
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the registration data policy IRT meeting held on Wednesday the 13th of October 2021 at 17:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior.

Before I turn the meeting over to Dennis, I have a bit of information to share. Mark Svancarek has left the IRT, so our member list has been updated. In addition, for our ICANN 72 session, it is scheduled for Wednesday the 27th of October at 16:00 UTC for 60 minutes. Please register for ICANN 72 as soon as possible. You do have to register in order to get the information for all of your sessions, and session Zoom information will be posted on the schedule 24 hours before each call.

With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. If you don't mind, provide the link to the registration site.

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.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, I will put that in the chat.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. That would be nice. So welcome, everybody. Let's get us started here. In addition to some of the news that Andrea just provided for you, I do want to let you know that one of our IPT members, Genie, just left last week on a maternity leave. So, guess what? Our implementation team is about to have yet another baby. That'll be baby number three on our way. So that's another exciting news to share.

Next, this is the agenda we have. So we have today the following agenda. We are going to mostly focus on this technology agnostic concept that we have been—we talked about it several times and last meeting, we really got the idea of separating the RDAP requirement from the legacy WHOIS requirement to make it easier for us to think about and implement and handle it in the future also.

So what we'll do is we'll start with our OneDoc, and as I mention, in the e-mail, I think you saw, I have changed the due dates for this addendum, item one on task 169, changed the due date to November 19. The reason I did that is to allow you, after today's session, to go back and consult with your colleagues—technical colleagues especially, those who are more in tune with doing the RDAP implementation and WHOIS implementation. Yeah, congratulations to Genie. Indeed, Marc, please wish her well. She's just a wonderful lady, we're very happy for her.

So let's look at OneDoc. The thing that I wanted to focus on was a couple of things. One is the newly created appendix, and maybe that is

where we should start. I keep calling it appendix. It's an addendum. Addendum one, this addendum, if you examine it, it talks specifically about implementation of WHOIS and the Port 43. And second, the web-based WHOIS directory service. And it provides a couple of details on how those will be implemented and required to comply with. And this is to answer the question—I think Sarah asked a good question, if we took all these languages out, how would people know how to do the WHOIS? And let's make that clear. So that was a valid input, and so we agree with that.

So we want to maintain that clarity and requirement. And of course, things like this, like [inaudible] redacted is something that we want to maintain, because this is something that we already agreed with. So that is the addendum one that we are adding now. So if you recall, we had various addendums and at that time, decided that rather than addendum, we were going to incorporate all this language into implementation notes and the policy language.

But in this case, this language we feel is better structured as part of an addendum rather than implementation notes or the policy language. So that is the addendum explanation. And the thing where that came out of is what that allows to do is the deletion of the text of 10.1, and this is the 10.1, minimum RDDS publication requirements.

If you recall, we had a lot of discussions on this and we struggled with how to make this language clear and be helpful but not leave it to interpretation for something other than what we had wanted to do. So Roger made some comments here and Alex made comments here, and we had various discussions whether or not a field could be left blank, or

what about if the inquiry response is missing? And all that discussion can just go away if we delete that and add the addendum for WHOIS at the end.

Then the main part of the policy language is technology agnostic, and everything about RDAP will be handled with the RDAP profile and protocol. That's just outside of this policy. And should there be, in the future, another protocol or scheme that is used to transfer registration data and exchange this registration data, then we don't have to change the policy. So that's the idea. Marc, you have your hand up. Please.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hey Dennis. I have a couple comments. And if you could scroll down to the addendum text. Thanks. All right, so a couple things. I think your explanation is helpful. Thank you for that. I appreciate the explanation and the context. First, if I could vent or share a pet peeve, you sort of described the addendum as technology agnostic, whereas the addendum itself is technology specific.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, I'm sorry. I didn't mean it that way. you're right. I think you're about to describe it more accurately right now. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

And that's fine, but when it was described, I went to read it, I was expecting to read technology agnostic text and instead got technology specific text. So that kind of ... Let's just say I cringed on that.

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry.

MARC ANDERSON: That's fine. Just a pet peeve that I wanted to vent at you a little bit for that.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: That said, I don't think there's a problem having technology specific text, just as long as we understand what we're doing, what the ramifications of that are. I think you've described it well and in a way that makes sense.

I don't see Beth on the call. Beth made a point in a comment—it's on the screen under yours, it says if this section is expected to be made moot in the future, should we include that explicitly in the text? And I think a little clarity in the text would be helpful. There's an expectation that at some point, WHOIS will go away in favor of RDAP.

So I think it would be good to have some kind of text in this addendum just describing that and saying—I don't know what the best verbiage is, but just explaining that this language here is there to make it clear for registries and registrars how this should be implemented for as long as WHOIS remains an obligation or a requirement, or for as long as

contracted parties are implementing WHOIS. Whatever the right wording there is, I think there should be something there to describe that.

And then I have one last point. I don't know how strongly I feel about this, but in the text, you have [i.e. right side of the colon and i.e. the string on the left side of the colon. I think all of us on this call know what you mean by that very clearly. But I'm slightly concerned that someone else might not be as clear on exactly what that means, and I'm also cognizant of the fact that there are scripts that are read right to left instead of left to right.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh my gosh, you're right.

