ANDREA GLANDON:　　　Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting, being held on Wednesday, the 24th of February, 2021 at 17:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you.

Hearing no names, I would like 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 Multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG:　　　Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone to our IRT meeting on this 24th of February. Already, this is going to be our last meeting in February and we're headed toward March already. Time is really going fast, at least for me.

Now, let's talk about our agenda. This is what we have today. And we have some announcement to make on the IPT membership change and some happy news. And then, we will talk about the public access to the files on the IRT shared drive. And I want to make some changes. And before I do that, I want to get your input—the IRT input—on it to make

sure that we do this effectively and efficiently. I think it will help all of us on the team. So I'll talk about that.

And then, we're going to talk about OneDoc changes. We have that big reduction of the introduction section that we want to accept today. And then, we want to now begin to do some wordsmithing—not any content changes but you will see that we have begun that, starting with quoting "policy," to mean Registration Data Policy throughout the document. And further clarification, like section 3.7, inserting "in either case" because somebody noted that it could be misread and that wasn't our intention.

And then, Sarah, I put in a comment that she wanted to talk about 9.1.5, registrant organizations. So we'll talk about that, anything else that we see in the time that we have.

And we have three RedDocs. We want to maybe just quickly review them as a team. They were all due prior to today. So the IRT comments should be there already by now. And I think we're in pretty good shape with those three.

And then, the FAQ document that we added number nine in response to Alex's question. And Alex could be there today. But hopefully he saw my email, and then we'll look at it, and then we may publish that. But we may not publish that. We'll see how it goes. That's a discussion for our Google Drive discussion. It'll be clear when I begin to talk about this. So any comments on the agenda? Any inputs?

No? Then we will go ahead and talk about our IPT membership change. As you know, we have our list of members for IRT and IPT on this wiki.

And Registration Data Policy Implementation Team members include both IRT and IPT, as you know. And as of today, we have 40 IRT members and then we have 13 IPT members. And this is just a list of names that are continually working on the project, of course. And they are doing most of the work behind the scenes. You may not recognize some of them or their work but this is a chance that I want to … I want to take this opportunity to share some good news.

So this may be hard to believe but it's amazing that we have number two and number three member here, both named Amanda. So we have two Amandas on our team. So that was kind of confusing in the beginning but we figured out how to distinguish the two Amandas, by giving them nicknames in our inner circle and as we work.

But the news here is Amanda and Amanda will both be leaving on maternity leave. So they will be getting off of the IPT for a few months. And we are going to have Andrew and Genie replacing them in their roles, to continue our IPT work. So I'm really happy to announce this and I'm so proud that our Registration Data Policy Implementation Team is going to produce two babies. I've tried to convince them to name them RegData or something like that. But so far, they're not buying it.

So I want to wish them well and I wanted to share this very happy news with the IRT. It's a team that's dear to me because we're been together for like two years already. A lot of things have happened. But undoubtedly, this is the most tangible and happy products that we're producing. So that's the announcement. So I don't know if Amanda wants to say something but Marc Anderson has a hand up. I will give him the mic. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. That's wonderful news. Congratulations to Amanda and Amanda and thank you, Dennis, for sharing. It's good to get news like this—happy news, with everything else going on. So thank you for sharing. And congratulations, Amanda and Amanda. But Dennis, I'm disappointed. You didn't tell us what their nicknames are.

DENNIS CHANG: That's a top secret, man. And I will not reveal, in respect of their privacy. Without their consent, of course, I cannot reveal those names. So you will have to ask them directly when you get a chance. Okay. Amanda, you have your hand up. I'm happy that you will speak here. And I tried to get Amanda to do a bump show but I'm not sure if she's going to go for it. Go ahead, Amanda.

AMANDA FESSENDEN: No, Dennis. I'm not going to bump show. Just wanted to say thank you all for the well wishes. It's been quite a ride and I'll see you on the other side. Good luck over the next few months. You're in good hands with Andrew and Genie.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Amanda. The other Amanda, Amanda Rose, cannot be joining today. So I will make sure that we relay your good wishes to her. And I want to give the floor to Andrew and see if Andrew will introduce himself, as it is our tradition when a new member joins our team, that

we introduce ourselves. Go ahead, Andrew. Tell the IRT what you normally do and what you will do for the IPT here.

ANDREW DICKSON: Hey, Dennis, and hey, everyone. Mic check. Can everyone hear me okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Yep.

ANDREW DICKSON: Great. Thanks so much. And I also congratulate both Amandas. I've actually been lurking in the shadows on this project quite a while but will be taking a more front-and-center role. And yeah. I've been with ICANN, I guess, for about two and a half years. I'm a recovering lawyer. Was in private practice before I joined ICANN and was very happy to join ICANN. It's a great organization. And happy to be doing this work as well. And yeah. Look forward to working with every one of you. Thanks so much.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrew. Now, Genie is not here yet. She is going to join us later, in about 30 minutes. So Andrea, when she does join, can you alert me? And she can say her hello then.

