

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting being held on Wednesday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February 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. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang, please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. First of all, happy new year, everyone. And for those colleagues in the Asia who celebrate the lunar new year and have days off, when you listen to this recording, I wish all of you a good fortune in this Year of the Tiger. So tiger, as you may imagine, symbolizes courage and leadership and a bit of stubbornness, which is poorly fitting because my brother is a tiger. There's just thousands and thousands of years of study that went into all these different animals, zodiac signs, Chinese zodiac, and it's somewhat interesting. It's something that I find interesting and talk about with my family and friends. We talk about why some people behave the way they behave is sort of like the original behavioral science practice by our ancestors long ago. So I don't know. For those of you who are tigers, this is your year, so enjoy it. I heard

---

*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.*

---

much good things are going to happen for you. So, happy new year to everyone.

The next thing is in the announcement. I think I sent you an e-mail about this. Good news. I would say it's good news. January 21, GNSO Council responded to the clarification or the confirmation on the Recommendation 12 from the Board. I know that there has been a lot of work done by the GNSO Council and the support staff on that side. And I want to thank you for that progress, especially Sebastien, who probably worked through his own personal time to push that through because he knows being on the IRT, that is a one of our critical path driving the pace and the schedule of the whole project. So thank you for that. We won't discuss it, because it doesn't translate as a direction to us. So we'll wait for the Board direction before we consider and then complete our One Doc where we are on hold in several sessions for the One Doc for the Rec 12. Sebastien says, "Merci." That's French.

Okay. So let's see. The first thing on the agenda—before I continue, I just want to share with you. I know that some of you already know this, but I feel close to all of you because guess what? We spent three, four years together now and, of course, some of you much longer, a decade. You've been working with me on policy implementation. So I consider you my very, very long-term friends. I have sad personal news that my mother passed last week. So I actually took the whole week off and we immersed in the memoir that she wrote, incredible life of Korean history background because Korea has gone through a lot.

So that and on top of that, the COVID situation in Los Angeles is really, really bad. So my father is in Hollywood Hills. There is a Forest Lawn

---

Cemetery there. She has a plot already designated for her. She planned well in advance. But even with that, I have to wait until the 15<sup>th</sup> of February for the first opportunity for a burial service. Then the other thing is and this is probably around the word to headstone, just a simple headstone that matches my dad's. That is like backlog over six months. Everything is just taking a very, very long time. But her remaining word was for me to be grateful and be good to all of you. She was a deeply religious person. She knew she was going to heaven and she said she'll get me in. So we're all happy about that even though I may not deserve it. But mom's got my back. It's always not nice to know, isn't it? So, here's love to all the moms around the world and my friends. So let's continue.

Thank you for indulging me there a bit. And if there's any other news you have for yourself and your family, I want you to know, we're [inaudible] policy implementation but there's something more important and deeper that we're doing here together. So that's just me, Dennis Chang being transparent. I'm just a guy and trying to do something good. By the way, she really approved of my work here, working on the Internet. Every time she uses it, she thought it was me. I got all the credit.

Okay. Thank you for all of your contribution along the years and more. But this year is going to be good. I think we're going to be converging. As I said in my e-mail, Rec 12 was of great progress. Rec 7 got done, Rec 12 is in progress and we're going to get to closure on that. So I want to move at a good pace to close down and everything that we can do on our side. So when other things come to us, we're ready to react quickly and get to our public comment.

---

So the next thing on the agenda is the new advisory review. This is a document, if you recall, we had at one time attempting to, as a task 173, revise an existing advisory. We received comments from the IRT that that was really confusing. It's just an advisory. And it's within our power and authority to re-issue a new advisory. There is no sense in trying to get a redline and trying to understand. So that was a really good input. And we heard you and because of your wise counsel, which we did exactly that, which is we wrote it. As far as we can tell, I think this works well and is sufficient. So I think it's ready for public comment. So if there's no other comment—and I see none here—we'll go ahead and go to public comment. I just remind everyone that don't ever think that this is the last time that we can touch this. We are going to go to public comment. Hopefully, we'll receive some comments, good or bad, either way, and we'll have an opportunity to update all of these red docs after the public comment when many, many more eyes have been on it than considering the whole thing together is probably a lot more meaningful. In isolation, when we look at one piece at a time, you may look okay, but when you go to public comment and look at the One Doc and by all 20 red docs together, they may look different. And that's a good opportunity for us to take another look and update it to make it better.

