

---

ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy Implementation meeting being held on Wednesday the 27<sup>th</sup> of January at 17:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no rollcall. 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. Please note the “raise hand” option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar, “reactions” section. 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:

Welcome, everyone. So, this is our meeting number ... I lost count but I’m sure Andrea has it recorded in our workbook. What’s remarkable is this is our last meeting in January already, so one month has passed, it seems, in 2021. That was fast.

Today, what we want to do is talk about these items on the agenda. I would like Andrea to tell you a little bit about what she's doing about planning the ICANN70. We want to talk about Rec 7, GNSO resolution. Unfortunately, Seb couldn’t make it but, regardless, I think that I want to provide a bit of a forum for IRT to interact and discuss it.

---

*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.*

---

And then, I have asked Beth to provide a short status on what's happening with DPT, the Data Protection Term between ICANN Org and CPH. And then, we will head into the IRT comments on OneDoc. This is a reaction to Sarah asking for time to discuss her comments on OneDoc.

So, I don't know which ones that she has in mind but I'm sure she'll guide us through it and we'll do that. I don't think we will spend the entire 90 minutes and I've already gotten alerted some people need to drop off 30 minutes earlier, so let's see if we can wrap this meeting up in one hour. Any questions on the agenda? If not, I will hand it over to Andrea. Andrea, go ahead. Tell us about ICANN70.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Absolutely. So, for ICANN70, which, of course, will be a virtual meeting, we are tentatively/pretty sure this is what's going to happen. We will have our IRT meeting on Thursday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, from 17:30 UTC to 19:00 UTC. Of course, ICANN70 is being held in the Cancún time zone so it's pretty close to what we are doing now. That will be an open session to the public so we will be on the official ICANN70 schedule and anybody in the community will be able to join that call. And then, after today's meeting, I'll send out a placeholder Outlook invitation to the IRT and the IPT so that you'll have it in your calendar. Back to you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you very much, Andrea. So nice to have you there to plan early for us. She does a good job of grabbing a good time slot for us—or most of us, I'm trying to say. The only difference is, this time, it being

---

Thursday instead of Wednesday but it is, I think, in the same alternate week that we usually have our meetings.

So, that's good. We will talk about agenda as we get closer to the session. Feel free to contact me if you have any thoughts about how we should leverage and utilize the ICANN session to benefit our implementation.

Next item is any questions on ICANN70. Let me just pause here. If not, we'll move to item number two, Rec 7 GNSO resolution. So, as you know, last week there was a GNSO meeting and a vote on Rec 7. Roger wants to enter the room, okay. Sebastien has written an e-mail to IRT and, as he said, he fulfills the item number five of the resolution. Item number five. Oh, this is interesting, Andrea. Do you notice that, on the archive, all the numbers have changed to one?

ANDREA GLANDON: Oh, I didn't notice that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's an interesting ...

ANDREA GLANDON: Formatting issue.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. In the original e-mail, which you should find in the Outlook in your inbox from Sebastien, is one, two, three, four, five, six resolutions. You

---

can look them up directly, too, on the GNSO website, as well. This item, number five, says that GNSO Council instructs the council liaison—in our case, that is Sebastien—to communicate with the GNSO council to the Implementation Review Team.

So, that's what he did. So, he wrote this e-mail to satisfy resolution number five. So, resolution number five, effectively, has been implemented. I have asked him a question about number six, and that he has not replied to yet but I am sure we'll hear from him soon.

So, in terms of our process, we, the implementation team, must wait for direction from the board or our ICANN CEO being directed by the board. That's how we work. But we all know about this IRT, so it's to our benefit to be aware of this and, maybe, come on the same page as much as possible on how we should understand this in anticipation that the board will agree. Of course, the board may disagree and there may be further resolutions from the board, but at least let's try to understand what GNSO Council is advising us.

I heard that many of you were busy and this e-mail came yesterday, or this morning, so you may not have had a chance to read it all. But for those who have read it, I wanted to let you discuss it. If there is anyone who wants to open the floor with a discussion, please raise your hand, or if there is anyone who has information that they want to add to this resolution please go ahead and raise your hand. Sarah raised her hand. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi, hope you can hear me.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I can.

SARAH WYLD: I guess I just have a process question. So, I thought that we were asking the GNSO Council for direction or for clarification, and now they have provided that and they have communicated it back to us. I guess I'm confused about what we're expecting from the board. Is it a standard part of our process that we now have to wait for the board to confirm what the council said? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, that is the process. Especially if this is inconsistent with what the board had directed, then we must wait for the board. That is the reason why the board and GNSO Council were having a discussion in the first place. So, we need to wait for the board to come back to us and provide clarification on what we need to do. So, that's the process. Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. So, is the board aware of this and do we have a timeline for when we expect to hear back? Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, that's the question that I was asking Sebastien, whether he is aware of the GNSO action to contact the board or inform the board, but I have

---

not heard back from him yet. So, it's really a question to GNSO. As a liaison, we should go through Sebastien to ask questions on the GNSO action.

I suspect that that's done but I don't know. I don't know what the timeline is at this point. Unless I see some evidence that I can provide to you that this has officially been communicated, as Sebastien has done to us, I cannot tell you that it was done. In any case, I'm sure he'll follow up and respond to us. So, let's give him a day. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I understand that it's kind of closing out the conversation for between council and the board on this particular question but my understanding is that it's more of a check the box, close the loop, we're responding to you. Do we anticipate anything from the board in response, other than "thank you, proceed"?

DENNIS CHANG:

I cannot speak for the board, Beth. That may be a good expectation but I shouldn't presume. Did everybody ...? Okay. Well, we will probably resume conversation online when Seb responds but my goal here was to make sure that you were aware that there has been a GNSO resolution and you are all aware of exactly what the wordings were, and have a look at it, and give you a chance to ask questions to Seb. But he is not here, so please do it online. Roger, you have your hand up.

---

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Thanks for the update. It's good to know this process. Can staff provide us any other information? Is this the last step in the process? Is there more process that has to go in place after this? Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a good question. Let's see. My understanding is that council and the board were having discussions in small groups. I hope that there is a resolution one way or the other. But if the board comes back and says, "Yes, we agree, this is what it means," and then we proceed, then it is the last step.

