ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum - GNSO - Registration Data Policy IRT
Thursday, March 25, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello and welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting. My name is Andrea Glandon and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I will note in the chat shortly. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the full transcript button or show subtitles. It may also say live transcript at the bottom. With that, I will turn the floor over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome everyone. This is the Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT meeting. Let's get started. My name is Dennis Chang, I'm the ICANN Org GDD Program Director responsible for the implementation of this policy. And this policy is called registration data policy but many of you will probably recognize it as EPDP Phase 1 consensus policy. So, this is

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.

our 45th meeting of the IRT convening here and today, what we will do is give you a brief overview for the public and then we'll just let you know what we have delivered so far, the policy implementation team, and then we will get to the working session. This is an IRT working session so you can observe us work. Now, during the working session, I ask only the IRT team members participate but at the end of the session, we have reserved some time for community Q&A.

So, if you wouldn't mind, let us do the work first and then you'll have a chance to ask your questions and converse and discuss any issues that you would like directly with the IRT here. So, let's continue. The registration data policy implementation background, of course, is a consensus policy that was adopted. And during the phase, important phase is what we call Phase 1 here and I will get to more about that. But the policy had really 29 recommendations and 27 of them were adopted as is, and there were two recommendation and they were adopted in part and those being Recommendation 1, purpose number two. Recommendation 12, organization field. Now, it's important to point out that currently, there's actually a discussion going on with the GNSO and the Board in Recommendation 12 and whether or not the organization data field should be deleted or not deleted.

The other recommendation that's not stated here and that is a subject of a high level discussion between GNSO and the Board is Recommendation 7, that deals with the transfer of data elements from registrar to registry operator. So, while that's going on, the ICANN Org and the implementation team here have devised a three-stage policy implementation for this EPDP Phase 1. Stage one, we needed to do right

away because the temporary specification that dealt with the registration data expires on 25th of 2019. So, we took under our scope to immediately address this and we actually got started before the Board resolution at the advice of the GNSO Council and started work to with at that time pre IRT community group to work on stage one so that contracted party had a clear requirement of their operation.

And stage two is what we're trying to get to right now and that is what we might call a—and this will happen after we publish our policy registration language and that is what's going on now. But let me quickly show you what interim registration data policy is. It basically talks about the three stages and makes it clear that contracted party are to continue to implement and operate under the requirement of temporary specification. And during the stage two, we have designed it in such a way that if the contracted parties wishes to implement some of the requirements earlier, then the effective date they may do so. So, we are devising a no later than date for the effective date. And stage three is after the policy effective date when everyone has to comply with the requirement.

So, to date, this implementation team have delivered several items here on the list here. Firstly, it's the interim data policy but there are other reports and studies that the recommendation requested or asked for and those have been delivered on these dates. And these documents can be found in the community Wiki page under—let me see here. We will show you—this is our community Wiki page and we have a lot of resources here where you can find all the reports and correspondence and also our draft policy language. And on this correspondence, you

can see that there are correspondence happening between the board and the GNSO Council on Recommendation 12 and Recommendation 7. But this is a community Wiki page that you can track our work on and we use this for the IRT work.

So, what is involved in all the policy implementation? So, number one, we are drafting the policy language based on the recommendation and that's over here on this quadrant, top left. The other things are reports and studies that the recommendation ask for and that's on this top right quadrant. Bottom left quadrant talks about data protection arrangement and there are two types. One with a contracted party, ICANN Org and contracted party. And the other one is the ICANN Org and a third party, service provider, such as data escrow service provider. Those are also going on. And of course the wave 1, 1.5 and wave 2 impact reports is what we call it. And we will talk about this more. We refer to them as red line documents and one of the recommendations specifically, Recommendation 27 requested or asked for the implementation team to review all the consensus policies and examine the impact of the registration data.

So, these are the scope of work that the implementation team is doing. When I say implementation team, by the way, I refer to the implementation project team and you may hear terms like IPT, and IPT is the team that ICANN Org compose of. These are the ICANN staff, including myself. And then you are familiar with IRT Implementation Review Team and this is the ICANN community volunteers that supports the IPT in reviewing all the work and advising us in a technical manner. And most importantly, ensuring that we are aligned with the

recommendations, our implementation that is. So, at this time, as I said, we are going to switch to our IRT session and go to our Wiki. And in the Wiki, we have of our meetings, agenda and the notes and this is the way we do our work.

