SAMANTHA MANCIA:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting held on Wednesday, 30th of March 2022 at 17:00 UTC.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting held on Wednesday, 30th of March 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'll turn it over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sam. My goodness. You did that so well. So nice. Let's see. Today is the 30th of March, it's at the end, right? I see we have one more day. Welcome, everyone, to another IRT meeting.

I have sort of an announcement, bittersweet. I wanted to share that our team member Andrew here is leaving ICANN and tomorrow is his last day. So I wanted to take a moment and thank him for his services, supporting us for a very long time, working very closely with Amanda, of course. I wanted to give him a chance to say farewell to the IRT whom he spent so much time with. So go ahead, Andrew.

ANDREW DICKSON: Hey, thanks so much, Dennis. Hey, everyone. Yeah, thanks so much for giving me the chance to say goodbye. I haven't exactly been the loudest voice in the room. So I think this is probably the first time that some of you guys are hearing from me, but I did want to say thanks for the opportunity to work alongside you guys. It's been really interesting work with interesting people. So I'm really grateful for that. So I'll be watching for when we get to implementation, and we'll celebrate a bit when that happens. So thanks again.

DENNIS CHANG: Certainly, I'll be sure to invite you back for the celebration when we go publish our policy and become effective too. So I don't know if those of you, if you knew that Andrew is actually a Canadian. He's from Canada. He's a Canadian lawyer and he just passed the bar here in California, and is going to do some lawyerly work. For those of you lawyers, that probably will be interesting to you. Of course, as he said, he's been quiet on the IRT call, but in the background, he has done really, really good quality work to make this easier for us, all of us. So thank you, Andrew. Just one last IRT meeting. Let's see how much progress we can make today.

Welcome, everyone, again. I have one trivia. So this is for Andrew, too. But do you know how many IRT meetings we had in total? Guess a number. How many IRT meetings? Too many, okay. Okay, fine. You guys aren't playing along. In the thousands. No. I meant our IRT, Registration Data IRT. Okay. So let me make it easier. How many in-person Registration Data Policy IRT meeting have we had? Sam reminded me of

this number and I was surprised. Beth, you're pretty close. It's actually three. Yeah.

So how do we know? Well, we don't really keep track of how many in-person meetings. I know Sam does, but I use this sheet. This is our attendance sheet. Our team is tracking the attendance of all the IRT meetings and this is #27 meeting today, and we mark who attends. So I know it's 27 but I look at ICANN73 we just had that was virtual. But going back all the way to the beginning, and I see that the last time we got together was I think ICANN67 back in March of 2020 when we had to shut everything down and go totally remote. So hopefully, we'll have a few more in-person meetings before we're done. And ICANN74, as you know, is being planned to be in person, and that is what we call a hybrid meeting. We are going to let you know more about that when we get closer, probably at next IRT meeting. Andrea would have some news on that.

So looking forward to seeing everyone and let's get on with the agenda. Question from the RDAP Working Group. Marc. Marc is here. He was the first one here. He's like the—what do you call those students who is always on time?

MARC ANDERSON: Teacher's pet. That hurts, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, you don't like it? It's supposed to be a compliment.

MARC ANDERSON: It has kind of a bad connotation.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. In the States, I guess in America, it is? Bad is good, good is bad kind of thing. Anyway, I know that we had this discussion last time. Last time we finished the answer #2, so you got the answer there. So that answer I hope was communicated to the RDAP Working Group. We were getting into this discussion about #1, differentiation, real e-mail and non-real e-mail, and whether or not we need to indicate that it needed to be redacted or not. What I wanted to do is, hopefully, we can have some more in-depth discussion and finish this. But before I let you go, I wanted to maybe turn over the floor to Gustavo to show you all what he has added to this document. Perhaps that can support or make it easier to facilitate the discussion. So, Gustavo, do you want to perhaps share your screen?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah, sure.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Thank you, Gustavo, for doing this.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Can you make me a host, Samantha, please? Or, Dennis, could you make me a host? I don't know who is the host for this meeting.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: It's not giving me the option. I think you have to do it, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let me see if I can do it.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: You have the superpowers.

DENNIS CHANG: I have the superpower. Yay. Okay. You are now the co-host. Excellent. I can see you.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Correct. So for those of you who are new to the conversations, we were discussing about Section 10.2.2 in the One Doc. Section 10.2 deals with redaction. And within that redaction section, we have the requirement that registrars must publish an e-mail, an e-mail address or a link to a web form to facilitate the communication with the contact, and that they must not identify the contact of the e-mail address.

During the conversations of the IPT, we were wondering if there was some kind of expectation that an RDDS user should be able to differentiate between cases when you have like a real e-mail address, like case A that you have on your screen, or case B when you have an anonymized e-mail address, which is what this Section A in 10.2.2 is requiring that you provide some kind of e-mail address. That is not the real one but can allow that communication with the relevant parties.

So we were trying to tap on your brains to know from the past what was the expectation was discussed. It appears that some folks believe that that was the expectation. All folks believe that is not the expectation. So we took a step back in the IPT conversations, and now we have a new set of questions. So we were looking at the recommendation analysis, and we were wondering if Section A of 10.2.2—I'm going up, sorry, guys, for the scrolling—but this text that we have here that I have highlighted, which basically requires the registrars to publish that, let's say, anonymized e-mail address or a link to a web form, if this is one type of redaction because from Rec 10, there it suggests on the e-mail. But then Rec 13 defines the actual treatment regarding the e-mail address.

