
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT Meeting being held on Wednesday the 19th of January 2022 at 17:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will 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 ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

And I will actually turn it over to myself because I am going to discuss the ICANN73 session for the IRT. That will take place on Wednesday the 9th of March at 20:30 UTC for 60 minutes. What I'll do is send out a placeholder for everybody in the IRT so you'll have it on your calendar. It will be in a normal Zoom room just like we always do.

And now I will turn it over to Dennis Chang.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to 2022, our first IRT meeting. I hope you all had a good break. And for those of us in the U.S., we actually had an MLK holiday on Monday, too. So sort of an added bonus in January. In any case, let's get started.

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.

It should be another fun year, 2022. And we hope to get some accomplishments this year. I think things are converging, as I see it, toward the end of last year, and less of a divergence. So I think the trend is there that we are going to get to something concrete and for public comment soon.

So this is what we have today as an agenda. And the first thing I wanted to do, and this to facilitate better communication and use of the same language and terminology when we are discussing our requirements—recommendations and requirements.

So what I will do is give you a short tutorial for what RDDS client is, web client is, lookup website is so that we can all get into the same mindset when we are discussing the rest of the OneDoc policy requirements. So what I did was, I asked [inaudible] ICANN staff and Gustavo made a set of slides for me and gave us a tutorial on what RDDS client is. And I thought that it would be helpful to you, the whole Implementation Team, as it was helpful to me to talk about it like this, look at it like this and seeing things as different as we have seen.

So this is titled “RDDS Client,” but more specifically I want to narrow it down to what I call a lookup website because I think part of the confusion is when we’re talking about the registration data and publication, we sometimes talk about the lookup website. But more so we’re talking about other things that people have in mind and we seem to be using the same terminology.

So let's get on with this little tutorial. I think everybody's here, so Gustavo is the one who made up the slides for me so I'm going to turn it over to him.

Gustavo, would you like to speak? And do you want me to keep driving the slides, or do you want to [take it over]?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: No, you can [run] the slides. Sure.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, go ahead.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: So I'm going to talk about the first two slides, slide #2 and slide #3. As Dennis has mentioned, he asked me, "Will you please explain it from an implementer's perspective how all of these RDDS servers, RDDS clients work?" And this is the visualization that I think will help us to understand that the mindset that we have in the IPT when we're discussion Section 10 of the Registration Data Policy and other policies that we have.

So what you have on your screen is what we call the RDDS server. And here it's really important to mention [that is] RDDS, meaning it could be WHOIS, it could be RDAP, or it could be any future protocol. Who knows?

And what we have there is some kind of a data base that we are going to call the registration database. And let's imagine that in the registration database we have the full information for a specific domain name, meaning we have all the contact information, all the recent information, etc.

So we know that the contracted party or the operator of the RDDS server has access to all of this information. So now we have, when someone asked this RDDS server for the information of a domain name, the server needs to provide data, information to the end user. The way we see Section 10 of the Registration Data Policy is as a filter. So basically, it's what we call the registration data filter. That is going to help that implementer of the RDDS server to understand which information should be redacted, which information should not be in the bundle of data.

And we came to this conclusion based on the definition "publication." And you have the definition there. It's my understanding that the definition was agree after several months of discussion regarding what "publication" means. So you have it on your screen and you can see it there.

Now, Dennis, would you please go to slide #3. So on slide #3 we have the response from the RDDS server, and as an implementer I need to know a way to interpret this data. For example, if we are talking about WHOIS, need to understand that registrant name means the name of the registrant. I also need to under that [the created] date means the date that a domain name was registered and so on.

So as an implementer, what I will use to pass this data, to understand this data, well, I will use the CLD or Consistent Labeling and Display, the RDAP Profile, the RDAP RFCs, the WHOIS advisory, the registry agreement, and the RAA 2013 requirements, Addendum #1 of the Registration Data Policy, and so on and so forth.

Then once we have this parsing, we have data that we can use. For example, if we have an automated client, now we have information that we can use to, for example, identify bad actors or other things that we would like to identify in the data.

And then in the case of users, let's say human users, that's when we have what we call the human presentation logic. And the human presentation is a way that the developer is going to present information to the end user to make it easier for the end user to understand the information.

I remember back in the day when I was working for [Datamex], I had remembered looking at some clients that were trying to, for example, provide the keys in different language, basically doing a translation of a domain name to numbers and [inaudible] so that it was easier for those users in those regions to understand the data that was presented.

So these other two slides that we have about how we see the different aspects of the policies and Section 10 of the Registration Data Policy and how they interact will provide some meaningful data for automated clients or for humans in this case.

Dennis, back to you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Gustavo. Why don't I run through all the slides? And then after we're done, we can take questions. And yes, Roger, we are going to make these slides available. And I would actually like your help on refining it. I find it helpful to educate our staff here, and I think it will also be help for the public.

And as you know, our Accounts and Services Team does provide educational materials with the policy implementation, so they're working on it in parallel. And this will be handed over to them to further add to as we go.

And thank you for catching the typo, Marc. You are already helping.

Okay, #4. Lookup website. After a long time thinking about why we're having so much problem communicating ... Because I'm listening to the dialogue conversation and I can hear people using the same words and talking about the different things, and I can hear people using different terms but talking the same thing. So I decided to call this "lookup website" because this is a term that is non-technical. I know everybody is familiar with websites, what it is, and lookups tool that you've seen everywhere. It's all around.

So what we are going to call this is a lookup website. And you can see an example here. Of course, though, I'm going to use the ICANN lookup [tools]. Right? So when you query "Project Management Institute Lost Angeles," this is what you see. This is a typical lookup tool. It is ICANN's lookup tool, and this is a lookup tool that ICANN controls and modifies and do whatever we need to do.

And we are continuing to improve the tool based on the feedback. And of course, there are other examples like domain name tools provide a lookup capability. And there are countless lookup tools that are available by many service providers and third parties. And tomorrow, Gustavo can have a gustavo.com lookup tool he can create for his own purposes in his own unique way.