ANDREA GLANDON: Sure will.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Next on the agenda is what we called this shared drive—an IRT shared drive. And this is what it looks like. So if you look at your shared drive, you will see a lot of material. And we have different folders. And we've been producing a lot of documents, and most of it all working documents.

What I wanted to do is discuss with you and get your input on how we should manage this and files in this drive. And it's our intent to start sharing the documents in this drive with public, meaning that this is the point that I want to make. And I know that IRT members, you are used to accessing the drive and then working on the documents. And we've been doing this for a long time.

So this number g is new thing here. So instead of you having to download the file and sending it as an email, or downloading a file and uploading to another Google Drive that your team uses, we are going to change that and start giving read-only access to the public. But we're going to do that document-by-document at a time.

So I will go ahead and open the floor and get your input. And most importantly, we will tell you and we will discuss which document that we're going to share. I'm not going to go back and take all those hundreds of documents and make it all publicly accessible. That's just too much overhead for us and I don't think there's value in it.

But going forward, any documents that you wish to share, please tell us. Alert Andrea, or me, or both of us and say, "Hey. I want to share this

particular document with my team. Can you make it accessible?" And we will do that.

And immediately, the thing that I have in mind is this primary document, our OneDoc. I want to share this with public, meaning that anyone who has a link can access this document for view only. Does that make sense? So view only access. So if you want to share our policy in draft with your stakeholder group, you would simply need to provide them the link and they can come in here directly and read the document.

They can't change anything or make any comments. The privilege of making comments is reserved for the IRT. Of course, they can always join the IRT and gain that privilege. But if they should want to read it, they can, if we give them access.

So we're going to start this process but I want to hear from you and get advice from you and the experiences that you might have working with different groups. Is there any concerns, or objections, or cautions, or anything that you can advise me with before we get started? Go ahead, Marc. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. I think that makes sense. No immediate red flags jump out at me. I'm generally a proponent of more transparency. And maybe the converse of that, I don't want the IRT being accused of doing its work in a non-transparent manner.

So what you've proposed makes sense. I think view only mode makes sense. I think in order to comment or suggest changes, you should have

to join the IRT to be able to do that. But allowing the public, generally, to be able to view our proceedings and see the work that's being produced, I think makes sense, certainly in the spirit of transparency.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: I just wanted to say I support it also. I've had a few requests from folks in the Registries, saying, "Hey. Could we look at what you've got so far?" And then, there's the question of, "Well, it's not open so do I send it?" So I think this is nice, and it'll be helpful, and people can just take a look if they're curious. And it makes it less uncomfortable to share it with someone who's not on the IRT because it's not public. So thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. I see affirmation. I see Sarah thinks it's okay, too. So I'm just adding a note here. What I'd like to propose is that if somebody that you know wants to make comments and they have read-only view, they don't necessarily have to join the IRT. I said that but that's not the only one. They can just contact you and say, "Hey. Can you make this comment for me?" And you can do it, certainly. So let's see. Anyone else? Sarah. Oh, Beth. Beth, you just spoke. Did you want to speak again? Sarah, your turn.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Thank you. I just have a question. When I go into the OneDoc and I change the display mode to "viewing," it does not show me comments. And also, the suggested changes don't show up. So for example, all of the text in section one that has been suggested removed … You can see this if you … Yeah. See? It doesn't show that that text is coming out. So I just wonder how we're going to represent that to the public because it doesn't quite seem to accurately show where we are with it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. You are correct. That's the way that privilege works. So that is a caution that you need to make. This is one of the reasons it's hard to just go ahead and do it but let me see. "Viewer should be able to see comments and suggested …" Oh. Caitlin, okay. You stand corrected.

Anybody else have a solution they can offer? Any suggestion? Because I think Sarah is right. If you go into "view," they can't really see what we're discussing and it comes across as a clean document that's rather finished. But they should all know that this is not finished and there's lots of work going on here, like this.

So please suggest for me. But each time you share a document … Yeah. You're right. So each time you decide to share a document from our drive, please caution them or at least if they need to see the comments, then you will have to download it and send it to them. I don't know of other way to do it. I think we just hit the technical limitation. And our friends at Google may change this for us. I don't know of another setting. View only with comment is what we would be asking for. But

how are the other working groups handling this? Is there any experience? Did they find a way around it? No?

Anyway, what you see is this. No. What you see is … This is the "about our drive" that we created to let anyone know that once they come into this drive, hopefully they will see this and see what the drive is. It's sort of an introduction.