So, agendas are posted in advance for the Wiki and we use this agenda and [inaudible] to conduct our meeting today. So, we just cover what I would consider the overview and the background for the public attendees so now we are getting to the working session. And the first item on the agenda is an introduction to our implementation team. Samantha, so it's been our tradition when we have new team members join that they introduce themselves. So say hello, Samantha, and tell us a little bit about you and what your role will be in supporting us.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Hi everybody. I am a new project coordinator so I'll help with some of the coordination and support functions on the IPT side and I'm happy to be here. My personal background is in travel, degrees in linguistics and public administration. So, it's a bit of an industry change but some relevant knowledge there, and happy to help.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome, Samantha. So, Samantha, especially work very closely with me as the project coordinator and helping me in the background, the IPT and the IRT. What I'm showing you on the screen right now is the Wiki page letting you know that if you are wondering who the IRT members are, here are the list of IRT members. We have 40 IRT team

members supporting our implementation and we are ever so grateful because you will get a sense of the scope of this implementation. It is vast and extensive and far reaching and it touches on a lot of things that ICANN is doing right now.

So, next item on the agenda is our RedDoc. As I mentioned, that this is a consensus policy and procedures, redline has an impact of our new registration policy. And what you're looking at is a list of RedDocs that we will be reviewing. And the way we work is what we use is an IRT workbook and you will see that the IRT has been busy and very helpful. And so far, we have 142 items that the IRT have reviewed and we will continue, of course. And we use this workbook to list the items and list the due dates of when we are asking for the review to be completed. And typically after the review is completed, we gather and we review it as a team, so that's what we're doing.

So let's start with the registrar transfer dispute resolution policy. And on this, we reviewed this before actually and let me just look at the comments here. Let's see. We said that—hold on. Let me look at the—it's in section 3.4. So, section 3.4, let me get there. At our last meeting, we reviewed this together and we were discussing this item here. And there was some discussion on whether or not this is the best we can do with the changes for clarity. So, we asked the IRT to please review and propose maybe some revised language. We looked at it again, meaning that ICANN staff has, and we really couldn't think of how else we could improve it. But let me start here and let me see. Marc Anderson had made a comment so maybe I will turn it over to Marc to see if he could explain his comment and help us here. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Hey Dennis. Can you hear me okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Wonderfully. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Excellent. I don't know that I'm going to be a whole lot of help. My comment was on part A and I think the real challenge is on part B. I was just suggesting using the word applicable instead of required. I don't think it's a substantive change but I think applicable is a better fit there for that particular update.

DENNIS CHANG: Require was a change that we put in, right? It wasn't there before, I think?

MARC ANDERSON: I think it's actually a change to a change. But I think it had been changed initially to say pursuant to a particular section of the transfer policy where applicable and then it was changed to be where required. So, I think what I'm actually doing is saying I liked the initial applicable language better.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, that certainly makes sense.

MARC ANDERSON: But sometimes that's where the challenges of edits over time.

DENNIS CHANG: 3.4. Was it 3.4? I forget now already. Let's see. It was 3.4, right? So, here, is this the right one? Maybe not. Okay. Any other have comments on what Marc has proposed? IRT? Not sure if I'm seeing the hands of—

ANDREA GLANDON: There aren't any hands right now, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So, let me know.

ANDREA GLANDON: Marc has his hand up.

DENNIS CHANG: Again. Okay.

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry. I was just going to note that Sarah and Roger both agreed in chat. [Roger] has his hand up, so I'll …

I C A N N | 7 0
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I see. Yeah. I should pay attention to chat. Okay. That's a good input. Thank you. Anything else about the other language that we were struggling with? Thank you, [Eric.]

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, another hand for Marc.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. So, on B, I know this is the one where there is a bit of a challenge and I believe—maybe others can help me out here but I believe that that part of the challenge is that so that the particular requirement to have a copy of the RDDS output for the data transfer was like that particular requirement, I believe—And please correct me if I'm getting this wrong, but I believe enforcement of that particular obligation was suspended by Board action. And so, that I think is the particular sticking point on this particular item is, how do we acknowledge that in this particular update to the policy noting that a full review of the policy is in the process of being kicked off by the GNSO Council? And so we don't want to do too much here now knowing that policy work is going to occur on the transfer policy by the GNSO Council. So, I think that's the challenge and I don't know if I've gotten that exactly right but maybe noting that somewhere might be useful, particularly the suspension or the lack of enforcement and the pause

on enforcement but I don't know what the correct word is there for that particular obligation.

DENNIS CHANG: Are you thinking about maybe adding a note to the policy like on top here? That I know we did something similar to what you're talking about on the thick WHOIS [inaudible].

