
DENNIS CHANG: Do you want to do the intro like Andrea does? Or if not, I can do it.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: You can do it. I'm not too familiar.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Welcome, everybody. This is Dennis Chang, ICANN Org Program Director for this Registration Data Policy Implementation, and we have an IRT meeting today. For the time efficiency, of course, attendance will be taken by Zoom. And please let us know if you're only on the phone. Speak up now so we can take attendance.

Hearing none, I presume, I'm assuming that everybody is on the Zoom list and you have been let into the room. And today Andrea is out and I'm trying to do this, but of course Samantha came along just in time and she's helping me in the background. So, she'll be taking the attendance and keeping track of the time for us and for me.

Please speak your name before you comment on the audio so we can know whose comments are these for the transcript, too. Thank you very much and we'll get started.

So on our agenda, the key item today is what we call the drafting error document, and I will show you how we are going to deal with that. And we'll talk about each item individually so you're completely clear on every item on this document. And that will probably be the majority of the meeting today.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The other thing that we have is the RedDoc. There was a task to the IRT to see if we could come up with a suggestion for the language. So, we'll see if we have some suggestion there. And then we have a couple of OneDocs items that we may just look at very briefly. But I think this may have two days that are, two weeks from now. So, you'll have more time to look at it and.

And at the end, we have an AOB item we want to talk about, possibility of skipping an IRT meeting next week. I mean not next week, but the week after the next IRT meeting. And I'll tell you why I'm thinking that when we get there. So, that's the agenda.

So, let's get into our first agenda item, task #136. As you know, we are using our IRT task list, and 136 is this one. So, I probably highlighted. I should have highlighted this one. But this is what we call the Public Comment form, and within the Public Comment form, we have drafting errors.

So, you'll recognize the Public Comment form that we have been creating in the background. And we had entered a bunch of data and asked you to comment. And this was maybe a little too brief, and it was hard to follow and reason. So, Sarah suggested that we maybe have put it in more detail so that it's easier to read and for us to review and discuss.

So, instead of trying to revise it here, what we did is we deleted it from here and we created another document called Drafting Error document because I thought that there is enough substance content here that are important and we need to really understand. [I mean] understand

meaning every member of the IRT must understand and needs to understand. We all have to agree that there were indeed drafting errors and we're correcting it. And if there are any question about us, you know, being misaligned with "intent" of the policy recommendation, then we have to consider the separately, and possibly maybe even go to the GNSO Council for that kind of an item.

But I think that in our own deliberation internally with the IPT, we have identified now seven items. And we wrote it up the best we can in the most plain language as we can. And I don't mind telling you that it was getting confusing at times because we couldn't remember when we talked about it, first of all, and why we decided that there was a drafting errors. But it is so important that we know why now. Right? It's less important when we discovered it. It's more important that we know now, today, and we can document it and we can present it to the public.

So, we will start with our first one. So, let me just show you the format of the document. We have a title, and this highlighted item is just to let you know this is the format that we're going to use. And whether or not we're going to take this content and put it back into the public comment or create another document and link it, that's a decision we'll just leave until the end. But just so that you know that we have a choice. And we have some language up here basically saying that we discovered it and we agree that this is a drafting error and we are asking the community to check on us and give us comments.

So, first item. And the title is pretty important because the title can get confusing. If you look at number 2 and 3, they seem like they have the

same title, but they really are not. So, pay attention to the title. And we would appreciate your suggestions there, too.

So, this is a Data Elements Matrix version reference. So, 1.1 is what does the EPDP final report say? Well, the report had a Data Elements Matrix referred to and it had a link, but that link was pointing to an obsolete or incorrect version. And what we're saying here is that we noted that, so there may be people who are going to use the incorrect version of the Data Matrix, so we want to make sure that that is an error.

And then the correct version should be this, and here is the rationale. And then, also, it's noted that an updated version of the Final Report is also published on this page.

