Again, this comes down to some pedantic definitions, but I do think that as an implementation group, we do have to set expectations about how we transmit things and how they will be interpreted even though we are not necessarily doing [the implementations or the thing on the other side].

But hopefully that helps. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. Yeah, and I think the last five people, I think, that have talked, have talked about what is supposed to be displayed. And again, I think that's the key here, the difference between display and transmission.

Mark Svancarek mentioned this, and I'm not sure that this was what he meant actually, earlier, or not. But I agree with Alex. I think that there should be requirements in this policy that dictate what an ICANN-compliant display looks like. And I think that it's one of the things ...

Again, who creates an ICANN-compliant display? It's interesting that everybody brought up that maybe ICANN is the only one that needs to do that. That's fine. But I think that they should still be held to a policy that states, "This is what needs to be displayed."

If others have to do it, then that's even better. That's a better reason why we would include it in here. But I think that there will be many client applications that are not ICANN compliant that still will rely on RDAP.

I could foresee LEA writing a client that uses RDAP to pull in some registration data, but also taps into something that they have access to on their own side that pulls it back. And it's this one client that does all that work.

So, I think that there will be non ICANN-compliant client applications, display applications. But to Alex's point, to me, personally, I think that it

makes sense that this policy dictates what an ICANN-compliant display should do, and that application should conform to that.

Just my thoughts. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Roger. So that I'm clear, are you proposing that we levy a new requirement to the registries and registrars for ICANN-compliant display?

ROGER CARNEY: I am not. Again, I'm not saying who has to be compliant.

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible].

ROGER CARNEY: But there should be an ICANN-compliant display, and it should be dictated by this policy. I think this section does that for the most part. But I think it gets back to this discussion of, is that lookup.icann.org the only one? Or if someone creates one that wants to be ICANN, then they have to follow these rules as well.

I'm not saying that Contracted Parties have to do that. I'm just saying if you are creating an ICANN-compliant display, then this should be what happens. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Let me ask one more time. Sorry.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm really focused on registries and registrars who have direct contract with ICANN. Right? That's where this enforcement comes in. Any third party—Dennis Chang can create my own client and display whatever I want, and I can claim that this is an ICANN-compliant display. ICANN has no way to enforce any of that right?

ROGER CARNEY: Right.

DENNIS CHANG: Are you proposing that we put out sort of a guidance and advisory and suggested format if you're going to provide an ICANN-suggested display client? That certainly makes sense to me.

But in terms of enforcement, I need to be very, very clear on what it is that we're asking registries and registrars to do and what we are asking Contractual Compliance enforcement teams to do. They need to match here, and that's why I'm getting confused.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. And I'm not arguing that line at all. I'm trying to stay away from that argument completely. I think that's being discussed in the RA/RAA amendment process.

What I'm saying is, I think it's this group's responsibility to create an ICANN-compliant display.

DENNIS CHANG: You do?

ROGER CARNEY: I think that's our responsibility. Now, who is responsible for providing that? That's something different. I'm not trying to go down that line. I'm just trying to say let's create—and again, I think ICANN needs to be held accountable to it as well with their lookup.

This is what ICANN-compliant display has to have. And I think 10 says that. Right?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. And it also says "registries and registrars" shall, as a requirement—

I'm agreeing with what Rubens said in the chat here. "The ICANN suggested display standard is not the task of an IRT." I agree with that. That's why I want to make sure that we're taking on the scope appropriately.

There are a lot of things that we would like to do, but I want to make sure that we stay in the narrow scope of the IRT and implementation team. And this is very important for me, of course, and all of you because it guides the work that we do together.

Marc Anderson, if Roger ...

ROGER CARNEY:

Just one more thing. I would say, how do you disconnect the IRT's responsibility with recommendations that require publication and display then? Just a thought. No answers needed. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thanks, Roger. Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I raised my hand a while ago and I don't know if the conversation has passed me by. I raised my hand to react to what Berry was saying. I think, similar to what others have pointed out ...

Berry used the term "display." I lost track of how many times Berry said "display" when he was talking. I agree with what Berry was saying in the case of the Organization field where the intent is both in the Phase 1 Recommendations of the minimum public data set, coupled with the CL&D requirements, the intent is that a display would show the Registrant Organization field and no value there.

I think that's the intent of what the minimum public data set and the Consistent Labeling and Display requirements are, and what a user would expect to see from a client. But that's different from the transport protocol which I think is the concern here.

And Rubens in chat said it very well. He said, "For computer-to-computer protocols, it is very odd to have value-less field."