Let me go to this example here. This is a web client for human presentation logic. That's what we called it. Right? So on the left is the raw data, and on the right is this logic that translates the raw data into what you see on the website. So the lookup tool website is something that is unique and different than the raw data that is available to us. And sometimes when we're talking about registration data, we're talking about what registration data are accessible and available for someone to come in and fetch for the human presentation logic and what are not available. And that's what we're talking about.

Let me go to some assumptions. So what we're saying here is, the EPDP Final Report actually defines the registration data filter, and that's the word that Gustavo used. So think about them as a filter. Section 10 specifies that "filter" in this definition ...

And as you know, Section 10, the definition that we are using is 3.5. And I'll remind you that definition 3.5 has been finalized after much, much, much discussion. So we are locked in and we all agreed to use that definition as we develop the rest of the policy language.

And then the one thing that should be clear to everyone, I don't think that ICANN can enforce the human presentation layer by RDDS clients.

It can only control the ICANN lookup tool itself. So those are the three assumptions I wanted to present to you as we go into this Q&A.

I think this is a page, if we answer the same way, I think we're on the same page. But if we disagree with any of the answers, then there's no ... It's really hard to have a further conversation about what a recommendation is and what a requirement is.

So, first question. Does the EPDP Recommendation 10 include a requirement for publication and redaction? The answer is yes.

#2. Does the EPDP Recommendation 10 require the registration data that must be publicly accessible? The answer is yes.

#3. Does the EPDP Recommendation 10 include requirements for web clients? The answer is no here. I think there are a lot of comments that I've heard that leads me to believe that answer is yes here. So there's a caution area for me.

#4. Are there any recommendations in the EPDP Final Report for web client? I found no. But if somebody does find it, please point it out to me.

#5. Is not having a requirement for web clients a drafting error? I can only say no, unless the entire IRT in 100% consensus and agreement tells me that it was a drafting error. And you know my rule about drafting errors. I will not go forward with a drafting error without everyone on the IRT agreeing. If there's one person who does not agree, I cannot claim it as a drafting error.

#6. Can Registration Data Policy contain new requirements for web clients based on the final report? The answer is no because there isn't any requirement/recommendation that I found.

#7. Can we still have a web client that conforms to the legacy WHOIS format and presents the data in the way that people like to see it? Of course, yes. And I'll give you one example. ICANN Org lookup tool. I can make a request today to change it in another format or a different format or multiple formats because that's controlled by ICANN the organization.

So that is the end of our presentation, and I'd like to get some feedback from the IRT. Does this make sense—number one? Do you agree? Are your answers to any of these questions different than my answers? Let me hear from you.

Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, Dennis. How's it going?

DENNIS CHANG: Alrighty. Happy new year.

MARC ANDERSON: Happy new year to you, too. Good presentation, thank you. I think, generally, I agree with the spirit of it. I have a couple things that I'm maybe nitpicking on, so please take that with the spirit it's intended.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: If you could go to, I think it was slide 2. It's one of the earlier slides. Yeah, the filter. I guess I appreciate using the registration data filter as a tool of explaining what it means. I've got to say I don't think of RDDs as a filter, though. I think maybe as a tool to explain it, I get it and I get the intent. But I think I would sort of nitpick with trying to explain RDDs as a filter. In my experience, generally it's a stand-alone application. It's designed to respond to queries with data, based on what the query is. Explaining it as a filter, again, I really don't think of it that way.

DENNIS CHANG: That's not helpful. [inaudible].

MARC ANDERSON: But I do get that for purposes of sort of explaining the functionality. I get where you're going with that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

MARC ANDERSON: It's just a little bit of a nitpick of mine. And then back to the slide, 7. I'll nitpick with a couple things here. And these really are nitpicking. But on

#2, the wording is a little odd to me. “Does Recommendation 10 require the RegData that must be publicly accessible?” I think that’s odd wording. I think the intent is fine, but I think what the recommendation does it that it specifies what registration data must be publicly accessible. More specifically, I would say Recommendation 10 specifies what data an RDDS server must respond with.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah. I wanted to stay away from the RDDS. Okay, I see what you mean. You're saying the same thing that I am, but [inaudible].

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I think I’m saying the same thing. I’m just sort of nitpicking your words a little bit.

And then the last nitpick I have is on #7. I would nitpick that and say that lookup.icann.org is a wonderful site. I’m a fan of it, but it does not conform to legacy WHOIS format. In fact, one of the good things about lookup.icann.org is that it does not conform to legacy WHOIS format. It has some nice features in there that are not legacy WHOIS format.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, and you are so right.

MARC ANDERSON: But I’m nitpicking there, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: I know you are.

MARC ANDERSON: The spirit of it is fine.

DENNIS CHANG: But remember what I said. "Can we do this?" The answer is yes. But we're not doing it today. I think the point that I'm trying to make it, can we control this website? And I think the answer is yes. So legacy WHOIS format is probably the wrong word to use. "Some expected format" or something like that. Okay, we'll play with this.

Next person who had a hand up. Hey, Beth. Did you go away? Are you shy this morning?

BETH BACON: No, I just didn't want to repeat people.

DENNIS CHANG: No, I want you to repeat people.

BETH BACON: Well, I'll take the opportunity to say happy new year.

DENNIS CHANG: Happy new year, dear.

BETH BACON: Thank you. And I'm sorry, I missed a little bit of the beginning. Are we going to present this—and by “we” I mean you—at ICANN73 or is this just for information? What's this going to be used for? I apologize. I was a little bit late.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. My introduction to this was that I asked for a tutorial for me to better understand what RDDS Client is, what web client is—and more specifically, lookup website—what are the differences, what do they mean? And this is a tutorial that Gustavo created in terms of diagrams, and I added some words to make it clear for me. And I thought it was helpful for our team and I'm sharing it with the IRT.

And I'm going to put it forward as an educational material and hand over to our Accounts and Services Team who will take it and provide it as a future education material with the help of the IRT to make it more clear. That's the purpose.

BETH BACON: Super, thanks. I appreciate it.