So we were confused. Well, there were some folks in the IPT that believes that it's a type of redaction. Other folks believe it's not. So this is a question for you guys. What do you think is that requirement in Section A 10.2.2 a form of redaction? And if you believe that is a form of redaction, then should the requirement of the redact definition that says that somehow you should indicate that the value is redacted shall apply to that case? So the floor is yours. So let's start the conversation. Is that requirement in A is a type of redaction or not?

DENNIS CHANG: Hands? Is this subject understandable? Can everybody follow it?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yes. So the question is, is that requirement, which is highlighted on your screen, is that considered a type of redaction or not? Sarah, please.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I have a question. If we decide yes, it is a type of redaction, what is the implication of that? Or if we decided not, what happens?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Well, if we decide that it's a type of redaction then the next question is, we agree in the past that when we are doing redaction, we don't show the actual value, the real value. That's already there because we are saying that you need to show a web form or some kind of anonymized e-mail address. So we are in compliance with A or B word redact or definitional redact with capital R. But we need to say something about this, right? I mean, what is going to happen with that signaling that the value is redacted or not? So if we say yes, it's a type of redaction, then the question is, is there a need to signal to the end user that that's not the real value? And if we say yes, we also need to signal to the RDDS user that that e-mail address is not the real value, then that answer will provide the input to the RDAP Working Group that is needed, because the RDAP Working Group, well, not the RDAP Working Group but the IETF is working on a draft on how to signal redaction to the RDAP users. So that input will be really important because then that draft will be updated to consider these potential cases in which you are replacing a value that you need to signal that redaction of placing of that value.

Obviously, we will need to decide what to do with legacy WHOIS because legacy WHOIS, there is no requirement right now about how to signal that. I was just showing an example that, I don't know, maybe we can just add the word anonymized or not real or something. But here I

think that we need to understand if that is a type of redaction or not. And if it's a type of redaction, if we say yes, then we need to signal the end user that the value was redacted.

DENNIS CHANG: I see Steve's hand. Do you want to give him the floor? Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Sarah asked what I thought was the relevant question. Let me take it a step further. If somebody is shown the anonymized e-mail, and then they send a message, what happens after that? Do they get a response back from that anonymized e-mail? Or do they get a response back from the real e-mail address, or do they get something else entirely? So the common sense question here is, in what sense is it redacted? I think it'd be helpful just to get a picture of what actually is going on here, and then whether or not this meets the exact precise notion of redaction can be understood better.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: On the chat, Sarah is mentioning that there is no policy requirement for a response.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, that's one answer. But what happens if they actually do get an answer?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I think that maybe Sarah has a raised hand. So I don't know if you want to participate, Sarah.

STEVE CROCKER: Sara is asking what happens where? Somebody contacts the registrant by using this pseudonymized e-mail address, and they get an answer back, does that pierce the pseudonymization or is the pseudonymization preserved?

SARAH WYLD: Steve, I think that that would reveal the real e-mail address because they're just responding like a normal e-mail. So there's no expectation that the contact service that forwards the e-mail from the anonymized one to the real one, there's no expectation that that would result in a method to respond anonymously also. Is that what you're asking? I hope that helps.

STEVE CROCKER: No, no. I'm trying to understand the cases. So, clearly, if there's no response, then there's no response. But if there is a response, then doesn't that pierce the pseudonymization?

SARAH WYLD: But that would be the domain owner deciding to respond.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not objecting to it. I'm just trying to understand it. It's just peculiar, in a sense, to think how much is being hidden. So I don't know whether you want to call it redacted or not. But I think it has to be understood that if there was a response, then that response is going to include the real e-mail address of the person. Do with that what you will. But I like your question, basically, what's the purpose of trying to be precise about whether that is a redaction or it isn't a redaction.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Steve. You can lower your hand.

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. Thank you. Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah, you're next.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Glad to hear that it was a helpful question for more than just me. So it seems to me that this is a form of redaction because we are only publishing a forwarding e-mail or web form URL if the real contact is redacted. So it's redacted by replacement instead of redacted by replacement with other information that's useful rather than just by replacement with redacted for privacy values. So I would say yes. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for your input. Beth?

BETH BACON: Thanks. Hi, friends. I think yes, I agree with Sarah on it's redacted. And just to get to Steve's point, I appreciate the down the line in gray. But I think that since this policy is just governing what registries and registrars have control over and what our choices are, this will be redacted on our end. And any sort of, as you say, piercing the shield is a choice of the domain name registrant, should they respond or not respond, and I think that's something they understand through whatever service that they have engaged with. So I think that it's fine. I don't have a huge concern with that going down the line, but I appreciate to see you flag at that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I think I saw Alex's input on the chat, too. He believes this is a form of a redaction, too. Sarah, did you have anything more to say?

SARAH WYLD: No, I forgot to lower my hand. Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So I think you're getting good input from the IRT. Let me turn it over to Marc Anderson. Marc? Is that enough of a clarification that you can take back to the working group?

EN

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Dennis, sorry. I think that we have only answered one question which is the first question, is it a form of redaction. Now the next question is, if we are saying that it's a form of redaction, then that means that we must indicate the values redacted somehow to the end user. I think that that's the next question.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So before we try to answer that question, yes, the requirement is that it must be indicated. How it's indicated, is that something IRT we have to decide here as a policy, or can we leave that to the working group?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So you're saying that the answer to this question we should have highlighted is yes? Are we in agreement with that this is yes?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, it seems like this. That's what I'm hearing from everyone. I heard so far from—I haven't heard any objection. So that's a yes. Roger has a hand up. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I think the yes your hearing is that it is a form of redaction. Now, I'm not sure everybody agrees with … what I think Gustavo was trying to get to is the A and B here at the bottom of the screen. I think everybody thinks it's a form, not specifically redaction, but a form of redaction. I think Gustavo's question on it is, should that

EN

be indicated as redacted? There are fields that are truly redacted and don't display data have the identifier saying that it's redacted. But if you're including data, how do you trigger that?