MARC ANDERSON: So that's not necessarily internationalized friendly language.

DENNIS CHANG: I apologize. I'm so used to this. You're so right. As we are promoting the IDN.

MARC ANDERSON: Sure. Yeah. So that was just something that jumped out at me. I just wanted to flag it. I'm not sure what [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Yeah, I think it's a very important point. Thank you for sensitizing me with that. It's remarkable how you can think of that. I get so immersed in what I'm doing. So that's a really good point. Let me see.

Number one, when I say technology agnostic, I meant to say except for the addendum, because addendum was clearly written to be very specific to WHOIS. And what we wanted to do is sort of isolate the technology specific requirements to this addendum one.

So as you say, if in the future, the WHOIS requirement goes away, then we can simply know that addendum one does not apply anymore. And to your point and Beth's point, of how to indicate that in the language, we've thought about it and it was very difficult because it's a requirement now, so if we have to make it clear that it is a requirement per this policy—so that doesn't go away, but then if we say anything like in the future, it may go away and this doesn't apply, then the other argument that we were getting, another point is, should this one policy make predictions about another policy in the future or the policy to come?

I think, actually, Beth made a point also, which are both very valid points. So we're trying to craft the language to precisely say what we want, and that is something that you can help us with. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. Totally fair point. I get that that's tricky to word. And also, I'll just say it's even more tricky—as I understand, the proposal being discussed on sunseting WHOIS includes the callout that your registries and registrars who want to can continue to offer WHOIS. So

the language would apply to that as well. Because I think what's being negotiated is that you can implement it or you can continue to support WHOIS if you choose to, as long as you do it per the policy and per applicable policies. So it's not just it goes away at some point. So I know it's tricky and getting the right language might not be easy, but I do think it's important to call that out.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, let's use our collective minds to see if we can work that out. So I'll leave that as homework for all of you to see if you can think of a way to word it to make it more clear. Gustavo, go ahead.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Regarding why we put the text saying left and right of the colon, unfortunately, WHOIS doesn't support any kind of [inaudible] encoding, so you use UTF-8 or ISO or whatever other encoding, there isn't a way in the WHOIS protocol to indicate that. That's one of the reasons why we're moving to RDAP.

DENNIS CHANG: That's right. WHOIS doesn't support IDNs?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: The encoding, right? it is just a protocol that says you receive some input and you send some output. If you want to use UTF-8 and codepoints outside of the ASCII repertoire, you're free to do that. It doesn't mean that a client is going to be able to display that, because as

I mentioned, there is no signaling for what is the encoding that you're putting on the wire.

So this text saying left and right from the column comes from the WHOIS advisory that we created a long time ago because we received all these questions from different registries, registrars, and even some end users, like if you go to the agreement and you just look at the output, there is just an output, an example of an output but there's no requirement—there is no WHOIS profile, if you want to see it that way. So that's the reason why in the advisory, we put left and right of the column. In the advisory, there was this idea that if you want to put translations of the key, like for example if you want to say .name, it's nombre in Spanish, you put that in brackets right of the key to indicate that. But there is no guarantee that you use left to right or right to left—I mean sort of right to left, that it's going to work on the WHOIS protocol. It's just a note of how the protocol works. And it's one of the limitations, basically, of the WHOIS protocol. Yeah, that's it.

DENNIS CHANG:

So RDAP solves that problem and that's why [it is better.] So yeah, one of the benefits for the RDAP is the IDN [as I've learned,] so that's what you're saying. Okay. So that is the OneDoc. As we are going to continue, you will see we will discuss this concept reflected in other documents, and let's start with this one.

This one is the additional WHOIS—oh, before I show you this, I did want to just point out—I'm sure you saw it, but we want to go ahead and update 3.1, and this is the new updated RFC. In [RFC2119], there is an

update to that that is a supplement to 2119, it's called 8174. And 8174 basically gives you a little more description of what 2019 is meant to do and it actually tells you the exact words that should be copied and pasted to your documents if you're going to use that definition. So that's what we did. So we're trying to keep up with the RFC update. As long as we're creating a new document here, we should be using the new RFCs that are in effect. So that's 3.1.

And then, so when we come here, we are trying to do the same thing. As we go through all our documents, we want to use the same normative standard definition language so they're consistently reflected. And then on this document—

GUSTAVO IBARRA: There is a hand from Marc.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. You brought this up before and I promised to look at it further, and I didn't. So I have not done my homework here. But I do want to ask a follow-up question. Is there a question—I get why you're including the new RFC8174. Is there a reason why you're also expanding it to include BCP 14? Which is quite old, it goes back to March 1997. I generally get a little nervous about including BCPs. So I'm wondering if there's something in BCP 14 that you don't think is covered in either of

the other two RFCs. Is there a reason why you're including that BCP here as well?

DENNIS CHANG: Good question. Lucky that we have an RFC expert here, Gustavo. You're on point. Go ahead.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, that BCP is basically RFC2119, and this text just came from the IETF. So if you go to RFC8174, it says if you were using the old text saying that this key was blah-blah described in RFC2119, now you need to use this text. And it's basically just a copy and paste from the text from the IETF.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, so one of the things that I like about the 8174 is that they actually give you, "here's the text to include," so I just copied it over. It's more of a technical, in-depth discussion about why the IETF has quoted it that way. It's something that I didn't venture into. But go ahead, Beth, you have your hand up. Welcome.