I can already tell you we have some discussions internally here that our public comment is going to be probably longer than most public comment because it is so extensive and involved. I mean, if you think about it, what is ICANN all about anyway? It's about registration data, right? So this is the policy that you guys are working on. So we want to give plenty of opportunity or time for the public to consider. So that's

---

what's going on. So I'll pause here and see if there are any unanswered questions on this advisory. If not, that's great.

We'll just continue and we'll go to One Doc next. This is something that Gustavo brought up. I should probably do this. 913. IANA ID, registrar IANA ID. I asked the IRT to think about this a little bit. Check with your team. Thanks, Sarah, for getting back to us so quickly last time and you're already doing this. So this would not be any changes to you and your team, but are there any objections? This is something that you see as a problem or an issue? Hands? Comments? If not, I would like to do this. I am going to consider that I had the support of the IRT to make this one change, 913. Thank you for the suggestion and your support. We'll consider this done. Let's write something up on some explanation. I don't think we've done that, but we'll go ahead and do that to document it for our public comment. Thank you.

Next item is the note BCD, task 181. BCD. This is an implementation note. Here are the couple of items we added. Alex has a comment. Is Alex here? No? I don't see him on the list. To Alex, I will say there isn't anything I could find in the recommendation that directly says this. But does anybody else have a comment about this? No? Silent crowd. Okay. Then we'll consider that done, BCD.

Okay. Then C. I think we talked about this before and the reason why we needed to do this, I did explain it. But if there's questions about this, one, you probably know this better than I do. They're all the registries anyway. That you have your Registry Agreement and you wanted to add additional services. And of course, we wanted you to continue to do

---

that and not have this Registration Data Policy somehow be an issue or non-compliant. Go ahead, Marc.

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

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Always.

MARC ANDERSON: Good. Good. Apology, I meant to add a comment to the One Doc and didn't. I think this language looks good and makes sense. So I'll just add my verbal plus one to this. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Thank you for that. Good hearing your voice. Somehow he comforts me. He has been one steady, reassuring, a friend for a long, long time. Thank you, Marc.

Okay. Next item is red doc for Transition Policy. This one, let's see any. Did anybody have comments? No. I did not see any comments but I thought about this. We talked about this a lot about what is really the job for the Registration Data Policy in going to the public comments. We probably complicated in our head in the beginning worried about it, but then at the end, we thought that this is all we needed to do. So anybody who comes here will say, "Okay, for this policy, go look at the Registration Data Policy," and they don't have to do anything else other

---

than that for Registration Data Policy implementation. What do you guys think? If there's no concern, we'll just go ahead and publish it and add it to the list of all our red docs. There's no content being redlined here, and only one use box added to the top. That's the entirety of redline. Let's see. Jody looking at it. Sam. If you've thought about this, I think probably it's a simple thing. Okay. Thank you for that. And then we'll move on.

It's a drafting error, number 11. So number 11 is a new drafting error we wrote up. It's the name server IP addresses collected by registrar is the title. Let me see. This is the one—I just gave you this, right? Yeah, okay. So this is due in February 15. So please take your time, look at it. But I'll very quickly just introduce this to you.

This one is a name server IP address in the recommendation. I think it is represented as a may requirement, as far as we can tell. But we are going to add it to the Section 7.5, the must requirement, like 7.53, this is the one that we're talking about. So if you're looking at this together, I think that it was intended to not be a change. And that's, I think, our main argument. We discussed this last time, actually, that it was never meant to be a change to the existing RAA and existing technical requirement, but it was just a simple oversight. So I think that's what we're saying here. But go ahead and take a look at it later with your team and get back to us with your comment. That is it for our agenda this morning. Berry, you have a hand up.

---

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Dennis. Just to close the loop on item five of the agenda here, the drafting your document, and channeling the group's conversations on our last IRT call, and determining whether this is a continued must as it's defined in the RAA versus the elusive yellow optional box that was a part of the recommendation from the final report. I've said this before probably six months to a year ago and hindsight is 2020. I'd love to be able to do it all over again. But the data elements matrix within the final report that produced the tables for each of the recommendations is far from perfect. And I think that this goes to the welcomed task by the [Amanda] a while back of creating a next generation data elements table to more specifically define the requirements in a must, must if, may, type of aspect about how these data elements are processed across our chain of custody from collection to transfer, to transfer to escrow, and publication down the line. So if we weren't time-constrained in policy development and somebody had thrown out the idea of doing the may's versus must versus one versus zero in the final report, we certainly would have.