DENNIS CHANG: I'm sorry. Maybe I'm not following you. Didn't we agree that this E is the policy requirement, that it must indicate the value is redacted? If it's redacted, it must indicate. That's our policy, right? Do you agree?

ROGER CARNEY: That's when data is not provided. Again, I think people are saying this is a form of redaction. This isn't something people thought about. So when you don't pass back data and you pass back redacted, or whatever it is, when you're not passing back data, then you need to indicate that it was redacted. But how do you indicate that it was redacted when you're passing back data? I think that's the thing. Maybe I'm wrong, Gustavo. Maybe that's not what you're trying to get at. Thanks.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: No. That's specific, the question. I think that I'm not asking the how, and yes, we need to indicate somehow that the value is redacted. I mean, there are solutions, right? For example, for WHOIS, and yes, an example, they write there a yes, came up with maybe you need to show like anonymized between parentheses or not real. I don't know. Something. But I think that the first question that we need to answer is, do we need to signal to the RDDS user or to the legacy WHOIS user or RDAP user that this value is not real, it's not the real e-mail address, it's

EN

something else. It's an anonymized e-mail address, or in the future, I don't know if it's a privacy/proxy or something else, not the real e-mail address. So the question here is, do we need to indicate or not? And the question came to be because what we said in the past is, when you redact something, you don't show the value, which is A, that you indicate that to the end user. So that's the question for you guys. I'm not asking the how, I'm asking yes, if we need to signal that to the end user or not.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's let Alex speak next. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks. Yeah, I think this obligation is crystal clear unlike others in the policy. If it's redacted, which we just agreed it is for e-mail address, it must indicate that the value is redacted. So I think to answer Gustavo's question, the answer is yes. I think that's pretty clear. I don't see how we could interpret it any other way. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Alex. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Let me argue the other way. This data, pseudonymized e-mail address is one way of masking who the real registrant is. Another way to mask who the real registrant is is if the registrant provides an e-mail address that is somehow dissociated with the rest of his identification, in which

case, the registrar would publish that data as real data. And so you would wind up with the user seeing what could be similarly looking e-mail addresses, one of which is created by the registrar as a way of pseudonymization, and the other is created by the registrant with the same purpose. So the question is what's the distinction between those and what does it mean to mark one of those as redacted and the other as not redacted? Both of them are masking access to the regular e-mail address for that user.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Sorry, Steve. But the question is coming from the requirement to a particular service that is provided by the contracted parties, right? So the contracted party, I don't think that they know that you as a registrant created a different e-mail address, which is masking the real e-mail address or e-mail address that you use for this kind of stuff. The question here is because there is a requirement to the contracted party that regardless of—because they don't know the intention of the e-mail address you provided that whatever is provided—they could not provide that real data that was collected from the registrant but they need to provide something else in that registrant e-mail address, which is basically a requirement that is here.

STEVE CROCKER: I understand. That's the way if you sort of just read it step by step that that's what's going on. But if you look at it from an overall point of view, what's the difference as seen by the user, by the requester? He's asked for data on how to reach the registrant, he gets data on how to reach

the registrant, and there's no operational way in which you can determine whether or not that was a masking e-mail address that was created by the registrar or a masking e-mail address that was created by the registrant. What is he going to do with the indicator that says that's redacted? What does that tell him that he can make any use of?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I don't know if that signal is going to be really critical or important to the RDDS user. Just trying to have an interpretation of the recommendations from the report and interpretation of what we have agreed that redaction is and is not.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, that puts you in the position of saying, "Well, I don't know why we're doing it but we're told to do it, so we're doing it."

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Well, we agreed that if the value is not provided, we need to say that it was redacted.

STEVE CROCKER: You did provide the data.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: You provide not the real data, right? That's why—

STEVE CROCKER: It's as real as any data could be.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I'm not arguing that real changes trying to come up with understanding of what the recommendations and what the EPDP agree to do.

STEVE CROCKER: You've got a logical contradiction, which the response is, "But this is what we were told to do, so we're going to do it," but it makes no sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Sorry, Steve. I've run into that many times. We try to remember what our charter is and not over guess or judge the value of the recommendation itself. I think our implementation is pretty clear. I think a lot of people are agreeing that it's clear. If it's redacted, we must indicate that it is redacted. I see a lot of agreements on the chat, too. So let me turn it over to Roger. Steve, if you could lower your hand.

ROGER CARNEY: I just wanted to follow up on a couple of things. Alex has said in chat twice now that if the value of the e-mail field is not what the registrar or whoever provided, then it's obviously redacted. I don't think that that's true. I mean, it's probably redacted but it also could be just an invalid—someone may have messed it up at the contracted party. So I don't know that you can say, "If it's not what they provided then it's redacted," because it could be just incorrect. So I think he had to be

careful there. Maybe Alex can jump on and if he doesn't agree or understand that.

The other thing I wanted to make clear is we're talking about what is published through—okay, I'll try to explain, Alex. What is published through RDAP and not what's displayed to an end user. RDAP provides back that a value has been redacted, and how that gets displayed is up to the client systems. I know that there is work going on in IETF to allow for this special case redacted because redacted means no data. But there is data here, so it's a special case redacted and it's actually a replacement for a redacted. I know IETF is working on that. I'm not concerned that why it decided on B yes or no. IETF will solve that for us either way so it works out okay. I think everybody's leaning that they make sense that it's indicated because that's the requirements for other redacted. But I do want to recognize that this is not the same as redacted as in not providing data, this is redacted and providing data. There is a difference. I think that that's what Gustavo was trying to get across and try to get the answers to.

