

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT Meeting, being held on Wednesday, the 16th 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.

And before I turn it over to Dennis, I did want to let the IRT know that we do have a new member. Steve Crocker has joined. I don't think he's on ... Oh. He is here. Great. Yes. Steve is here. So, Dennis, did you want to turn it over to Steve to say a little something?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yes. Please. Steve, it's our tradition. When a new member joins, they do a little introduction of themselves. Specifically, I want to know how you're going to help us. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, let's divide that into the two parts. First of all, thank you very much for the warm welcome. I want to specifically acknowledge. Dennis did a first-class job of onboarding me two days ago, I think. There is a ton of material here that I need to catch up on. So I may be helpful or I may be still coming up to speed.

---

*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.*

---

I have been spending quite a lot of time in the last few years rethinking and working with other people on thinking about the fundamentals of data registration process. I want to try to bring some of that into this forum here.

I recognize that this group is focused on the implementation of an agreed-upon set of recommendations that came out of, I guess, just phase one or maybe phases one and two of the EPDP, which is fine. I will try to be helpful in bringing the kind of insights that we've developed in the group that I've been working with over the past few years, principally around whether or not there are consistency and completeness in specifications. So identification of where there's ambiguities, or contradictions, or just uncertainties in all of that is a key part of what I've been working on.

So with that, thank you very much. I will try to be respectful of the group's time and stay focused on what our job is here.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Steve, and welcome again. Let's get on with it. We have this thing called OneDoc, which I introduced Steve to already and it looks like this, of course. Then our first agenda item is section 8.5. That is here, 8.5. This is a simple little addition, "if supported by registry operator," that Marc suggested.

I think it's okay but I did want to get the team's input. A few thought that this could possibly make it a little more confusing. I think it means the same thing. What I emphasized is that it is a "may" requirement and therefore I don't think it actually changes the requirement itself. But if

---

Marc believes that it could be helpful for the registry operator and registrar, I'm all for it. So please take a look at that. I'm showing it to you now.

But as you know, we have our task list. I think I said that this one was due on the 22nd. It's this one. So task 188, due on the 22nd. You have some time to look at it and give us feedback, comment. For now, is there a question? Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. I guess I had intended to hold back but this provides an opportunity to share the kind of things that come to my mind when I see this. This says, "the registrar may," or by implication may, choose not to, "transfer the following data elements to the registry operator," with the caveat that if they're supported by the registry operator.

The "if" part is fine. But what is one to understand about the "may?" Under what circumstances with the registrar choose or not choose to do that? That's one question. The next question is will it be evident, or is it going to be advertised, as to whether or not the registrar does or does not do that? And what is the purpose of this clause here? Because from an external point of view, the most conservative reading of that is that there is no way to depend upon that data being transferred to the registry. So how is that going to be helpful or how is that information going to be useful to anybody. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thanks for the question. Marc, would you like to answer that?

---

MARC ANDERSON: I wouldn't, actually, particularly since Steve is okay with the "if" part. I think his question is more on the "may." So I am going to respectfully decline to wade into that particular—

DENNIS CHANG: Let me see if I can—

STEVE CROCKER: Let me just say quickly I'm assuming that the "if supported by the registry operator" is—and that the registry operator documents whether or not they are in a position to accept that data. So if that's not the case, then I have an additional, related comment on that. But my focus was assuming that the registry operator is—it's clear which data elements they're prepared to accept. Then the force of my comments is focused on the "may" part.

DENNIS CHANG: So let's start from beginning. Why do we have a requirement that says "may" at all? And if you have noted our key terms here, we have adopted the RFC IETF definitions of "must" and "may" here. So we tend to use that to our advantage.

Let's see. Where did I ...? Oh, yeah. Here. In this particular case, we are trying to address each one of these data elements that we have received from the EPDP team. You will note that there is a number of data items in this section, "must" section, and "must if" section, and the

---

“may” section. So the implementer will be able to figure out what to do with a certain data element if they have to take action. That is the reason why we have decided to include “may” as a clarification of implementation.

Now, the other question about how will someone know, we have not imposed any requirements for registrar, for example, to document and announce how they make such decisions. The only thing that we are looking at here is a policy document—this, what you’re seeing—to say that if you’re looking for what to do with a reseller, registrar has the option and they choose how they will do it. It’s not a requirement that they have to transfer it to the policy.

I think it’s probably a lot simpler than what you are thinking about. But if I may, Steve, these are fundamental questions that we have dealt with probably two years ago when we were trying to outline and categorize the requirements in terms of “must,” “must not,” “may,” “may not,” “must if,” “must” with a condition. But I can go through that with you after this meeting, if you can hold off, because I want to go ahead and get into the substance that is on hand.

You did ask a good question. “If supported by registry operator.” And the question was raised. Will the registry operator document in such way to show that they are supporting it or not? I don’t think we’ve asked that question before but that’s probably a reasonable question to ask at this particular point, addressing 8.5. Marc, do you want to address that? Can you?

---

MARC ANDERSON: I'm sorry. I didn't quite follow. Address which?