BETH BACON: Hi Dennis. How are you. Sorry to be a few minutes late today. Team, I apologize.

DENNIS CHANG: No problem.

BETH BACON:

So on this—I don't disagree with the definitions. I think that they're fairly standard and we've gone through this. What I do have a question about, or concern I suppose—and I don't think I'm going to die on this hill, but wanted to mention it anyway, is that we're using this IRT as a means to populate this RFC and these definitions to every single policy that the EPDP touches. And I don't know that that's part of the EPDP. I don't know that that's part of our mandate.

And then also, what happens if these RFCs change or get updated? Do we then have to go back through every single policy and change and update them to make sure that we agree with the new recommendations? I'm not anticipating a change, but this is just something from a process point, that it feels like we're maybe overstepping a tiny bit. Again, I don't disagree with the definitions, but it's just the process that I have a question with.

DENNIS CHANG:

I see. Anybody else have a comment on this? It's a good comment and something to think about. This OneDoc, our policy is a brand new document, so whenever you publish a brand new document, of course, you should use the latest. That's just expected. And I think your question is more related to something like this, right? Should we include this definition here, and whether that is something good that we should do, or not? I'd like more input. Yeah, Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Yeah, in the OneDoc, of course, we've made that decision, it's in the—it's what we used in the EPDP. But yeah, when we start kind of populating it to other consensus policies that aren't the one that we're kind of mandated with changing, we're certainly mandated with updating it and [inaudible] any impacts or conflicts. So for me, it's just a process and like, are we going a little beyond what we're allowed to be doing? And again, I'm not going to the mat on this, I just want to direct it.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, it's something to think about. When we started this redlining process, we had to decide what we should do and what we shouldn't do. We definitely said that anything that touches on the content, the scope of the policy, we're not—we will pass that on to the GNSO Council. And we will try to limit our changes to what must be changed.

And while we were doing it, we did say that we were going to correct errors, if there's an obvious error of reference or broken link, we will go ahead and fix that. So you bring up a good point. Let's think about it, and it's a good thing to do, it's easy to do, but do you feel that we're going overboard in doing this? I'm actually comfortable doing it, I think it helps everyone and it's just standard language that should have been there probably early on anyways. So I see it that way.

The more important thing about this change here is this section one and two structure, sort of a change—I'll let Gustavo explain this. He does a

much better job of this than I do. Gustavo, do you want to share your screen? Is that easier?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure, let me just open the documents.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, I'm going to make you a cohost.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Can you send me the link?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, here's the link, but also, all the links are built into our agenda for your convenience too.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Oh.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc is so nice.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: So yeah, it's one note. All, if not most, at least of all the documents that I have been involved from the ICANN perspective that have been published policies, recommendations, advisories, all have been

following the IETF keywords or using the IETF keywords to define the requirements. So when we were going through all the policies that are affected by this work that the IRT is doing, this is one that is not using those keywords. So that's the reason why we believe that using the keywords is going to make clearer to implementers what they need to do.

We don't think that we're changing anything of the requirements, that's just transforming this into using that language that we have been using. So as Dennis was mentioning, we have now two sections, or that's the proposal, to have two sections. One section is to have the technology agnostic requirements that apply to any RDDS service—for example, for RDAP—and to have a section that details the requirements for WHOIS Port 43 and Web WHOIS.

Unfortunately, in the case of WHOIS Port 43 and Web WHOIS, we don't have a profile like we have for RDAP, and we have all these requirements that apply to the implementation of the service itself in all these policies, and you have requirements that are technology agnostic and requirements that are pertaining just to the implementation of WHOIS and Web WHOIS all mixed together. So what we want to do is to separate them to assure that an implementer understands, okay, these requirements apply to WHOIS 43 and Web WHOIS and these requirements are just technology agnostic requirements. In other words, we want to follow the same idea as we're following with the OneDoc.

So if you go through the document—I don't know if you have an opportunity to read it—you will notice that we're trying to do that.

We're trying to get the requirements that are just technology agnostic requirements like you need to show the link to the EPP status code explanation that we have on the ICANN website and you need to show the GURID when you're referring to the IANA ID of the registrar.

And then on section two, you will find those requirements that are specific to WHOIS and Web WHOIS, like the statuses must be referred by the respective EPP status code. This is not the case on RDAP. On RDAP, we have an RFC that is doing a mapping between the EPP status codes to RDAP status codes.

Also in 2.2, it says that a link must be shown to each of the EPP status codes. That's not the case on RDAP, that's not how it is. [inaudible] we have an array with all of the status code. And also, we have this requirement, the registrar should not remove the links from the messages described above when providing WHOIS data from another registry or registry WHOIS service, which is not what the RDAP profile is saying or requiring the contracted parties to do. Basically, the gTLD RDAP profile describes what you need to show, [inaudible] so on and so forth.

So that's what we're trying to do here. So yeah, any questions? Yes.
Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hey Gustavo. Thanks for the explanation. That's really helpful. I have to admit when Dennis first sent this out and I was looking at the links, I did not follow this at all and I was very confused what you guys were doing

and where all the edits were coming from. But the explanation is very helpful. Thank you.