So, that is a pretty easy one, I think. This is something that anybody can check. And those of you who are on the EPDP Phase 1 team will readily recognize that, yeah, that was a simple incorrect or in-error link idea. I mean, that was the problem.

So, let me stop here and pause to see if anybody has a question on this number 1 item. We have a hand from Sarah. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi there, Dennis. I just want to thank the team for putting together this version of the information. I did find it much more reasonable to review. I really like, in number 2, where you highlighted exactly what the change is. So, I think that was super helpful to make it visible, and I don't have any problems with what I'm seeing here. So, thank you 5very much for that.

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, thank you for your suggestion, Sarah. I mean, if you hadn't spoken up, we may have been struggling. But I think that I was telling Samantha, too, earlier as she came on the call that as a newcomer, please use her fresh eyes to see if what we're doing makes sense and common sense and easy to read. So, she's definitely going to help and has been helpful already, listening to us and advising us. So, we're fortunate to have Samantha come along at this time, too.

So then, let's go to number 2. Number 2 is a little more interesting than number 1. So, first of all, when we titled this, we wanted to make sure that registrar registration expiration date is the data element that we're talking about. And you're right. I highlighted this because this one is not so difficult to find, but if you go to things like this, we were getting confused as to which ... Were we talking about this or that data item?

And so, that's the first thing we did. But the idea here is that the final report said that this was an optional, but then in our policy language we are using the word "must". Right? So, it is a misalignment or perceived misalignment based on where your perspective is, and we are trying to explain here that the intention is to say they must be transferred and if generated or collected. So, it may be marked as optional in the final report, but the policy language is written as a MUST.

So, that means it needs to be, it must be transferred if the data escrowed does not include the ... Let's see. If it doesn't then, of course, we would not know where the expiration date is, and that could be a problem.

And we further note that RAA reference expiration date ... This is an existing ... I think this is another important point that our policy support team has pointed out, that they remembered the intention was not to change an existing requirement here. So, if we was done that was totally unintentional.

So, that's the rationale, and we believe that when we present this to the community, they will agree with us. And, yes, it is misaligned but it is considered a drafting error. We should consider it a drafting error and then we should proceed with our policy requirement like this.

Number 2. Questions on number 2? Comments? I don't see any comments from IRT, so I am thinking that you all thought that this was clear enough.

Well, okay. Let's move on to the next one. Now, I want to make sure I caution you that I was getting confused between two and three. And I had to keep reminding myself that they are the same. They are elements, but the requirements are different.

Now you note that this was a section where the registrar has to transfer the data to the data escrow provider. Right? That's the requirement. This one, however, on number 3 is a requirement that the registrar has to generate. And technically, of course, they are two different requirements and we wanted to point this out. That over here, this one is actually maybe easier to see. But again, this one, in the same way, the final report marked this data element is optional. And we, an implementation team, is making a change to that and making it a MUST.

So, that is a different implementation on what others could perceive as the recommendation, and we're not following our recommendation.

So, rationale follows the same logic, the same reason, as the one before. Again, there was no intention to say the registrar now can decide whether to generate or not to generate. That would not make sense. I know that all of you registrars probably know this intuitively, or as a practice, that doesn't make any sense. Of course we're going to generate it, but then if we write down that the policy language is optional, that is not what happens now and what we should be doing.

Number 3. No hands up. Then I will proceed.

Number 4 is a registrar registration expiration date. This one, again, requirement is to publish now. This is a different section of the requirement, and this is a 10.1 in our policy language. And this one is a little different. It says registrar registration expiration date is a MUST here. And if you recall, we decided to do it this way. Let's just put it in as a MUST and put in exceptions for the registry operator to do this. In this section, we said that doing it this way would be more efficient.

So, the logic here, the rationale is here. I think you all read it. And I'll give you a moment to look at it again and see if you have comments on this.