DENNIS CHANG: Chris, do ahead. Chris, you have a comment.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Hi, Dennis. Hi, everyone. And just to nitpick a little bit more. And I apologize if this was covered. I also missed the first couple of minutes. [inaudible] web client I struggle with. Requested RDDS data is over the web, so any way that you can publicly receive that information will be some form of web client.

DENNIS CHANG: I think the term “web client,” so maybe we should just delete that.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible].

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: I think “website” is clearer. I mean, people understand.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That’s a good feedback. Yeah, I used the term more personally as a web client because it’s meaningful to me, but I’m an engineer and i have to be sensitive to ... I’m trying to be conscious trying to get feedback on how other people think [about] what it is when I [inaudible].

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, because even an API-type query can say it’s a web client.

DENNIS CHANG: Exactly. API is a web client. Yeah, I know. So we have Roger, plus one. So all these technical people have already helped me, but I do want to hear from maybe non-technical people to see if this makes sense. So the term that I'm catching here is "lookup website," and lookup website is critical to critical to us.

And the most important thing for the IRT in this Q&A is, can everyone agree with the answers to these questions. And if we can, then I think we're on the same page and we are ready to continue with our [inaudible] on OneDoc.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Sorry, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Sorry, just to butt in, Dennis. I think if we change 5 and 7 to say "websites" that would be the point I'm making—and obviously throughout the presentation as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, yeah, yeah. That's exactly, yeah. That's very helpful, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: So I think everybody on this team now is in sync when we say “lookup website.” So I’ll stop wordsmithing here. And that’s the last thing I’m going to do. And then I’ll turn it over to ...

Let me turn it over to Gustavo. He is going to start discussion the OneDoc and Section 10 that he was doing before. And then he wants to continue. Can we do that? Gustavo, are you ready?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure, [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, take it over.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Can you make me co-host, please?

ANDREA GLANDON: I can, one moment.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: All set, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Perfect. Can you see my screen?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Wonderful. So I'm going through the updates that we did from the last meeting in which we showed the new sectional thing that we are planning to, at some point, transform/migrate the actual Section 10 of the Registration Data Policy.

So as you know, we had this conversation about the updated date. There was the idea that the updated date should be part of 1.1.1 and that we should create some kind of rule saying that contracted parties must use the same ... If the domain name has not been updated, then the updated date should be equal to the created date.

After further discussions internally with the IPT team, we decided that the updated date should be part of 1.1.2. We cannot request, or we cannot create rules like the one that I just mentioned about using the same value for [created date] as updated date because we don't see that kind of rule in that report. And also, we cannot ask registries and registrars to basically follow a rule that is not there.

When you also [inaudible] EPP [RFCs], it's pretty clear there that the updated date is an optional element and it should only appear in the

EPP data transfer channel, let's say, when the domain name has been updated.

So we believe that the updated date should be in 1.1.2. So basically, it will only appear if the domain name has been updated, or you will see data in the key if the domain name has been updated. So that's the first update that we have for you guys.

Excuse me for the scrolling. I don't want to make you dizzy. The other change that that we have is in Section 1.2.2. In this section, by mistake we didn't put the requirements for what the registry operator should do about the registrant e-mail and the tech e-mail, so we added those requirements. And basically we added, "The registry operator must apply the requirements that area detailed in Section 1.2.1."

So if the registry operator must redact the registrant e-mail or tech e-mail, then they need to follow the requirements that are above, basically these ones. That's the second change that we have or your guys.

And the third one is on Addendum 1. And if you go to Addendum 1 ... And again, apologies. It's the following. If you remember in Addendum 1, the requirement was that if there is no data for any specific data element, you have two options. One option was to not put the field. So basically, in the case of the updated date, for example, you would see the key updated date column blank. And the second option was to put the key, column, and blank.

This possibility of having these two options which came from the WHOIS advisory based on the survey that we did years ago about what

implementations we're doing was creating a lot of confusion internally. Probably it was also [inaudible] great confusion externally because, obviously, this is an implementation requirement and when have to two options, then things start to get complicated.

We look at several WHOIS servers. It appear that we cannot say with 100% certainty that all of them are showing the key blank, but at least it appears that there is a tendency to do that.

So with this in mind, we believe that we should only have one possibility when you don't have data and that, in the case of WHOIS 43 and web-based WHOIS which is the, let's say, legacy protocols, you should show the key like updated date, column, and then on the right-hand side of the column which is basically the value, you should how blank or nothing, basically. So that's the other requirement that we changed in the policy, and this is Addendum 1.

Hopefully, this is [inaudible] will help to clarify things and to make things easier for the consumers of the legacy protocols to understand that data that is being presented onto the legacy protocol.

So those are the three changes that we have in the policy. And before I open the floor for questions and comments, there is also a comment from Sarah saying that we should move Registrant Country from this section into 1.1.2. Yeah, it could work if we move it to 1.1.2 because there is an implicit "if"—"if collected or generated." And in the case of the registrar, it will always be collected. [We think that it's] easier to ready if we have it in 1.1.4 because the requirement is pretty clear that the registrar must publish these data elements. There is no "if" about

collection or generated because we know that it's going to be always collected in the case of ... I'm talking about Registrant Country in this case.

And we know that the registry in this case is transferring information from the registrar. And also, we believe that it's good to have what we call the technical elements in Section 1.1.2 and the, let's say, registrant information elements in 1.1.4. Now it may be not clear because it says "subject to the redaction requirements," but when we were discussing in the IPT, we think that if we say "subject to the redaction requirements" and in the case of Registrant Country it's not here, it means that you cannot apply any kind of redaction requirements to the Registrant Country because it's not part of the Section 1.2.1.

So that's the way we drafted the text and that's the way we are interpreting the text. But if it's not clear, maybe we need to change that. Maybe we need to create a new section just for the Registrant Country. But we believe that this, as I mentioned, "subject to the redaction requirements" only applies if [inaudible] redaction requirements in Section 1.1.2.

So those are the changes that we have in Section 10. Now I'm going to open the floor for comments/suggestions/edits.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah has her hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Do you hear me okay?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yes.