Okay, so that's it. I do have some reactions. So first, just sort of a general comment that applies not just to this one but the other updated documents you sent out. The way you sent out these documents, it looks like you created a new document based on the previous redlines that we had gone through and reviewed as part of the IRT. So I have to say, sort of tracking changes and understanding what was an old change, like changing WHOIS to RDDS for example versus what the new restructuring, having technology-specific versus technology-agnostic language, was really hard to follow. So that's just sort of a feedback to share.

So that aside, I want to ask—have you given thought to how this updated additional WHOIS information policy would be communicated to the broader community? So, would you be able to go to ICANN's website and see, okay, this is the previous additional WHOIS information policy and it's been supplanted or replaced or superseded—choose your words here—by this new policy—and I don't know if it would be an additional WHOIS information policy or an additional RDDS information policy, but I guess I'm wondering, how would that be communicated just to community? Would you be able to see the previous policy? Would there be clear breadcrumbs as to how this was the previous version and it's been updated here, it's been superseded by this version here?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: That's a really interesting question. The only example that I can think of is the [CLD] policy, if memory serves.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, let me answer that, because we already have a process of doing that, and we used it for IGO/INGO most recently, and that is if you look at the protection of the IGO/INGO identifier policy, what you will see is a link to the latest policy but also it'll mention that this has been updated to the Red Cross and Red Crescent list update that was provided as a policy update. And at the bottom of the consensus policy page, you will see the old policy and the redline. So that's what we intend to do with all of these.

So as you mentioned, recorded breadcrumbs, so in the future, this redline and the original version will be maintained on the consensus policy page along with the latest. And the way that this gets done is when we do our public comment, we will of course refer to all these redlines so that it's visible for the public so we can get comments on them, and then the effective date of the new version for all of these redlines will be synchronized to the effective date of the policy itself. So on the same date, whatever that date is, all of these documents will be switched over at one time and they will all be linked correctly to the latest versions and then all the archive, if you will, original version and redlines will be maintained. Does that make sense?

And I think those of you who worked with me on the IGO/INGO know what I'm talking about. We did this.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis, for the explanation. That is helpful. And like I said, thank you, Gustavo, for your explanation. That context definitely helps. With that context, I'll be much better able to review the redlines and understand what the edits were attempting to accomplish. So thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: And while I'm looking at this, and now that I'm thinking about this, do you think that it would help you now to see a clean version of this at the same time as the redline version? In other words, you'd be looking at three things, the original version, the redline version and the clean, updated version. Would it be helpful for you? So question to you. And we have to do that anyway, but asking the question if we should do that to help you review it. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I think Gustavo has shown that within the document, you can look at the clean version. So I do find it useful to be able to look at the clean and redline version, but I don't think at this phase, staff needs to produce anything separate, because I think you can do it just within the document that's been provided.

That said, what I would have found useful that I had trouble doing was being able to understand what the new changes were versus what previous changes we had already agreed to were. For example, the RDDS versus WHOIS. So I don't know. I think if I dug more, I might have been able to find the old redline versus the new redline to be able to do that. But that's the one thing I was looking for to be able to do and I

wasn't able to quickly and easily do that. So that would have been helpful to me.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Does everybody know how to use the feature that Gustavo demonstrated? If not, we can send out instruction for you. Okay, if we're done with this one, let's go to the next one, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: the next one is CLD, right?

DENNIS CHANG: Whatever is on the agenda order. I believe it is. Yeah.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: So this is the same concept. Well, this one is easier because we're already using the keywords from the IETF. Obviously, we updated the reference as RFC8174. And again, it's the same idea, same concept, just trying to have two sections, one defining the technology agnostic requirements and the next section, or section two, trying to define the requirements that apply to WHOIS 43 and Web WHOIS.

And we believe that we have been successful doing that, but obviously, if we have more eyes and brains looking at this, it'll be better to be sure that this is the case. So in this case for example, section one, it's pretty technology agnostic. It says that in the RDDS output, you need to show the URL to the ICANN WHOIS inaccuracy complaint form, which in the

RDAP profile says—not remarks or notice, I don't remember off the top of my head.

Then it says that the values of the IDs are the ROID as defined in the EPP, and then we have the text about the additional RDDS fields that they should not include browser executable like JavaScript and things like that. So that's the requirements that [we instruct] that are pertaining to any RDDS service.

And then in section two, what we do is just to get those requirements that only apply to WHOIS for example, that that link that we were discussing above about the WHOIS inaccuracy complaint form should be after the registrar abuse contact e-mail and registrar abuse contact form.

DENNIS CHANG: Gustavo, I just noticed Beth has her hand up.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sorry about that. Yes.

BETH BACON: Thank you, Gustavo, for the introduction to this and walking us through. And I understand the impetus behind this is, I guess, to be more clear. But again, I'm unclear, A, we already went through these and agreed our changes. Now we're making more changes and I think that—I share the issue with Marc where I'm not sure if there are new changes and which ones are old changes, and if the new ones are simply reordering

things or if we're making more changes to the language. So that's a question.

And then also just if we've already reviewed and agreed, are we doing this just because it seems like a good idea, or is it something that has come out of the IRT, or we're just doing it because it's open and why not? Which isn't always bad, but also, is it within our scope?