SAMANTHA MANCIA:

We have a hand from Roger.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Roger. Did we do this correctly?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. It's interesting because I don't really ... These last three kind of go together, so kind of talking about them as a group here.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

ROGER CARNEY: Two and four for both have the statement "if generated or collected." Three says that it has to be collected, and I don't really remember discussing that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So, it's okay if you don't remember. You're right. I don't remember if we discussed it or when we discussed it. The point now is, does it make sense right now as we are presenting it.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep.

DENNIS CHANG: And are you saying it does or it does not?

ROGER CARNEY: So, I'm not sure. And maybe others can pipe up, but I'm not sure 3 makes sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, number 3.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, number 3. Okay.

ROGER CARNEY: And 2 and 4 make sense because they have the clause "if collected or generated," but number 3 says it has to be generated. But I was thinking there are some registrars that don't generate their own expiration date. They just use the registry's expiration date. So, they're not generating their own. I suppose it's a technicality, possibly, because you could say "generate" based on, yeah, they use the registry's as their own. But it seems like some registrars don't actually generate a registrar expiration date.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh.

ROGER CARNEY: That's just my ... We as GoDaddy do, but I had thought that there were discussions that some registrars don't. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That's a good observation. Let me give the floor to Theo. Go ahead, Theo. What do you say?

THEO GEURTS: Yeah. I agree with Roger. We are actually one of those registrars who don't put in a registrar expiration date. We just pull the expiration date from the registry, and that is what we put in our system. Whatever the registry displays is the exact same data that we have in our database which is available for our customers so there's nothing out of sync. So, we never have discussions about...

If a domain name expired an hour too early or too late or whatever, we just go with what's in the WHOIS. So, what's probably in WHOIS, that's what the truth is and nothing else. So, we don't have those senseless discussions like 10 years ago. We actually did that, and at a certain point we would go, "Okay, that is just asking for a lot of trouble for us," before, in our particular case. So, we just follow whatever the registry says it is.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. It would be nice to just have one expiration date. Period. Let me give the floor to Berry. Go ahead, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Dennis. Thank you, Roger and Theo for that intervention because in less of an informed way, that's how I recall the discussions when we were talking about this particular data element as a part of the workbooks that eventually came to this. And hence why it was marked yellow as optional.

But to Theo's point, being one of those registrars, even though you're using the registry's expiration date, you're still publicizing through WHOIS that it's the registrar registration expiration date. So, either way you're either getting the expiration date from the registry through EPP or you're generating your own registrar expiration date. Not in the case of Theo, but regardless, it is presented at all times as the registrar expiration date. Correct?

THEO GEURTS: That is correct, Berry, so we have that completely in sync, yes. There's no difference. And we publish that data, indeed, in WHOIS. You are correct.

BERRY COBB: Great. And you do that because it's a requirement per the RAA. And to Sarah's point in the chat, it's really not about [inaudible] published. And so, I probably shouldn't have used that word, but at the end of the day, you're complying with the requirement in the RAA that this field be processed, basically. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: How about—

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, but from a compliance view, there's no issue. I mean, are you are correct there, yeah. And there's never been an issue, actually, in my opinion.

DENNIS CHANG: So, let me ask you this question. Oh, Roger. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Berry, I'd have to look at it, but I'm not sure that our contract says that we're required to generate a registrar expiration date. We are required to supply it back in responses, but I don't know that we're required to generate ...

And again I'll have to look, but I think that's the big difference to me. Number 3 here is saying that it has to be generated. And, again, number 2 and 4 say if you generate it or collect it. And, obviously, as you mentioned, you're using it that. Thanks, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thanks. And we can do a final confirmation, but as I understand it, based on the one regarding the escrow part, it means that you're processing it one way or another. You're getting it from the registry or you're generating it on your own, and therefore to meet the RAA, you're escrowing it.