So what I would do is something like "external.icann.org." And I changed this to "anyone in the group." So this was what I would do, "anyone on the internet that has the link," meaning that if you copy this link and send it to them, they can see this particular file. This is the only thing they can see, not anything else. So that's one thing I wanted to make clear. So this officially is, now … Marc, I don't know whether …

Okay. Maybe I should do something like this but I don't know. So we're exploring better ways and more efficient ways. But know that we can do that and let me hold off on sharing this publicly. Let me think about this, maybe a couple more days, before I start sharing or giving public access. And I will let you know. And you can make your requests to us, which documents you think is useful to share.

Of course, the reason that I'm doing this … And this is a good example. And maybe I'll talk about this first, that we have an FAQ document that we publish on the wiki, like this. And what we basically are doing is cutting and pasting. And that's an overhead that I can eliminate if I just share this doc. Where is it? Where is that FAQ doc? Let's see.

This is our workbook and this is another document that I would probably want to share. Let me see. Reference. Where's our reference

document? Okay. This is our reference document. And in our FAQ …
This is our FAQ document, right? I would just share this instead of
copying and pasting. And then, we'll never have to go through that
overhead again. And in the wiki, we can just provide a link that will pull
up the latest.

So that's what I'm thinking about. We'll look at this later. But it was a
good example of what I'm talking about and thinking about. That make
sense, everyone? Any more inputs on the number two agenda item?

If not, we will go ahead and go to OneDoc. So our OneDoc, we'll start
with our section one. There's a lot of reduction we talked about. And I
don't think I received any comments but if there is, please let me know.
But I'm going to start deleting it or at least mark for deletion by doing
this because Isabelle … This tells Isabelle that she is okay to do that.
And of course, I'm doing that because she captures all the changes into
that.

Isabelle, stop me if this doesn't make sense but I'm trying to get all this
done. Okay. Now, I've already made that mark. So that's section number
one. And while you're not seeing it, next time you'll see it. When
Isabelle does her work, you will see a much smaller and shorter …
There she goes. Okay. Wow. Look how clean that is.

And we'll talk about this one. So this is a policy data, Registration Data
Policy. And this is typical in any contract or legal documents. You'll see
that the first time when we use it, we will spell out the policy. But after
that, when we refer to this policy, we mean Registration Data Policy and
that's what we want to do. And an example is right here. So it makes a

trimmer and cleaner document. And we'll follow a best practice on writing documents. Any objections or any comments, doing this? I wouldn't think so but I just wanted to check with you. So we'll go ahead and start.

So just general instruction for Isabelle, "Please accept all changes from here for the same." I think that makes sense. And we won't both the IRT with it anymore but you'll see that happening in the background.

Next item is 3.8. This one is not a content change. But as we have people reviewing, one of our team members noted that and inserted this "in either case" because of the language, basically, that didn't … Of course, we meant for both but it could be read that this applies to registered name only and that's not what we meant. But if there are cases like this, when somebody could read it in a way that could be misread, then we can just insert these three words and avoid the situation. So let me know if you see anything that you don't think is working.

All right. We'll keep going. Next item was 9.1.5. Before we get there, let me just browse to see. This one, I have to work on, I think. I haven't done that yet. This one is a transfer. We were going to wait for Rec 7. Let's see. Where was it? What was it, Sarah? 9.1.5? Oh. It's here. So, Sarah, you wanted to discuss this. So I added some comments. And then I added some more comments. It's a little more extensive. And if you guys want to go into the document and look at it directly, here's a link again.

So I'll open it up for discussion here, why we are doing this, if there are comments and explanation. And those of you on the IRT, we discussed this and remember why. Please go ahead and speak up. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Dennis. Hi. So for this field, "registrant organization," it's, as I mentioned in my comment, not included in the list of data in Rec 8. So I don't think it belongs there. I was hoping that you could speak to your comment in the document and explain to us where you're coming from, why we might need to implement something different than what the recommendations say, and just a bit more generally about the several comments that I've left on this escrow section.

I noticed that you mentioned that we had a previous, perhaps, agreement that the language in the final report … You said we agreed that it was a drafting error and I don't actually remember that. I do see the data elements chart but that's just a chart that says this is an error. That's not a discussion where the IRT members went through it and agreed. So I would imagine that we must have agreed to that in some meeting, if you say that the IRT decided it. So I was hoping you could remind us, actually, when that was so that I can review the discussion that we had at that time. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I wish I could. Hindsight, maybe we should have captured the date of our IRT meeting when we decided this. And I don't know if any IRT members remember the exact session where we talked about this. And I was trying to figure it out how … I could have done this and we could

have added a comment, where we made that decision or when. But I couldn't so I was trying to look for it and look at my notes. And I found this.