If the board comes back and says, "There is a disagreement," and the board directs us to do one thing or another, then we are obligated to follow the board direction, and then that action may spur another action by the GNSO, so that I cannot predict whether it is the last thing.

Of course, "last thing" means that there is going to be a public comment, and the issue may raise back up after the public comment, and we may get into another discussion. So, until the policy is published, there is always the chance that things can get opened up. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Dennis. When you say public comment, you mean public comment on our published consensus policy, not on this particular issue, right?

---

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, there is no public comment.

BETH BACON: Oh, I was going to say, well, that's new.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm trying just to get the public comment part with the whole thing because I don't know what we will hear then. But hopefully, [inaudible]. We have a good representation of the community here in our IRT, so I think that we're hearing a well-balanced input as we proceed.

When I hear back, internally, I'll reach out. If there is action and movement on the board side, I will inform you, keep you in the loop as to the progress there. In the meanwhile, please go ahead and write e-mails to Sebastien if you have questions about what the resolution is exactly and what it means to our policy language and what we can and cannot do.

We want to avoid another one—interpretation among IRT—so it would be good to get the IRT on the same page. I don't know that the IRT is on the same page yet, so there is my challenge to you. And then, we'll move onto our next item. Our next item agenda: DPT status. DPT, DPA, this is something that is an item that we are also looking for good progress on.

It's one of those [pacing items] for the project. Good thing we have Beth here. I would like Beth to give us a quick status and what has been happening. I know that you have been working and you have ... In 2021,



---

there is some structure triumph or progress, so maybe you can share that with the IRT. Beth?

BETH BACON:

Hi, folks. Really quick update. As you guys know, we have been working on this for a while. We did, at the end of December—I think I updated this group on our last call about this—work with ICANN, and drill down, and identify our outstanding list of issues. We have a timeline and a structure for which to address those, and address one, and then move onto the other in a timely fashion. So, we are hoping to be able to close out the discussions on those discrete issues and get this draft out the door.

So, that is what we're doing right now. We're digging through those. It is, again, a pretty discrete list, so hopefully that will not take too much time. We were really hoping to get it done in 2020 but that didn't happen. So, I think the goal here is to get this done as soon as possible because we understand that this work in the IRT is dependent upon that, as well. They're kind of "of a piece." So, we do want to close that out so that we can close this out—not that I don't love spending every Wednesday with you guys, everyone.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, we love you too, Beth. Thank you. Let's then move onto the OneDoc. I have a hand with Alex. Go ahead, Alex.

---

ALEX DEACON:

Yeah, thanks. Good morning, everyone. It's great to hear that there is progress but if I could be annoying, can you guess as to when we'll see this? Is it a week away, a month away, a year away, ten years away? How long? It seems to me that ... I was thinking about the ICANN70 session planning and I think that seems to be a good forcing function for us to not only get the DPT drafts out so we all know what the foundation of the policy that we're writing is, but also work hard in attempt to get the OneDoc in a much better shape. Is that kind of the goal or is that even a pipe dream? Thanks.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Alex. I don't know. Right now, we have broken them into, I think, nine issues right now, and we're working on the first three, and we kind of anticipate each chunk taking a few ... We have meetings every Friday and we are trying to accelerate those and make sure that those meetings are more decisional but still anticipate each block of issues probably taking two weeks.

And then, also, we do have to go back before we kind of publish, I suppose, a draft of the DPA. We do have to go back to our stakeholder groups, so that's going to be another cycle because those are biweekly. So yeah, I'm hoping that, maybe, in this group we can discuss it in more detail before ICANN70.

Maybe that's something we can try and do. But I don't know that they're going to be ready for publishing at ICANN70, but I can flag that for the roles and responsibilities group that's drafting the DPA and say that that is a desire of this group. But I will say that there is an appetite

---

to get this done and, quite frankly, I don't want to be doing this for another six months. It needs to get done.

So, there is 100% a dedication to getting this done as quickly as possible. But let me bring that back and let them know that there is a desire to talk about in March and maybe we can think about bringing some stuff into this group before or in conjunction with ICANN70. I don't think that's unreasonable. So, if that's at all helpful, I don't have a definitive answer.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thanks, Alex, for the suggestion. ICANN has been an organization that rallies around ICANN meetings. It seems to have worked before. The fact that we went virtual, that milestone seems to have somewhat diminished but it's still a flag that we can plant to work toward. It would be good to have all of this drafted and be reviewing at the ICANN70 meeting in front of the public. That would be good. Thank you.

BETH BACON:

Dennis, I just want to follow, if I could just weigh-in. Again, certainly, we have in the past ... It would be great to do it in March but we have about ten issues, nine or ten issues, and this is taking time on both the ICANN and CPH side. We're kind of trying to go back and forth and work with these schedules. So, again, I would be happy to discuss it in this meeting, in our meeting, but I don't think it's going to be finished by March.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I didn't mean that. "This meeting," meaning the IRT meeting, right?

BETH BACON: Yeah. So, we can discuss it with our colleagues because you guys have been really patient in working on this, but I don't think the thing is going to be done by March. I don't want that expectation. I don't want to set that expectation. I do think that we're going to be a lot further along. Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: So, Alex, good clarification. The DPA that we're talking about is the DPA between ICANN Org and CPH. There are other DPAs between ICANN Org and what we refer to as "third party." Those DPAs have not started because what we do here largely is setting a baseline and platform for how the other DPAs will be done. So, that is the priority.

Thanks for that clarification, Beth. We'll then move to the next item on the agenda, and that was ... Before I get there, I just wanted to make sure that you knew that these two deadlines were there for Rec 27 Wave 1.5. I have looked at some other comments—and thank you for doing that—but your comments will be now taken as input to our team who are working on the Wave 1.5, and then they'll process that and it will go to the GNSO as we have planned. I forget the exact date but there was a plan that was provided by Karen just last time she was with us.