MARC ANDERSON: I was not thinking that but that's the good idea.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Because I added the top of the thick WHOIS consensus policy, the fact that there was a pause on the enforcement and I think that helped everyone. What do you guys think as part of our update? We can suggest that. Yeah, deferred enforcement. Yeah. Okay. I'm getting an idea that is probably a good idea from the chat. Now, feel free to speak so we can clarify a note somewhere that a particular item has been—the enforcement has been paused. We can either add it at the top or add it as a note but the suggestion here is let's make that clear. The idea is to make it clear for the enforcement. Okay. Yeah. Okay. Well, before, of course, what we will do is let us come up with some language, whether it's a note on top or a footnote or something and we'll share that with you to see if it makes sense and we'll ask you to review that once more. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:
Thanks, Dennis. Sorry for all the talking. But yeah, I mean, just I agree with Eric saying it'd be good to see the actual language but just thinking about what you've suggested, I think the combination of the edits you have now for B with the explanation of the Board action in the header, I think that would work. So, I mean, it'd be good to see the language but I think at least conceptually that makes a lot of sense that I think that would work.

DENNIS CHANG:
Okay. So, let's take the next—Isabel or Samantha now. Please take an action for us to come back with some language. Thanks, Eric. Good suggestion. So, that was the only item on this document on this one, the first one. We reviewed all the rest of the document and I want to maybe say that thank you to Beth who suggested that we add the meeting dates on this other changes so that we know that we reviewed this already. And I have been doing that. Let me just show you one of the prior one we have done. Let's see. You may not have noticed it because—you see these Marc, IRT date. So, I started doing this after a suggestion that it was difficult for the IRT to know what are new comments and what are the old. So, every comment that or every redline that we reviewed is now date marked. So, that was a good suggestion in the process and thank you, Beth.

Next item on the agenda is this one. It's the additional registration data directory service and we'll start here. This one we already reviewed. Let's see, this one, I think this is the same note that we have been inserting to every policy that we're touching to make sure that they are

consistent and people know why we're doing this. And let's see. So, here, please guide me if IRT has made a comment or want to discuss something. Otherwise, no, I don't think we need to go it again.

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, I think there's one thing that still needs to be an outstanding item, section 3.2.4 of the TDRP, Genie has said.

DENNIS CHANG: You mean before? Okay. This one. You want to go back to this need, Genie? Say the number again? 3—?

GENIE CHOU: 3.2.4.

DENNIS CHANG: 3.2.4. Okay. You'd like 3.2.4. Okay. Here, you like some—you want to discuss this? Go ahead. What is it that you want to discuss?

GENIE CHOU: I think these two sections were discussed at the last IRT meeting and we asked if the IRT could propose suggested language, since I believe the consensus was that there needs to be some edits to these two sections but we weren't exactly sure how to go about doing that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So, this is a section we requested some help. Marc, did we get any help? Did anyone come back with anything? IRT members, any suggestions on this or no? So, I remind everyone that all these documents will be published for public comments so we will have more time to review it but if you don't have any suggestions right now, let's go with current language. So, this was a to-do list I think. This was the to-do list. Yeah, 3.4. So, this was the to-do list that was due March 23rd and we did not receive any comments. Am I getting a request to perhaps extend the due date which we will talk about with these other ones that you saw that Alex had requested? Due date change for these two which we will talk about later and whether or not it should be an April 5th due date or—I think he asked for a month so we will talk about that. But let me ask so that I'm clear whether the IRT is requesting additional time to review those. Marc Anderson has got a hand up. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. Yeah, I think we're going to need more time on this one. I think that the language that's in there right now to me reads that if the contact data doesn't match what's in the authoritative RDDS or if the data is redacted, the data subsequently provided by—the redacted data provided pursuant to the policy. Then the dispute resolution panel should contact the registrar and require additional documentation but that additional documentation would be the same as the redacted data provided by the registrar to the dispute resolution panel. So, I think that's a little bit sort of circular logic. So, I think maybe we need a little more time to consider the wording and try and address that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We went around and round to see if we can come up with something better. Yeah, we need help on this one. So, I have no problem with extending the due date. And before I change the due date here, is there a suggestion on how much time more we want to take? How about the April 5th? Or is that too soon? Let's try April 5th and see if we can get something then. So, I appreciate you keep trying and let us know if you have something. We'll be watching the document to see if we note any more changes. Let me make the suggest—okay. So, it's little more than just reviewing but let me make it a little more clear that we are looking for suggestions on the language. Okay. Thank you. Shall we continue? We don't need this. Let's see. We'll go back to our agenda again.

So, next item on the agenda is this one. So, on this policy, it used to be called WHOIS information policy and we are removing the word WHOIS and trying to be consistent in using a word either RDDS or registration data or some other words to make clear. Let's see if there's any IRT comments on this RedDoc. I agree with Marc, here. I don't think we need this. Any objection of maybe deleting this? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. I'm clearly not going to just object to that [inaudible]. So, yes, I support my point.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Yeah, so this is what to be specific, this is—to be clear, this is what we're talking about, right?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you for that. I actually raised my hand for your previous point, noting that we're changing the title of the policy and answer the acronym. This was previously the additional WHOIS information policy, more affectionately known as AWIP. And so, now it's the additional registration data directory services information policy which doesn't exactly flow off the tongue. But I think my suggestion here is, in addition to making the note about the change, I think it's probably important to know the name of the policy is changing maybe in that note, note that this policy was previously known as the AWIP or additional WHOIS information policy.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. It's very important. We were trying to do that and somehow, we missed this one. Okay. I will ask Isabel or someone to do that for us later but let me just make it as a comment for now. Yeah. Let me not mess it up here. So, here, I think that's a good comment. I like that. Thank you. Alex, go ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Hi, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Hi.