And then, finally, as part of the RAA, and what is an improper use of [CLND], is that the WHOIS output part of the RAA requires that that field and its value be displayed.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay, yeah. And I completely ... I think we all agree on those parts. It's this bullet 3 that says that it MUST be generated or collected. And again, I think it may be just a technicality that you can say, "Hey, I generated it by using the registry expiration date." Or I think "collected" is meant from the registrant, so I'm not sure that you can use it in that vector. But at least, generated, you can say, "Yes, I pulled it from and used ...". But, again, that's the confusing part of 3 for me. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

How should we make it less confusing, then? So, our choices are to not mention this at all—right—as a drafting error because if you are okay with this requirement ... Right? That's the requirement that we're putting into our policy language. If you are okay with it and it makes sense and everybody can go along as a requirement and it doesn't present any ambiguity or a problem, then we're fine.

No, the only thing that we're trying to do is ensure that we are ... We want to make sure that there's no perception that we have somehow changed the requirement from the recommendation. And if we did, we need to explain that. So, this is where we need your input and advice. How we present it as a ... 1) Should we present it? 2) If we do present it, then how should we present it? Maybe we can ...

I think Roger sort of talked it out for himself. If we think about it this way, then it will be okay and it makes sense. Should we capture that? I know that we have a transcript of what you said. Should we capture that and supplement it in the rationale here, number now 3.3?

Are there any thoughts? Any suggestion that it's not even worth bringing it up? I don't want to just ignore it because it is important, and I want all of us to agree on how best to handle this.

Okay. Roger, you have a hand up. Please help.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Dennis. I guess since I'm the one that kind of brought everybody into this, my suggestion would be to remove 3, as I'm not sure that it changes anything. I don't know that we're saying there's actually an error, and I think 2 and 4 make sense because we're clarifying that if you have it, you have to send it. But I'm not sure we're contradicting what the language says. And maybe we are, and maybe I'm missing that. So, if we are, then we'll have to come up with a way to display that [inaudible] present it.

DENNIS CHANG:

On the surface, this is what the perceived conflict would be. It says "optional" here and we're saying "must" here. So, if it's "option" over here, shouldn't we say "may" here? Do you know what I mean?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah. And we have multiple sections in this Section 7, don't we?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we do. We do. Yeah. That's why I was looking at this. We put it in the "must" section, right? We have a "may" section, but we have put it in the "must" section. It's right here. And there could be a question with "optional." Why are you making it "must" now? And then, of course, we have to explain why.

ROGER CARNEY: Right.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. That's why we put it in. It was actually a late catch for one of us, too. I think Genie caught it. So she, again, is relatively fresh eyes. She said, "What about this?" Oh, yeah. You're right. "That one, too." So, we added it.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think that, looking at it, we either do it like 7.4 for the reseller or we ... If we're going to keep that it's a drafting error, then I think we have to come up with language that better states that "generating can be also consuming of registry expiration date" or something like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. We have a footnote, so maybe add a footnote like that on the language. Is that what you were getting at?

ROGER CARNEY: Well, I was more specifically talking about the drafting error document.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, drafting error document. Oh, okay. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

ROGER CARNEY: Making sure that it's clear there that, hey, we understand that this may not actually be generated by the registrar, but it may be imported from the registry generation or something.

DENNIS CHANG: Now, that's my preference. As you were talking, I was thinking along that line because I think that would be more transparent and comprehensive, in my view, for people who are coming along later and looking at this.

So, let's do that. Let's add some words here. And here, "collect or generate could mean that some registrars may be receiving this expiration date from the registry operator and just simply using it. And that that is understood and recognized." Let's do that. Agreed?

Okay, Roger. Let's go on. Thank you for the intervention. Let's make a note here per Roger/Theo. Theo, that was a perfect intervention. Glad you joined today. Nothing like hearing from people who are actually doing it, yeah.

THEO GEURTS: You're welcome.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. A lot of things to thank you for today.

Number 4, we did. Right? We finished. And number 5. Now, this one is a registry expiry date. And this one is a registry extra date and registrar to publish. And here, let's see. "Must" publish is the requirement. Let me see. Where is the ... Oh, I see. Yeah.