What I think is important for this group to know is that due to the limitations of green required or yellow optional, we can't rely just on the table that is included in the recommendation. And we need to understand the full context for each data element throughout the entire report. Specifically for this one, the name server IP address, if you were to go into the final report and go to the Appendix D, I believe, and I can't remember which—I believe it's purpose 1A, maybe it's purpose 1B, one of those two. But the collection for registrars is labeled as O-RNH or optional for the registered name holder. And the intent there was during the policy deliberations—and I believe Mark and if some of



---

the others that were on the small team would probably agree with this—but when we talked specifically about this particular data element, it was understood that not in all cases would a registered name holder provide or set up their own name servers, and thus, would also need to provide an IP address for those name servers. I believe that term is bailiwick domains or something along those lines. In fact, I don't recall being made aware of that specific provision that exists in the RAA today. But the point of my intervention here is when I spoke last time on the call, the statement was, I don't believe the intent was to change existing requirements that existed in the RAA unless the working group discovered through its analysis of the processing activities of these data elements that a change was warranted.

So setting all of that aside and trying to understand the full context of how this particular data element showed up as a yellow, let's push that to the side. I think to further define about the intent of the working group here is by looking at a different example. And let's take the technical contacts as an example. By and large, through the legal analysis and the deliberations, the group determined that the technical contact was no longer a requirement. Or even better yet, the admin contact was completely removed. There's nothing optional about it, it goes away entirely. However, with respect to the technical contact, in effect, it probably goes away entirely. But the working group did make it optional for registrars to offer whether they want to offer to the registered name holder the ability to enter in the tech contact name, e-mail, and phone number, I believe.

So in that particular case, the working group opined specifically about a particular change as with respect to those certain data elements. So to

---

conclude here, with respect to the name server IP address, other than it maybe should have showed a green versus a yellow, the point here is that the working group made no additional statements about changing any of the existing requirement with respect to how this field works, especially within the context of what exists out there in the RAA today. Otherwise, I believe that the working group would have made a separate statement about why that requirement would change.

So I hope that provided some context here about why we're stuck here. And whether we call it a drafting error or not, I don't have an opinion on nor do I have an opinion about which part of our draft One Doc where this should go, but again, to restate that we weren't intending to change the existing requirement here. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Berry. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Dennis. Thank you, Berry, for the explanation. I just wanted to jump in and say I agree with Berry. I'll just plus one. I don't think there is any intent or discussion at any point to change the existing obligations when it comes to name servers. I do think the optionality in the table is correct. But as Berry noted, you have to drill down into what is meant by optional. Page 99 in the Appendix, as Berry pointed out, notes the optionality, it's O-RNH. That was the designation that we came up to indicate that was optional at the discretion of the registered name holder, as opposed to optional at the discretion of the contracted party, which would have been Optional-CP. So I think it's a must for the

---

registrar to require it but it's completely optional for the registered name holder to provide that information, which is I think a really long way of saying I agree with what Berry said. And I don't think this is a drafting error, I think you just have to drill down a little bit to understand exactly the intent. So that's my two cents. Hopefully it's helpful.

DENNIS CHANG:

I was trying to figure out a way to document it. So readers of our public comment do not do the same thing that we did. Okay. We'll figure out a way how we can document it. So drafting error is a vehicle where we explain things. I remember. Jody made a comment that maybe we title this as implementation, interpretation or something like that. That would be okay, I think, to include it. Okay. So let's do that. I agree, Sarah, plus one for [Amanda A], a new name we've given to the two ladies that you see on top with A's coming first on my list anyway. Thank you so much. It is truly a team work. I know that not everybody on the team is engaged all the time. And between having babies, these two ladies are contributing to something that are very, very important. Thank you so much. That's the power of a project team as I've discovered and known for a long time.

Okay. All right, let's go back to our agenda. There was nothing else. I think that was everything that I had prepared to talk to you about. Unless you have anything else, we're perfectly good to call it a session, complete conclusion. And then we'll continue to work to be prepared for the next meeting. Now that we're converging, we're going to track the Rec 12 movement and see where that's going to come up and not to

---

bother you just yet. But we're going to internally do some prep work and look at the timing and see what our year looks like for all of us. Marc, you have your hands up.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, Dennis. I am loathe to keep everybody from being able to drop early, but I do have AOB item.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: I'd like to give a quick update from the RDAP Working Group.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh yeah, yeah. I would love that. Thank you, Marc, for volunteering.