ALEX DEACON: I'm just wondering why we remove the obligations for webpages in Port 43 from this consensus policy?

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah can answer that probably. Go ahead, Sarah. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I will take a shot. I'm not actually sure if what I have in mind is the same rationale as what Marc has in mind. So, the reason why I thought we would remove it is just that it's not necessary. The obligations to provide that query based access already themselves outline how and where to provide it. So, this text is just not necessary and it doesn't actually add requirements. And then also like, it might not be applicable, right? So RDAP doesn't happen by a Port 43 and it kind of happens via webpages but not really. So, I think it maybe adds confusion without adding extra helpful information and their actual requirements live in the agreements that it refers to. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Sarah.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks, Sarah. I appreciate that you've used a lot of mays and mights, and I don't think we should be removing something like this just on a guess. I'm concerned that we need to think about what we're doing

here and why and understand the impact. And also, we shouldn't be setting precedent for removing obligations from existing consensus policies that are consistent with Phase 1 policy either. It just seems like a terrible idea.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, actually what you said, Alex is very important. We are not supposed to do anything that is inconsistent with the Phase 1 policy implementation. So, this is why we're reviewing this very carefully word by word. So, Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: I mean, I agree with what Sarah said so I'm essentially saying the same thing but maybe to try and help Alex. Like that change does not mean removing the obligation, any obligations at all. This sets it up by saying—this paragraph is set up by saying, "This requirement applies to registrar and registries obligations pursuant to their respective agreements," which includes consensus policies by the way. So, removing that sentence doesn't remove any obligations. I think that removal is part of the overall updates to acknowledge that WHOIS is going away and will be replaced by RDAP and this is an attempt to update the policy language to make it technology agnostic.

DENNIS CHANG: Berry, go ahead.

BERRY COBB: I think Beth was before me.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Dennis, I was getting a complex. Come on.

DENNIS CHANG: You didn't want me to call on you. You [inaudible].

BETH BACON: I'm just [inaudible]. So, I just wanted to say that I actually, I agree with Alex. I think we were on our last call, we were trying to be really careful about some changes that we were talking about simply because we were like, it sounds better. It makes more sense. I don't think that leaving this in, if we take it out, it doesn't change a requirement.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I remember.

BETH BACON: I think it's an editorial change that doesn't have a substantive impact because as Marc and Sarah both said, the requirements lie within the reference to documents. So, Alex, I think I'm happy to leave this in because again, it doesn't add or remove any requirements to my knowledge. I see Roger and Berry both have their hands up. So, if I'm

speaking out of turn there or saying something inaccurate, please let me know.

DENNIS CHANG: Berry, do you want to say something? Go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Yes. Thank you. In agreement with everyone, I think tactically, the removal of this probably doesn't change a requirement. That said, I'm leaning more towards Beth's statement. Our original mandate is, one, to make changes to the consensus policies based on the implementation of Phase 1 that just so happens to be technology agnostic. But in terms of implementation of Recommendation 27 was really more about terminology updates. And I don't think that this is the appropriate forum to make this kind of change, especially with the understanding of other activities going on with relation to RDAP and those kinds of aspects. So, it seems that this change would be better connected to other activities than what we're trying to accomplish here. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Thanks, Berry. Yeah, I remember our discussion last time we met and I think that approach had somewhat relieved some pressure on us to find every single change that we could make and we need to step back and really look for changes that we must make to be consistent with the policy implementation. So, looking at it that way, it actually made our job simpler. And don't forget that if there's any doubts as to

whether or not it is aligned with the policy recommendation, then we can take it to the GNSO as per their instruction to us. We are making a list of things that is what we may consider on the borderline or if the IRT [as a whole] does not agree, then we can probably send it there. Roger, you have the floor.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I'm glad everybody's agreeing that the goal here is to edit as little as possible. So, I think that's a positive, I'm glad everybody's saying that. The one caution and, again, I don't—this being in here is probably a mistake to start with. Again, the obligation doesn't come from this additional WHOIS policy that was just created a few years ago. I mean, that's been a requirement for some time. I think the caution I would have is when that changes, when 43 sunsets, it goes out of everybody's contract so and so and so. This is just one of those areas that we're going to have to remember to get back to because, again, it seems like it shouldn't even have been put in here but it's just one of those areas we're going to have to come back at and clean up. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I'm looking at it that way and feeling the pressure of making that list for someone and I don't know who will do that later. This is a request for Samantha and Isabel, is that when we say we reject this suggested change and our comment disappears, please capture somewhere where we have this discussion and put it on a parking lot for future action. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks Dennis. Lots of good points by everybody. Great comments. Dennis, I think your point about, hey, if we don't come to consensus on this, then we should go back to GNSO Council, right? I think that's [inaudible] and I think you're absolutely right there. I will make one more point and if it fails to sway everybody [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Last argument. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: So, let me just point out, if we leave the language in there and read that sentence literally, that constrains the AWIP policy soon to be the additional registration data directory services information policy, it constrains that to apply only to webpages and Port 43 which I don't think is the case. Or I don't think that's the intent, I should say.