DENNIS CHANG: Part of Steve's question, if I heard it correctly, is this clause that you would like to add, this part is okay, he said. But he said, "supported by registry operator ..." I think he was asking whether you would be documenting that in some way and make it known. If I didn't hear that question right, Steve, you may repeat it. Maybe Steve should repeat the question first. Then you can answer. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: No. You got it exactly right, Dennis. Marc, the question is the explication of the "if" clause there. That is, will registry operators be explicit about whether they do or don't or which subset of these data elements they do accept.

MARC ANDERSON: Support for both of those requires support for a specific EPP extension. Both require support for EPP extensions for the transfer of that data from registrars to registries. So registry that wants to support either of those fields would have to clearly communicate that to the registrar that they support it and how that is supported. I can't speak for all registries and how all registries would or would not communicate that to the registrar. But I know, for my registry, that's documented and made available to registrars via the standard documentation we apply to all registrars.

---

But I think, to Dennis's point, that's really beyond the how. It's beyond the policy. The policy is just saying that it may be supported and not really the how.

STEVE CROCKER:

The touchstone question is not so much focused on the communication between a registrar and a registry but from the external point of view— from a user's point of view. What information will a general Internet user be able to know about this situation. So to say it again in a slightly different way, if I'm a general user and I want to know whether or not those pieces of data are going to be retained, or potentially retained, or acquired by the registry, will the registry be documenting that fact in a way that I could look it up and depend upon?

Of course, apropos the previous part, even if they are, there's no guarantee that they will get any data from any registrar. But at least this is a precondition. How well is that going to be documented and made publicly available?

DENNIS CHANG:

I see Beth's hand's up. Maybe she would like to comment. Yeah. Go ahead. Sure.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Dennis. Hi, Steve. Welcome to the team. I can understand, Steve, why this is a question for you and why this would be of interest. But I do not understand how it's relevant to this particular consensus policy. This consensus policy and this language is meant to reflect the

---

recommendations, which it does. It puts out the requirements for registries and registrars with regards to how we handle this specific set of data.

As, I think, Marc really clearly and well defined, there are other parts of registry and registrar operations, like the Registry/Registrar Agreement. Speaking for my personal registry, we have an onboarding tool kit that gives all of these very detailed setup and operational requirements to our accredited registrars. These are internal operations.

So I think that there's going to be a point where maybe this is either ... It's, a, a choice of the registrar and registry how much they want to publicize about that. There's already requirements for figuring out exactly what data elements you may or may not, as a registry or registrar, choose to make available in this context.

But I just genuinely don't think that that is something that this IRT is meant to address. The recommendations certainly didn't go down to that level of detail. So I just wanted to voice that comment, concern. I think it might be a discussion for a different fora. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I agree. So, Steve, we're welcome to stay longer after the IRT call. And I can go through all of your questions. I'm not trying to ignore you.

STEVE CROCKER:

That's fine. Thank you.



---

DENNIS CHANG: This is a good question, which I think would be a really good preparation for public comment because I want to put out a document for public comment that would cover a lot of these questions and frequently asked questions that ... There's another document that we're working on, on the side. So don't lose your questions because we probably want to capture all those questions and provide answers to them. When we do put out the public comment, I think it will save a lot of time for the reviewers to have that. Thank you so much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Next item on the agenda is the 10.2 and subsections. For this one, I think Gustavo wanted to cover this. Right, Gustavo?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: That's correct. I'm going to share my screen, okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Can you see my screen?

DENNIS CHANG: I can.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: On previous meetings, we agreed as a group that redaction means for the purpose of this policy and from a technology-agnostic perspective. And when we say “technology-agnostic,” it means that these requirements shall apply to any technology, meaning legacy WHOIS, or RDAP, or any official technologies that are used to publish registration data on the Internet.

So we agreed that “Redaction” or “Redact,” for an implementer means that they should not include the value of the data element. And we also agreed that it also means that they must indicate that the value is redacted. Those requirements are here. I have highlighted the text. And as you may remember, we have this exact text on section 10.1 and 10.2. You can see the [red links] there.

While working on creating some examples for you guys on how the WHOIS output will look like, we realized that, also, those requirements should be in 10.1.5, 10.1.6, and 10.1.7, meaning that we will need to copy and paste this exact text all over the place in section 10.2, which makes this text really difficult to read and really hard to understand for an implementer.

So the proposal that we have for you guys is to have a local definition on 10.2 that basically says that “Redact,” was capital R, we are following the same idea that we have with Publish, which we have the definition of “Publish” with capital P. So the definition of “Redact” with capital R means what we agreed, which are these two requirements.

---

And now, with this definition, we can just go over the text and use that definition instead of copying and pasting that text all over the place. For example, 10.1, in this case, will be, [when you hover on the screen], “Registry operator or registrar must redact the following elements.” So we are using, now, this definition on 10.2.1, 10.2.2, 10.2.5, 10.2.6, and 10.2.7. We don’t think that we changed any of the meaning of the provisions. Basically, what we are doing is, yes, using the new definition of “Redact.” Questions to the group, now?

DENNIS CHANG:

Again, this is introduction to you, at this time, to facilitate your review. So we’re just going to try to get you started. So it’s okay if you don’t have questions and you want to take it back to your group and deliberate in a more leisurely fashion. But Sarah has a question, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA:

Yes, please, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. This seems entirely reasonable to me. It matches the definition that was used in the different sections. So yes, of course. I just want to understand. Maybe we should put this in the definition section at the top of the OneDoc instead of here in section 10. Why is it limited to only for the purposes of this section? Thank you.