A client would expect that if there's no value, to not have it returned. And it would be the client's responsibility. Even though it didn't get the Registrant Organization field in the response, it would still display to the user the Registrant Organization field with no value.

I think, and hopefully I'm representing Roger right here, I think that was the original point that Roger was making. That there's a difference between the transport protocol and what's required for a display.

Hopefully, that clarifies instead of muddies the waters. I think I'll stop there before I make things worse.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Mark Svancarek.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you. Hopefully, to make this more concrete.

I've already built a WHOIS public data processor that collects data through RDAP. And we did that by looking at the server profile that was

created by the RDAP Working Group. And it is our assumption that the implementation by Contracted Parties will conform to that profile.

And really, all we need here in this implementation phase is a recognition that your implementation shall conform to that server profile. And that allows me to create my clients so that I understand what's being transmitted. That's really all this is.

And I do think that falls within the scope of the IRT. If it's just as simple as saying, "The policy is for data transmitted by at RDAP server, that it will conform to RDAP server profile..."

That would probably be sufficient. And then all these details are encapsulated by that profile and you don't have to go into that level of detail here.

So, that would be my preference.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Anyone else on this?

Okay, so let me ask this one question. Do you all feel like we understand the issue better? I think I understand the concern, and I understand more about what it does now.

One thing that I want to be very careful about is that we do not try to change the policy requirement so that we can accommodate what technology exists now and today. I think it absolutely has to be the other way. The consensus policy dictates the requirement, and

implementation is where we all have to follow that requirement and make it happen.

So, that point is something that I need to remember again, why it might be attractive to just maybe take an easy way out. I don't think we will be doing our duty if we take the other approach.

Go ahead, Alex. Do you want to talk about this?

ALEX DEACON:

Well, that's a good question. The more we have this discussion, the more I think it's important that we have some type of document that describes how clients that display registration data to end users behave. If you go to lookup.icann.org and search for "Tu cows.com" you'll see that the display of that information is—well, it's incorrect. Let me just say that.

If you scroll down and look at the contact information, there's no e-mail address. That's required by policy. And if you look in the raw output from Tu cows, you see that this information exists in the response—in the protocol—but it is not being properly displayed by the client.

And it seems to me that it would be helpful for lookup.icann.org clients and any other clients to have a document that details what they should do and how they should do it. And what they should do if they don't receive a field that should be expected by policy. And what they should do if they received a field that is expected by policy but is empty. What do you do? Or what they should do if they receive a field that is tagged as "redacted" or "private."

But without a doc like this, you are going to see inconsistency in how users are getting access to this information or seeing this information.

So, I just wanted to point that out. I think it's always useful to look at a concrete example that describes the problem that we're talking about now. It's something that exists and is real today. It's a problem that needs to be solved. Whether it's within the scope of the IRT or RDAP Working Group or something else, I don't know. But I think it needs to happen.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. And my role here is very much trying to make it clear, the scope for the implementation team. And that's probably why I have talked more about the scope than others.

Yeah. There are a lot of things that we've got to do, but what we have to do as an implementation team is what I'm trying to focus on. It's nice to know the RDAP protocols and profiles being worked on by a lot of people, but so are many other things. And we just have to make sure that we stick to the job that we have here.

Let me hand it over to Marc Anderson again. Help.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. First, I want to just acknowledge your point about sticking within scope. That's a great point and well made. I think we need to always be cognizant of that.

I was more raising my hand to respond to Alex. That is a great example from Alex.

My suspicion, just having looked at this for 10 seconds, is that this is probably a good example of the client expecting an e-mail value and getting something other than an e-mail value in the response. And that's causing problems for the client. The client is receiving a value other than what it expected.

So, I think that really underscores the risk of not having the right implementation here. If clients are receiving things they don't expect, it can break client implementations.

Obviously, I don't know exactly what's going on with the client and the response. That's just from quickly looking at it. But it is a really good example and why this matters and we need to make sure we get it right.

DENNIS CHANG:

Agreed. Ruben, did you want to speak? You're posting a lot and I'm having a hard time tracking you. So, if you want to speak, go ahead. But if not, that's okay, too.

Anyone else?

Well, that was certainly an interesting discussion. Thanks, Roger, for bringing it up and 1) educating us, and 2) giving us plenty to think about. The separation protocol versus client app was a very good thing to be aware of—what we do with the policy language and what can be done outside [that's] surrounding policy.

And we do and we will create a lot of educational material, advisory guidance around this policy. And that is part of our implementation plan. When we get into implementation for the 18 months, that's what our staff will be working on mostly.

And that's what we will be asking the IRT for review and guidance on also—what materials are important and should be available when and to whom. All the discussion is going to happen, but later.