SARAH WYLD: Great, thank you. Thank you so much, Gustavo, for taking through all of the explanation. That was very helpful.

Specific to this item of the country and, I guess, basically as I said in my e-mail, this field will always be collected by the registrar and it is not subject to redaction requirements. So I think I understand something just now that you said that's really interesting. It's sort of a different way of thinking about it.

You characterized the Section 1.1.2 as being more technical information, and then 1.1.4 is the registrar information which is certainly not wrong. Definitely that's correct. But I was thinking of it differently, and I was thinking that 1.1.2 is not personal data and 1.1.4 mostly is personal data. So it's just a different way of thinking about how those elements are divided up. But it doesn't even really matter. We don't need a new section. We have a section that's exactly for this. It's for data that is collected and that must be published and is not subject to redaction.

So I just don't really understand why it wouldn't be in 1.1.2, and I would especially appreciate hearing from Dennis because it seems that Dennis had not agree with me which is fine. We don't all have to agree about everything all the time. But Dennis, you're a smart guy. You have a lot of

insights and I want to understand your perspective on this. But I do want to make sure that it gets fully discussed and considered as a team.

So just to sum up, I do still think that we should move the country up to that other section as I said by e-mail. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sarah.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Do you want me ... So I think what I was thinking was what, basically, Gustavo has pointed out. It's not inaccurate to have it at 1.1.4, and of course it would be okay to have it at 1.1.2. But as an implementer—and again, I'm sorry if I'm thinking too much like an implementer—what would be easier for me.

And also, the other thing is that if there are two spots that can both work, it's a matter of design for us in policy language. So certainly, the recommendation [inaudible] wise, we have a choice here. So it's my personal preference to have it at 1.1.4, but I can certainly understand that maybe 1.1.2 would make it more clear for other people. So I would like to hear from other people, too. So we will go ahead and collect your input here. And I want to hear from other people. What do you think? 1.1.2? 1.1.4? We have a choice.

Any preference from anyone? Sarah has a strong preference for 1.1.2. And I think Alex followed up on your comment and he also agreed. Right, Sarah? Or Gustavo. Do you remember?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, I think there is this agreement. [By the way]—

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Lauren agrees with 1.1.2. And we have a hand up from Sarah again. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yeah, I appreciate the agreement. I appreciate the discussion. One of my coworkers has messaged me suggesting that maybe it belongs in 1.1.1 instead of 1.1.2.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh.

SARAH WYLD: So maybe let's just take a quick moment to think about why it goes in 2 1.1.2 instead of 1.1.1. I think it should go in two because it's data that is collected. And Section 1.1.1 is all about data that, sort of, the registry creates that data rather than collects it from the domain owner. So that's why I was thinking it should go in 1.1.2 instead of 1.1.1 because it's collected. Thank you.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: But there is something more important, I think. The registry operator may not transfer [all of the] information because I think the registrant [inaudible]. So I think it should be in 1.1.2.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, exactly. Absolutely [inaudible].

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I don't think that it can go in 1.1.1. It's 1.1.2 or 1.1.4.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Good thought. 1.1.1 is out. 1.1.2 or 1.1.4? Beth, "I agree. The more we can streamline the better."

"I do not have a preference, but happy to ..."

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay, so I think there is a preference to move it to 1.1.2.

DENNIS CHANG: Generally, yeah. I see Roger, "1.1.2 makes sense." Okay. Ruben, okay. I think we're getting more 1.1.2 proponents here. Chris, do you have a comment?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, sorry. Just maybe a question for Sarah. So 1.1.2 says “if collected or generated.” So is there any instance where we wouldn’t collect the country?

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Chris. I do not believe that there is any instance where we would not collect the country. I went back to Recommendation 5 and it’s green which I think means “must be collected.” It’s not optional.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: So in that case, then I feel it goes into 1.1.1 because 1.1.2 is only the ones that might not be collected or generated, whereas 1.1.1 is elements that will always exist. So if it always exists, then I think it probably goes in 1.1.1. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD: So I guess I don’t agree with you on that on is because the way I read section 1 is that this is data that the registrar and registry will always have. It's data about themselves and they must always publish it. Whereas Section 2 is about data that they either collect it or generate it, but it’s not ... Yeah, so because the data is collected and not created by the registrar or registry, I think because it’s collected it belongs in Section 2. Thank you.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Sorry, I’m not going to die in a ditch over which one of the two it goes in. So, quite happy with either. But I think it is 1 or 2.

DENNIS CHANG: 1 or 2. Thank you, Chris. Okay, Gustavo, let's make a mark to move the country from 1.1.4 to 1.1.2. Or Sam. Yeah, just mark it and make a comment for Sam to move it. Okay, thank you for your discussion.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Any comments on the other changes? We have the change on the requirements about redaction for the registry operator and the change on Addendum 1. And I just want to point out so that everybody understands what the change of Addendum 1 means. It means that if you have a WHOIS output, for example a registry that may not be transferring most of the information, you will have a lot of keys that are going to be blank. I don't think it's an issue. I think it's probably clear what is going on if you're using the WHOIS 43 and web-based WHOIS. And as I mentioned, we want to have just option so that it's clear what is the requirement.

Just one comment. This Addendum 1 is only about WHOIS 43 and web-based WHOIS. It's not about RDAP.

Okay, if there are no more comments, I think that ... Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey. I'm looking at the 1.2.2 language if you could scroll to that real quick.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah. Oh, sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: The registry operator got your attention?

MARC ANDERSON: Well, yes, but maybe not in the way you'd think. I think maybe in an intended reading of this, adding "or registry operator" ... So I think this would mean if a registrar is not applying redaction—as in they're publishing the Registrant E-mail field but the registry operator is redacting the Registrant E-mail field—then the registrar would have to also provide the link to the web form or e-mail address which I think that's kind of not a fair burden to place on the registrar to know when a registry operator is applying redaction and making a change as a result of that.

But I also think that's just not really the intent of those words. I think that's just the way it could be read. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: No tot me. Can somebody else, maybe Gustavo, if you understood it maybe you can say. I couldn't [understand].