---

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: We went through the document and this definition of “Redact” only needs to be used on 10.2. And our legal department, they provided some guidance that it may not be a good idea to have, in the definition sections, definitions that also contains requirements because usually the requirements, which are these requirements that we have here, are part of the body of the policy itself. That’s the reason why we’re using the concept of a local definition.

SARAH WYLD: That’s very interesting. Okay. I’m going to need to think about that. Thank you very much for the explanation.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Please think about this, Sarah. We went back and forth. I think we actually have ... At one point in our long, three-year-lives. I think we actually had the definition, probably, back in the definition section. Then we changed our mind to localize it. But maybe we localized it too much. So we’re kind of bringing it to a middle point. But it’s a style and technique of a policy document. It doesn’t change the requirement, in any case. But it is definitely an opportunity to put our footprint on a set of policy language that is going to be very widely used for a long time.

So thank you, Sarah, for you question. Good question. We all asked the same question. But it’s good that you’re thinking it, just like that, with us.

---

The next item is ... Let's see. Gustavo, if you don't mind continuing sharing, can you go to section 10.1.5 and 10.1.6? State and province is the next item. It's right there, right?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Correct. I think that we have an error on the agenda. It's 10.1.4 and 10.1.5.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. Please. Excuse me. Yeah. You're right. What's on the IRT document is the one that you wanted to talk about, right?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Correct. So on our previous meeting, there was this confusion that we were seeing "and subject to redaction requirements" and we have the state and province. And there are not redaction requirements for the state and province. There are not any requirements in 10.2 for that element. It's the same issue with country. We're saying "and subject to the redaction requirements," blah, blah, blah, and with registrant country there.

What we are suggesting or proposing now is to have two new sections, which are basically the same requirements as 10.1.3 and 10.1.6 but removing "subject to the redaction requirements" and now we have the state and province under section 10.1.4 and registrant country on section 10.1.5. So this is a simple change. Its basically just removing the "subject to the redaction requirements" so that is not confusing.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. This was a result of, actually, your comment, too, Sarah, that, "But it's not subject to redaction." I heard the same comment from other people and I realized that even if we're using the if, that it makes it sound like that it could be possible that it is subject to. So I think laying it out this way, I think, makes it a lot more clear. It's a little wordy. It's more sections. But I think it's worth doing it.

So please have a look and review it. And this particular item, again, is due on the 3rd. Or which date is it? The 15th. What's today? Okay. Is it? Yeah. So it's due today. Is there any questions? Oh, good. Sarah, thank you for your feedback, "Super clear." That's what we're trying to do, make it clear. So that's good to hear. I think that I don't hear any more comments on that. So I think that we could close on that if everybody is agreeable. Excellent. Good job. Thank you very much, Gustavo. That, I think, was your idea. It was very good.

Next is the ... What's next on the topic? Let's go to revised implementation note B.b,c, d.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Do you want me to continue sharing?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Do you mind?

---

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Sure. No problem.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. That would be good. It would help me, actually, if you don't mind. Okay. Oh, this is the one that Beth wanted to talk about. It said, "Would like to discuss why the text was changed." Yeah. Let's discuss it. this one is assigned to you to review and provide us comments back later. I think I gave you up to 22nd to review this one.

But the reason is simple. We added implementation notes to clarify or to help understand what's in the policy language up above. So this particular policy language is an explanation, if you will, for the transfer requirement that we state above. And there was a lot of questions about, "What will ICANN Org do in terms of compliance, enforcement?" So we have tried to lay it out in two steps.

If there's questions, we'll accept it, but there's a reason that we are ... We first added the language a little more briefly. Then we added more language in a more precise form. Is there any questions or more questions of that? Yeah. Go ahead and ask your question.

BETH BACON: Yeah. Hi, Dennis. Hi, everybody. I think we understood that this was targeted towards clarifying for compliance. And we know that, obviously, we're pretty open to having some implementation notes. We think it's helpful and clarifying.

This one, however, it feels like, by the addition of ... In b, where it says, "where a legal basis is required by applicable law," and then just in c

---

and d, it felt like the original language was concise, and clear, and a targeted. But it also feels like it opens it up a little bit to ICANN Compliance evaluating whether a legal basis is required or if it exists. I think that the ICANN staff liaisons in the EPDP were very clear that you wanted to touch that with not a 300-foot pole. The 10-foot pole wasn't even enough.

So that's the basis of our question. Is this needed? Is it going to create clarification or more confusion for enforcement? That's just the discussion we wanted to have, just to make it clear for you guys, make it predictable for us in the end. It just feels like it expanded it quite a bit.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's see. Amanda, do you want to speak that?

AMANDA ROSE: Yeah. I can speak.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Amanda. Amanda is from our enforcement team, as you know—the Compliance Team. So she looked at this really hard and looked at her role in terms of compliance and enforcement, and potentially, what she might be asked to do. She wanted to be super clear what she could do and what she could not do. But using this note to make it clear right now, as we are drafting this language, so that we are not going to have the same discussion later when we implement this policy. So thank you, Amanda for being here and explaining it to us. Go ahead.