So, let's wrap up the RDAP conversation for now. And we'll take it as homework and consider what our scope should be, if there's any policy language that we have to develop or change.

And [I'm] thinking [that] adding a whole section for client requirement is an option, but it's something that I really hesitate because I don't know how that requirement is for. If we're assigning that requirement to ICANN [shell] through this or registry/registrar [shell] through this.

Any third party who we don't have a contractual relationship with, we cannot put obligation to them whether that has any value in putting it in our policy. So, [inaudible]. But it was interesting learning about RDAP and the work that you guys have been doing.

Marc Anderson, do you want to go ahead?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah, Dennis. Sorry. I know you're trying to wrap this up, but just for what it's worth, my two cents on what you just said. I support having ICANN Org responsible for implementing the authoritative lookup service. I think it makes sense to have one single location for users to go

to, and I think that's also in line with the recommendations that came out of the WHOIS1 Review Team and reaffirmed by the RDS2 Review Team.

So, I think it makes sense for that to be the single authoritative source. But to how that relates back to us, usually policies are written for Contracted Parties. There are obligations for Contracted Parties. Obviously, you can't enforce compliance on non-Contracted Parties. So, somebody that's not ICANN or a registry or a registrar is free to do what they want.

In my view, I think the display obligations are on ICANN Org and how they implement the lookup.icann.org service. Again, that's just my two cents on that one. And, again, I'll shut up there.

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, I take your point, and I'm just laughing at Alex's comments. Alex, [the staff who probably down this] [inaudible]. Right?

I did the best I can, I guess, given whatever resources and timeline that they had. And this is obviously one of the tools that ICANN is supporting, and we'll continue to update and improve tracking, whatever it is. [And it needs to track.]

And, obviously, since this is an ICANN service that we provide, you as a community can demand and ask for this tool in a way that does support you. And that is the kind of project priority that ICANN does each year to try to pick up what it is that is important to provide to the community as a service.

So, I wanted to let you know that, and please feel free to provide your inputs directly. I think there is a link somewhere within this lookup tool where you can provide your input.

With that, let's see. We have 15 minutes left. Did Beth join us yet? No? Okay. So, we'll wait for Beth to join.

But before we break, I did want you to know that they're still working, and the team may meet again. There are five days, but there may be more development. But the thing that I can tell you with certainty is that IRT is not going to get this draft this month. Probably the earliest is January, but we will see what, if anything, Beth has to say if she comes on. If not, we can hear more about it when we return next year.

But the other is this RDDS definition deletion discussion I would like to have. I sent an e-mail out, and I saw a couple of reactions just this morning, I think. They were coming. I saw a couple of e-mail replies. I think one was from Alex. The other one from Sarah.

So, I know that you've been looking at it. I haven't seen any reaction on the doc itself, but I do want to open it up and give you a chance to talk about this.

So, I'll open the floor for discussion. The suggestion is that we delete this, period, and not have further discussion about the definition—is what we're suggesting.

Does anybody have anything to say?

Yeah, Sarah doesn't want to talk about it anymore. She supports deleting it, so that's good.

Laureen, you have the floor.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Dennis. I have to say that I, like Alex, would love to hear from you about the thinking behind this. I've been looking back at the Phase 1 report. It seemed to me that those definitions contained in the glossary were part of the recommendations, as the recommendations used those terms.

If we had wanted to define it the way it is defined in the Registry Agreement—which, as I understand it, is different than the way it is defined in the standard registrar agreement—it seems to me that the Phase 1 team would have done just that.

But that's not what they did. They included this definition, which is fairly generic in my view, but does include the concept of access. So, I would love to get some more insights on how we can disregard that.

DENNIS CHANG:

Marc Anderson, do you have your hand up?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I guess I'm curious to hear a little bit more on your thinking in proposing that, dropping it here.

But I do want to disagree slightly with Laureen. The definitions in the glossary were never intended to be part of the policy, and they're not.

They're in the glossary in the back. They're not part of the policy recommendations.

Those aren't definitions that we debated and are recommending that the community adopt. Those are just definitions that staff provided as reference in the document. So, I think that I would not want them to take on more meaning than they were intended to have as part of the Phase 1 work.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Marc. Anyone else have comments? Okay.

Then I will tell you and share with you. We certainly—the IRT—has spent a lot of time talking about these definitions. And in the background, you can imagine how much staff resources have gone into trying to define RRDS here.

And I think it was Susan last time who cautioned us, and it struck me. She said, "You know, the ICANN community has been discussing these definitions and we have not been able to come to any agreement."