ALEX DEACON: So at RDAP—and we're done?

MARC ANDERSON: Alex, I think that's the wrong direction.

DENNIS CHANG: Is going back, going the other direction, Alex. We try so hard not to use the word RDAP.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. We want to be technology agnostic.

ALEX DEACON: Just remember there's many of us on this call are not kind of involved in the negotiations happening around the sunsetting of Port 43 in RDAP and what have you. And so, it concerns me, you know, I understand Port 43 will be sunsetted at some point but webpages, is that also going away? I don't know. So, I think we just need to be careful.

DENNIS CHANG: I think Alex is saying that Marc, your last attempt did not work. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: Thanks. [inaudible] pile on but to pile on. So, I think while, Marc, your point is valid that it does have an impact on that application, because that's about to be policy, that change would be under the scope of those changes. So, yeah, we're going to change this and then in a month or two, that policy will change this too. So, if they find that in that effort that this language constrains it inappropriately, then they can take it out. But I think it's important and I know that we're kind of just having a fight about who can be more pedantic right now. But I think it's important bit of pedantic-ness. It's not a word. Because we're making sure that we are staying within our scope of our work and I think that's important for us, it's important for every consent that's policy and IRT

work to do that. So, I do think that this will get changed so that it doesn't constrain the future policy but it will be under the scope of the future policies change if that made any sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Does to me. Any questions to Beth or any other—so we're going to keep this. We're not going to change it. That's the bottom line here. I think that's the decision. And if there is any IRT members who feel this is important enough to take to GNSO council, then please let me know so that we can add to the list. That list, I'm trying to make sure that it's very, very small and try to gain like, you know, us to agree at our level because we know this better than anyone else, right? And let's not escalate things that we don't absolutely need to. So, that is my request and thank you for that discussion. Shall we continue? Were there anything else anyone notice we should be looking at with this one? If there isn't then we're going to say this one is done. And what will happen just so that we can all see the process, we will go up to our document list here. Let me show you this.

So, for us, IRT we have it all here, you can access it any time. But for the public, they will see it in this list. Where did it go? Yeah. Over here. And the reason that we chose to do it this way is because if you're looking at the version in the way we are looking at it in the Google Drive, they will not be able to see the changes actually. So, this forces us to convert into a PDF and then share it here so that we're careful not to—try to make it clear for everyone. Right? That's understood. So, we will continue with our work here. Next item is ERRP so let's look at this one. ERRP stands

for Expired Registration Recovery Policy. This one, we didn't need to change the title. We did put in a note and then we started some changes here. Okay. And we went back and forth but I think we're ending up at not changing this but keeping it at the registrant. Here, we are changing it to registered name holder. I'm looking for IRT comments so if you know your comments, please refer to me.

I'm not seeing anything. Does this mean that you're okay with this one? No comments. Did we get this one right? We had one comment and that was resolved. Pause. If no comment, I'm going to move on to our next one. IGO, INGO one. Didn't show up here. Let me close this. IGO, INGO identifier in all gTLDs policies. I know some of you have worked with me on this. This is a fun one. And had been revived recently for the Red Cross names. That was interesting. And looking for changes or comments for the IRT. I don't see any. Does this mean that—okay. So, this is the kind of note that I'm talking about. I like adding notes to the top of the policy for the readers to comment and we do things like this as an example. So, if you want to see the red line and the old policies, we can show you like this.

We will employ something similar to this on our updates when we do our public comment session. We'll talk about the process, the methodology of how to make it easier for the community later. So, that's IGO, INGO so I'm going to close this. Thank you for your review. And the next item is the UDRP ones. So, these two—and I made a note so you will see—you saw this. Alex had requested more time because he's reaching out to the UDRP experts for review and comment. So, I wanted to just quickly browse to see if there's any questions that we

can answer for the IRT but I agree to extend the due date. So, one thing that I want to ask is, which due date would you like I—I change the due date and then I'm not sure.

Okay. So, we are looking at some—we do have some comments on this one so we will not review it unless it's a question to us but then we will go ahead and entertain that or answer that question. But more importantly, let's set a due date. Alex?