AMANDA ROSE:

Yeah. Just to address Beth's concern, I think we were trying to do the opposite, I guess, of how you're reading it. This is typically why I had in there that the existence of a legal basis is not determined by ICANN. It's not subject to enforcement, nor is whether a data protection agreement is entered into because that's not a specific requirement. So those, I tried to lay out in c to make clear that ICANN Compliance has no part in determining that.

We're trying to envision in what way will this be something that we can actually enforce. It's going to be extremely limited. That is what we're trying to make clear, is that it's up to whoever's trying to say that something here needs to be transferred, those two elements need to be in place and it's not something for us to determine whether they need to exist or not.

So if those are established—so, for example, a registry operator says, "These are supposed to be transferred. We have this, this, and that," and we need to somehow enforce it. I'm not actually thinking in terms of what will actually happen in real life but as broadly as I can of how this might come up in a compliance situation. Those elements need to be established and it's not our position to do so.

So that was the intent. That's why we're taking it to you to get any kind of feedback, if that can be made clear, which I was hoping I had done in bullet c. I think you might have been honing in more on b and d. Those two issues ... b is outside the scope of the policy anyway. That's basically

---

additional data elements that are not covered by this policy so that's out of scope of compliance altogether.

Then, with respect to d, it's trying to also acknowledge that legal basis is not ... It's specific to a regional or jurisdictional type requirement. So for data processing purposes, we know legal basis has to be established for GDPR, blah, blah, blah. We're all familiar with that, I believe. So to the extent that you're in some type of jurisdiction, you have no touch on any type of legislation that requires that to exist. We're saying that that's up to you. It's not something, again, Compliance is going to get into. But just to make clear that that's not a specific part of the policy.

Hopefully that helped. But again, we're happy to take suggestions to make that more clear. I think we're all on the same page. But if not—

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. I think we are, too. Marc, do you want to help us?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. I'm thinking it through. I think I agree with what Amanda is saying. So I think I agree, in principle. I'm just trying to reflect if that's captured in the words of c. I guess I'm still thinking.

DENNIS CHANG:

It's not due yet. You do have more time. You know that I can allow more time for you to think about it. If you do, just ask me right now. Go ahead. You were saying?

MARC ANDERSON:

Actually, thank you for that. I did raise my hand for another question. I guess this is related to d. Here, maybe I'm throwing to my colleagues from the EPDP. See what their take on this one is. But one of the things we talked about in the working group is wanting to have a standardized—a global policy.

While GDPR was certainly front and center on all of our minds, and we talked about it considerably, I'm not sure that I agree with the statement in d that the legal basis is only needed where required by applicable law. I don't think we discussed that as a carveout. I think we just said in order for that transfer to occur, the registry must establish a legal basis and must enter into an appropriate data processing agreement with the registrar.

I don't know. I'm curious what other people think on this one but I'm not sure I agree with that carveout, that it's only if required by applicable law.

DENNIS CHANG:

You're really good. You're looking at the other side. I didn't see that. Beth, you want to speak to this? Go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Oh, sure. First, Amanda, thank you very much for the clarification. I think that's one reason we flagged it before we wanted to make any suggested changes or clarifications, is because we all know that Compliance is always four steps ahead in thinking it through. It's always

---

---

funny that we read it one way and then, from a different perspective, I'm like, "Oh. It totally makes sense."

So I think that maybe what we can take back is that the registries and registrars, since we do have time before this is due, we can maybe noodle on it and try and think of something that's clear to all parties so we have a shared understanding.

I also just wanted to plus-one Marc's thoughts on d. I think that some of it's going to be a clarification from us. And then others, where we might explain where we have a concern, and maybe we can flesh that out a little bit, and then we can get Compliance and Amanda's takeback on that. So appreciate it. Thank you for the background.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. That's exactly what we want from the team. Please do share your concerns with us if you do have anything. We're taking all your suggestions for clarification. Go ahead, Amanda. You wanted to speak?

AMANDA ROSE:

I just wanted to comment in response to Marc's [note] on legal basis. I think the struggle we're having is legal basis is really the bases that are established by law. So what happens when there's no bases that are established by the law that you're in? You're assuming, then, that people have to go look at some other legal basis in another law.

So I get that we were trying to get away from GDPR. I think that was almost impossible to really do, in a way, because those concepts are so

---

ingrained in how everyone's processing data, as there's new privacy laws added on from so many different countries.

So yes. There are lot of legal bases to rely on. But those are generally something that is actually created or founded upon a law that exists. So again, if you're outside of that, what happens next is the question. So that's why we added those. But again, my comments stand. I'm happy to hear all the comments. Take it back to your teams and let us know next steps and how we can maybe improve it.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Let's do this. Let's take some more time to review and I'll revise the due date accordingly. I'll do that. So thank you for your input. That was good conversation.

We'll move on to our next topic, then. For our next topic, if you could, can you go to the drafting error, Gustavo. Okay. So let me tell you about the title of this document, or the label. You'll notice that I have added "implementation interpretation" to the title. Roger suggested "implementation interpretation" as the title of them document. I think I like that. So for now, I just added. So "'Drafting Errors' and Implementation Interpretation" is the title.