This is our public comment form that we were working on. And as you know, behind the scenes, we're gradually building this. And this, of course, in the list of the references, you have access to it right here. And it's something that we're developing. And I remember that we wanted to capture all the drafting errors and in detail. So we were documenting them as we were going on.

This one was … Let me see. I think it's one of these things. Which one was it? Yeah. This one. No. Is it this one?

SARAH WYLD: It was the Org field. We were talking about the org field just now, right?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. No. Sorry. I switched to this thing. It says, "registrar registration expiration date." And of course, I gave you a matrix.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. So, Dennis. Sorry. What you're showing is documentation that your team has created, which is great. It is very important to have this documentation, yes. But what it's not is agreement from the whole IRT Team that we should change something from one of the recommendations. And I understand you remember that we had that

conversation. I'm just saying I would love to be able to review that so that I can understand why we came to that agreement.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I understand what your request is. You don't remember and therefore, you want me to point to a transcript that proves that we have discussed it and we made a decision. And I am very sorry I can't just do that. It actually may take a research effort. I'm now trying to decide whether or not that is a prudent use of our time. But Marc Anderson, maybe you remember. Marc remembers everything.

MARC ANDERSON: Well, I definitely do not remember everything, I'm sorry to say. I do remember a discussion on the registrar registration expiration date. I don't remember one on the organization field, either way. I don't remember that we did. I don't remember that we didn't. So sorry I don't have better clarity.

I'm sorry. I'm just reading and reviewing this now so apologies I didn't get to look into this ahead of time. But I'm looking at your note, Dennis,

the one like 1:29 February 22nd. You say, "This should be considered a drafting error. The registrant is the org, if org is populated via Rec 12."

And I guess I'm wondering is that true? Because if it is, that's not how I understood it. I understand the registrant name is the registrant. That field is required and the registrant organization is just an undefined additional field. So I guess I'm wondering—and maybe this is a question more for registrars. I don't know how the RAA treats this. But my understanding, at least, is that the registrant is the registrant and that the registrant doesn't become the org if the org is populated. But that could be just I understand it wrong. So I guess I'm questioning that and asking for clarity on that one.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone want to speak? Let's see. Okay. So let's do this. Let me do one thing at a time here. Let's do this. The first one is a drafting error. And this is, in my mind, more critical than anything else because "drafting error" is what we said we would call things that actually goes against the policy implementation and policy recommendation letter. That is inconsistent with the recommendation.

And this is not "something that Dennis is trying to do," because Dennis wouldn't know any better. But when we got to discuss these particular items, it was obvious to those members that are in the IRT—especially those members who are on the EPDP Phase 1 Team—have told us that this was a drafting error.

Now, first of all, the concept of "drafting error" must be agreed upon by the IRT. So IRT has the obligation to notice these things and it's okay for

us to make the correction and then send it out for public comment. So I hope that there isn't any objection to that effort. They are trusting the IRT to make sure that that happens. So that is what "drafting error—" what we decided to call it.

And in this case of the first item, registrar registrant expiration date, which Sarah is looking for the discussion, now I'm trying to think about whether we need to go ahead and do the research to find out our prior discussion where we made the decision or if there is someone else on the IRT member who can just explain this right now and then capture that as a discussion. But I understand if nobody remembers, then I guess it would be upon us as a staff to go do the research and find that transcript for us.

Beth, you have your hand up. So can we talk about this one first, registrar registration expiration date—why we added this on this list of a required element when it was not in the recommendation language. Sarah's absolutely correct. It was not. And we're doing this on purpose. Oops. Beth, did you want to speak or no? She put her hand down.

BETH BACON: Sorry. I put my hand down because I thought you wanted to explain that first. But yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'm looking for help. Marc Anderson?

MARC ANDERSON: The registrar registration expiration date, that one I do remember talk about.

DENNIS CHANG: Good, good, good.

MARC ANDERSON: And that one, I think we agreed. I don't have the data elements worksheet in front of me right now. I'd have to pull it up. But we agreed that that one was listed wrong in the data elements worksheet. So that one, I do recall talking about and being a drafting error. The org one is the one I do not recall either way.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. "Data Elements Matrix referenced by EPDP Phase 1 Final Report." I think this is the document. No. Maybe that's not the document. Never mind. So is there a way you can just explain it to us and Sarah so that we don't have to go back and try to find that transcript?

I know you remember. I remember, too. This is a pretty big deal when we do things against the policy recommendation. So I remember making the decision, clearly, but I don't remember when we made the decision and which session. That's the help that I'm looking for.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. If you give me that as a homework assignment, I could write it up for you. How about that?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh! That would be fabulous. Sarah, is that okay?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. Thank you. That would be much appreciated. I have a related but slightly different question.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. Dennis, you had shown a moment ago a form that was the public comment proceeding form and that had the list of drafting errors. So I found the link to that in our workbook. I love the workbook so much. It's super handy.