ALEX DEACON: Yeah. If we could do 30 days, that would be appreciated.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I saw the 30 days but do you know how I think, right? 30 days from which date is important to me so before I set a date, do you mean like April? I know it's April but you have a date in mind? What do you think your friends will be able to work with?

ALEX DEACON: Let's see. I don't know. I'm just looking at my calendar now.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Make it comfortable.

ALEX DEACON: The week of the 19th. Our meeting will be on the 22nd, I think. No. On the 21st.

DENNIS CHANG: Our next meeting?

ALEX DEACON: Well, no.

DENNIS CHANG: Next meeting. Yeah.

ALEX DEACON: The 21st [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Andrea, when is our next meeting?

ANDREA GLANDON: April 21st. Alex, that's correct.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. How about 19 then? Is that good? Or do you want to go right to 21?

ALEX DEACON: I mean, we could put the date of the 19th. I'll convey that back to the team. I think the goal though, is to have all our input prior to the meeting on the 21st, where I assume, we'll be discussing, right?

DENNIS CHANG:	Yeah, we will.

ALEX DEACON:	And we need to give people some time to review so, yeah, the 19th seems reasonable.

DENNIS CHANG:	Yeah. So, and that's why if they do the comments on the 19 and you enter them, then they'll give the IRT a day to review it before we have the meeting and that will be helpful. Right?

ALEX DEACON:	Yep.

DENNIS CHANG:	Thank you very much. [Some type of needed] discussion. Okay. So, I see some comments but do you want to ask any questions from us or do you want to just go ahead and wait for Alex to come back and everybody to come back on a due date and talk about it together? Thank you for reviewing it, Sarah and Marc. I see your comments. Appreciate it. Okay. So, decision. We will not talk about it today and we will resume on the next meeting or next, next meeting. So, we will continue now on OneDoc. We had some things to work on. This one. Here's our OneDoc. So, according to our agenda, we had 7.6, 10 and 11.5 so let's look at those.

7.6, my one question was to ask if this should be moved to the implementation notes, which I think I did, and—was it this one? No, it's not. Okay. Oh, this had to do with registrant organization, and registrant organization is one of the items in Rec 12, and I think what we want to do is postpone discussion on the registrant organization until later. So we added some words here, and I don't see any comments here. so I don't think we're ready to discuss 7.6 yet. Is there any comments on 7.6 that you'd like to make?

Okay, the other section that we wanted to review was 10. On the RDAP, Marc, I think that you asked for us to reach out to the RDAP working group to see if they have a suggestion. What I did was internally, I reached out to our technical service team who's working on RDAP. We have an RDAP team. and I asked a question. And their response is that technically, you can do either or both. You can return blank, you can omit from your return, or your inquiry response.

So it's really not a technical decision, and of course, the RDAP team is there to implement whichever is a requirement for us. So I looked at this again, and I think the way we have the language set now, and that is, to be very clear, it does not provide an option, it requires a response with a blank, and I think that is the language that is consistent with the policy recommendation. So now I invite the IRT to comment on what really is the requirement based on our recommendations. So we'll start with Roger. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis.-I think that part of what you said was accurate. Technically possible to do any number of ways. Technically correct is not to pass back blanks. Technically correct, you should not include the element if it's blank. So there shouldn't be anything. I don't know if that didn't come across correctly from the RDAP working group, but that is the stance on that, is if a field is blank, then the field should not be returned at all. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, so I think that's the part that you're having a difficulty with, correct versus possible. Correct is if it's in line with the policy requirement, then it is correct. If it's not compliant with the policy requirement, then it's incorrect. I think that's the way I understand it. But please educate me here. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON. Thanks, Dennis. Yeah, I think Roger said part of what I was going to say. It is technically possible, but it is not good practice. But you said something else where you said you think that returning the field with no value is consistent with the policy. And I guess I don't agree with that, but I'm curious if maybe you could explain where you came to that conclusion from, and maybe we could look at that a little bit more, because if you think that the policy is requiring this to be the case, then I'd like to understand that a little bit better.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I think that that is our key question. From what we could study internally, that's what we understand. And we would like, of course, help in ensuring that our reading of the recommendations then is accurate. So let me see.

MARC ANDERSON. Dennis, if I may, if you don't have that information in front of you right now, I don't want to ask you to have to find it in the middle of a meeting here.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Appreciate it.

MARC ANDERSON. I guess, like I said, my recollection, I don't think I agree with that but I'm happy to be corrected if I'm wrong, but maybe we could just take that as a follow-up item.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. That's probably right. Let us probably do something like you know how we do our rationale documents. I really need to write this thing down so that I don't forget, and with the policy implementation taking a long time, I struggle to remember all our past conversations. So internally, we have now changed direction and we're doing a lot more documentation of our discussion and the decisions. So that's probably a better way to do this.