So, that's the end of your homework. We want to look at our policy document language and—let me see—I wanted to start here, 5.0. This is

---

where we said that we're not going to touch this section, five, until we see a draft DPT. And so, that's the way we are linking this data processing term with policy language. So, we're going to skip that. Any comments on number five? Sarah, I've heard you before. Do you want to guide us on which comment you would like to discuss?

SARAH WYLD:

Sure. Hi. Thanks. I guess before I jump into it I do want to just say it's not that I, individually, specifically want to talk about these things, although I love nothing more than to talk about these things. But really, it's that I think we need to get these pending issues resolved and I think it makes sense to use our scheduled call time to do so. So, I'm happy to speak to these things and lead us through it. Yeah. I'm not sure why we're starting in the middle of the document. Do you want to start at the top or did you want to look at specific sections, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG:

No, I want to follow you and your guidance on which topic you thought that we needed to discuss. There are topics we cannot resolve. I wanted to show you number five as an example. We're not going to be able to resolve this until we see the DPT. So, let's establish that. Are there other items that you want to [inaudible]?

SARAH WYLD:

Yeah. I'm actually not quite sure that I agree that we can't resolve that one without the DPT but I am happy to start elsewhere. I like starting at the top and just working my way through the document. So, this one

---

that we have on-screen right now from a good year ago, I think, is no longer relevant. It's not attached to any language in the actual policy and I think we can just close that comment. I would like to hear if anybody else objects before we do so. Okay. So, I'm comfortable with resolving that at this point and if we find problematic language elsewhere that relates to this we can come back to it. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible]. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. What's next? Yeah. So, this was just a wording suggestion to say that those policies are informed by the board resolution and scorecard. I do think they are just as important. I think it's more clear. I don't really have super-strong feelings on including this language, so I guess I would like to hear from other team members as to whether we should include it or not, but I think we should make a decision and move on.

ALEX DEACON: Sorry, where do you want to add "as informed by"? It's not clear.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, it's right after the link about the ePDP. So, it's saying that "implements the recommendations from the Temp Spec for ePDP." Yeah, "those recommendations informed by the board resolution and scorecard. So, I personally am in favor of including the language, but if

---

other people in the team think that we should not include it I am willing to agree with that and move on. I see Marc's hand, and then Stephanie.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. Can you hear me okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, wonderful.

MARC ANDERSON: Great. I think maybe this might have come from me, although this was a while ago, obviously, so I'm trying to wrack my brain here. I think, maybe-forgive my dusty memory, here—my concern was this reads like the ... I think maybe my concern was that it sounds like a board resolution and scorecard was being implemented like it was policy, and I think we want to even give that impression, right?

The GNSO Council has the remit to create policy recommendations and I think my concern was avoiding the suggestion that the ICANN Board in its resolution and scorecard was creating or modifying policy. I think we can all agree that that is not appropriate or the intent. So again, forgive me my dusty memory, here, but I think, maybe, that was where this suggestion came from.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Marc. Stephanie, go ahead.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. I gather I'm a phrase ahead of you folks. I'm on the next para. May I go ahead and give you the comment?

DENNIS CHANG: No. Can hold that? Because we want to resolve this for a minute. So, here is what I'm saying. I absolutely believe that GNSO Council ePDP final report as recommended can and are being modified by ICANN resolution and the scorecard. I think that is the process. I have heard Marc say that we all agree with this and I guess I disagree.

So, I wanted to make sure that you are aware if I get an ICANN resolution that is in conflict, and they say that and ask us to implement, I am obligated to follow the ICANN Board resolution. That is the process. The process is not that ICANN Board directed back to GNSO. That is not the process right now.

Right now, current process is that if there are ten recommendations the GNSO makes and ICANN Board accepts eight of them and rejects two of them, then we implement [inaudible] recommendation. That is the process. That's why I hesitate to use the word "inform." So, I would disagree with taking in the "inform."

SARAH WYLD: Okay. So, in the interest of being able to move on, what I would suggest ... Although I do see a couple more hands back in the queue and I completely jumped them— I'm sorry about that—what I would suggest is to mark that there is a disagreement on this one and I would say we



---

note the disagreement but then close the comment so that we can all move on with our lives.

DENNIS CHANG: That's actually a good suggestion.

SARAH WYLD: But maybe we should still hear Marc and Amr.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah. I know that Stephanie wanted to comment on other things. Amr, is this on this one? If so, please speak up.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Dennis. Yeah, it is on this. I'm perfectly happy moving forward the way that you and Sarah just suggested. I just want to clarify something. I do understand that the board resolution and the scorecard are sort of the documents that instruct ICANN Org to proceed in implementing policy recommendations. But leaving aside policy recommendations from the GNSO that the board does not adopt, let's just focus on the ones that they do adopt.

What we come up with as an IRT is supposed to be inconsistent with the intent of the policy recommendations developed by the GNSO. In the event that there are disagreements between members of the IRT and the IPT, then this disagreement, again, is referred to the GNSO. This doesn't necessarily reflect what happened with the Rec 7, for example,

---

because that was some disagreement between members of the actual IRT.

But my point is that, again, the ICANN Board resolution and the scorecard are not really meant to be in conflict with the GNSO policy recommendations in any way. And in the event that a conflict does occur, or there is a conflict has occurred, then, again, the ruling on this should be the GNSO, not the ICANN Board.

So that, to me, says that the scorecard does inform the work of the IRT, as opposed to actually determines it. But in a way, I think this is an academic discussion. I also think it's fine to leave as-is or to add "as informed by." I don't think either are necessarily wrong because, ultimately, in the course of our work, if there is any sort of mismatch between what's in the scorecard and what the members of the IRT believe is the intent of the policy recommendations, this has to follow the regular process in the implementation framework. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Amr. You bring out something very, very important. It's not academic to me but it's actually core and essential to the way we work procedurally. The process is and must be that the board resolution is what we follow. And I don't know if you were part of my IGO/INGO identifier policy implementation, but that, if any, is a long example of how a board did not adopt all of the GNSO recommendations, and we're still implementing some of it but waiting for resolution on others.