This was particularly important to me because, as we added number 12 ... Go to number 12, Gustavo. I want to share number 12. You can present this one. This is a new one that we added. I think it was Marc's comment when we talked about this IANA ID—the fact that it was never the intention to change anything but to say that it was an error is maybe going too far. So he cautioned me on calling it an error and I accepted

---

and understood that. But before, Gustavo, you talk about it, I think Marc has a comment. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. My comment was actually on the title of the document.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: I was going to suggest “explanation” instead of “interpretation.” Interpretation, for me, has almost—in this context, has a bad connotation. It implies that you’re trying to ... I think it could imply that you’re trying to twist the meaning.

DENNIS CHANG: It could be interpreted as interpretation.

MARC ANDERSON: Right.

DENNIS CHANG: It’s in English. Yeah. Interesting. I like “explanation.”

---

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. "Explanation," I think that explains ... I think that maybe is better. That describes what we're trying to do.

DENNIS CHANG: That already looks better. Thank you, Gustavo. Your wish is granted by Gustavo. Okay, Roger. I think you're okay with it, too. Thanks for your suggestion but we're a team here. Okay. We've got a plus-one from Roger. "Explanation" has the say so we'll continue. Go ahead and, Gustavo, why don't you do the number 12? Explain. Go ahead.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. So number 12 is the explanation of why we changed from "Registrar" to "Registrar/IANA ID." We discussed this on our previous meeting. We believe, as a group, that "IANA ID" is superior to using the name of the registrar because a name, obviously, is in a string. And trying to match in a string, it's always complex.

So the IANA ID is a unique number identifier so that should be easier to manage when doing the processing on the computer system. That's the reason why we changed or why we are proposing to do the IANA ID instead of the registrar name. I don't think that disagreed with this one on the previous meeting. Oh, Steve.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Steve.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. This seems to me a particular instance of a more general problem, which is—or a more general situation—which is data is being transferred from one party to another. What are the constraints and how well are they specified as to what the syntax, and format, and so forth of each of those data elements? Is that nailed down in some place?

This seems to be pointing out a particular issue with respect to the identification of the registrar. But if you look across the entire set of data elements that are being transferred, is there an explicit statement as to what the formats, as I say, and the field length, etc. about all that are—basic system design issues.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: This is about data escrow. For example, in the case of registries, we have an RFC describing how the format of the data is for deposit. It goes to all the potential technical details on how to do the format, basically. I can send you the link to the RFCs that describe how to do that escrow.

STEVE CROCKER: I don't want to go study those myself if I don't have to. But I'm just asking why is this ... Implied in my question is why is this not already encompassed in the basic definition of what those data elements look like?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: What we have in the policy, as I was mentioning, is basically which data elements should be included in the deposit from a technology-agnostic



---

way. So basically, the policy is saying, “You need to transfer these data elements to the data escrow provider.” And the idea of this policy, as I was mentioning, is to be technology-agnostic—just to say which elements. If you want to see how that’s ... I should know my RFCs but I have 400 or 500 of them, now.

DENNIS CHANG:

If I may interrupt, Gustavo and Steve, we’re about to get into a really fascinating, interesting technical discussion that I, myself, would be interested. But I think that I’m going to stop you here. Let’s see. I’m going to invite you to go offline, though syntaxes of all these data elements is a fascinating subject. But it is not the subject of this policy-making. So if you don’t mind, let’s do that first. Go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Dennis, the point is, it may be ... I don't know what the answer is because I haven't looked. But it may be the case that this was already specified. Or if it's not, then what you're saying here is that because it's not specified in the other documents, this is an augmentation of what could have, or perhaps should have, been specified in the—

DENNIS CHANG:

Precisely. That is an excellent point. Gustavo, can you take a homework assignment to look into that and then come back with an answer? We can add that to the rationale language to answer Steve’s question directly. Okay? Thank you.

---

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Maybe we should provide an explanation on how—

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We should.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: - how all the different RFCs that we have, and the contracts, and how they interrelate with each other, to clarify this.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think that as soon as you relabel the document as an explanation document, there's a lot of explanation I think the audience would benefit from. That includes Rec 7 explanation. I don't want to keep calling that interpretation. I do want to call it an explanation, now that decision had been made by the Board and the GNSO Council. Same thing with Rec 12, when we get that direction. Steve, did you have another question?

STEVE CROCKER: No. Sorry. I'll take my hand down.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. The next item is another drafting error. Can you present that? Which one was it? I'll tell you. Drafting error 11 and 10. So go backward. Let's do 11.

---

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: 11 is in the explanation.

DENNIS CHANG: What was outstanding here? There's nothing outstanding, is there?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I don't think so.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We talked about this already, a week ago. I remember why. We already talked about it and we wrote it up. I think Marc asked for, maybe, additional ... Oh, Marc has a hand up. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I can maybe help. If you look on the screen, you can see my comment from February 7th. Sorry. The next one down. Yeah. That one there. I think this is flagged because of this point. Then your comment to mine to was, "Would you be able to suggest wording changes in the rationale for this?" So I think this was flagged for discussion today, based on my comment there and your ask for wording changes. So in answer to your question, yes. I just haven't had a chance to do that yet.