DENNIS CHANG: For this particular one, [inaudible], we have never done it. This is the first time. This should be all new to you.

BETH BACON: So we're doing this to all of the—we do it to the WHOIS policy also. Didn't we just go through that, putting it in two sections?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think the earlier version, Marc said that we've gone through it before, and I think he is right. I have to take a look at that. But [inaudible], we haven't done it before and this is the first time we're reviewing redlines. So it's sort of a different ... So you don't have to worry about what Marc was worrying about for the first one, is what I'm trying to say.

BETH BACON: Not for this one but if we're going to be doing it for all of them, then I think that going forward, that's a question. But then also, are we just

reopening these because we want to reorder them? Other than the opportunity is there to make changes, why are we doing this? Is it helpful? I don't know. I'm asking the tech folks. Is this a good change?

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Speaking as an implementer and on the new TLD program, I remember when my boss told me “you need to implement whatever is in those requirements for the new TLD that [we’re going to] apply for.” And when I was going to read through all these requirements, it was really complex. And we just want to follow the same idea that we are following with the OneDoc, which is to have technology agnostic requirements and things that apply to WHOIS and Web WHOIS.

Unfortunately, as I explained before, we don’t have WHOIS profile and we have all these requirements that only apply to WHOIS. So the idea is to follow the same concept as with the OneDoc. And the idea is, yes, this is useful for technical folks. Talking as a technical folk that was tasked with implementing all of this [inaudible] having this separated and having the requirements for sure will make things easier or should have made things easier in the past. But maybe other technical folks want to chime in.

DENNIS CHANG:

Gustavo, I think you can continue.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

The other thing we’re trying to do with this redline is to remove—or if not covered by the [registration data] policy, to move those

requirements that appear to be related to the [registration data] policy, for example, 2.2, it defines that the registrar registration expiration date and reseller are optional fields, but now that's something that the registration policy should define.

Also, for example, 2.4, it says that the reseller field must be the name of the organization if there [is a legal entity or natural person.] Again, this is something that we believe should be covered in the registration [data] policy and not in this policy. We don't want to have requirements that are from the registration data policy into this policy.

DENNIS CHANG:

Let me interject here to share my thought with Beth and everyone. It's my belief that when we are asked to review all these existing policies and redline them to be consistent with registration data policy, one of the things that we have to do is if there are requirements that is already specified very clearly in the registration data policy, if there is already—that is a superseding requirement, that must be followed when it gets implemented.

So what we don't want to do is have similar or same requirement or if the requirement is in conflict, certainly, we all agree that we have to delete them or correct them, but if there's what we perceive as the same requirement repeated in other documents, it's my belief that those things should be just stricken out so that we don't have a potential confusion of where to look or which requirement.

This is a philosophy, of course, that is my belief and that's what I would like to do. That's why we're putting forward these type of changes, to

strip any registration data requirements from here and make sure they are reflected on our policy. So that's what IRT is asked to do. When we delete it from here, make sure that you're okay and you verify the same requirement is already covered in the registration data policy. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Gustavo, for the explanation, again, and for calling that out. I did notice there are some places where things have been removed from the [CLD] policy altogether as they're now covered or superseded by what's in the new registration data policy.

And Dennis, as you point out, this is kind of tricky ground where previous policy has been replaced, modified, superseded by new policy, and this is kind of new territory for ICANN the community. So I think you're aware of this, I think you just said it, but I think we have to be super careful here that we're doing this correctly and that it's clear why the [CLD] policy used to have language on a topic and then now it doesn't. And maybe that means that the new—and I'm not sure what the right answer is, Dennis, but maybe the right answer is in the [CLD] policy, you have a note that you include the old language and say this language has been deprecated or has been superseded by the language in the registration data policy, and have a link or direct people to that policy.

I don't know. I'm just thinking out loud. But this is kind of tricky and has the potential, I think, to cause confusion. So I appreciate the explanation and your philosophy there, Dennis. And I don't know what

the right or wrong answer is. I just do want to flag this and say let's proceed with caution, everybody, on this one.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. This is why the IRT review is valued, because we certainly don't want to remove a valid and useful requirement because we're making a mistake or an assumption. So we need to be careful. We agree. So take time and consult with your team, and we'll look at this again for sure, but we added some comments of why things are being deleted. Can you show that, Gustavo, on the comment side? Can you show one that has a comment on why it's been deleted? Do you see those?

So for each change, we tried to provide you with explanation of why we're making that change, and I hope that's helpful. So know that that's available. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I did notice that, yes, it was super helpful. Again, thinking out loud a little bit, it might be ... There's two sets of major changes going on. One is reorganizing the document to separate out the technology agnostic from technology specific. That's one challenge. And then the other is places where sections have been removed because they've been superseded by the registration data policy. It might be helpful if we consider those as sort of two separate reviews rather than trying to cover them both at the same time. I think both of them independently are complicated enough, but it might be ... take it or leave it, my thinking out loud thoughts, but it might be worth us considering them as two separate sets of edits.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Let me think about that. I don't mind telling you, it did take us a lot of time to go through this line by line and try to understand and be sure to even make the edits. But I certainly understand the difficulty in reviewing. Okay, Gustavo, that was [inaudible], that was I think what was important, and I think we're together and Marc summarized it nicely. So this is a change case where we're deleting the duplication and requirements. And if so, it's not a structural change, if you will, so it's a different case. So continue.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

And again, if we go and see this requirement from CLD, here we have two requirements. One requirement is the need to show the WHOIS inaccuracy complaint webform link on the output and the other one is where to put this in the case of WHOIS and that's the reason why we're making the separation. One requirement is go and show the compliance webform in the RDDS output and the other one is if you're implementing WHOIS, then you need to do it in this specific section of the output.