So, in the recommendation language, it does not differentiate registry operator or registrar. It just says you all must. And we know that this is a registry expiry date, and we're not trying to now all of a sudden make registrars also to publish. So, that was not the intention of changing a requirement for the registrars. So, we put in the exceptions here.

Does this one make sense? So, some of these recommendations were clear on how registries should do this, registrars should do this. It was separated. Some of the recommendation just said, "Do this," and it did not specify registry or registrar. So, we have to assume they're both ... That was the recommendation.

Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. Dennis, just a couple comments. The title for Section 5 here. When I just looked at it, I thought what it was telling me is that registrar **MUST** publish. So, maybe instead of saying "registrar to publish" it could say "registrar may publish" just because that ... That would reduce my confusion and hopefully help other people. That's one comment.

Next comment for 5.1. So, “redaction must be applied to the data elements. Right? But it doesn't actually indicate what the redaction requirement was for that specific data element. In previous ones above in this document, whichever data element is being discussed is indicated specifically in where you listed the recommendation language. So, I just think for a viewer who hasn't spent a lot of time in this document, it might be more clear if it shows us what the actual recommendation language is for that data element. Do you know what I mean?

DENNIS CHANG:

I think I do. So, add the data element. Okay.

SARAH WYLD:

In the one above, I mean. Yeah, thank you. And I really, again, I like that highlighting and 5.2. That's super helpful. Thank you very much.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. That's a good comment. Thank you. We'll do that. Anyone else? It's funny because I highlighted it for myself. But I'm glad that it's working for you, too. In spite of what you may think, I don't look at this every day.

Number 6. Let's talk about the name server IP address. This is a little more technical. It took me a while to understand, but then I forgot. So, I'm trying to ...

Oh, yeah. My mistake. Thank you. I do have a ... I think this is a spelling ... Thank you, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Dennis, thank you. It's later on. At the end of that line also, you've got the same typo. To the right. To the right more. Yeah, see? Right there.

DENNIS CHANG: Yep. So, I was asking Samantha to help me with this, too, as I was writing—appear and appear. Okay, so this one. Right?

So, in the policy language we use the word “may.” Right? And so, in the recommendation language, it uses the word “must appear” which sounds like it's not a “may.” It should be a “must.” Right? So, that is an inconsistent and misalign, but we are ... We believe it's a drafting error, that it was not meant to be a “must.”

And I think this one. I remember, I think, Marc Anderson explained this to me. Unfortunately, he couldn't be here, so we did our best to capture his instructions and thoughts and present it back to you. So, those of you who are more familiar with this can speak up and help explain if it needs to be explained. But if this is good as is, then we should just leave it.

Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: I can't read Marc's mind, of course, but this looks good that “may” seems to be the case. I mean the resellers, yeah. If there's no personal data, we just publish the data of the reseller ourselves. But others don't. [There] could be several reasons for that. And the name server IP

addresses, well yeah. They're not always available. So, it's "may" in both cases. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. Thank you very much. Yeah. That's what I understood. It's not always available so we cannot—or there was no intention to make it available. We're not asking for it to be added as a requirement. So, thank you for that, Theo. So, I think we got this one right. So, we will continue, then.

Number 7. I kind of debated about whether to add this or not, but I decided to add it just to be comprehensive. 2nd e-mail address comes up. If you're looking at the data elements, the matrix or the table, the 2nd e-mail address comes up as on the list on the Annex D workbook. And you see it on every table. And, of course, a 2nd e-mail address is not a requirement at all, and we never talk about it. It's not added to any elements as a generate or transfer or publish or nothing. So, we just wanted to make sure that that was intentional.

And we heard from people who were on the original EPDP Team that they probably would have deleted this had there been more time. So, I think this is an easy one. But just to [note it as] a complete and comprehensive document.

Now let me get into this discussion. And that is that we have seven items, as you saw, that we consider drafting errors. And if we discover more, of course we'll add it. But at a certain point, we're going to be considering this document as done. Meaning that we've found all the drafting errors that we agree on. This is not the list of where we have

disagreements within the IRT on the interpretation. There's no disagreement within the IRT here. The IRT, IPT—the whole team, every one of us, agree that [we'll have] the items on here.