So my question is just which one of the drafting errors listed here represents that change. Because what I see is, "Registrar must publish the expiration date." So I don't see a note here saying that transferring that to the escrow agent is a drafting error. I see "must transfer registrant registry," which I'm also confused about. I don't know what that means.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I understand what you mean.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: So I was wondering whether I should bring this to your attention, this document. This is a document that we were working in the background and it has not been getting the attention until I brought it up yesterday and I wanted to use this particular document to actually capture the decisions that we make and spell it out. And when Marc produces his … He's going to help us with a write up. Of course, he's going to put it into the document as a comment but I'm probably going to capture that in this document so that we don't ever forget it.

And that's particularly efficient because this is the document that we will go to public comment with and public will ask why we're doing this. And we should provide a rationale that we all understand. So I'm not particularly … It's not particularly important when we made the decision because decisions can change. But why we made the decision is very important. And that's the help I need from the IRT. Thank you so much.

So what I would ask is give us some time to clean this up on the drafting errors, section five. And I will come back to the IRT and say, "Hey. Section five has been updated." And then, we're going to try to make it as complete as possible. We were just throwing things in there as we get them for now. But it's certainly not ready for IRT review. And I will add that to our tasks when it's ready here.

And Beth has a hand up. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I think we're getting a little bit, maybe, off the point, just simply because while the documentation is important, and I think it's good, and I think drafting the public comment response as we go is smart, I think more the question is not why did we have the discussion? It's that none of us remember the discussion so we need to have it again.

So if Marc has details with regards to the registration, 9.1.2, let's talk about that. Then, we can wait and he can provide explanation. We can talk about it. But I think we need to talk about registrant organization and not so much that, "Oh. We think it's a drafting error," but how did we come to that decision?

And if we have to have it again because none of us remember … And that's fine because we've talked about this for quite some time. We all get confused. Then, let's just talk about it again. And then, we can put in the comment when we agreed or when we disagreed. And then, we can have a nice explanation to provide, if we do need to put something into that public comment document. But yeah. I think the question is we don't remember so let's talk about it again.

DENNIS CHANG: So are you proposing that we talk about 9.1.2 right now and not wait for Marc to produce the write-up?

BETH BACON: No I'm saying since you've already assigned it to Marc and he has a rationale for us, why don't we move on to 9.1.5, since none of us remember that one?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I don't have any volunteers to write this one? Okay. So Marc said he couldn't remember this one. We added a lengthy comment. I want to see if Caitlin, who is our registrar expert, and has been active, and really on the EPDP Team … Caitlin, can you talk about this a little bit and discuss why? I know that you provided a lot of this rationale but it would be good if you can just talk about it. And I'll just put this up so you can use it as a reference.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Dennis. In terms of when the group agreed to this, I have to admit that I have a conflict during the IRT calls. But what I can say is that when we were talking about this as an IPT Team, we were looking at the required fields to be escrowed. And we had a discussion about how, when Recommendation 8 is right in conjunction with Recommendation 12, that it makes sense that the organization field should be escrowed.

I think for a little history of Recommendation 8, if I remember correctly in the EPDP Team's discussion, the goal was not to add additional data elements that registrars are not currently required to escrow with the data escrow agent. When the EPDP Team discussed Recommendation 12—and EPDP Team members, please feel free to correct me—that recommendation was agreed almost at the end of the team's discussion, when it was going into consensus designations.

And in terms of the previous question that Marc had asked about the registrant org being considered the registrant, that is text from Recommendation 12, the implementation note, which I can paste into the chat for everyone's benefit.

But I think our rationale is documented in this comment. And of course, it's up for discussion. So if any IRT members disagree, again it's mostly because it makes sense that if there is a registrant organization field, that if there's some sort of registrar failure and the portfolio needs to be transferred to a gaining registrar, that the gaining registrar would probably want to know as much contact information as possible to get in touch with the registrant. I think that's one point of the rationale.

And as noted, the other point is right in conjunction with Recommendation 12, it seems that that probably should be escrowed if the registrant organization is to be considered the registrant.

I hope that's helpful. I can paste the language into the chat. But again, as I noted, it's certainly up for discussion and I agree with Beth that it's good for the IRT to have that discussion. Hopefully that background is helpful.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth?

BETH BACON: Thank you, Caitlin. As always, you remember everything and it's perfect.

DENNIS CHANG: She's amazing.

BETH BACON: I really appreciate that. That context is super helpful, especially with regards to the implementation note. And I think, just because we want to have the conversation, I don't think that that means … For me, that doesn't mean that we're like, "No. We don't want to add it." It's just that I don't remember and I want to discuss it again. So I'm really appreciative of having a conversation.