This requirement, again, is defined fields that are optional which we believe should be covered by the registration data policy. This is a requirement that was moved to section one. We believe this applies to all RDDS services and this one, again, is a requirement about showing JavaScript code and things like that.

And in the RDAP profile, we have part of this requirement in the RDAP profile [inaudible] you should not put JavaScript code and things like

that. And the edits and implementation note is just saying that [inaudible] advisory, and the advisory applies to the WHOIS services. And yeah, that's it.

DENNIS CHANG: Can you slowly scroll down to the end of the document?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure. These are basically the examples that we have there, and we are not doing any edits on the background.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. I think what we'll do is add our—a new [inaudible] on top of it. That's what we have been doing. So we haven't done it yet, so we'll do that to provide a note and a link back to the original document. Can you do us a favor and show us the clean version?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yes. [This] shows the clean version, right?

DENNIS CHANG: In theory, yeah. Show us the RDAP technology agnostic portion. That should be really simple, right?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah. It's not only for RDAP, it's for any RDDS service.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's right. I meant the technology agnostic portion. So for those people—and the point that I was trying to make is for those people who are going to provide—[or has to, they're all doing it,] for everyone who is not doing the WHOIS and web services, that this document reduces to this brevity, and that's it. So this is what Gustavo meant. Yeah, it's a lot easier. We're not doing WHOIS stuff, we're just going to provide RDAP, and that's all this whole policy reduces to. That's the part of reorganizing the document this way and then taking out any superfluous requirements that is already covered by, one, registration data policy, two, RDAP profile.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, and from implementer perspective, it just makes things easier because if you go to the RDAP profile, you will see that there is a requirement to show a notice or remarks—I don't remember, sorry—for the WHOIS inaccuracy complaint form. But then if you want to know from where that requirement in that profile was generated, then you can go to this policy and see, this is that requirement that generates this requirement in the RDAP profile. So hopefully, it makes sense or is easy to read.

DENNIS CHANG: Roger, what do you think so far? You've been quiet. I want to hear your thoughts on this sort of change. Do you like this as a technical implementer?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I think I'm going to have to read this because this seems like a lot of changes.

DENNIS CHANG: It does, doesn't it?

ROGER CARNEY: And maybe it doesn't turn out to be that. And again, it just seems like ... I started thinking, it's like, does our scope with this IRT really include these changes to numerous other ...? Again, maybe it's not as big as what I've seen. So I think I just need to look at it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, that's why when I first looked at it, my immediate reaction was, "Woah, look at all these redlines." And then when I examined it, I could see it's not that much of a change, it just looks big. Jody, provide your input, comment. Thank you.

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Dennis. I just have a question on the implementation notes. There's a lot of redlines in this, but I'm curious as to why a domain name data hasn't been updated or redlined or anything. Is that to be done later?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I'm sorry, is this what you're referring to?

JODY KOLKER. Yes, that's what I'm talking about. If you go below the fold there, if you keep scrolling down, Gustavo, there's registrant postal code, admin, technical. A lot of this won't exist anymore and there'll have to be—will there have to be two different examples, one with redacted and one with unredacted?

DENNIS CHANG: That's a good point.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: That's a good point. Maybe we need to put [inaudible]. Yeah.

JODY KOLKER: That's the only question I had. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: It's an excellent point, yeah. Okay. Thank you, Jody.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Or maybe we should show how an example will look like after the registration data policy. Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, that is something that I really wanted to see, and I think we've looked at it internally and it has some examples drafted, so we were looking to see what the impact would be and what it would look like. But I don't think we've ever shared that with the IRT. So this is maybe a good time for us to look at that together to see—yeah, okay. Good input. Thank you, Jody. Gustavo, back to you. You know the next one?

Just for the IRT, I realize this is a lot for you, so this is why we wanted to do it in two stages. Consider this an introduction to the changes and then next time, you can come back with more substantive inputs to this if you'd like. So don't get overwhelmed with all these redlines, and this one also. Go ahead.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Yeah, again, this is the advisory. In this case, we don't have two sections because this advisory only applies to WHOIS and web-based WHOIS. This advisory was drafted after we received all these questions from, as I was mentioning, contracted parties, registrants, what are the requirements for WHOIS, right? And again, the idea here is just to go through the document and for example, remove anything that is related to for example these optional fields. That should be covered in the registration data policy.

This, which is the first requirement pertaining how to display the optional fields, that's already in the registration data policy in addendum number one, so there is no need for that to be here. As Dennis was explaining, the idea is to not have the same requirement in two policies.

Then if we go down, we have changes like this one because the idea is to not have clarification one in the future, this clarification is already part of addendum one. And if you go down, you will see again this removal of clarification number one. This is just a reordering of the numbers that we need to do once we have something that is more or less final. And again, we have another text saying that these fields are optional—and again, we believe it should be part of the registration data policy and not of this advisory.