Now, it's nice that we do. But to you, and this is ... I'm seeking an opinion. I know that Sebastien joined us. So, this will be important to you, Sébastien, at your GNSO Council. And we were kind of discussing whether this is important enough to at least alert the GNSO Council or let them know that we've identified seven items that are inconsistent; that we're going to be implementing inconsistent, and we're calling it drafting errors—and here they are, so they're all biased—before we go to a public comment. And this is a sort of a judgment call, and you know how important this is to the GNSO.

So, Sebastien, it's up to you. And you can talk to us now, how you feel about it. Or you can talk to us later. But this is something that I wanted to bring to your attention and to the IRT so the IRT, as a team, can decide how to go about it. Sebastien, do you want to speak?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Hi, Dennis. I'll definitely take note of it. I don't have any major comment. I think, as a GNSO member, I personally would respond to that you guys are probably better placed to, normally, after finding them, to find a solution to them or find what is the most plausible resolution to it. And then the GNSO will go with it. But I can't speak to them. I'll definitely at least ask the GNSO management to see what they think of it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think Rubens is right. What I was thinking is that at least let them know that we're doing this, Sébastien, so should they wish to review this or weigh in on this, they have the option to do that before we go to public comment. I think that's what I was sensitive to because if you think about it, we're doing things that are against what GNSO told us right here—and for good reason and we can explain everything. But maybe it will be a good courtesy liaison activity for Sebastian to let them know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'll send an e-mail today. If you don't mind, I'll send you a quick draft for you to just verify that I'm on topic because we have a meeting tomorrow. I don't expect anything to be resolved tomorrow, but at least I can bring it to their attention.

DENNIS CHANG: Sebastien, it's not urgent. It's not urgent at all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: So, just think about it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm just taking the opportunity at tomorrow's meeting.

DENNIS CHANG:

All right, okay. And we do have a couple of things that we want to edit here. And also, I would not say that we are not going to find any more items. This is just sort of the concept of liaison with GNSO Council that I was thinking about that. But I'm glad to know what you think about this and get an IRT's input here. Thank you very much. Glad you can join, too.

Let's see. So, that was the drafting error document and we've finished that. The next item is the RedDoc. Yeah. I think we got a thumbs up from Roger. Thank you, Roger.

And this is a Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, Section 3.2.4. This was a task for the IRT to see if the IRT could come up with some suggestions for better wording. And the last time we met, the IRT requested additional time, so we said okay. But I don't see any suggestions, so not sure if this means that maybe this is sort of the best could do or did you want more time? So, those are the questions to the IRT members.

We looked at this again and we think this is okay. But if it could be improved, we would like suggestions, please. So, that was the action. That was in Section 137. But it's okay. If you don't have suggestions, that's okay, too. I wanted to give you an opportunity.

Beth Bacon. How are you, Beth?

BETH BACON

I'm better now that I'm on the IRT call, Dennis. You know that.

DENNIS CHANG: Of course. Welcome.

BETH BACON: So, I think that we maybe just didn't get around to that one. So, it's probably okay, but maybe we could just put a pin in it and let the CPH look at it one more time because we're already into [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: Sure. I am actually ... I'm really agreeable today because—you know why.

BETH BACON: And I'd also like [inaudible] section. No, just kidding.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

BETH BACON: I was going to say, if you're agreeable I have a list.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

BETH BACON: Thank you, Dennis.

BETH BACON:

Okay, sure. So, what we'll do is we'll just put a pin in it and provide more time. So, let's do that.

And we have a couple of items OneDoc. Let's see. These are 148 and 149 which are due April 20th. So, no pressure. Okay? No pressure. So, you can go ahead and take your time looking at it—14 and 11.6. Is that right? That's the agenda? 14 and 11.6.