MARC ANDERSON: I'll try again. So essentially, this requirement is if a registrar redacts the e-mail address, then in its place they have to provide either a web form or an e-mail address to facilitate communication. Right? This is a special

carveout for enabling communication with the data subject. If the registrar redacts this field, they must provide either a web form or an e-mail address. So Sarah's with me so far. So that's the basis of that requirements.

Adding "or registry operator applies redaction," so if a registry operator applies redaction to this section and the registrar does ... Sorry, if a registry operator is redacting the e-mail address, this change in the language creates an obligation for the registrar to publish a link to a web form or e-mail to facilitate communication regardless of whether or not the registrar is redacting the mailing address or not.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Well, that's not the intent. The intent when we were drafting this is that if you have these two fields, if you're the registry operator, you apply these requirements which is basically that you do not include the value data, you indicate that the value is redacted. And if you are the registrar, then you [inaudible], show the link, and so on and so forth. And we made this change because in the past, we have the section and the e-mail and tech e-mail was part of this.

And then we had another saying, "Oh, by the way. Forget about what the previous requirement says. If you're a registrar, then you need to do this." So it was kind of strange the way it was drafted. So that's the reason why we prefer to only have the data elements Registrant E-mail and Tech E-mail only mentioned in one section, either 1.2.2 or 1.2.1. And this is the way we found to do this.

But, no, the intent is not to create that requirement to the registry operator that somehow they need to understand what is going on with that registrar regarding those fields.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I didn't think that was the intent, but I think ... Can you see how reading it that way ... If you read it, "Where a registrar or registry operator applies redaction" then "the registrar must publish an e-mail address or link to a web form." Like I said, I don't think that's your intent.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: All right, go on [inaudible].

MARC ANDERSON: The unintended consequence of ...

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I know, and now I see it. Oh, my gosh. You're right. I didn't see it until you explained it to me.

Okay, Sarah. Let's hear from Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Okay, so I think I know understand Marc's concern. And I guess I was confused about something slightly different. My first reading of the second change in this section, I misunderstood and I

thought it was saying that the registry must provide the e-mail contact info. Like provide a link or publish an e-mail address [inaudible]. It does not say that. It doesn't. So if I misread it, probably somebody else is probably going to have the same problem. So maybe we can make it more clear.

But then also, I don't quite understand that purpose of the second change that the registry operator must apply the requirements in Section 1.2.1 because 1.2.1 already says they must do it. So why do we need a thing there at the bottom that says they have to do Section 1.2.1 if it already applies to them? That's what I don't understand. Thank you.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Because the registrant e-mail and tech e-mail are not part of 1.2.1.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, yeah. Okay. All right, thank you for explaining that. I wonder—

GUSTAVO IBARRA: We can go the previous route of moving Registrant E-mail and Tech E-mail here, but then you need to have this section saying something like, "Forget about Section 1.2.1. If you're a registrar, you need to put an e-mail for this field."

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, I guess. Shoot, okay. So I don't have a better idea, but it is still confusing. Thank you for explaining that, though.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Gustavo, I think let's take this back as a homework. I see Sarah's point. I see Marc's point. And let's work on this section a little more and come back.

Marc, do you have a suggestion?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, I think so. I think the way to clear this up would ... I think you can remove the first "or registry operator."

"And registry operator must apply ..." And down at the bottom, the "and (2)." Change it and say, "... and where a registry operator applies redaction, they must also apply the requirements detailed in Section 1.2.1."

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, that's better. Actually better.

MARC ANDERSON: I think that accomplishes what you're trying to cover without the confusion, I hope.

DENNIS CHANG: Gustavo, do you agree?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, it sounds better. So I think that Samantha is taking notes. Right? So maybe this could be our homework to clarify this text and we can use Marc's suggestions.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I like Marc's suggestion.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Yeah. If, Marc, you could just repeat the last part around the "and (2)" language, I couldn't catch that quick enough. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, absolutely. So for the "and (2)" at the bottom, "and (2) where a registry operator applies the redaction they must also apply the requirements detailed in Section 1.2.1." That maybe needs to be tweaked a little bit, but I think that's the gist of it.

DENNIS CHANG: You know what? Let me just do it here.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: But I think that we can just discuss it within IPT. Right, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: I know we can, but it's so much easier ... "Where registry operator applies redaction applies redaction." Did I get that right? Something like that. This is our working document. It's okay, Gustavo.

And let's continue with the next topic then. Shall we? Thank you for your input. That's a good suggestion, Marc. Want to continue?

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Yeah, the next topic is ... Just let me go to the agenda on my screen. And it's about Section 9.4.5 and Section 9.5 So let me go to Section 9. Based on the conversations that we had on updated date, Dennis [inaudible] this issue that we have in Section 9.4. Thank you, Dennis.

Basically, we had updated date as part of the elements that are a must of transferring to the data escrow agent. And as we already had the conversation about updated date, we believe that updated date should [move] to section 9.5 because there is a possibility that the domain name has never been updated. So the data is not going to be there or the value for the key, if you want to think about a WHOIS kind of mind. It's not going to be there.

So that's [inaudible] basically to move updated date from Section 945 to Section 9.5.2.2. And let me see if I can show the change in the window. Yeah. So that's the change.

Any comments? Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Gustavo. That makes sense, and I did add a comment to that effect in the OneDoc. If you click on the updated date change, there's a comment from January 10th indicating such. Yeah, I think the rationale makes sense. It's a good point. And CPH reviewed it and agreed.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Okay. Well, thank you, Marc. And thank you, Dennis for finding that issue.

The next topics is Section 9.1.3. We have the following suggestion. So the current says “Registrar must submit an electronic copy” to ICANN and their escrow agent. And in Section 9.1.3 we have “Registrar” which we believe is the registrant name. Being the implementer of the [inaudible] and parsing the names of the registrants and so on and so forth is really hard, and it’s really prone to errors. So we believe it’s better if, instead of having the registrant name we have the registrant IANA ID because that’s an identifier, it’s a number, and it’s unique. So probably it’s going to make life easier for everyone—the data escrow agents, the consumers of this information. So that’s a proposal that we have for you guys.