So as I said, if the recommendation said don't do this or make it flexible, so either you respond with a blank or you respond with the omission of the data, either are okay, then we can easily rewrite this policy language to accommodate that and allow that. And before we do that, we just wanted to make sure what we believe is the recommendation, did the recommendation change us to behave in a different way, or if the recommendation is silent and we shouldn't be changing the way we are behaving. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Hi Dennis. Thanks. I think what I'm going to say is maybe in line with what you sort of just summarized, and a bit of a reflection as well on what Roger has shared, that it's not necessarily correct, you don't want to send data that's not required or necessary. But what I think my question is, whether you return a blank field or you just don't return the field at all, that seems to be the same result. So if it's not collected, it's not returned. The same result is that it's not there.

So I think either way, whatever way is more technically correct is probably the best way to do it, and wouldn't impact the policy being implemented correctly, because I think the policy is simply if it's not collected, it's not returned. And however that not returned looks doesn't really matter. Does that make sense? I think that's what you were saying a little bit.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I kind of see what you're saying. Just don't address it, is what I'm hearing. I'm trying to make it clear.

BETH BACON: No, I don't think not address it, but I think we're splitting hairs here. I think that if it says it's for data elements where no data has been collected or generated, the value may be left blank. Okay, so that means it's just not returned. Maybe we say the value may not be returned. So you're just not going to get it either way, but you're still fulfilling the policy.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I'm trying to make that point very clear for the implementers. So for the implementers who are coding, they have to decide whether I'm going to provide a response to it showing the blank, or I'm going to ignore that. And that's what I'm trying to clarify here. And Marc is saying that—well, I think there was one comment that currently, the practice is that nothing comes back if it's blank, but our technical team advised me that that's not really the case. There are cases where things are coming back with a blank value. So if we're behaving in a different way from different operators, then maybe this is an opportunity to make that consistent and perhaps that's our job here. Berry, go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Dennis. And reacting on the fly here, so I'm likely to be incorrect or for sure we have an action to take this back, but my recollection from the policy discussions as it relates to the

recommendation about the minimum public dataset, what is to be displayed or published, I believe, was the term used for that minimum public dataset, and in line with the intent of not changing existing requirements unless there was agreement through the recommendations to change those requirements, that in the case of this is that we're trying to mimic the requirement with consistent labeling and display. So the idea and the—I hate to use the term "legacy," but in the world of WHOIS, and that protocol that if there is no value supplied, that the output in many cases—I'm not going to say all— would still show that a particular data element had no value or the display of it was blank. And we can see through the comment here and response to Marc is where we start getting into discussion about RDAP, and I can't authoritatively state on what the protocol actually does, but I recall that when we last talked about this on the IRT, that this is where we started to tread, and while the protocol may not allow for it, but that the client or the profile could accommodate that depending on the rules that are established around that profile. But setting the technical stuff to decide, my recollection from the policy discussions is that the intent was to try to provide a consistent display of data returned regardless of where it was supposed to be queried and returned back to the end user requesting that display. So I'll stop there and return with more investigative comment later. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Berry. Yeah, we'll write some stuff up and propose it to the IRT. Roger, you have another comment?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. And Berry hit on the same thing that Alex has hit on several times in our IRT discussions, is this isn't talking about what is displayed, this is talking about what comes back in a query. And again, you can throw the technology aside, if it's WHOIS, RDAP, the next greatest thing, it's the data coming back in the query itself, it's not about the display. If we want to create a display section—and it's something Alex has suggested many times, is we need to create a client display requirement. And I think that's true, but I'm not sure that phase one has requested that.

DENNIS CHANG: No.

ROGER CARNEY: So I think that what we need to focus on here is this is what's supposed to be retuned back as data, not as what is displayed. And I'll jump into some of the technical reasons here. When you get down to writing protocol-level technology, you don't want to send back unnecessary data. So sending back the name of a field that is blank is unnecessary data. So you don't want to do that because all you're doing is using bytes that people laugh about, "Oh, that's only 8 bytes" or whatever, but when you start multiplying that at Internet level, that gets to be a huge amount of data so you don't want to do that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I understand the practicality from technical point of view. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: And again, Dennis, technically, you can do just about anything, but you shouldn't do those things. If the policy is written right, it shouldn't require those things. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I 100% agree on the efficiency of that technical exchange. Berry, you have another comment?

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Dennis. Just to follow up on what Roger said though, section 10 is about the publication. Specifically, this whole recommendation was about the processing activity of publishing registration data. So from my perspective, it's less to do about how the data is transferred technically from whatever protocol is being used, but again, it's more about how this output is displayed in that query.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Berry. So I try not to use what I believe is the right thing to do, in other words, personal opinions aside, of course, like Roger, I'm an engineer so I like to see things in an efficient manner, so I will certainly not write a policy like that. But I have to respect those EPDP team who have thought about this and whether or not they decided to change something or they decided deliberately not to change

something. That's what I'm trying to do, so faithfully implement the recommendations.