My request here is because I don't have the Registrar Agreement in front of me, ever—very rarely. But I don't have my Registry Agreement in front of me either, right now. But I guess the base question is, is this a required element to escrow now or would it be additional? Because I think that's something that would tip the scales.

If it's already something we escrow, then clearly, it's a drafting error. If it's something additional—if it's an additional data element that the EPDP Phase 1 decided to add to the list to escrow—then that makes it a little more complicated and we'll have to dig in. But if we could just check that, I think this might make our lives and this discussion a lot easier. That's my suggestion.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Beth. Can a registrar answer that question? Is there anyone here? Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Okay. So Beth, you're asking what are the current escrow requirements, right, in the RAA? Okay.

BETH BACON: Yeah. Sorry. This is the registrar section, right? I just want to—

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. Oh, for sure. For sure. I just wanted to make sure I answer what you're looking for.

BETH BACON: I need a [inaudible] on that.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. So the RAA, section 3.6, says that we have to submit the data that's in subsections … Okay. So I'm just going to paste the section numbers there so I don't lose it. So the data that's described in 3.4.1.2 to 3.4.1.5. Okay. So then, we look for 3.4.1.2 and that says that 3.4.1.2 actually refers to another section. Good times. So now we go to that section. Okay. So what's that? It's 3.3.1.1. So 3.3.1.1. is the name of the registered name.

Okay. So now, I'm going to paste in all of that data, what it says. That's what it says. So we have to escrow the data in those sections, 3.3.1.1. to 1.8. I don't see an org field. So we've got the name and postal address of the registered name holder, tech contact, admin contact. So I did not know the answer when I started talking. This has been a discovery for all

of us. But it doesn't see that the org field is included in current escrow requirements.

BETH BACON: Yeah. Okay. So it's an addition. And I think maybe that's why we're all going, "Wait. Why is this in here? Let's double check."

DENNIS CHANG: Yep. Certainly important. Is there any other registrar who can confirm or have an opinion? I think you have your answer, Beth. It was not there. I think that's what Sarah is confirming. And we are, indeed, adding. So it is a huge deal, then. The public will ask, "Why are you adding this?" And we have to provide a good rationale. And that's what we are looking for with this discussion.

Certainly, from common sense point of view, if you are a gaining registrar, you would want to know or need to know the organization that you need to contact. But I'm not a registrar. I'm just trying to look out for the future registrars, for their benefit. Certainly, it may pose more work for current registrars or registrants if we do go ahead and add something here. Sarah, did you want to speak again? Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: No. Sorry. That was an old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: I think Beth's got her hand.

BETH BACON:	Yeah. Thanks. And I'm sorry. I'm a registry and I'm talking a lot about this. I don't know why. Just because it's intriguing to me. So I think, if we look at what Caitlin's context was … And that's from the implementation notes, where if the organization will be listed as the registered name holder, I think that's only if there is no registered name holder. And quite frankly, that would then be the registrant name. So then, the registrant organization would be redundant. So I'm not sure why we're adding this. I think that's the question.
	Yeah. And Sarah does not agree with my common sense. So it would be the registrars who would have to answer that question. If you're a gaining registrar, is this something that you really need? Because recommendation did not point that out and at one point, we thought it was an oversight. But we can't remember why now because I don't think we captured the rationale. Roger, please go ahead. Help us here.
ROGER CARNEY:	Thanks, Dennis. Yeah. I would say, as a gaining registrar, I think that's not a given fact that you would want it or not. I'm guessing, actually, you probably wouldn't want it. I'm only going to say this, just taking a registrant's viewpoint, that when I registered this domain however long ago, whenever ago, I had an idea. And maybe it was for my small business. I don't know. Maybe it wasn't. But I put an org in there anyway. But now that I'm transferring it, is that still applicable? I don't know.

And I think that that gaining registrar should actually have to reestablish that. To me, it seems a little dangerous to move it. And again, I think the registrant is the registered name holder. It's actually the person. So I don't see, from a gaining registrar aspect, that I would even want the org field. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. I just want to remind us that there is very limited circumstances when one would be a gaining registrar in the context of escrow data. So I think we need to focus on how the existing registrar would escrow data in order to maintain that—be a backup of who owns domains, which is absolutely necessary, while also adhering to data protection principles, such as minimization. That's also important. We have to balance those things.

So the only time you would be a gaining registrar to get this escrow data is if you're taking over a de-accredited registrar's domains. Otherwise, I think that because that is such a small use case, we should focus on the primary use case, which is a registrar backing up their data in case of catastrophic failure, in which case the org field should be optional for the registrar to determine if they need to escrow it or not. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sarah. Any other comments? So let me hear from you. Would you be suggesting that this be not transferred at all or would you

be suggesting that this may move to the "may" section? What would you be suggesting? Beth, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Sorry.