And if there are other IRT members who believe in the same way that Amr suggested then we need to have a procedural discussion again to

---

make sure that IRT is thinking all of the same way, and if we had to have another training session, we need to do that. Otherwise, we can't put ourselves in-between the GNSO and the board, so that is something that I want to make perfectly clear. Marc, you have your hands up, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. Amr said most of what I was going to say, only better. So, well put, Amr, thank you. I did want to make sure I heard what you said correctly, Dennis. I think I understood what you said as that you're ... Obviously, I understand that you take your direction from the board, and that makes sense. But I think what I heard you say is that the ICANN Board in its resolution can modify the policy recommendations approved by the GNSO Council. I guess I'm just trying to clarify if I heard you correctly and understand what you were saying, there.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I've seen that happen in the IGO and INGO policy. If you are referring to [advising] procedurally, they cannot modify it but they can only accept or reject a recommendation, then I won't argue with you, there. To me, I just have to be very clear on what the board's direction is one way or the other. Does that help, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

I feel like you answered it both ways. You said that they can modify it but then you also said that they can only approve or reject. So, I guess I'm still confused on your answer.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I think we need to get into specific examples of the scorecard, the way we solve the scorecard. When we started reviewing the recommendation, we talked in terms of a number of recommendations that were accepted and number of recommendations that were partially accepted, or something like that. I think that's the language that we used. If that works better then we use that term. I'll go by that if that helps. Marc, you want to come back?

MARC ANDERSON: I see a bunch of people with their hands raised so I'm just going to lower my hand and move on, defer to other people.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, that's fine. Beth.

BETH BACON: I don't think I was next. I think it was Stephanie, Thomas, and Sarah.

DENNIS CHANG: Stephanie had a comment on a subsequent policy language, so I want to see ... Stephanie, do you want to talk about the process, procedural issue? If so, then go ahead.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I think this is pretty darned important and I'm still confused about where we're landing on it. It seems to me very clear that the board can, yes, accept or reject, but fundamentally it's still up to the GNSO to decide policy. I give you a hypothetical.

Supposing the board had a bad day and decided to reject the concept or the recommendations regarding the data elements—I'm mixing Phase 1 and 2—and then turned around and said, "But go ahead and build the SSAD," a different recommendation altogether, which those of you who have the numbers memorized would recall but I don't.

The GNSO would then be left rather confounded as to how the heck they're going to build this thing. In other words, by dissecting a report and saying, "I like Recommendations 1 to 24 but hate 26 to 30," that leaves the GNSO Council stuck with rejigging the policy if the objection is going to stand. That remains a policy matter.

Now, operational instructions to staff follow the scorecard from the board but that doesn't mean that the policy has been changed, unless I'm crazy and we're going through all this work to develop policy at the GNSO only to have it rewritten by the board and [emitted] in a scorecard. Thanks. You don't want me to talk about the grammar mistakes in the next paragraph yet, I take it.

DENNIS CHANG:

Beth, you're next.

---

BETH BACON: Yeah, thanks. I think the question here is—and perhaps this is the thing that we need to nail down—what is the final word from the board? Because we send the final report, GNSO approves, and then the board accepts or does not accept recommendations. We then have an IPT draft consensus policy.

However, I also want to note that I just floated through our other consensus policies—which doesn't take long as there are only, what, 12?—and there aren't any other intros like this in the ones that I have quickly looked at. I don't know why we need this. The process is the process and the consensus policy is what we put.

Why do we need to put all this up here? Could we just get rid of it, seeing as we all understand that the GNSO takes a final report, approves it, communicates those recommendations to the board, the board considers, accepts, rejects, and we then move onto a consensus policy? Why do we need this? Especially if it's [inaudible] all this.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a really good comment. It almost feels like this is the kind of information that should be included in the background, here.

BETH BACON: Well, it could certainly be the background but, also ...

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I mean, I tend to agree with you, personally. I don't find this particularly important, that, when the policy is published, do I really

---

care that there was something called Temp Spec and all that? I just want to know what the scope is, and what the requirement is, and the date, of course. That's what I want to know. That's how I think. So, if you're thinking like me, you're thinking the same thing.

BETH BACON:

Okay. So, just as a follow-up, Dennis, I appreciate that. If we just want to put it in the background or it lives on as information in the background on the webpage—I mean, if you look at the other consensus policies, you just go to it and there is the policy. And certainly, there is some background and you can provide some links to other things but, frankly, I don't think that including this as part of the policy is necessary.

And again, I'm only speaking for me. This is me looking at this and understanding that we're having an odd discussion about how this appropriately captures procedure when I don't think any of us doubt that the appropriate procedure was followed. This just doesn't necessarily, A, need to be in here, B, need to be spelled out this way. So, I'm going to leave that up to everybody else to discuss. This is not a contracted party position, this is just me talking.

DENNIS CHANG:

Beth, I remind you, the way the IRT works, we are representing individuals, as well. There are a lot of people here who do not belong to a stakeholder. So, I'm going to just, if you don't mind ... Reduce, that's it. So, I'm going to consider this or we'll talk about it but I really like this suggestion. Does everybody disagree/feel strongly that this language

---

has to be in here in the introduction? I want to hear that, too, if there are people who think that way. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you, hi. So, I do want to retract my earlier suggestion to just close this and move on. It is more important than I fully appreciated, so thank you very much to this whole team for this discussion. I mean, really, if we just consider how the sentence is written, it's saying that there are recommendations in the board resolution and scorecard, which there are not. They are in the final report where they belong.

So, I would definitely support just removing this entire paragraph, or putting links in the background section to the resolution and scorecard, or put those links on the consensus policy website if we need them. But I don't think this is helping us by being here. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, you just joined Beth's team and my team. Thank you, come on board. Thomas, do you have remarks?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yes. Thanks very much, Dennis. Hi, everybody. As you guys know, I'm quite new to this group, so bear with me if I get things entirely wrong. First of all, I would prefer the policy not to be encumbered with information on the genesis of the document. So, that should actually go into the archives for those who want to look at that for academic purposes or otherwise.