DENNIS CHANG: You keep promising, man. I want more Marc on this policy. That's what we need. Okay. Thank you, Marc. So go up to number 10. Gustavo, number 10. Okay. So this is another area we added some more

---

language on the “rationale,” which is really just the explanation part. So read this. If you have comments, please make them. But it’s here.

This whole explanation document is something that you are invited to keep looking at and adding to, especially you, Steve. It would really be good for you to go through this and why we have made the decisions that we did. And in cases, you will find that our implementation and policy language is directly in opposition to what we received from the recommendation. It’s very, very important that we explain that well when we go for public comment.

Okay. I think that was it. Let’s see. Okay. Good. Thank you. Was that it for the drafting errors discussion? Okay. So let’s go to the—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Marc has his hand raised.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I’m sorry. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. My comments here are ... Sorry. I have similar comment to 10.3 as I did on 11. This is really mincing words here but I don't know that it was an unintended omission to not include the DNSSEC elements there. I think it just ... We weren’t trying to be exhaustive. Berry had the pen on a lot of this stuff and had a herculean task here. But I don’t think, as these sections were drafted, it was intended to be exhaustive.

---

So in my mind, the exclusion of those DNSSEC elements in the report was not meant to imply that we were making a recommendation that they would no longer be required.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Maybe we should say that. Write that down, what you just said.

MARC ANDERSON: I think the end result is the same. I don't like the word "unintended omission." I'm trying to stick up for Berry here because Berry—

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. It's all Berry's fault.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. It's not Berry's fault at all. Berry did not miss anything.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm just kidding.

MARC ANDERSON: We were not trying to be exhaustive. But I think the explanation is that—

DENNIS CHANG: I like the words that you used.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. I think the explanation is that not including them was not meant to imply that they were no longer required.

DENNIS CHANG: I like those words. Sam or Berry, if you can capture those words, let's use those and replace the "unintentional omission" that I came up with. Okay. Thank you for that. This is how you are helpful. Yeah. We certainly do appreciate all the work that Berry has done and the EPDP team, of course. It was amazing to see that that got done in a year.

Okay. Next item is ... Before I go to the next item, why don't we switch roles here. Gustavo, I'll share my screen. I'm about to launch into a little bit of a project status discussion.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I stopped sharing.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. All righty. So what we want to do ... Is Alex here? No. Alex is not here but Sarah's here and Owen is here. So we have good amount of people who asked for, basically, a project timeline, plan, status. So what I want to tell you now is that we are working on a very, very comprehensive project schedule, status. We want to share them with you—probably next IRT meeting—because your intention is to have that done and published on the IRT wiki prior to the ICANN 73. So that's an exciting news.

---

But the way I want to do this is let me just look at this. Probably want to do it this way. Status map is what we use, right? Remember our status map? We have these maps, first, when we get the recommendations. Steve, you asked a question. Is it just Phase 2—Phase 1 or Phase 2. And the answer is it's Phase 1 plus some Phase 2, is the correct answer. You'll see which recommendations exactly from the Phase 2 was rolled into the scope of this team. So I'll say this is 33 recommendations that we're dealing with.

The first task for the IRT was to review our implementation approach. Or do we know what to do? We have done that. That's done. The second couple of things that we're looking at, you saw the OneDoc. This is looking at OneDoc, which is our final product—this here. That is “the policy.” When we publish it, that's what you'll get. And see, by each section, whether or not we we're done.

So we can look at this whole document. I will go through this quickly, next. But I can look at this map and see, “Okay. The policy effective date, no. We're not done because we don't have a date.” But as soon as we have a date, I need to plug it in and we're done with that.

DPT, that we said we will wait for the DPT to come. But I think the language for the DPT, we may want to start working on that as soon as we're don't with other priority items. These two, 9 and 10, I think are ... Oh, yeah. Sam has been writing notes for us. “Resolved and the baseline approved ...” Okay.

So transfer, I think, is number nine but number nine is not done yet. Section nine is not done yet, even though ... Is it done? Let me see.

Almost done. Section nine has some comments so we'll have to deal with that. But I think section nine is .... Oh. It has the registrant organization, which we said we will wait for Rec 12 to be completed. But when we get some time, until we clear other things, I'm going to take another closer look at whether or not we have to really wait for Rec 12 for this number nine. But that's the idea.

So here's where we are. I think we're getting close to actually having what I call a ready-for-public-comment version of the policy. So not to be confused with is this final? And the way I look at this map—and this is another [way]. When we are doing our schedule, we actually have a detailed schedule for every one of these recommendations. But for you, this is how I look at it. Are we done with the collection?

Here, we have reopened it because name server IP address. But I think we're done now that we have that resolved. So, Sam, I think you may want to change the color on this one. Then the other ones—the transfer—we're doing pretty good with our Rec 7 implementation, like this one, the Org field. If it's not the Rec 12-dependent or DPT-dependent, or these things that we have identified as a dependency, then I think we can close this.