BETH BACON: Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: No. I'm sorry, Beth. You put your hand up like you're supposed to. So we should do that.

BETH BACON: The one time I follow the rules. So, Dennis, right now I feel like we're all saying we don't understand why it's here. It's appeared. And I'm not hearing any supported reason to have it. So I'm not sure why we would continue to either find a home for something that has been added for an unsupported reason. Why do we need to find a home for this if it didn't appear in a recommendation? Why make it a "may?" That's not in the recommendation, either.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So your suggestion is deletion. I got that. Thank you. Any other—

BETH BACON: Just because there's nothing there to begin with.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I understand. Thank you. Yeah. I don't know how it got in there because we were tracking the final report and I certainly can't remember. So if it doesn't make sense, then it doesn't make sense. So I am going to capture it as a deletion, per today's discussion. And let me look into it to make sure that there's a little bit of research before we go ahead and take the decision to delete. And I'll keep you all in the loop. Beth, did you want to speak again?

BETH BACON:

Yeah. Sorry. Just one more. I really appreciate that. Thank you, Caitlin, and thank you, Dennis, for the discussion. I think it was important that we got that straight in our minds. If, when you guys look into it, if you feel like there is some reason, through the implementation note or anything else—if that's a reason why we should put it in a "may" section, I don't think that I would die on that hill.

So if that's something that we need to do, then I think that's great. But if we could just have that documented, saying, "This didn't appear in the report but we feel that, to be clear with regards to the implementation note, we're making this optional," and put it in the "may" section, I think that would be fine as long as we wrap it up pretty tight. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Yeah. So we have that option, as a "may." And that is a possibility. So let's look into it and consider it. And then, we will go ahead and come back to you about this. That was a good discussion. Thank you so much.

Let me see. I see that Genie's here. She joined us. Genie, when we opened the meeting, we announced the two Amandas having babies, and therefore leaving, and then you and Andrew joining the team. And as the tradition of our team, you get to say hello to IRT and the team. And please, open up your mic and let us hear you. And tell us who you are, what you do, and what your expertise is, and how you will support our policy implementation. Are you ready?

GENIE CHOU: Yes. Hi. I'm a senior specialist in the Contractual Compliance Department. I was the subject matter expert with regards to transfers. And I'm excited to join the group and hopefully I'll be able to contribute. I know that I'm stepping into some big shoes to fill. But I'm really looking forward to it. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Genie. And you didn't say you were a recovering lawyer like Andrew did.

GENIE CHOU: Never recovered. I don't like to talk about it.

DENNIS CHANG: You don't even want to talk about it?

GENIE CHOU: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Genie. Welcome to the team. So yeah. We're just so happy to hear your expertise is in transfers. So 9.1.5 is something. I think you heard the discussion. So we will go ahead and talk about it internally. And we hope that you can help us with this one, too. That's great. Thank you very much.

Let's see. Next item. I think we were done here so let's see. Is there anything else the IRT had in mind? I'm just trying to scan to see if we have anything that jumps out. If not, what I want to do is come back to the OneDoc, if we have time. But I do want to go over the three RedDocs to close these three items.

This is test case, too. And I'll tell you why. Because when we are ready to share this document with the public, we will no longer try to copy and paste and upload it to the wiki but simply change the access so that the public can have a view on it. And when we do share the view with public, we will, of course, take all these comments out. So the clean document is what we have and the public will see, too.

So let me see if anyone had made comments. If you did, just speak up. Otherwise, I'm just scanning quickly here. Oh. Here's Sarah. Okay. I agree with you. So I think that if there's no objections, we'll alert Isabelle. So she's assigned to go ahead and take the action to remove it. Thank you, Sarah.

Oh. Here's another one. Thank you for catching these. And you've been very, very helpful. We're going over these things again, and again, and again and we still miss things. So it's so helpful.

"Wasn't marked properly." You're correct. And then, we tried to change it to mark it correctly. And I think we've done that. So once Isabelle accepts all the changes, it should be reflected correctly. Yep. Same here. I think Sarah should win some sort of an award for being the most vigilant on IRT. Thank you so much. Really appreciate this. Okay.

Just stop me or raise your hand and yell at me because I'm going through this rather quickly, I think. But I am trusting that you have reviewed it already and found it acceptable, all the changes.

So let me say this. Now that I'm thinking about it, this is … So I'm going to task Isabelle to figure this out. If we share this with the public, they won't see the redlines. Or would they? I'm not sure. But please figure out how to do this. So when this gets ready for public view, please consider the fact that they don't need to see the comments but they do need to see the redlines so they know what's changed. Yeah. Sarah is confirming. Yeah. You're right. So we may be stuck with having to download it and publish it as a PDF. Marc Anderson, do you have a suggestion?