---

But I think the question we're discussing is more fundamental, and that is you are getting paid, Dennis, by ICANN, so you need to follow the directions that you're getting from the board, ultimately. We are a group that is seconded by the GNSO and we need to make sure that we truthfully help implement policy coming out of the GSO.

In this particular case, these two different approaches seem to be at odds. So, whilst I don't care what language we put into the introduction—although I would prefer there not to be any on this particular topic—the question is, what do we implement as policy? Do we just look at the final report or do we treat the information, the board's scorecard, equally to our final report, or even superseding it?

So, I think we need to get clarity on that and then proceed on that basis. I'm not sure whether this group, or everyone in this group, is clear on how we're dealing with these things. So, I think it's far more important than just discussing whether we want to have three or four additional words in this paragraph or not. So, I'm not sure who was actually able to decisively give an answer to that question but I think, at least for me, it's inevitable that we need to get that question answered. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Thomas. I was kind of looking at you as the expert on this matter as you have gone through the IGO/INGO policy, both in terms of original policy and then had to go back and reconvene the Policy Working Group because there was a board resolution that did not adopt the original GNSO language and all this. But you have lived through this.

---

THOMAS RICKERT: I did.

DENNIS CHANG: Can you speak to your experience?

THOMAS RICKERT: So, Dennis, I was hoping you would not ask me that question. It is correct that I was the PDP Working Group chair at the time when policy recommendations were developed, and I then was asked to be part of a discussion team that was facilitated by Bruce Tonkin a couple of years back to help with getting this resolved.

I know that there were a lot of good intentions by the board to have Bruce work on this and Bruce was very efficient in trying to get the diverging views together and find a path forward. But to be perfectly honest, I do not know where to find those approaches in our bylaws, or PDP manual, or elsewhere.

So, that's why I was hoping that somebody else could probably point us to a section in one of those procedural documents to guide us. But let me take this back. I'll give it some more thought and, hopefully, I'll come up with something useful during our next discussion.

DENNIS CHANG: So, thank you, Thomas. Having worked on the IG/INGO policy implementation from implementation side from the beginning, I am keenly aware and personally have implemented only those recommendations that were authorized to implement and still cannot

---

implement some of the recommendations that the GNSO has that the board has not told me to implement.

And because of the inconsistency between GNSO and the GAC advice, the board is trying to resolve that, but it's ultimately up to the board that I look, too, to resolve this from my perspective. But thank you for volunteering.

Also, I think if there is a ... Let me see if I can talk to people internally who know this process inside out and may come back to you, procedurally, to make it very, very clear, and we can point to the procedural arguments and that GNSO approved, or the bylaws, that make it very clear one way or the other. It's surprising; after a year of working together, we did not know, or I did not know, that there were IRT members who were not on the same page, procedurally. Thank you for bringing this up. We will discuss it further. Beth, do you have more on this? Go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Sadly I do, sorry. So I think that, first of all, yes, let's do what you just said. Since we have had this conversation and there do seem to be questions, let's nail down exactly the procedure in process.

But second, I think that this is a product of so many people editing a document, so this is not a ding on anyone who might have written this paragraph. But I think a poorly phrased paragraph has created a problem where there might not be one. I think it's the interpretation of a poorly phrased paragraph and I still stand by the suggestion that, A, we 100% need to be on the same page with regard to procedure and

---

process, but B, I still don't think, no matter what that procedure or process is, this should be in a policy.

This isn't in any other policy. The policy is the policy. It starts with the scope and goes on from there. I still support deleting this while we, in a parallel process, go through and confirm that, yes, we're all on the same page with regard to how we do this. So I think that I support both those tracks but, mostly, informationally, let's get on the same page, but still, let's delete this. I love deleting. We all know this.

DENNIS CHANG:

[inaudible] from Thomas, Sarah, Beth, who are all thinking the same way. I like where this is going so I didn't want to lose that point. So, thank you for reiterating your suggestion. You are winning people over, Beth, this morning.

BETH BACON:

It's how I roll, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Now, boy, that was quite a lively, interesting sort of core, essential discussion, Sarah. Thanks for bringing that up. Thank you for surfacing. I had no idea that we were there. Let's see if we can get out of that. So, we'll leave this one alone. Now, the next item. I think Stephanie had some grammar mistakes, or you wanted to point that out. You lowered your hand. This one, I would rather not add a [peer], if you don't mind, Sarah. So, it's a minor thing but ...

SARAH WYLD: That's fine.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, thank you. Isabelle, can you confirm that you're tracking this and I don't have to type all these comments?

SARAH WYLD: Do you want me to just resolve it because it's my own comment?

DENNIS CHANG: I think Isabelle is.

SARAH WYLD: Okay, no problem.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, she's recording all the resolutions, so let's let her do it. Okay. Next one is this one. I said that I don't want to review any comments on section five but do you feel strongly then we will want to talk about this?

SARAH WYLD: I mean, I feel that we will need to talk about it at some point and I don't feel that the content of whatever data processing agreement is eventually reached will modify or remove my need for this suggested

---

change. I think we're going to need this change either way but I am fine to wait and review that later.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That's my suggestion, anyway. Stephanie, did you have a comment on this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. My comment was back on the grammaticals on the next paragraph, which I think are rather important. Can we go back to it?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Which section, you said?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, it was right under the ... Yes. "Nothing in this policy prohibits registry operator or registrars from processing additional data elements for their own purposes," because it's plural. And normally I am a big fan of commas but, in this instance, I find it rather disjunctive because the purposes are beyond the scope of the registration data policy. So, I would remove the comma, lest there be any confusion about what purposes we're talking about, and in the interest of plain language I'd put "that are beyond the scope." "Purposes that beyond the scope of this direction registration data policy."

---

DENNIS CHANG: Let me see if I can do it this way as ... Let me see. Go to this mode and capture it. I think you should [inaudible]. Stephanie, you know you can do it now? Okay, no. We said that. "Their own purposes."

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Remove comma.

DENNIS CHANG: Remove comma and then?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: "That."