Publication is something that we're working on. But the retention here, Rec 15 and Rec 21 from the Phase 2, I think we are done with these in terms of recommendations. So I think we can close this. We have finished our section 13 that had to do with Rec 15, anyway. This is all resolved and completed. So we can, Sam, turn this into green and we're done with this.

---



---

And the DPA here. DPA, probably we want to keep it open as a yellow. But hearing the comment from Alex and wanting to hear more about the DPA, I'm planning to bring some folks to you. And with that, who's been working with the ICANN Org team—present to you the status of the DPA in one of our sessions. So look out for that.

The other thing that I was probably wanting to do is show you this. Do you remember this? We used to keep track of our projects in a general, high-level timeline. So when we got hit with Rec 7 and we had to wait, we stopped tracking timeline and tracking—updating you on this—because we couldn't quite predict when Rec 7 would be resolved. But we got there. So we are implementing that in our language document.

The other things that are ... RDAP is ... You heard from Marc a report. I think they're doing pretty well. We're going to get there soon. And this is the DPA I just talked about. We're going to give you a report. And Rec 12, this is the one that is outside of our control, still, that has a dependency to our schedule.

By my attempt will now be ... Okay. Yeah. You haven't looked at this? You can look at it at any time. I don't have to show it to you. This is your document. It's been here. So what we are going to do is try to guess at a date and that's what we'll do to go forward because, importantly, this is where I am focused on. This is public comment opening. This is the date we need to hit for everything else to flow because everything else, like the 18 months of the implementation, we've already agreed. We've had lengthy discussions so I'm not going to reopen that discussion.

---

So the only thing that we have to do is hit this date, open public comment, and I think it will flow unless, of course, we receive some huge public comment that alters our course of events and things like that. But I don't think we will. So this team has been very, very diligent on looking at every detail with every angle. So I think that's where we ... Beth, do you want to speak? Go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Sure. Thanks, Dennis. First of all, I don't know if you're following the chat but there's a lot of love for your charts. You guys, these are next-level charts. There's color-coding. There's linking. My little nerd heart is so happy. And I will take just a moment to say thank you to the entire ICANN staff because you guys have done so much work. Even the chart is ridiculous levels of work. But so much work on this and just really appreciate it. It's giving me a little boost to hear that we're going to go through the OneDoc and clean it up. It's very exciting.

My specific question, though, now that I'm done gushing over how great everyone is, and everyone else on the team, too, it says 2022 for public comment. When are we thinking? When do you think we're thinking, the month? I know. I don't want to be salty but when are we thinking? But yeah.

DENNIS CHANG:

Here is what I'm going to tell you. Beth, tune in at the next IRT meeting and you'll find out. How's that for a teaser? But the reason that I'm saying that is because I want to get a feel for how I'm going to predict the future by pointing to you and just showing you how I'm looking at

---

the policy. See? Section 1, introduction, I think we're done. Section 2, we're done. Section 3, we're done. Section 4, as I said, as soon as I have my date, I'm going to plug in the date and then we're done with Section 4.

Section 5, I'm going to work on this language. And thank you. I think Sarah already provided some languages here. We're going to talk about this. After everything else is done with this OneDoc, we're going to talk about this and we're going to hit this language and get this one done.

Section 6 ... This is going to be renumbered 7. I think we're done. We know what our collection policy is and this is, of course, waiting for Rec 12. But I am going to try to [step] the best prediction that I can make on the Rec 12 outcome and how it impacts the Section 7.

Then Section 8 is the transfer. Remember this is the thing that we waited for, for a very, very, very long time—Section 8 or Rec 7. But we're down to this. What I'm hearing is if we're okay, we're going to accept this suggestion and we'll be done with the transfer section. Ooh-wee.

And of course, the data escrow section, we have registrant organization in here. So that may be the only thing that's left. We have some comments from here, from Sarah, with the tech stuff. We'll need to talk about this, Sarah. And I promise you, we'll resolve it one way or the other.

Section 10, publication section is done, I think, as of today. It looks really good. You guys like it? I think Section 10 is done. Redaction section? Yeah. We made a lot of changes. It looks like a lot of changes but they're

---

all good changes and it doesn't change the requirement at all. Section 10 is done. Disclosure, oh my gosh. Do you remember our discussion on disclosure? One-day, two-day, one-hour discussion. We're done with that. That was a hard thing to do but we got through that.

Log file, we're done with this. Look how clean that is? And then retention requirement for the registration data, we're done with number 13. Our addendum looks clean, our implementation note. A is clean. B, we just made some changes. C is clean. D, there is something here we need to talk about. Sarah, I promise you we'll do that. And then F, there's some more things that we want to talk about. I think there was a comment which I cannot find.

We need to talk about what our priority is. What's what I wanted to hear from you. Background, approaches ... So where do you ...? Now we have some time and this is where I need IRT's assessment because I have mine. Where do you see the items that could take us a longer time—like "requirement-driving section?" Where do you see that? Do you see anywhere? What are you most concerned about or what are you most uncomfortable with? If we're going to put a date out there to the public, which would you say is the number-one risk in your radar? Do you want to look at the map?

BETH BACON:

Sorry, Dennis. Are you asking what we think that we're going to get the most public comments on what you think is our biggest hurdle to getting to that stage?