Some renumbering that we need to do after the draft is final, and again, this clarification number one that was removed is already part of addendum number one. Again, more optional fields that should be defined in the registration data policy. This requirement about the registrar object that should include at least one admin contact, technical contact, again, we believe that this should be part of the registration data policy and other requirements related to the registrar WHOIS server, and if you go to the comment, again, we believe that it should be covered by the registration data policy. And if we go down, again, more requirements that should be part of the registration data policy.

So that's what we are doing with this document. and again, with this one, we don't have section number one and two because this document since the beginning only applies to WHOIS 43 and Web WHOIS. Yes, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Gustavo, and thanks once again for the explanation. I'll make a comment, and maybe this is meant to be feedback or thought provoking

for the IPT. An advisory is maybe a different category than what we've been dealing with previously. So I wonder, is the right approach to update an advisory, or would a better approach be to issue a new advisory once the registration data policy goes into effect or before it goes into effect after it's finalized?

This initial advisory was true and accurate at the time it was issued, and so I wonder—and I'm not sure what the right answer is, and maybe this is something for you guys to take back and consider, but I wonder if a better approach would be to issue a new advisory rather than try and update this old advisory which already has a life and history and purpose.

DENNIS CHANG:

That's an interesting point. My immediate reaction is I really like that idea. Anybody else have a feeling about this? Roger likes that idea too. I would much rather—because as you know, we actually wanted to do that with the policy, [get rid of the] policy and incorporate it into our registration data policy. But then we recognized that consensus policy, we cannot just rescind them without going back to GNSO, but in this case, it's just an advisory. So if it's not a consensus policy—and therefore, we have the option of terminating this advisory and issuing another one to replace it. That's an excellent idea. What do you guys all think?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: One question. When we say an advisory, it's just an advisory, right? We're not saying that we should have for example addendum number two in the version—

DENNIS CHANG: No. I do mean a different document. Instead of redlining, just write up a clean—basically, what you would do is just have a clean new document. So they don't have to even look at this old one. That's a lot easier.

So what we can do for public comment is here is a new advisory that will replace the old advisory, and they can just review the clean document and not deal with redline at all. Isn't that easier for everyone? What do you think? Should we—let's take a look at that, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, sounds like a really good idea.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I like it. Anybody else, any objections, any difficulty you see with that kind of an approach? Yeah, we got into a lot of changing consensus policy, so we just kept going without even thinking that as an option. This is a very good input. Thank you so much.

Okay, and what's next?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: The RDAP profile and the drafting error on the DNSSEC elements. I don't know what you want to continue with.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's continue with the RDAP profile. We talked about RDAP profile. So as we said—can you show the RDAP profile page?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sorry, I stopped sharing. Maybe someone else can take the screen.

DENNIS CHANG: I'll do it. Oh, I don't have the link here. But you all know, I believe, where the RDAP profile [launched,] there's two documents. One is called technical spec, the other one is actually called the profile. And those need to be reviewed, redlined and then be kept up to date with our policy. I'm just noticing that comment—yes, please, do comment later and write back to us on all these changes.

This is to just let you know that we haven't been looking at the RDAP profile yet, but it is going to come and it will be added to the IRT task list for you to review. So in concert of reducing or deleting things from all these documents, we have to make sure the correct requirements are landing on the registration data policy and on the RDAP profile. So that is a task that still is remaining for our implementation policy team.

One thing that I did want you to know is we have a community team, group, and it's called the RDAP working group. For example, I think both Marc and Roger are in that RDAP working group. So can I hear from one

of you? And whoever is in that group, are you guys still working on it or looking at it, and have you been tracking the changes from our policy to the profile? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

I guess I'll take a stab at that. So yeah, one of the things that the RDAP working group does is it tracks existing efforts that may impact the profile. And certainly, this IRT is one of the key ones. So we are currently meeting on a biweekly schedule, and I believe there is a sort of open draft of the current profile—I should say a working draft of the current profile for making changes based on what comes out of this IRT.

There's been a hesitation to get too far into the work of updating the profile until this IRT gets a little further along in its work and a little bit more firm in what the final language is going to look like, but we are closely tracking the work that goes on here and across the broader community to understand what policy and standard work is going on that will impact the profile itself. So hopefully, that's helpful, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

It is, yeah. Thank you so much. It's great that we have a team of volunteers looking at the profile for us. And we will coordinate in the future more closely about how to share your work with us and make sure that we're in sync and everything is consistent. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Dennis. I was just going to ask—and I think you started to answer it, but what's the IRT staff's plan to deal with this? Because it is

something that needs to be addressed by the IRT. Are we just going to wait for the working group? I know that—I will just give a little nugget that you guys know there is an RA/RAA negotiation process ongoing with regards to RDAP profile, and we have talked about the dependencies between what the IRT and the working group are doing just to be like, what's going on? And we were not sure. I would like to know what your plan is if there is one or if we need to come up with a plan.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Well, I have a plan. A good project manager always has a plan. And that plan always changes. But yeah, so I am aware and I'm in coordination and keeping track of everything that's going on that impacts our policy and maybe the other way too. So there's several things going on. One is this RDAP profile, and we're very fortunate to have a team of experts looking at this for us.