So we will come back to you and document some of the reasons why we believe that this was meant to behave this way, this requirement. And of course, not being—there are other people who are involved who believe, this is not just the staff trying to do something. And I'm trying to balance the IRT's opinions here and the weighing in on both sides. So we will go ahead and take some time, and make sure that you're okay with what we're doing. So we'll take that homework, and thank you very much.

All righty. Next item was 11.5. So we're not going to get into the calendar days, business days. That's not the purpose of this item. We're trying to make things easier for all of us to see the language. So there was a suggestion that this sentence is something that could be moved to the implementation notes, and I wanted to make sure that you are all agreeable. And I agree with this, but let's move it to the implementation notes. Anyone object to this?

ALEX DEACON: Dennis, I've mentioned this before, implementation notes in an implementation document makes no sense to me. I don't understand the distinction or why we would bother. I would keep it where it was and I would suggest any other implementation notes be put into the body of the document. That just seems logical to me, but [I know I'm in the minority.]

DENNIS CHANG: I understand. Yes, I know you brought this up many times, and we have decided to use the implementation notes as a section and as a language—it's a convenient tool where all these languages are helpful language and rather than putting it into the upper section, it's easier for us as a reader to have it here. And this is for all of us to use.

So this is where I think it belongs, or it works better. We originally, I think, suggested as an implementation note, but it got moved out because of some discussion, but I think looking at it now, the IRT members, at least a majority of the IRT members, are seeing that this is easier to see and it would be better served as a note here.

ALEX DEACON: Dennis, can I just ask another clarifying question?

DENNIS CHANG: Sure.

ALEX DEACON: Will ICANN Compliance enforce any obligations in the implementation notes section of this document?

DENNIS CHANG: As long as they're consistent with the requirement, yes. So for example, there are examples—let's see. Okay, we're having this discussion again.

ANDREA GLANDON: Five minutes left, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

ALEX DEACON: Dennis, it's okay. Let's move on.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Alex. Yeah, appreciate that. So I do want to go ahead and make the move, but Beth has her hand up, so we'll honor her hand.

BETH BACON: Thank you, Dennis. Unfortunately, in my little registry land, if you say Compliance is going to enforce something, I can't really skip over it. So, to be clear, we've said in the past that implementation notes are not enforceable. You enforce what's in the policy, but the implementation notes are informative.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, so I have to be careful with that answer, because if the implementation note says something and that is consistent with what's on the top as a language, then we don't want to have any conflicts between the two. So of course, if the language, the requirement is in the policy and is also in the implementation note, I cannot say that because

it's in the implementation note, that is no longer required. So this is a—okay, we've had this several discussion, and if we want to have discussion, I'll put it on the agenda for our next IRT meeting, so if you don't mind, we have to wrap this up on time. I don't think we should be going over as we may do some of these IRT meetings. So if you don't mind, let's put that for our next discussion, and we'll have an in depth, long discussion about that. We want everyone to be clear on this topic.

Okay, so I have five minutes left and I promises our attendees in public a Q&A opportunity, and I will do that now. And we have this important discussion called drafting errors, which I wanted to talk about it today, but we ran out of time. So I will assign this to the IRT, and what this is is a list of drafting errors that we were trying to review as part of the public comment form, and we decided to break it out as a separate document because it's involved. And I think Sarah wisely suggested that we break out what it is and what it should be and why, so we took a lot more time creating this. So we'll go ahead and do that next.

So, public comment, or community Q&A time. Are there any non-IRT members who would like to ask a question to the IRT? Any questions about the policy implementation of this registration data policy EPDP phase one?

ANDREA GLANDON: No questions in the chat, Dennis, or hands up, and that's probably good because you have one minute left.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Well, at least we did provide an opportunity. This policy is complicated, complex, and it's difficult, I think, for many people to engage in a quick way.

Our next IRT meeting is April 7th. So we'll see you on April 7, and on the task list, we will go ahead and assign the drafting error document, and we'll make it due before our due date.

Before I close it down, anyone have final words? Or if not, we'll continue our work online. And thank you, everyone, for joining. Genie, go ahead.

GENIE CHOU: For the TDRP document, I believe there's also subsection XX, that's part of section 3.2.4 that the IRT is going to want to look at as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah.

GENIE CHOU: I just wanted to make sure [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: This one, yeah. That one's already assigned, but maybe I need to put out a reminder. This one is going to be a new one and you'll get an e-mail from me on this task assignment. Okay, thank you, everyone. Thank you for joining, thank you for your support. We always appreciate all of your work. Bye now. We may close the session.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. I will disconnect all lines, and everyone have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]