DENNIS CHANG: That. Okay.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Okay, that's good. Next we will look at ... Yeah. Data processing terms. Should we discuss it or should we not discuss it? I guess that's the question. My purpose is that we leave it until we see the actual document. It may inform us to think one way or the other. That's my preference.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sure. I think there are plenty of things for us to discuss in the remaining half-hour that is scheduled for our time today, so I'm fine with moving onto other things, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, good. Let's move onto the next item. Where are you?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Betty Fausta's comment, just adding a letter S.

DENNIS CHANG: This one?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. I think that's a good change.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Isabelle? Let me see. All right, let's do it. Just in case she is ... Thank you, Betty. Next item is here. It says "so on." This one, Sarah and Amr had a comment, here.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, thank you. And I think we did talk about this one at some meeting. The intent of my comment was to indicate that there are two separate things, here. Number one is confirming the value of the organization, confirming that that is correct. Number two is agreeing to



---

its publication. And so, I just think it's really important that we don't somehow conflate those two things.

DENNIS CHANG: Confirming and publication, okay?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. Thank you, yeah. So, I would love to see some, I guess, alternate text, and then we can review how that aligns with the [Rec]. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: We'll take the action to review it and make this clear. Amr, did you want to talk to this, also?

AMR ELSADR: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I don't think I'm going to add much to what Sarah just said but I just also wanted to confirm that there is a proactive sort of step that the registrant needs to take, here. The way that the text is currently worded, it seems like all that is required is that the registrar has to sort of display a disclaimer.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, you're right. I agree with you.

AMR ELSADR: Yeah, all right. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. So, we'll go ahead and take a look at this, and reformulate some of the language, and come back to you for its review. Thank you. Thank you, Sarah. Next item is on this, Marc Anderson's.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, and this one is Rec 7, so this one is the one that we are waiting on the board, I guess, to hear.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so let's skip this, okay?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. This one?

SARAH WYLD: Okay. And then, 8.3 refers back to the section five. So, if we're not done with that yet then we can't close this one out yet.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, yeah. Next one is Sarah. Is this all related?

---

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. I'm trying to look at it but it jumps around a bit on the screen. Yeah, I think this is all related to that Rec 7 issue.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. And the next item is ...?

SARAH WYLD: Sorry. So, click on where Marc has "if supported by the registry operator," and you see ... So, those ones ... Marc, maybe you want to speak to that? It's a good comment.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sarah. So, for this one, the registry operator has to have support in their systems for those two fields. So, only if the registry operator ... So, "the registrar may transfer" is conditional on "support at the registry operator" for those fields. So, that was the only clarification I was trying to make there.

DENNIS CHANG: Now, don't you think that "may" covers it, anyway? It's a "may" requirement, so it's optional, right? It doesn't say "a registrar must transfer," it says "a registrar may transfer." So, they may transfer it.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, but they cannot transfer it if it's not supported by the registry operator. Apologies for the double-negative. It's not that they may

---

transfer it, it's that they may transfer it if it's supported by the registry operator.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I think I see what you mean. We want to put that into this language. So, this is a separate ... "Registrar may transfer the following data on this to registry operator." Are you suggesting that we just add these words, "If supported by registry operator"? Does that work?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, that would be—

DENNIS CHANG: [Talk to me]. Okay. Let me see if I can do that.

MARC ANDERSON: Supported, not suggested.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, sorry. Thank you. Okay. We'll consider that, then. We'll take that as an input and contact you. Thank you for your suggestion. That's a fine distinction that we wouldn't know if you hadn't told us. Next item is ...?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. So, on the topic of escrow, I think we had talked about this one at a previous meeting, also, and you'll note, if you scroll down a bit, there are some comments from September 30<sup>th</sup> about things that should be

---

moved around between the “must” and “may” section. So, I don't personally have a strong opinion about the must/if format. I'm okay with that.

But I know that we did have some concerns that the scope of what is required to be escrowed here was too broad and did not correctly align with the recommendations. And my recollection, which I think is correct, is that the staff team was going to review our comments from that meeting in, I guess, September when we talked about it, and adjust this to more correctly align with what the recommendation said. And it looks like that hasn't happened yet, so I guess what I would ask for is an update from Dennis or the team as to when those changes will be made for the IRT's review. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. I'm reviewing Roger's comment. It's okay either way. Alex says this new language is less clear. “Use a ‘must’ if contract is wrong and confusing. I prefer the original wording.” If/must. That seems like a ... Oh, we were trying to make it more precise or make it more brief. That was our attempt, here. Okay. So, homework for me, then. Let me just ... Okay, or do that. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you, Dennis. Please just keep in mind it's not only about the wording, it's about the scope of what is required to be escrowed, and that needs to be aligned with the recommendation. Thank you.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Dennis, if I could, I put my hand up on that one.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I'm sorry. Go ahead.[Which one?]

MARC ANDERSON: I just wanted to expand a little bit on what Sarah was saying. My recollection of that meeting is the same as Sarah's. This language doesn't map to what's in the policy recommendations. On that call, I provided an example, a specific example, where this language makes the field mandatory that is to be escrowed that wasn't mandatory in the policy recommendations.

And so, I think Sarah is right, the action item coming out of that meeting was for staff to go back and just do a [diff] between what's in here and the policy recommendations and address that. But I did just want to point out, even in escrow, escrow is a processing of data and, in the working group, we looked really hard at the mandate to only process data that's necessary.

And so, we looked at what data is necessary to be escrowed and that's where we put in all the "musts" for fields that must be escrowed. So, I think that's pretty important, that the policy reflects that data minimization principle and that we're only requiring data be escrowed if it's necessary to fulfill the processing purpose.

DENNIS CHANG: Do you follow this [contract]? I think we had “must” and “must if” as separate sections, and what we did was we merged the two and just used “must if” because “must if” covers the “must” and “must if.” That’s what we were thinking, trying to make it more concise. And you’re saying that this contract is not good?