But to Alex's point on e-mail, I mean, if you go out and look at someone's WHOIS data today and the e-mail address is 123@something, whatever, it's probably incorrect data, not necessarily what was provided. So again, I don't think you can assume that what if there's data there that it's just redacted. I think that that's the whole point of it should be indicated as well because then you know it is. Otherwise, when you get it and you say, "Well, that's not their real e-mail address," or you don't think it is, then you can question that. Otherwise, if it's just always redacted, then you can't even question it. Does that make sense, Alex?

ALEX DEACON: No. I think we have to assume. Don't we have to assume that the registry or registrar in this is doing the right thing?

ROGER CARNEY: Well, you could assume that, but then you're assuming all WHOIS data or RDDS data is accurate 100% of time.

ALEX DEACON: I'm not following. I'm not too sure it's relevant, this accuracy discussion. We can have it if you want.

ROGER CARNEY: We don't need to have it. You just brought it up and I was just clarifying it.

ALEX DEACON: Oh, I didn't bring up accuracy. I wouldn't do that. This is not an issue. My point had nothing to do with accuracy. It was just a simple statement that said, "Any e-mail value that is not the value provided by the registrants when they signed up for the domain"—I've written it twice. I'm lost now I think in this conversation, so maybe I need to go back and look. I'm not understanding what's going on.

EN

ROGER CARNEY: All I wanted to do was say I don't think your assumption that it obviously just it has to be redacted is correct because there's other scenarios that it could be. Thanks.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Just one comment. I think that we need to be technology agnostic because the policy that we're trying to define here is technology agnostic. That's one of the objectives. If we decide that we need to signal that to the RDDS user, we will need to define how to do these in all the different services. And those services are the legacy WHOIS, WHOIS port 43, Web WHOIS, and also on RDAP. So I think that we should focus on the technology agnostic questions. I mean, how can we interpret those recommendations about not providing the real value, let's say, that was collected from the registrant? Obviously, the question is, is that redaction, and if we need to signal to the end user? So let's continue the conversation. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Gustavo. This has been a great discussion. I think one thing I want to say is this is certainly a use case. This is a scenario that we didn't consider in the working group. If that's not clear, I think it should be set. It's not something we talked about either way. It's a particular scenario that applies under the Temporary Specification as well. It's policy that's in place right now based on the Temporary Specification and something that was adopted in the Phase 1 recommendations.

So the way it was implemented in WHOIS was to not provide any signal at all, and that's what we had at the time the Temporary Specification

first came out. We hadn't really implemented RDAP at that point, at least not broadly so. So under the existing WHOIS, with the e-mail field where an anonymized e-mail address or web form is provided, that information is just put as the value for the e-mail address, and there's no signal or indication. That's been fine. That has worked fine and has been sufficient for everybody. So for that reason, I would not want to make any changes to WHOIS implementations.

Now, in the RDAP Working Group, and I'll further say, at no point in our discussions have we even considered this either as part of the IRT discussions. It only really came up during the RDAP Working Group discussions about how to implement these recommendations because we have this new redacted extension. So we have this new tool in RDAP that provides a way to clearly signal when a field has been redacted. So given that we have this new field in RDAP that we can leverage, the question came up, okay, do we add the e-mail field? Where for the e-mail field and anonymized e-mail address or web form is provided? Do we add the e-mail field to this redacted extension or not? Again, this is not something we discussed or considered or anything like that. I think you could make an argument either way. I think there are pros and cons to both approach. So, I don't think there's a clear, easy answer. I think that's obviously indicated, but I think this is our fourth meeting where talked about this. So I think this is an implementation decision. I think this is clearly within the scope of our discussions here. But I think there isn't a clear-cut answer based on the recommendations.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So, Marc, you're saying that the answer to this question should be no, right, that we continue to do what we're doing right now? There is no requirement to signal that, is that correct?

MARC ANDERSON: No. I've tried to be neutral in this. I think you could make a valid argument for either approach, and I think there are pros and cons for either approach. I think I would not want to make changes to WHOIS. I know we want to be technology agnostic, and I've been a proponent of that, but I don't want to have to make any changes or do something unnatural WHOIS. We have an existing implementation that's worked and I would like to stick with that for WHOIS. With RDAP, though, we have a new tool. We have this redaction extension. I think, basically, the question is do we include the e-mail address in that RDAP redacted extension or not. So that's my two cents. I hope that's helpful.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Let me try to understand and let's see if I explain it correctly. So I think that what you are saying is maybe we should answer this with yes. And in Addendum 1, let's say that we don't need to implement this in WHOIS. Like, yes, we need to signal that to the RDDS user. But in the case of legacy WHOIS, there is no need to implement this requirement. Is that correct? Because I'm trying to have like a technology agnostic policy but also be able to point to the actual requirements. So that's the question. So what you're trying to say is yes, we can signal that you'll be clearing the technology agnostic part of the policy, let's say, and then in Addendum 1 that deals with WHOIS, we can say, by the way, regarding

this requirement, you don't need to do it in WHOIS. Is that what you are suggesting?

MARC ANDERSON: I'm going to try and give you a little bit of a weaselly answer and say that I would not be opposed to that. I wasn't suggesting one approach or the other. But if that's the approach we landed on, I would not object to it.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Okay. Sarah?