Yeah, the IANA ID or GURID. When we say IANA ID it means the GURID, Rubens.

So that the solution that we have for the group and we would like to hear your comments. And also, obviously, it’s going to be a waste of the space because you have a string that is really large. And then when you have names that are maybe not only ASCII but they have different Unicode points from the [inaudible] regarding things, yes, it’s complicated.

Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, Gustavo. Thanks for explaining that. I think Rubens has a good question. What's in the current draft? I missed this change, so apologies. I didn't review this ahead of the call. I'm not sure I'm qualified to speak to the impact of this one. I'd like the chance to go back to my technical teams and ask for their input. So I think I'd like a little more on this one. I'm not ...

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah. It's important to mention that this requirement is for registrars. The escrow specifications are loosely specified. They are specified in the RAA 2013, and then there is the PPP specifications. So this is not specified in the registry escrow draft that Rubens was [referring] to.

This is an interesting question, Sarah. We are trying to understand what is the current practice, and it has been complex based on the specifications that are not really, really clear.

SARAH WYLD: So the question is, "What exactly is in that field?" I can ask my technical guys what we include in our escrow deposit.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah. It will be great if you will ... If you need more time, you can go to your technical folks, for those that are registry operators, and maybe provide more input on this.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. I'll see if I can find [inaudible].

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Jody.

JODY KOLKER: Thanks, Gustavo. At first looking at this, I liked the idea of having the IANA ID instead of the registrar name. Registrar names seem to change constantly. Or I shouldn't say constantly, but they have changed over the years. GoDaddy [has had] GoDaddy LLC, GoDaddy.com, etc. And I kind of like having the IANA ID in there because that makes it very definitive that this is what the name of it is even if it starts doing business as a different name in the future. That's just my two cents. Thanks, guys.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay. So let's do this for those that are [inaudible]. If you can go back to your technical team and see if this change is something that will create issues. Feel free to provide more input.

And I think it's time for the next topic. I will hand it to you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I'm going to stop sharing. Okay? Of do you want me to share?

DENNIS CHANG:

No, you can stop sharing. Let me share. Probably easier. So for that item, then, we are going to extend the due dates. And that was the ... What was that? IANA ID. This one, right? So let's extend this due date. Is that good? Something like that? Thank you. We would appreciate your feedback on this.

It is sort of tricky in my mind because I want to be very clear and transparent that we are changing the label, the word from "registrant" to "registrant ID" as you pointed out. What was the section? What was that section number again? Here, 9.1.3. So we are changing and that is different than recommendation language. So registrar, then. IANA ID. [If you can do that, it's different].

But certainly it's more beneficial to have IANA ID there, the number, rather than Registrar. In my mind I think that is better for everyone involved. But do you consider that not in alignment with the recommendation or do you consider that it's sort of the intent of the recommendation anyway? Because we have a chance to improve our registration data system here. And I'd like to do that every chance we can get without deviating from the recommendation. So please come back with that homework.

Do you have a comment? Somebody want to speak? I heard something. No? Okay. In that case, we'll move on to the next topic, and that is 8.2 and 8.3, adopting the language "provided ..."

Okay, this is an old topic we've had for a long time, but we do want to resolve this. And it's basically following the GNSO Council guidance and I

want to stop talking about it and accept this change. So I wanted to do that because this was such a big deal before and we've spent enough time talking about it. So if you don't mind, 8.3 and [8.4]. We're going to accept the changes and move on. Okay, no comment.

This is the last, 8.5, IRT suggestion for addition. 8.5, let's look at that. 8.5, we have a suggestion. What was the suggestion? Oh, Marc's suggestion. "If supported by the registry operator." So in cases like this, Marc, it's already a "may" requirement. So I don't think those additional words have any impact/effect on the requirements. It's already a "may" so you can do it, you don't have to do it. It's up to you.

But you think that it's so important that we need to make that clear? I want to hear from you.

MARC ANDERSON: To use a term from earlier in the call, I don't feel like this is something to die in a ditch over. As you say, it's a "may" in the field already.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: The point here, though, is that it's not entirely up to the registrar whether they may or may not. If those fields are support by the registry operator, then the registrar may transfer them. So it's sort of double-conditional. Right? It's optional for the registry operator to support

those fields. And only if they're supporting those fields, then the registrar may transfer those data elements.

So again, as you say, it's already a "may" so I don't know if this materially makes a difference. But I think it's more accurate to say, "If it's supported by the registry operator, then the registrar may transfer the following data elements."

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, thank you. Anybody have a comment on this? Do you see any issues with adding those words? Does it change the intent of anything? Okay, thank you, Marc, for your input. I don't hear any other comments on that. Let me think about it then. I just accept it if I think that it doesn't make sense. But now when I hear from ... Maybe give our team a chance to think about it and study it. Yeah, it probably doesn't have a mature impact.

Next item is 7.2.7. Move to 7.5.3.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

So that me. Maybe I can share the screen, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, please.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

So, name server IP addresses. Apologies, I'm going to get into technical detail or technical [inaudible]. But in the DNS when you have your

records, you need to provide those IP addresses for the glue records or the DNS resolution to work. So for me it was really strange to seeing name server IP addresses as a “may.” So implying that the “registrar may provide opportunity for the Registered Name Holder ...”

This is not aligned even with the RAA 2013. So I think that name server IP address should be a “must” meaning that the Registered Name Holder wants to provide those name server IP addresses because they are required for the glue records. For example, they should be allowed. I don't see how the business resolution is going to work in that case. And again, in the RAA 2013, the name server IP addresses is, based on my reading, a “must” not a “may” for the registrar.

So let me open the ... Oh, yes, Jody.

JODY KOLKER:

Hi, Gustavo. Thanks. I disagree. If I'm a customer and let's say I've registered my name at GoDaddy but I'm going to use name servers at Tucows, I do not need to provide those name server IPs to the registry for that domain name to resolve. It's simply not needed. It's only needed— and it is only needed—when I'm using name servers that I created underneath my own domain.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Correct.