MARC ANDERSON: It certainly makes it simpler, I agree with that. But in the process, I think it had the side effect of difference in the policy. So, appreciate your attempts to make it simpler and more concise, which I’m all for, but I think in the process you ended up creating some divergence from the policy recommendations.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, so we may have to go back to this other construct, 91 and 92, must and must if, and may, and must, must if, as a more sectional wording. But I think that’s the feedback that I’m getting. Thank you for that. So, I’m glad I didn’t delete this. Okay. We’ll continue. Let’s see.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. So, this next one relates to how RDAP expects data to be there. Yeah. And so, this is something that we have discussed and Marc has been extremely helpful at explaining within the RDAP Working Group. I guess, really, I’m just not sure about the way forward from here because there does seem to be some kind of ... There is a problem and I don’t know how to fix it, but maybe Marc knows. Thank you.

---

DENNIS CHANG: I know, I wasn't sure how to pitch the research so I was asking Marc for further guidance on this because I was told that this example allows the address structure to be represented with blank value. If that's accurate then I'm not sure how to handle it. Go ahead, Marc, you know all about RDAP.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I don't know about that but I know enough to be dangerous. Seriously, we have been discussing this a lot in the RDAP Working Group and there is a fair amount of overlap. A number of people in this group are also in the RDAP Working Group. What I have asked is for the RDAP Working Group to develop concrete suggestions for how this could be written in a way that does not create unnecessary burden, so in an RDAP implementor, but still is consistent with the policy.

And so, that hasn't been completed, so maybe I would ask to put a pin in this one for the time being. My hope is that ... I don't want the suggestion to come from just me. I want the suggestion to come from a group that has a chance to vet it and flesh out the different impacts. I just will say, Dennis, you have provided an example of how an RDAP response can include a blank value. And while it's true an RDAP response can include a blank value, it shouldn't. That's not a good practice and could cause problems for an RDAP client reading it.



---

DENNIS CHANG: You know, this is really, really important, what you say. We need to make that clear. So this policy, the policy is what drives the RDAP, not the other way. So, let's make sure that we make that clear so that RDAP implementors are doing what they should do, not what they can do. I mean, so many things are possible but if they should not do that per the policy, we should probably make that very clear. Thank you for this. So, I'm going to wait for ... Is this okay, if I wait for Marc and RDAP group for input?

SARAH WYLD: Dennis, there's a suggestion ... I made a suggestion but then it was agreed to by Mark SV that we should more formally ask the RDAP group for input because, right now, it has been fairly informal. I guess I'm just interested in hearing whether that's a thing we should do.

DENNIS CHANG: Formally ask for the RDAP input. Okay. I can do that. Do you want me to do that?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, that would be great.

DENNIS CHANG: Also, Roger disagrees with me. Policy does not drive RDAP, RDAP is a technology. I guess the way we implement RDAP is the policy. Okay, Alex clarifies the RDAP profile is what the policy drives, not the RDAP

---

RFC. Okay. I think those are final points. I'm not going to disagree with you, there.

So, let me reach out to my RDAP team, and see if we can make the request formal, and then have them provide feedback. We do want to make sure that RDAP profile update happens in a consistent manner with the policy that we are implementing. Thank you for all of that. So, I'm going to change our action. Nope, not that. That's my ... Let me just make sure.

MARC ANDERSON:

Everybody got Dennis's personal e-mail? You heard it, that was consent to contact him there, right?

DENNIS CHANG:

This is being recorded, too, right? Oh, no, it's forever out there. "Receive informal ..." I don't know why my personal e-mail pops up instead of my ICANN thing but we are dependent on this technology and my limited knowledge of how to use my technology. Okay. So, next item is we want to add a value here if no objections. [inaudible]. I think that's an accurate thing as a suggestion, I suspect. I just wanted to show you that I'm doing that and I don't suspect that anyone has objections. Let me know if you do. Okay. Propose removing these words. Oh, yeah, this one. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. We spoke about this, apparently, back in September. Those words came from this team, not from the recommendation. I think

---

within two business days is fine for the acknowledgment. I think that's what we need to require. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, thank you for the input. I think we are ... I now feel like I am reiterating. I think I've said this multiple times. We have to decide how we're going to judge when somebody is in compliance or not. This whole policy will be turned over to the implementors and the enforcers of the requirements.

So, two business days is awfully difficult to enforce. If somebody says that I did this in two business days and I decided my business day was not the business days during that time which they were supposed to do something, there is really nothing that can be done for enforcement. So, the calendar days is what we want to use to make it clear around the world. It's universal. There is no interpretation.

So, as much as we can, we want to try to avoid interpretation or going somewhere else to find out what the business days are. For some companies, the business days are ... That information is accessible, readily available. So, you can find it. Other companies, you can't. You just don't know what the business days of that business is and there is no such agreed-upon definition of what a business day is, either.

So, this doesn't lend itself as a good requirement, and that's my point. So, my plan for this is not to resolve it with the IRT here but take it to the public comment, as we have it here, and let the public comment on this. Is there anyone who wants to speak to this one way or the other? Marc Anderson, go ahead.

---

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I'm quite sympathetic to the points you're raising. I understand the difficulty in enforcing that and the challenges. But those difficulties and challenges that you're describing were, when we discussed this in the working group, considered features—the fact that it was not a set amount but flexible based on the entity that has the obligation.

And so, changing it from business days to calendar days is actually a change to what was a hard-fought and hotly debated topic within the working group. So, while I do appreciate all the points you're making—they're all very fair points—this is a change to the policy recommendations and something that was agreed to and specifically discussed in the working group so I feel I would be neglected my job if I didn't flag that and point that out here.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Thank you for pointing it out. I hear you clearly. If the working group meant to say “calendar days,” they would have said so, but they used business days. So, that's why I say that I don't think we can come to a resolution here. My job, of course, as a policy implementor, is trying to make it as clear as possible.

If the implementation team or the working group considers it as a feature, meaning that they intentionally designed it so it's ambiguous and not clear to enforce, that is an interesting design. That is not something that I would do but I can understand the desire on that side.

---

Let me ask you this. If that's the design, how about if we put into the policy language that all businesses that pertain to this need to publish their business days where it's accessible publicly? If we had that kind of a requirement in addition to the business days, would you be okay with things like that?