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I similarly think that that would be a workable approach. So what I understand from the RDAP Working Group, which is, admittedly, imperfect, is that this redaction extension is sort of displayed as like a list of elements that are redacted. So what a person would see, and I'm not really considering what the client does to it, but my experience with RDAP is that I enter a URL in my browser and it shows me the RDAP output, right? So what a person would see would be in the e-mail field, they might see a real e-mail or they might see a web form or a forwarding e-mail created by the registrar. And if it is either of those latter two things, then the e-mail field is considered to have been redacted. So in the list of which things are redacted, it says e-mail. So

EN

even though there's output that is different than the words redacted for privacy in that field, it's still provided in the redacted list. I think that's the closest to what the recommendations want and what is understandable to a user. I also support not changing WHOIS requirements. Thank you.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So we need to enter into the RDAP conversation right now. I mean, we should define what the requirements are from the technology agnostic and whatever is required with the draft regarding redaction in RDAP will be updated to support whatever we need. I mean, it's still a draft, so it's not that such big of a deal if we need to do something different there. So just to be sure, what we're saying. This is back to my understanding of what is the end result of this revision is. At some point, we could modify this text that we have here and must indicate that the value is redacted, just to be clear to the implementers that this is the requirement that you publish an e-mail address or a link to a web form that is the anonymous e-mail address. And you also indicate if it's redacted because if that's what's some of this conversation then we will need to do the change to 10.2.2. And if we say that WHOIS should not be updated to support this then we can say that in Addendum 1 if that's what we're saying here. Is yes one of the potential solutions, right? We'd remove this text?

DENNIS CHANG: Roger has his hand up.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Maybe you just saw it, Gustavo, I don't know. It looked like it was only applying to registry operators and not registrars. So maybe you already fixed that. I'm sorry.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. We will need to see how. I think that we need to answer this question. One answer could be yes but not for WHOIS. I think that's what we're saying here. So is this what we agreed to? I'm asking the group.

ALEX DEACON: I don't agree we should be excluding WHOIS here. I appreciate why people would want to do that. But is it appropriate for us to be doing this here in the IRT? I'm not too sure we can or should make a decision here. If you're asking for my opinion, then no, I would object to excluding WHOIS. But that's my opinion.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Okay. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: A couple of things. I see what Steve Crocker put in chat. To me, I think that is one of the main arguments against doing this. I think also within the IETF, there are some discussions on this. Around are there other values that could be provided other than redacted? So I think this is an active discussion within the IETF. I appreciate that we don't we want to be technology agnostic and we don't want to bring the technology into

the discussion here. I've been a supporter of that as well. But I think we can't ignore that this is recognized as a scenario within the IETF, and they're considering if there's something that can be done around this as well as potentially providing a way to indicate if it's a privacy/proxy value or not, for example, with an eye towards future potential needs for the extension. So I understand this is an ongoing discussion.

Separate point, though, in answer to Alex, I know Alex doesn't agree with excluding WHOIS. I can certainly appreciate why, but I'd say we are excluding it in WHOIS under existing implementations, under the Temporary Specification, and how this policy has been drafted up until now, we have been excluding it in WHOIS. For all of the redacted fields, we provide redacted, but for registrars in their WHOIS response where the it's the e-mail field instead of providing word redacted, registrars are instead required to provide an anonymized e-mail address or web form. So that is the requirement and that is what they've been doing. So I certainly appreciate your perspective here but I don't look at it as excluding it in WHOIS. Rather, there's additional functionality, additional tools in RDAP, and we're trying to agree on the best way to leverage this new technology that has additional features and functionality.

DENNIS CHANG: Berry, go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Dennis. Gustavo, can you scroll up to your Option A, B, and C? I think kind of building on what Marc is saying here, from the Temp

Spec or when this policy becomes effective in WHOIS at least, we see these three examples today or we're going to see these three examples tomorrow. In essence, as I noted in the chat, the policy deliberations with respect to the processing of these three fields pretty much confirms what is listed in the Temp Spec.

So for the purposes of trying to get past the RDAP Working Group's issue here, and like Sarah, this is where I always get tripped up between what the protocol can do versus what would be displayed on the client or how it is displayed via a client, at the end of the day, it's these three fields or these three values that we see right of the colon that need to be presented anytime there's a query. So in terms of the second part—I guess I'm still having trouble understanding how Option A for RDAP, we're good, right? It's a legitimate e-mail address, even as to Rogers point, maybe the name is spelled wrong, but one way or another, RDAP can pass that through. So it really seems to me that it's Options B and C where we're getting tripped up, but why does there need to be this flag in RDAP like all of the other fields where it's triggered off of the redaction flag per what was being developed in the IETF that Marc was talking about?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I really think that we should talk about RDAP here. I mean, it's just a question on what is the requirement? And if we say that this is the requirement, then it's up to the folks working on that draft and the Reg Extension Working Group in the IETF to see how to support this in RDAP. RDAP is really extensible. It can support this and future requirements. I don't know, maybe in the future, you will want to say

that you are using a privacy/proxy. I don't know, maybe in the future ICANN communities will find a policy saying that the e-mail will be replaced by the ID in the metaverse in case that the user is in the metaverse. Who knows whatever comes in the future? I think that the question here is what is the requirement from a technology agnostic view? If we say that the requirement is that there should be some signaling mechanism to say, "Hey, this e-mail address you're seeing here, even if it's a proper e-mail address syntactically valid, it's not real. It's an anonymized privacy/proxy or whatever." If we say that there is no such requirement for that signaling then the answer is no, and that's fine. If we say that the answer is yes, then we need to understand how to implement that in RDAP or legacy WHOIS. Or if we don't want to implement it in legacy WHOIS, that's also fine. Either way, I think that we should not focus on the technology. We should focus on what is the requirement.