And here we are again, and I believe that others have made comments—and I think Beth was one of the strong voices here, and she's not here—that trying to define the definitions here seems to be out of scope.

And that kind of struck me, and I thought about that. And in general, developing policies, contracts, and whatever, I think the best practice is that we have definitions in, ideally, just one place. But if that's not possible, minimize the places where we define words.

And I heard Laureen say that the RA and the RAA definitions are different, but in fact I think they are the same. And the Contracted Parties are here, and they can confirm that. But effectively, they're the same definitions that they have been using for many, many years, and there was no need to try and redefine it. And it's been working well for us.

And I think that when I read these definitions that we have come up with after so much discussion, it basically points to the RA/RAA anyway. And therefore, why have a definition that says, "Go use another definition"?

The thing that we really got into this [inaudible] when we're were trying to have a debate on is this word "publication." But of course, it was "access." But the reason that we came up with "publication" is because "access" was not agreeable in the first place.

So, we can continue to have this debate here, but I didn't see the value in it. And this is why, rather than have some definition that we force into the policy language and then have it become another subject of discussion by the community for I don't know how long, I just don't think it's a value added for our policy implementation.

And that is why, in keeping with my main theme and strategy of just do the job, do my job. And you cannot try to [fall for] everything or the problems or orders, the complications that are around me.

Before I head into Christmas holiday, this is one thing that I thought that we could just take off the table and know that we can still do our job

without this definition because we have definitions already available. And we can use those definitions to do our further work.

And that's where I'm coming from. And this is after so much discussion—many, many hours. Many hours of discussion and thinking, morning walks and evening walks. And that's what I came to.

So, now you know how I feel about this and you know what I'm thinking. So, let me hear your feedback. If you have suggestions for me, I, of course, am happy to listen.

ALEX DEACON:

Dennis, my hand is up. I just want to make two quick comments. I would appreciate if you or someone from ICANN Org or IPT respond to the questions in my e-mail. I think it would be helpful for me just to understand, in the larger context, what we're trying to do and how things actually work in terms of setting policy and spending years and years and years on PDPs, in the end to just have decisions like this apparently change them.

So, if you could please respond to that, or someone, I would appreciate that.

DENNIS CHANG:

We're here. I'm here with you. I'm responding to you right now.

ALEX DEACON:

No, if you could do it on the list, I would appreciate it.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

ALEX DEACON: And then in terms of the red docs, the plan then is to do what? Is to use the definitions from RAA and RyA in terms of RDDS?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Look at this here. We have 3.10. I pointed this out. This is what we came to. We added this as a default, and it's a good thing we did because this is what I'm relying on. If RDDS is not defined here in this policy, just go find out. Use the definition in the RA and RAA. We already say that in 3.10.

And just more point. If you're concerned about the requirements themselves [that] the policy is dictating, then we should really be looking at to make sure that whether the requirement in collection here is clear, and that we didn't forget anything, ignore the obligations, or capture in collection. Same as transfer, and publication, and whatnot.

Those are the requirements. That's where it should be defined. Trying to rely on the definition, I think, is, again, dangerous and it could be subject to interpretation. I'm just trying to completely avoid that pitfall so that we can make our jobs easier. That's where I am.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Dennis. I don't agree. I think this decision which seems to have been made [and we'll move forward with that] is a terrible idea.

We talked about on the last call that in the Phase 1 policy, we spent a lot of time and effort updating the Registration Data Policy based on GDPR and other data privacy laws. But we're using definitions in the Registry and Registrar Agreements that have not be updated, that have not been brought into line with the reality of what's happening today versus—what was it, 2012?—eight years ago or so whenever they were define. And I just think it's a mistake.

DENNIS CHANG:

Understood. Thank you for your input, Alex.

Susan, did you want to speak? I know that I brought up your name, and I just want to express my thanks again to you. If you want to speak, I'll give you the floor. Oh, she isn't connected. That's fine.

I think we're at the top of ...

Are we? Somebody do a time check for me. Did we [inaudible]?

ANDREA GLANDON:

Yes. Your time is up, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Sorry. I'm sorry to keep you over the time, but I will just say thank you again and say goodbye until next year.

And right now, as I said, this is our last meeting. The next meeting isn't scheduled until January 13, so that's probably when I'll see you again. And I will see if I can give you some homework in between, but don't

expect a lot of homework from me because I'm trying to take a couple weeks off myself.

Thank you again, and I'll wrap it up and say goodbye. Happy holidays, everyone. Please take care and I'll see you all again in happy new 2021. Goodbye now.

ANDREA GLANDON:

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]