JODY KOLKER:

And that is a completely different situation. And that is not a common situation where people are creating their own name servers underneath their own domain name. [inaudible].

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Well, maybe it's not common, but we need to support it. I mean, two weeks ago I registered a name with glue records. Meaning that the name of the name servers was below the [inaudible] of the domain name that I was registering domain name that I was registering. In other words, [inaudible] for the non-technical folks, if you register, for example, example.com and the name of the name server is ns1.example.com or ns2.example.com, then there is no other way. I need to provide those IP addresses. If not, the resolution is not going to work.

JODY KOLKER: Absolutely. I agree with you, Gustavo. But it's not needed for every registration.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Correct. I don't disagree with that.

JODY KOLKER: You are a power user, Gustavo. Most people will not do that. That's why I don't think ... And I'm not sure that all registrars are going to provide that and I don't know that we need to force them to provide that.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Well, in the RAA 2013 it's already there. But imagine this. The way this is written right now, all the registrars in the world who say, "Okay, I'm not

going to support IP addresses,” so then what happens with those users that want to use glue records? So this means that [inaudible] glue records anymore. I mean I don't think it's the intent and it's not what the RAA 2013 says.

I'm not arguing with you that it may be not a common case or it may only be for power users, but it has always been supported.

JODY KOLKER:

I understand, but I think it's still a “may.” It's a business decision for the registrar to decide if they want to support a glue records for somebody that wants to create name servers.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Yeah, but if we leave it as a “may,” then it means that all registrars may say, “We are not going to support it.” And then what happens with the gTLDs? Glue records are not going to be supported in gTLDs?

JODY KOLKER:

No, I'm not saying that all. I'm saying that it's a business opportunity for somebody to add.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

But it's a rule. It's a policy. It says “may.”

JODY KOLKER: It says “may provide the opportunity for the Registered Name Holder to provide ...”

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah, and I think it should be a “must,” the name server [inaudible] elements. And it’s in line with the RAA 2013.

JODY KOLKER: I’m not sure where that is. Can you point us to where that is?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure.

JODY KOLKER: Or add it to the documentation or in the chat. Thanks.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: So we’ll go to Section ... I can even show it right now.

BERRY COBB: Gustavo, while you’re binging that up—

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sorry, can we go to Section 3. Just let me show where it says that. If we go to Section 3.2, for example, of the RAA 2013, it talks about the IP addresses, names to those name servers. And it says as part of this

obligation, “Registrar shall submit or shall place into the registry database operated by the registry operator ... the following data elements.”

So my reading is clear that this needs to be supported by registrars. And let me tell you it worked three weeks ago when I did this. Obviously, in the web user interface of the registrar ... Well, not obviously, but in that case of the registrar, there was not support for glue records. I created a case and the technical folks of the registrar told me, “Oh, yeah. We can support that. Just create a case.” And I created a case and everything was solved.

But if we leave it as a “may” then the [inaudible] tell me, “No, we don’t support that.” And that’s it. And that’s the action that I don’t think this policy’s trying to ...

JODY KOLKER: Can I jump in here? I’m sorry, Berry. Is that all right?

BERRY COBB: Yes, sure. Go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: Thank. That showed as a “shall.” It doesn’t say a “must.” Does it?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Well, the RAA 2013 was not right in using “must” or “shall” or [inaudible] legal language, I suppose it’s called. I think the “shall” implies

that you need to do it. Right? As you need to do it for the name servers, etc.

JODY KOLKER:

I don't know. I'm not a lawyer. So if somebody can speak to that, what "shall" means. I mean, I know what "shall" means in IETF. Or I know where to look for that. I'm not sure where to look for it in legalese. Are there any lawyers willing to step up?

BERRY COBB:

So if I may, first I'll note that this specific data element during the Phase 1 deliberations was confusing, too. I think the use case that Jody mentioned was what was batted around mostly, and how it wound up, I believe, as a yellow on the table. I am curious, though, because I do think Gustavo has a point here about an existing requirement in the RAA. And I don't believe the intent within the policy discussions was to disrupt that existing requirement because we're really just trying to focus on how these data elements are processed.

And so maybe as a suggestion to consider—and I'm not sure I even like it myself—but I kind of wonder if maybe there's a new 7.6 where the registrar must provide the opportunity in those instances where the Registered Name Holder elects to create their own glue records. That then they must process the specific data element so that it's separate from ...

You know, there's a little bit of an out for the majority of the use cases, as Jody mentioned, but we're still allowing or forcing the "must"

requirement in the cases where the RNH does choose to stand up their own name servers under their domain. I know it's a little sloppy about trying to have to create another section, but I wonder if that maybe bridges the gap.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I think it could. I mean, as long as a Registered Name Holder has the opportunity, if they want to use glue records because that's their decision to do that, I think it's fine. But I don't think that the [inaudible] name server [inaudible] Section 7.2 is going to work. I don't think it's what this policy tries to do.

DENNIS CHANG: Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER: Thanks. I would compare this name server IP addresses to DNSSEC information. Not every registrar offers DNSSEC and the Internet hasn't fallen down yet. Not every registrar should be required to allow a customer to set up glue records if they don't want to.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: If they don't offer DNSSEC, then they are not following what's in the RAA 2013.

JODY KOLKER: I'm sorry. Say that again.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: If they don't offer support for DNSSEC, then they are not following what is in the RAA 2013. The RAA 2013 is pretty clear that you need to support DNSSEC. If they are not supporting that, then maybe it's an issue for Compliance.

JODY KOLKER: Well, should DNSSEC records being here then, too?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: No, I'm just—

JODY KOLKER: In the same spot? I mean, I'm just comparing it to that, you know.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: But for me it's ... So we have this section for name servers. Right? And we say that you need to provide the opportunity to provide name servers. And in the RAA 2013, those name servers [inaudible] of the IP addresses. I really don't understand why we're trying to change what is in the RAA 2013. Oops, which I already ... Sorry about that. Scroll down.