Again, I'm neutral. I'm just saying that we should signal or not. I mean, I'm just trying to understand what this group, the IRT, believes should be the requirement. I have at least two answers. One is yes but not in legacy WHOIS. The answer is no. And for this one, very strong opposition to this one. So I'm just trying to understand. And if you mentioned that during the deliberations of the EPDP, that was not the requirement, then the answer is no, and that's fine. It's okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Is there any more input? If not, I think what I need to do is pull back and come back to you all. I think we need to think about this a little more and just land on one way or the other. Of course, I see value in both

EN

sides of the argument but we can't implement both. We have to implement one and have a good reason for it and make sure that whatever we implement is aligned with the recommendation language, whether or not recommendation language is something that all of us support. If all of us agree that the recommendation language is in error then we can of course use the drafting error vehicle.

So is there any more questions, Gustavo, you want to ask? Or, Marc, do you want to ask or not? I think we have to pull back and brainstorm on a potential solution. This is very difficult. I thought you were asking a simple question, Marc. I didn't realize that it was going to get this complicated. I am sorry that we can't give a clear answer to the working group on the policy requirement. But I don't know, maybe you guys can think of something and bring it to us, too.

So I will end that discussion here, Gustavo. I don't think there's anything more we can talk, say about it. I think we spent the whole hour on one good question. So let's move on to our next topic, which I think is another one. Number three, consensus policy redlining for the CL and D. Do you want to display that one, too?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Well, yeah, sure. I also prepared a document to help with this conversation because it's also kind of complex. I mean, after seeing all the different comments under CLD, I think that we need to understand what we want to do with Section 1 of Addendum 1.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So let's start with that conversation. I really like to do documents so I can capture all the things that we have discussed that we are discussing. So that's the way I usually work. So this is a new document for that.

So we've got Section 1 of Addendum 1. The previous text that we have there is basically what we have in the WHOIS advisory, that is for legacy WHOIS, if you have [inaudible] for WHOIS, there is no value in the database, basically. You have two options. One is to show the key, like registrant name with no information in the value. And the second option is to don't show the field.

When we created the WHOIS advisory years ago, as I have mentioned this before, we created the advisory because the policy language on the contracts, they are not very clear on a lot of aspects on how to implement the legacy WHOIS. We were getting a lot of questions from the new TLD participants, "Hey, how do I implement WHOIS 43? Because it's not clear if I need to press space between the column or multiple spaces, or whatever." So we create advisory. In the advisory, we have these two options, show the key with no value and don't show the field, because basically that's what we notice that was happening in the wild. We did a lot of WHOIS queries back in the day to a lot of different contracted parties, and some of them showed the key with the empty value and some of them don't show the field at all. So what we put in the advisory is basically what was happening in the wild.

During the conversations of this IRT, I mentioned that from a technology point of view, I really don't like that we have two options because we are implementing a client of legacy WHOIS. You need to accommodate both options and understand that no value could mean the key with an empty value or not getting the field in the legacy WHOIS. The proposal and the text that is right now in the current One Doc is you only have one option, which is showing the key registrant name with no information value. And this is an example of how the output of a registry could look like if, for example, you're not transferring data from the registrar right.

That's the context. Now, there's a comment from Marc. Marc, maybe you want to elaborate that this text will basically not be in line with the current policy contract language. It won't even be in line with the current implementations. I don't think that the policy or contexts are clear, really. It's just all over the place. So the question here is what do we want to do, guys? Do we want to continue with this text even if that means that maybe some folks that are doing—

DENNIS CHANG: Gustavo, why don't you show the IRT One Doc because Alex is asking, "Where's this Addendum 1?"

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: In the IRT One Doc, we have the Addendum 1, and here you have the text.

EN

DENNIS CHANG: Addendum 1 was established. Then this is a comment that Marc Anderson made. That's why we're talking about this again. So we have a baseline requirement language. As far as I was concerned, we're done with it. But I think Marc here is challenging that and proposing something. I'm not sure. So let's ask Marc to speak up. Steve has a question or has hands up. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I was just going to comment that, again, if you look at it in terms of how this might be interpreted or used by somebody who's receiving this, you could make the case that by showing the key with no data that's different from not showing the key at all in the sense that showing the key shows that you would have collected that data if it had been provided. And by showing the key and the lack of data, you show that no data was provided. Whereas not showing the field at all, could mean that the registrar doesn't collect that data. However, anybody who reads the specification of how that registrar works, assuming that the specification is made public, could figure all that out anyway. Bottom line, it doesn't make any difference.

DENNIS CHANG: So, Steve, you are in favor of going back to the previous text that allows either option?

STEVE CROCKER: I don't have an opinion, frankly. We're spending a lot of time on this. But in terms of the impact on the people that are going to consume this,

they're going to have to build software that operates to treat both A and B as basically the same. So the more time we spend on this, it's time that we're not spending on something useful. So pick whatever you like, and it doesn't matter.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, baseline is what we had already picked. So if Marc is okay and if he's willing to close his comment, then we're done.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yes, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Gustavo, for teeing that up. I think you did a great job teeing up the conversation and discussion. I recognize we did talk about Addendum 1 before, and I guess at the time, I didn't realize the implications of it until you applied that to the CLD edits. At which point, it became clear that there were unintended consequences here. As a registry, I don't ever want to display the registrar expiration date, for example. I think that that's confusing to end users. But under that policy change, I would be required to provide that field value even though I don't provide a value with it. I think that's a bad user experience. I don't want to have to do that as a registry. So I want to have the option of not displaying those fields as was previously the case having Option A and B. I support going back to the original text having A and B.