So, let's look at 14. So, I'm just going to show it to you. I think it's pretty easy, but I do want for you to take consideration and give you time to think about it. What we're trying to do ... And you know we as a team have been [inaudible] working on this. We wanted to make this policy as concise as possible, and sometimes we have to consolidate. But then we had to expand again because it didn't make sense. Start on this 14.

I think we did a ... We made a decision at one point to delete all the appendices or move the information around so we don't have any appendices. And we succeeded, but we forgot to delete the 14 comments, so that's it. That's it. It's very simple. So, please look at that because Section 14 will be gone and it will be nice to have less section. That's one item.

The other item is 11.6. This one is a little meaty. This is an Urgent Reasonable Request, and as you see we have suggested some changes. Meaning more addition. The concept was first broached by ... Let's see. Who was it? It was, I think, one of the IRT members, but I can't remember exactly who. But it was a ... Oh, Matthew. Maybe Matthew.

But it's for the urgent request. How about if we go ahead and put in like a two-step process. So, first you do this and first you do. So, we added some ... We worked on this language and then we added it to it. And this one, I have to thank to Andrew. He worked on this, drafted for us. And it makes sense to me. So, please look at that. And that is due on the 20th. Okay?

SARAH WYLD:

Sorry, Dennis. Can I just ask a question about that one?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. So, I like very much using that format that if responding, they can extend it for a longer period. I think that does align with how it's done in the GDPR. I noticed that the timeframe here are also 24 hours rather than business days. Or we've got calendar days rather than business days. And so, I guess I'm just curious if you could remind me what it says in the recommendation, and were those 24-hour timeframes—what the recommendation said. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

The recommendation, I think, said for us to work it out. The recommendation said, yeah.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, okay. So, it's the same timeframe as we were talking about before. Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So, the implementation team will work out the criteria and the timeframe [once] the recommendation ... So, that's what we're doing. We're following that recommendation. Yeah, but that is the kind of thing that I'm asking you to review and comment on. Okay? So, you have a couple of weeks.

Now, let's get to our ... Last item is AOB. So, if you would note our task list because Alex—I'm not sure if Alex is here. Alex had asked for a month to review the UDRP documents because he wanted to elicit support from the UDRP expert friends, which we appreciate. And then we were producing URS documents. And the same thing here with the URS and UDRP. We are providing a month of time to review, which means that all these RedDocs are not going to be due before our next meeting which is on the 21st, two weeks from now.

So, my proposal is that we skip the 21st meeting and continue to work online. And then on the following meeting, I think it will be the 5th. Let me just scroll back and check. Yeah. That's the 21st we'll skip, and the following IRT meeting will be on the 5th. That's when we can have all the documents that are due and which, again, we can have substantive discussions. And besides, there are some events happening on the 21st that some of our IRT members would like to support and not be in conflict with our IRT. So, I think that we can afford to go ahead and skip that IRT meeting.

So, that's what I wanted to tell you. And that's what the other business item was. Yeah, I know a lot of you ... Alex is away and I think Marc Anderson is away. We heard from him this week. Several people are taking the week off.

Thank you, Brian, for letting us know you're making progress. So, don't forget the URS ones. Right. So, I think that whoever are the experts on the UDRP are probably experts on the URS as well. So, they might as well do it as a set, and that will be ...

It's nice to look at the documents as a set. There are parallels. Excellent. Got it. All right. Thank you, Brian.

So, that's what I would like to do. Any comments on that? No comments. [inaudible]. Okay. Thank you very much. So, let's do that.

I see, "Samantha, please let Andrea know that that was a decision so she can go ahead and make the corresponding changes in her meeting invites and things like that."

So, that is the completion of our set agenda for today. I'll pause here to see if there is any other business the IRT would like to bring up—or IPT. Anybody.

If not, let's say good-bye and I'll see you at our next meeting. But, of course, before then I'll see you online. And we always appreciate your support of the policy implementation. Thank you very much. Samantha, you may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]