MARC ANDERSON: As I recall, you formally requested that the RDAP Working Group take up the edits necessary to the RDAP Profile, to update the RDAP Profile to be in accordance with the One Doc soon to be the Registration Data Policy. So the RDAP Working Group did take up that work. One of the things that we discovered as we went through—I don't know if discovered is the right word—but reminded ourselves of that the previous RDAP Profile had been drafted against the Temporary Specification. So, the previous profile is basically our contractual obligations, and then the Temporary Specification and other applicable

---

policies sort of added on to that in a cumulative manner. So the new RDAP Profile will be our contractual obligations as sort of modified by policy and the Registration Data Policy, what we call the One Doc, as sort of the basis for that profile.

So we began that work first by reviewing the document, the profile, which consists of two documents, a specification document and response document, and identified areas that needed to be updated. And then we restarted redlining the document, making the actual changes that would need to be done to update it in accordance with the One Doc. We're still in that process but we've gone through and made a significant number of redlines and are reviewing those redlines and preparing to sort of move through that review process. So that's essentially where we are. We've made redlines and are reviewing those redlines, sort of similar to the process we're going through here with the One Doc.

DENNIS CHANG:

That's good. So remind me, there's two documents, right, that you guys are updating, or is it just one?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yes. The RDAP Profile is actually made up of two different documents, what we call a Response Profile and a Technical Implementation Guide. So then the Technical Implementation Guide is intended to be less about what goes into the response and more about how the system works. And the Response Profile is intended to detail what fields are

---

required for the response and how they are required to be displayed, if that makes sense.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, I remember this. I think you were on the original pilot program where this RDAP Working Group was born, I think. And we did that for the purpose of keeping the technical document kind of independent of the policy changes, but I guess that didn't work. There was probably more of an extensive change with this version of the Registry Data Policy as I understand.

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah. Actually, there were very few changes needed to the Technical Implementation Guide. And it was more just a matter of sort of cleaning things up and clarifying where it made sense after we've had sort of some time to use it and implement it. All of the heavy lifting and all of the main changes required by the One Doc are in the Response Profile.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. That's really good to hear. Do you need anything more from the IRT right now? Is Gustavo behaving over there?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah. Gustavo has been an excellent help. I'm thankful for his involvement and participation in that.

---

DENNIS CHANG:

Good boy. My mom would be proud. Okay, let's see. Oh, Samantha suggests maybe do a quick review of 10.5 and 10.6. I think that's probably a good idea because it's new. It's another one that we just assigned to you. If I do this now, it may just save you a little time. I forwarded this change yesterday and I said that I added 10.15 and 10.16 range. And looking at the requirements of mapping, we added this A and B. That's another thing that we did. We changed using numeral 2 alpha, AB and AB. But this is where registrar must publish if collected. And this registrar must publish if transferred—registry operator from registrar. This is a plain registrar must publish. Period. There's no if and buts. Or the real difference here between 10.16 and 10.14, for example, is subject to redaction requirement. We've heard your input where you commented that having data elements in here where they're not subjected to redaction requirement makes it seem like they are. So we heard that. I think this is much more accurate. It does add a couple more section but I think it avoids the whole confusion, potential confusion in the future, and then misleading and people wondering why is this data element subject to redaction. So that's the idea. And then of course, if you look at the One Doc, you can see that highlighted here in purple.

The other thing is we think you guys brought up registrant country as a subject of that confusion, but when we looked at it carefully, registrant state provinces, sort of in the same situation. That's why we just went ahead and did both of them. So it represents the change to 10.13 and 10.14 and added new sections 10.15 and 10.16.

So that I think will help. Sam, is that what you had in mind?

---

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Yes. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you for that suggestion. All right. Anything else? Hi, Laureen. Has Laureen joined just now? How are you?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm good. I had another conflict. I'm sorry to be late. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That's okay. You're just in time because I'm going to announce that we are going to conclude the meeting.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good timing on my part.

DENNIS CHANG: It's okay. Just so that you know, everything on the list we went through it rather quickly. The team is in real good spirit starting this new year. So welcome to the Year of the Tiger. I'll see you in a couple of weeks unless anybody has final words before we conclude. Okay. Thank you very much. See you in a couple of weeks and online before then. 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]**