I'll also add, on top of that, that would be a change to existing practice, I think Gustavo was right in noting that there isn't clearly defined

specifications or policy in this regard, which is why there are different implementations of this in the wild. But this would constitute a change to existing practice that is not rooted in policy recommendations. I'll add that as ammunition to my argument as well.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Okay. Just to understand, Marc, you think that we should support both options? Because another option is to say in the Section 1 Addendum 1, if you don't have data, don't show the field or must not show the field so that we have consistency across all the different implementations, or we can just support both options and maintain things the way they are right now.

MARC ANDERSON: I think I want to think about that. I want to think about that. I was thinking only in terms of going back to the previous having A and B as options, but you provided a third option that I hadn't considered.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I'm providing that option, basically, the comment from Sarah saying that it will make things more confusing if you see the empty fields. So I don't know if Sarah's comment means basically, let's just standardize on not showing the field at all if you don't have the data, and that's it. Your option, let's say. Okay, Alex?

EN

ALEX DEACON: I just want to make a comment. I just want to make it pop up a few thousand feet and just make a general comment about this. I think we're kind of muddying the water here. In preparation for this call, I spent time, I read the original CL and D doc, I read the redline CL and D doc. As we know, these docs did or do reference the advisory. So there's display obligations in the CL and D policy, there's display obligations in the advisory, and now we're adding display obligations in the One Doc. It's very difficult to follow. I think we should take this opportunity to make life easier and simplify what the actual obligations are in a single place instead of spreading it out across the three documents. Again, I'm not as smart as most, but to me, it's very difficult to kind of wrap my head around what was going on, what applied, how it applied, when it applied, and where to find all the obligations that are required here. I think a little bit of work would go a long way to make life easier for not only people like myself who have to read and understand these docs, but the folks that also have to implement it and deploy software. Thanks.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Well, I don't want to enter in the RDAP conversation, but in the case of RDAP, it's going to be pretty simple. You just read these documents and the RDAP Profile and you should be good to be able to implement. The issue with legacy WHOIS is the way that it is. I mean, when I was implementing the registry platform and registry platform for the new TLD or I was working with that back in [inaudible], it was really complex. You need to read the agreements, policies, not only the CLD, you need to read AWIP, CLD, and I don't remember what other policies you need to read, and the advisory. With all of that, then you have a picture of

EN

how to implement legacy WHOIS. It's unfortunate, but I don't think that we are tasked by the EPDP to go and deprecate all those policies and create a legacy WHOIS profile, something that we got for RDAP. I don't know what is the answer to that suggestion. Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Gustavo. Again, I think that I support what Marc was saying and keeping it basically the way it is with 1 and 2. I don't know if they can be a little clearer. Again, the key value that's mentioned in A, I don't know if that matches with B well. Should be just saying you don't need to show key or value. Again, just for clarity, I think that we should stay with where we are here and not be changing because we don't really have any direction to change it. So I would prefer to stay. Thanks.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Don't worry. We have text from the advisory that is clear from a technological point of view how to implement this. This text that is here is yes to facilitate the conversation here.

DENNIS CHANG: That was very valuable for me to hear, Roger and Marc. Whenever I hear your conversation that is connected to recommendations language, I think it gives me a clear direction of where to go. By default, I think this is one of our principal. If there is no specific language, number one, to change the requirement, then we don't change. And then we can talk about the intention afterwards. But if there was no intention to change either, then it's a very clear case. The complication

is when people talk about the intention where disagreement happens within the IRT.

For me, thank you and I appreciate the conversation. But I think this one, we're going to wrap up to a point where the current status quo or providing the option stays as current advisory language will stay, and therefore we're going to revise our Addendum 1 language to reflect exactly that. So you'll see that as our next review request. Alex, did you want to add? Your hand is up.

ALEX DEACON: No. Old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. With that—let's see. Gustavo, do you want to look at CL and D document and go through some of the comments now? Or do you want to step back and—

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: For the CLD, we need to provide as we always provide an answer to the comment in writing within the comment, and then we can discuss that with the IRT.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I noticed that a lot of comments coming in recently. So we do want to respond to you all. But it's good to have this clarity on the requirement first before we reply. I think the step is correct. Thank you

EN

for that discussion, and we'll move on to our next agenda. We got 15 minutes left. Let me see if we can get some stuff done.

I will share my screen. What we're going to do now is to look at the IRT One Doc. What I like to do—of course, this is great fun going through and trying to resolve comments. So policy effective date, I asked you to review this, and I think you see the intent here that the revised work is that we're not specifying a date and this is a version that'll go to public comment. What we're saying is that it'll be 180 days after the policy is announced and the legal notice is issued. What I like to do, if there's no objections, I like to close this and make the Section 4 clean.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: There are hands raised.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you for noting me. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I guess I'm a little confused here and it may just be wording terms here. We know this says no later than being at six months. But we talked about the implementation window of 18 months, didn't we?

DENNIS CHANG: 18 months, correct. You're right. Okay. So funny.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I think that you need to put days, right? I think that days is clear. Months is not clear.

DENNIS CHANG: How many days is it? Give me a date.

SARAH WYLD: 540.

DENNIS CHANG: Of course. So nice to have you here. 540 days. The intent was the 18 months. Thank you for catching that. It is 18 months we agreed to. So what I like to do is go out to public comment with this version of the language. Agreed? Okay. Thank you, Roger.

Next is the—let's see. We're going to skip that. Policy effective date. 9.1.5 is the next one. Oh, this one. I didn't have it on the agenda. But I wanted to show you quickly. Marc suggested that we make this change. It had an extension; ext was a small letter ext, and he suggested that we capitalize the E, which I agree. So I went ahead and changed all the other ext in the document. But I saved this one so that you could see what was done. So go ahead and accept this change, Sam, and we'll move on.