So when we say—and it's just not us, but they will probably determine, because IRT members are probably capable of determining whether or not we have enough here, and when we feel like we have pretty close to what gets to a final version that we can publish for public comment, and that's I think when we can ask the working group to maybe share their redline with us and then we can look at that together before we go to public comment, because it's our intention to go to public comment with our OneDoc or the RedDocs, including the profile.

And at the same time, you mentioned the RA amendment going on with the RDAP requirement. That is sort of a separate thing, but also sort of

related because RA amendment is a negotiation between ICANN Org and registry operator, and the same thing is happening with RAA, with the registrars and the ICANN Org. Those updates for the purpose of RDAP is happening in parallel. And it's my belief right now—looking at the progress that they're making—that they will be ahead of us and we will be able to probably see them come out with the public comment for those items. And whatever work has been done there benefits us in terms of what we do. So they are also going to be tracking what we do, and I am tracking what they do. That's in coordination.

The other things that are happening right now is the—Beth, this is you. I've been wanting to do this for so long. Now I have you. If you don't mind giving us—let's see. You see this task determination map? And one of the questions the IRT had was [inaudible] recommendation number 22 for phase two, priority two items, right? These purpose two items, whether or not these purposes are going to be reflected in the data processing terms that you're working on. And if the answer is yes, then we can color this purple and say that, yeah, we know how this thing is going to be implemented, so we can color this purple.

So we've been waiting for that answer from you, and I think a few IRT meetings ago, you said you were going to go and confirm that and come back to us. So if you're ready, you can confirm that today and that's fine.

BETH BACON: I don't remember saying that, but okay. Can you just click on that so I can see what we're ...? I'm sorry, is this priority two or is this phase one?

DENNIS CHANG: Phase two priority two. This recommendation.

BETH BACON: So yeah, the purposes will be incorporated in the DPA. So to the extent this amends or changes or impacts that, then yeah, it'll be in the DPA.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Thank you for confirming. That's exactly what I was looking for. So you did it. Okay, so that one is also our task determination map at least is done, and that's what I've been wanting to do, and that's done. Thank you for that.

The other thing that is in light is recommendation 7 and 12, resolution items. That is happening with the Board and GNSO Council. And those are making some progress and I should be able to report back to you on what's happening there. And of course, with the ICANN meetings going on, the Board is really busy right now. We are seeing now where that lands and where those two things are already also a dependency as we go.

So there's many things going on in parallel, but I wanted to share with you that I along with the IPT members have our feelers out and trackers out and tracking all the things that are going on that impact our policy

and vice versa. So feel free to ask me at any time about things that you're wondering, such as what we were just talking about.

So that's the RDAP profile approach, and I just wanted to share that with the IRT. So you know what we're doing with the RDAP profile now, you understand how the RDAP profile is integral to our policy implementation, and the redline, it'll be added to the list of RedDocs and it'll come in the form of tech spec and the profile, two documents, in the future. So that'll be fine.

And we have one more thing I want to cover before we conclude our meeting. This one is called the drafting error and in particular, I wanted to draw your attention, there are some things—number ten, this is a new one that we added, and Gustavo found this one and upon examination, I think he's right, he's accurate in that this needs to be added to our drafting error list. Gustavo, can you just explain quickly what this is?

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Okay, let me share my screen, and it's probably going to be easier if I just show the OneDoc. So when I was going through the OneDoc doing a technical review, I was wondering, why don't we have the DNSSEC elements in the things that registrars must transfer to the registry operator if they're collected and generated? We have the nameserver and nameserver IP addresses, so for me, it just makes sense to also have the DNSSEC elements, because if not, then what about them, right?

In theory, if a registrant wants to use DNSSEC, the registrar is going to get this data, like the DS and other parameters that are technical in

nature, and they need to be transferred to the registry operator as the nameserver or nameserver IP addresses are transferred. So I think that that's a drafting error and [I think that] we should have it there.

I know the DNSSEC elements is something that is not defined, so in order to make things clearer, hopefully saying as described in RFC5910 which is the one defining the extension to transfer the data related to DNSSEC, make things clear. So yeah, that's my suggestion. Comments?

DENNIS CHANG:

More importantly, I think for those of you who were in EPDP phase one development phase, if you can recall any specific reason why DNSSEC element was left off from the list while you're listing nameservers and nameserver IP address. It seems like they go together. So if you can think of, if you recollect any reason, I'm very interested in if that was a deliberate design or simply as we see with others, just left off and forgotten. So it's our job now to recover it. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

I recall us talking about this item a while back. I remember us previously flagging a problem with the DNSSEC elements. But I'll have to go back through my notes and figure out ... This sounds really familiar, and I thought this is something we already talked about. And so I know we're out of time. Maybe we can just pick this up at [inaudible] meeting.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, that is the homework. [Please see.] We did talk about DNSSEC several times, so I remember that too, but I couldn't remember this

particular issue. And that was [your last task] that was issued to you, so we will go ahead and conclude our meeting. Beth has a hard stop, so we'll accommodate.

Thanks, everyone, and I'll see you a couple of weeks from now at the ICANN meeting. See you in Seattle, everyone. Bye now.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you. I will stop the recording. If IPT can please stay on.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]