---

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Biggest hurdle to get to the public comment. Open public comment is the flag that I'm waving. Let's get there, open public comment. Where do you think is the number-one item? The DPA? Yes. I agree. DPA. Anything else? Yeah, dependencies, number 12. We're going to have to take a guess. Org field, yeah. Clearly recognize it's out of our control. I agree. Number 12, yes. Rec 12. Where else? What other things do you see as an open item, still, for the IRT. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Dennis. I also just love this chart. Thank you, everyone who put work into it. The impacted policies—the other ones—that felt like we did a lot of work to look at them and see what else needed to change. Did we just go over that that I missed it or where are we on those guys? Is there a lot left to do there? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Excellent point. Okay. Let's look at that. The impacted policy is not there. It's here. We're almost finished. This is it, Rec 27. There's one more left. That's CL and D. We have it in our list of documents that we're reviewing but I think that ... Let's see CL and D. Where is it? I think that's interesting was Jody who asked for more examples so we're working on more examples. Where is CL and D? Somebody point it out to me. Oh, Rec 12. Okay. Org field. That's Org field. Here it is, RedDoc.

So RedDoc is the document we call redline document. This is the CL and points D. We were done with this except the only thing that we have left ... We were done with this Red ... We added a couple of examples. But we got a comment from Jody who said that these examples made it

---

more confusing instead of clarifying. So we're rethinking these implementation examples here and coming up with a different way to present to you.

Obviously, it's one version in a regular format. The other is the redacted version and maybe a third one. But we're almost done with that and we'll present that to you again. But that's the last one. That's how close we are.

SARAH WYLD: We're so close.

DENNIS CHANG: We've done a ton of work.

SARAH WYLD: Totally. So going back to the status map, I think there are so many that we can close out with just a little bit more work. I'm not sure that there's any that really need to be prioritized higher. The Org field, were waiting on from the Board and the effective date. So I feel like we could just work through the remaining yellow items in the order they appear, like by number, because why not?

And then, just the other thought that I have about the DPA—because I had mentioned in the chat that that's something that is important but we cannot control it. But the other half of that thought is our work to complete the policy language is not dependent on that DPA. We can come out with a fully-formed, completed policy, get it reviewed in

---

public comment. It can't go live into the world, and live, and be used until the DPA can accompany it. But we can have it ready to go. So certainly, I think we can't let that hold up our work—not that anyone—

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. That's exactly what I was thinking, too, Sarah. That's why I wanted to bring the team—our DPA team—of course, Beth and Beth's counterpart on the ICANN Org site. Come to the IRT as a team and tell us about the DPA. Once we all understand what the DPA is and how it relates to our policy language, I think we'll all make the same conclusion that we don't have to wait for that thing. We can finish our policy language here on Section 5 and get on with it and go to public comment. That's what I'm thinking. But we'll reserve that discussion after we hear from the DPA team. Okay. That's really good to hear.

So advise me. If you think of something, contact me. Let me know before I present a date to our management, and commit myself, and commit all of you to a date because you know what happens. Things could happen. And I don't want to spend our time explaining why the schedule was changed. I really don't. I don't think that is a value-added task for me. But I know that, as a product manager, I have to do that. It's not something that I would rather ... I would just set out a date, and meet it, and then be done with it.

So that's how we're going to go do this. Thank you all for your support. Now we have one more on the IRT who's going to help us. I'm so happy that we're all here and getting it done. Thank you so much.

---

So that is the end of my agenda for the day. If you have any other ... Oh. By the way, did you see your name, Steve? You're number 37. And you're the only SSAC representative so I think we have more diversity. Thank you so much.

STEVE CROCKER: Happy to be helpful, for your choice of values of helpful.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Anything else?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm just finishing a quick point in the chat.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'm calling the conclusion of this meeting so speak up if you want to. I have to be honest. I can't follow the chat closely while I'm running these meetings. So point something out to me if you need to.

STEVE CROCKER: I just was curious what the reference to requiring input from the Board—

DENNIS CHANG: On Rec 12?



---

STEVE CROCKER: On whatever it was, on the Org field.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Org field.

STEVE CROCKER: Having sat on the Board for many years, any time something is mentioned, "We're waiting for the Board to decide," sends shivers down my spine.

DENNIS CHANG: At least you know it's not you.

STEVE CROCKER: It isn't that the Board is incompetent or composed of [inaudible] but there isn't that much bandwidth available and it's delegating upward.

DENNIS CHANG: Exactly. I think that's what we've been suffering from is the priority on the Board. The Board has much more higher-priority items to think about and deal with. And our Rec 12 is waiting in its queue for this to be resolved. The GNSO has done their part. They've done a very, very good job of responding to the Board. So I can explain more to you later if you're more interested.

---

STEVE CROCKER: It's worse than that. The Board is not actually competent or organized in a way to answer those kinds of questions. What it really mean is that it's been bounced over to ICANN staff, or usually Legal or something like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Anyway, I'm tracking it so I will report back to you on how that's going. And we have ICANN staff here, on the IPT side who's working to make that happen. Let's see. What else? I think that's it for me. Anyone else? We'll see you in a couple weeks, then. Say goodbye. Thank you, Beth.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Bye, now. Bye, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**