Because that resolves my issue of telling the compliance team, "Here's where you can find the business days for this business in particular," and even though they may not be what you think it is, it's their own decision. Laureen, you have your hands up. Go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Dennis. I do agree that there is some ambiguity here, simply because, for example, a holiday in France is not the same as a holiday in the U.S., is not the same as what holidays are in Canada, and that relates to what are going to be the business days or not.

So, I do think there is some ambiguity and, of course, the issue of enforceability is always an important one. So, I certainly would support this publication of what the particular business considers to be their business days so that there is transparency and requestors know what to expect.

And the alternative, I don't oppose having this notion of a floor and a ceiling, the floor being the two business days but, in any event, no more than three calendar days. To me, it's adding this upper limit. So, I would be comfortable with either one but I do take your point, Dennis, about enforceability and the fact that business days will vary depending upon the location of the particular business. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Laureen. Beth?

BETH BACON: Yeah, thanks. So, I am sympathetic to the concern. I do also have a concern, Dennis, that your comment on this was to characterize it as unenforceable. I don't think that's what it is. I think that the discussion group and the PDP discussed this at length. The language that was chosen was, quite frankly, pretty clear, and I understand that perhaps it might be difficult.

I mean, it may be a question for ICANN Compliance but they were also in the room when this was discussed. If they have an issue and they are concerned about this, I think, then, we need to hear about it from them. But right now, the language in the recommendation is the language in the recommendation.

I don't think that this is going to be a deal-breaker, a calendar-day of response or a business-day of response. I don't see how that is so, so difficult that we continue to have discussions on this. I mean, we already have—Owen is making my point—rules that reference bs days and ICANN Compliance is able to climb that hill.

So, I'm still confused as to why we have been discussing this since ... Well, Sarah's comment is from October and I don't know if that's from last year or this year but I know that we have been discussing it for many, many months. So, I think that I am reluctant to change language that was in a recommendation and was agreed in a recommendation on

---

speculation that it might be difficult for Compliance when it has not proven to be so in other contexts. So, that's it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Beth. So, do I hear any objections to adding a requirement that the business needs to publish their business days? Do I have any objections? Is that something that you would be open to?

BETH BACON: Dennis, the hand is new.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Again, I think that's amending a recommendation, or augmenting, or adding new requirements that weren't discussed in the PDP. So, I think that, perhaps ...

DENNIS CHANG: You would object, simply.

BETH BACON: I have a question simply because, right now, we have changed the language in the recommendation, and then we want to change it more, then we're not actually sure it's a problem because this is already

---

something that ICANN Compliance is able to surmount in other policies. I would like to hear from [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Of course, I'm trying to support ICANN Compliance on this issue, as well. I am trying to speak for everyone that is providing this input. So, this is why I'm saying that I don't think that we can resolve this. You have heard Lauren. Lauren feels that this is okay to have, as a calendar day in addition to the business day, and I'm open to talking about four calendar days, or five calendar days, even, if that's a debate. I think that NICE proposed that early in the beginning to give you a lot of room but I don't think that idea was appealing to most of you.

Let's see. So, you lost the argument. "Automated and immediate." Okay. So, this is why I'm saying just leave it like this, and we go to the public comment, and after the public comment, if there is enough feedback that says let's get rid of the calendar days, then we'll do it then. But right now, I think that we should leave it there and have the public consider. That's what I think.

BETH BACON:

Hey, Dennis. Can I get back in the queue?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah.



---

BETH BACON: So, if we are going to go to public comment with something, I think we should go to public comment with the language that is in the recommendation.

DENNIS CHANG: I see. I see your point. I see.

BETH BACON: So if, then, people want to comment—

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible], yeah.

BETH BACON: Yeah. And then people have concerns, and if Compliance wants to comment, or, honestly, if we want to ask Compliance now, send somebody an e-mail and get some input [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Well, I know the Compliance ... I have received the Compliance input and they expressed the ... I would not say “impossible” but difficulty of enforcing anything that says “business days,” because businesses could just come back with defining their own business days afterward. That was the input that I received.

But I take your advice that, if we’re going to go to public comment, go with this, but have it noted in the public comment as a point of

---

disagreement and maybe a future difficulty in enforcing. Okay. Yeah. So, Laureen is making a suggestion, “We should include brackets with the explanation, perhaps, something like that.”

Roger, go ahead. Did you want to speak? No? You lowered your hand? All right. Yeah, I agree. So, I think I have received all the input. Thank you for that. I’ll come back to you with what we’re going to do, for the public comment at least. There may be a different way to approach it, as Beth has suggested. Next item.

SARAH WYLD: Sorry, Dennis, I thought—

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I’m sorry. Is it the time?

SARAH WYLD: It’s half-past now, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, my gosh, the time went by fast.

SARAH WYLD: I know, it’s so much fun to go through this and it went so quickly.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Sarah, I’m going to give you the last word, go ahead.

---

SARAH WYLD: I've got nothing else to say, just thank you all so much for your time. This has been delightful.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I'm glad you enjoyed it. Marc, you have your hands up. Final remark, go, quick.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, sorry. I know we're over time but I was going to ask if there is a plan to discuss feedback on the 1.5 report. Obviously, no time today.

DENNIS CHANG: No. I asked you to ... Your homework was due yesterday but if you want to do it today I'll tell the team that there may be comments coming in today. And then, please finish it because we want to move on and not wait for IRT. But I wasn't going to discuss it here. In two weeks? I don't know [where we're going to be] in two weeks.

MARC ANDERSON: I think our comments have been submitted.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Oh, good, good.

---

MARC ANDERSON:                    Maybe a question ... Like, do you have questions on it? I want to make sure it's clear and our feedback is understood.

DENNIS CHANG:                    Oh, yeah. That will be communicated via e-mail or whatever by the team. If there is a clarification or comment we were seeking then we'll let you know. If you want, we can add to the agenda in a couple of weeks but I hope, by then, we would be in the hands of GNSO. Thank you so much. Sorry for going over a little bit. I need someone to hit me on the head at five minutes. Thank you. I'll talk to you in a couple of weeks. Thank you, everyone.

THOMAS RICKERT:                Thanks, everybody. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**