MARC ANDERSON: No. I was just going to agree. It's useful for the public, when reviewing it, to be able to see the clean version and the redline version. A lot of people like to be able to see that. The other thing I was going to suggest is even if you're linking to the Google Doc or even if you're directing people to the Google Doc, I think it'd still be useful to post the link to the Google Doc on the wiki page. I know a lot of people use those wiki

pages. So having the Google Doc linked to from there, I think would be useful, if it isn't already.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I agree. I think that's a good comment. So we are trying to collect our public-ready documents here. So there are links and we can provide a link to the Google Doc but also publish a redline version. We'll figure it out. This is how we're doing it. We're going to collect things here. I'm trying to find ways for us to be a little more efficient as we do our work.

Let's see. That's the transfer policy so we're done with that one. Next one is FOA documents. And pretty much the same thing. Okay. Owen is just warning us that there is a PDP going on. He is right.

Okay. This one? Yep. Oh. So agree, so agree. Sorry, Isabelle. She's probably getting a lot of Google emails from me. That's it on the forms. Questions, comments on the form? Nope?

Then, we'll take a look at the other form, confirmation, registrar transfer form. So Sarah, when I say "plus one," it basically means I agree with you and we will take action if we don't receive any other comments. But if there are other IRT who wishes to comment and maybe has a different view, please go ahead and add that so we don't take the effect.

Okay. Those were the three items that we had for you. So thank you for doing all of your homework. And we'll have to make new tasks for more homework later but we don't have anything for you, unfortunately, so far. But I will probably assign this document as a homework for you to

review and comment before we go ahead and take any actions for public access. You can expect that as the next homework.

And let's look at our FAQ. So you're watching how I do this. This is how I do my work and I'm deliberately doing this so you can see how I am doing it and you can all do this. And I find this way very efficient because I don't … It's easy for me to look at, what we're doing here.

And on this FAQ document, we have so far nine FAQs. And we captured number nine and that's the new one. And I don't see any IRT comments so I'm assuming that you're all okay with it. And if that's the case, then we can close this discussion. Unfortunately, Alex is not here. He is the one who asked the question. But I have received this question several times before and I figure, "Oh. If I'm getting a repeated question, then other people were asked the same question."

Okay, Sarah. Yeah. When Alex is able to join next time, maybe we'll give him an opportunity to talk to this. Because I think this is what he meant, and I tried to answer it, and he has not responded to my answer yet. So I'm not sure if he's just too busy or he agrees with what I'm saying.

So the way I'm doing this is, of course, this is FAQ from us, the whole team. And it's not just an answer a staff is providing to someone. It's our team's response. So we should all be looking at it in that lens.

Next item on the agenda is AOB. So what I will do is we have 15 minutes left. And if there are questions or … And Alex is not here so I cannot talk about this because I think I understand what he's getting at but I'm not quite sure. Is there anything else that you do want to talk about?

EN

So, on the status of the transfer, we are still waiting for the Board to provide their direction. So that's why I'm not taking action on this. That's number one.

And number two … Oh. Beth is here. Beth, do you want to say anything about data processing terms?

BETH BACON: Do I have to?

DENNIS CHANG: I think this team is very, very curious about how that's going. And if there's anything you can tell us, that that would be nice.

BETH BACON: Well, to be honest, there's not a whole lot to tell you that we haven't talked about already. We're still working on it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Okay.

BETH BACON: So we will … Much like the IRT docs, it'll be nice to be able to share those at some point. When we get some language drafted out, it'll be nice to share our progress.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Please talk about the IRT viewing some of the working documents whenever you're ready. I think that's what they're curious about. Okay. That's that. And that's why I'm not talking about this section at all. And once we get some idea or have some view of the documents, I think this will be completely replaced. So please reserve your comments on data processing terms. There is a team that's working on something really, really nice.

So 15 minutes to go. If there aren't anything that you particularly want to discuss, I think that I want to wrap up the meeting here and let you all go instead of trying to look for things to do. I didn't have anything that I needed your input on. I think we've covered it all and I'm very grateful. So we'll pause here and see if I see any hands.

"Please assign homework to Alex." Okay. Thank you. Yeah. I will tag him. He did let me know—

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: - that he could not attend. But I did let him know that the two Amandas are having babies so he's pretty excited about that, too. Important things, right, we share immediately. Thank you, guys. Thank you, IRT. Thank you, team, always being so supportive. My pleasure. Good-bye now. I'll see you in a couple of weeks and that will be March. We're going to be in March next time we meet. Oh boy! See you later.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]