But I'm really [afraid]. [Imagine that] this policy is published with the name server IP addresses here and all registrars in the gTLD space say, "Okay, we're not going to support glue records." And they know what happens with those power user like me that have names with glue record. We are not going to be able to update them anymore? They are

going to ... I mean, they are going to stop working on the DNS.
[inaudible].

JODY KOLKER: I think what you're bringing up, Gustavo, is doomsday scenario here that all registrars will suddenly not allow you to set up name server IP addresses. I cannot see that happening.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I prefer to have things in writing and then, assuming that things are going to work the way we believe they're going to work ...

JODY KOLKER: I understand, but if you're not allowed ... Some registrar is going to pick that up, is going to allow IP addresses. I don't believe a thousand registrars are suddenly going to stop that [functionality].

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I really don't think [inaudible] yes. With the assumption that maybe things are going to work the way we respect expect it, I prefer to have things [inaudible] in writing.

So that's my comment, I think that is clearing on RAA 2013, the name server IP addresses [inaudible] the holder to provide any free one. So I think this ... I mean, for me this this really strange it needs to be now in 7.2.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think the key question for the EPDP Team, those members who are associated with developing the policy language and the recommendation language and policy recommendation—was the intent to change the existing requirement?

And if yes, then we must follow that and throw up a caution that we are raising a risk here. And if it was not the intent, then I think we are obligated to go and pursue this and write it up as a drafting error and then review it as that.

But I want to hear from those who were at the EPDP Team, those members who participated in defining this recommendation. Can you remember? And berry already commented that it was not the intent. But I want to hear from you. Was it your intent to actually change the existing requirement in the RAA? So that means RAA has to be updated to change this existing requirement. I want to hear from you.

Okay, “no such intention” from Thomas. No, Rubens, the concept here is that we define the changes that must be made to the RAA. It's sort of backward. The consensus policy by the community dictates how the RAA should be, like ... Getting rid of the admin data, for example, is a policy decision. So what is the requirement for the RAA for the future? [inaudible] defined by the consensus policy.

Okay, so let's do this. I can see Jody's point, too. And what we will have to do is we'll write it up as a drafting error and have you look at that with rational and see if it makes sense for you.

Berry has a hand up.

BERRY COBB:

Thanks, Dennis. Just one other thing to consider. And I don't love or hate this idea either. The whole point of what were the data element tables, again, was we were analyzing how each one of these data elements were processed from start to finish, basically. From collection all the way to some sort of disclosure, whether that's the public RDDS or whatever add defining personal data, whether it needed to be redacted or not.

And what we're replicating here within the OneDoc is to create this chain of custody through the policy language from Section 7 through Sections 8, 9, and 10. And Section 10, of course, these two data elements—name server IP addresses and DNSSEC elements—there's a requirement that those be published as part of fulfilling the intent of Recommendation 10 and what is published in the minimum public data set.

Now because both of these specific data elements have existing requirements in the RAA—and as I noted, I don't believe our intent in the policy discussion was to disrupt those—another possibility is that these two aspects—the name server IP addresses and DNSSEC elements—at least for Sections 7 and 8 with respect to transfer could potentially, as an option to consider, be removed from this policy document as to not create confusion or disrupt requirements that already exist in the agreements.

The downside to that of course is that we break our chain of custody trying to show collection, transfer, publication. So just something for the

group to consider. I don't think a decision needs to be made now, but I think we've got a couple of options. We just need to figure out which one is the best.

DENNIS CHANG: Gustavo, are you done with that discussion then? Anything more to say?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Regarding Berry's suggestion, I ...

DENNIS CHANG: No, you don't have to comment on that.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: I think the idea is that you make a very good case. And I think what I want to see is sort of a write up on the consequences of doing what was perhaps unintended. And we'll have a look at that because it seems really important that you make a case. And I certainly [inaudible] before I change something in the RAA, an existing requirement that makes it all work, and deleting requirements from that, I want to make sure that is what was intended.

Gustavo.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure. So what you're asking me is to write the drafting error logic. Right?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, yeah. The same thing you did before the other things.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay, sure.

DENNIS CHANG: Excellent. Let's do that. Thank you.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay, thanks. So I think that now the next topic is for you, Dennis. So I'm going to stop sharing. Okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Implementation notes?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. You know, we have three minutes left. Let me pause here and bring us to end of the session. We can do the remaining agenda items next time we meet. And I want to just offer the opportunity for the IRT

members to comment on anything else because I don't want to rush through 9 and 10. I mean G and H, I guess.

Anybody else? Anything for this? What I'm going to do is provide ... Let us work on it for some more, taking the comments and then provide it to you so that you can mark it up, too.

Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I just wanted to go back to the escrow question and follow up. I was able to speak with one of our developers and he confirmed—

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, really?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. He answered so quickly. Isn't that nice?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, my gosh. You've got a good team.

SARAH WYLD: And he confirmed right away that we do already do the IANA ID. So probably, hopefully, that's fairly coming practice. And so I don't think should be an issue. Hopefully I'm not the only one, but hopefully that useful information. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That's very useful. Very useful. I'm glad you're doing that. Thank you so much. Yeah, I've seen some crazy things, but you guys are right on. Yeah, I would absolutely use the number that doesn't change if we're going to use it for identification.

And that's another one that we may want to write up as a drafting error addition. I'm using the term "drafting error" sort of loosely. It's just something that requires explanation when we go out to public comment. People will ask, "Why did you use Registrar IANA ID when the recommendation just said Registrar?" So I think it would be good for us to write that up.

Berry, did you have more comments? I see Thomas is agreeing with you, but I'm not sure he's agreeing with you on. But we have one minute left. Do you want to speak or are you okay?

Did you want to speak again, Sarah? Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Nope. Old hand, sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

BERRY COBB: And my comment was the previous section about name server IPs. So, done.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Well, then let me take this session to a close. Again, welcome back everyone to a new year. And thank you so much for a very, very helpful input discussion. Every time I come to these meetings, I'm learning from you and I really appreciate it. And I'll see you in a couple of weeks. Thank you very much. Bye now.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]