Next, let's see. 9.1.5. This is an important change. It is a real change, 9.1.5 to 9.1.2. This is part of the Rec 12 and it's after the supplemental recommendation came out. And we had already discussed this before. I think we agreed that this registrant organization belongs in the if/must

category, not just the must category. So, if there's no objections, and I didn't see any changes, I think we're going to go with that.

The tech names, this is another item. We had talked about it before and we decided that we take your input that this tech contact information really belongs in the may section. So we made that change.

Addendum 1, I think we talked about it. That's what we were talking about just now. Thank you, Marc, for catching that. The one thing that I do notice myself, too, when I'm looking at the multiple docs at the same time, it occurs to me what we need to do in One Doc does affect the other and it reminds me that the other one has to be changed again for consistency. The Addendum 2 is new. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Are we going to delete Addendum 1? Is that the idea? Just leave the concepts—

DENNIS CHANG: No. We're going to revise to the original advisory language.

ALEX DEACON: Okay. I mean, deleting it but have the same effect, right? Because the advisory still applies.

DENNIS CHANG: No. It does not. Because we issued the advisory so we need to maintain that language here. We took that language out of the advisory

document because the requirement is really here. So we must have the Addendum 1.

ALEX DEACON: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So we're not going delete it. Thank you. Let's see. Addendum 2, Let's see. We said that we will introduce you to this new language. For the pre-existing policy, we will do 1 and 2.

I see a comment from Sarah. Sarah, do you mind explaining your comment? It will help us to evaluate it because we were—

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Can you just scroll to the side a little bit so the whole thing is visible? If you just pull the bottom bar over? Yeah. Excellent. Okay. So the text that's in green here on screen, that matches the recommendation. It is not wrong. But I found it confusing to read so I think it might be confusing to other people. Because in the same sentence, it talks about the registrant reviewing and confirming the data and also talks about agreeing to publication. And I think that those two actions could happen separately. And if they do the first one, they don't have to do the second one. So by putting them together in the same sentence, it might suggest to people that if they do one, they have to do the other. What if we split it up so that there's three items in the addendum? This is my suggestion. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else want to speak? Any of our team wants to opine on this? We did have some internal staff discussion. Okay. Thank you for your suggestion. We'll take that in and see if we can come back to you with a more clear language. I am glad to hear that at least we did not get it wrong. That's always a concern. So first is the requirement agreement. And the second is to refine the language for clarity. Thank you, Sarah.

Next item is the note B.c. We wanted to clear up this. Beth, are you there?

SARAH WYLD: I think Beth had to leave.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh no.

SARAH WYLD: She was here but I think she sent a message a minute ago saying she had to head out.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'll check with Beth. I think it's probably okay. I don't know if somebody else can answer this. But I think this is something that is okay to accept and move on. But she did ask for more time. Now it's been a very long time.

EN

7.6 Okay. Sorry, Sam, I probably … 7.6, this is something that we had already marked up before. And the point here is that with our evaluation of the Recommendation 12, I think our changes here as reflected is accurate. So we're going to keep this. Of course, after we clean up this document, you'll have one more chance to get the whole thing.

That's the plan. Once we clean up as much as we can and take out all the disagreement and we are left to more or less having a good policy language, what we're going to do is reformat the entire thing. Renumber everything to match and then come back to you with a clean document for one more review before we go to public comment. Remember, what we're building here is a version for public comment. Thank you for catching that, Sam. It's good to have her.

F.c. We have F.c. Okay. This one is a revised wording. As you saw—nice. Sarah, thank you for your comment here. I think it got to be such a simple language. There's not much thing for you to be confused about or objected to. This I think, we are going to consider complete. So that's the progress that you see in green.

B.c.d? Didn't we just do B.c.d? We did B.c.d. Or at least c. I'm getting my implementation notes complete. Sarah: "Can we remove..." Was there a reason? We couldn't find the reason why you are suggesting to remove it. Is it okay if we just keep it? Is there any reason at all?

SARAH WYLD: I also don't know why I thought we should remove that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That's okay. Thank you. Oh boy. Okay. Did I run this through—

SARAH WYLD: Sorry, Dennis, could you just go back to that screen for one sec? I just want to read. Yeah, I don't know. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Sam, we're clear to clear this comment from Sarah, and then we can move on. One hour due. We got three minutes left. We didn't get to our drafting error document, but it's okay. They're more or less documenting we've already agreed to. And of course, this is for the purpose of the public comment.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Dennis, there is a hand raised. Oh, never mind.

SARAH WYLD: I just wanted to know when we're going to talk about the Org stuff, but it's probably next meeting. So thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: The Org stuff? Okay. So let's talk about the Org stuff and what you are expecting for the Org stuff discussion. Next meeting, of course, certainly, you can talk about the Org stuff. Some of these things are due at the next meeting. But if you have anything you want to say right now

about the Org stuff, I'd like to hear it before we go to the next meeting. Is there anything that you wanted to mention?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. There was a document that the staff team put together that outlined all of the different requirements and stuff about changes for the org field. That was a really helpful document. Thank you so much to everybody who worked on that. Most of it I think I agreed with, but there were some concerns about some of them that I think I left in comments. Of course, we'll need to address that when we have more than a minute and a half left. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I think this is a document you mean, right? I just want to make sure. You mean this document? This is just our working document. It doesn't go anywhere.

SARAH WYLD: I know but it's super useful. That's a really great way of letting things out.

DENNIS CHANG: It sure was helpful to me. We can talk about this again but we'll keep that for next time then. Thank you, everyone. We got one more minute. Anyone want to have the last word? Here's your chance. Everyone needing to dash. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Of course, thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]