ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the registration data policy IRT meeting being held on Wednesday, the 4th of May 2022 at 17:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Chang, please begin.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Andrea. We have a new member joining the IPT. So I'd like to introduce Danielle Gordon who is part of our gTLD accounts and services team, mainly working on services. And she has been sort of my successor in the work that we do internally at ICANN for project management process and promotion too. So at this time, I'd like to welcome Danielle and then give her the floor for a short introduction. Go ahead.

DANIELLE GORDON:

Thanks, Dennis. Hey, everyone. Nice to meet you all. As Dennis mentioned, I'm on the gTLD accounts and services team. And I've been

with ICANN for about three years now. And I don't know, what else would you like to know, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: I think they probably would appreciate knowing that you work very closely, actually in the same group as Amanda Fessenden. And your expertise is the services that you're designing and delivering for registry and registrars. So all the processes that is being architected and delivered for improvement. And also, she is responsible for all the procedural changes that are impacted by our policy. So it's a great time that she's joining. So she can ask all the questions about what does it mean when we say this policy, that policy? Welcome, Danielle, and this is just a pleasure, because I've worked with her before and she's just fantastic.

DANIELLE GORDON: A lot to live up to, Dennis. Thank you, and nice to meet everyone. And yeah, I'm relatively new, as far as the team goes for the reg data policy, so if you guys have any tips or advice or tidbits that you want to share, please do.

DENNIS CHANG: We want to know where Pierre is.

DANIELLE GORDON: He's sleeping here. Hopefully I'll keep him quiet. Pierre's my border collie. You might hear him join the calls every now and then.

DENNIS CHANG: And that's perfectly fine. He's welcome. Okay, let's move on to the agenda. number two. Andrea, you're learning more about it. We're learning more about it as we approach this first ever, quote unquote, hybrid meeting. So maybe you can tell us about it more, make sure that we provide advance information that we're receiving on our end to help the IRT to prepare for the ICANN 74 session. Go ahead.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. So it's very important that all participants register for the ICANN 74 whether you're going to be in person or not, but especially if you're going to be in person, we're going to have some health and safety guidelines that will only allow us to have a certain number of people in each room. We're not sure about those numbers yet. But it's going to be very important as IRT members that everybody registers for the meeting and registers for this session if you would like to be in the room.

So I just sent over chat the ICANN 74 website. The schedule is not out yet. But once that is out, you'll be able to register for your sessions as well. And as more information comes out, I will be sending emails and letting everybody know any steps that they need to take. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me and I will get an answer for you. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:	Thank you, Andrea. The most interesting thing and that is new is that we're all supposed to, I think, choose our colors. Like I can't remember exactly, but it's like a choice of three. Do we want to have six feet distance with one another or are we okay with elbow bumping, or are we okay with hand shaking? That's another decision.

And I just want to let you know that I don't know what I'm going to choose yet. But I won't take offense to the fact that if you want to stay six feet away from me, that's just fine. Okay, thank you.

The OneDoc challenges, now, we're getting pretty close to being ready in my mind to take a pause, and reformatting or reshuffling, I guess, renumbering this document.

As you see, I've started to darken out the things that I think we're done with. And then I've also added comments to let you know that we are closing some sections or not to make any changes or suggestions. So that we can clearly move over.

So I think seven is going to move to six, and eight is going to move to seven and so on down the line. So what I see is we're going to have four sections when we are done with renumbering.

This is very important. Because unfortunately—and I've tried to resist this everywhere I can, but we are cross referencing different sections by section numbers within the policy, not just the policy. And we'll talk about this a little later. But for like drafting sections, this is our reorder drafting error document.

And Sam did a great favor by reordering this. And as you can see all of our drafting error document references or section number. So we'll have to renumber all these things to match them up. So we may need to take a pause with the IRT to allow us time to get this done. And my goal is to get a clean version of this drafting error document and the IRT OneDoc document and as many documents as we can before the ICANN 74.

So speaking of ICANN 74, I think it would be great if we can present to the public sort of a close to the end product that we will be sharing as for the public comment, and maybe receive some feedback on how we can make the public comment easier to handle for the reviewers.

So this may be a lofty goal. But I wanted you to know that so that you can be thinking about what it is that we can do to facilitate an easiest possible review, effective and efficient review for the public comment. And I know that those of you who have been involved in public comment for policies usually form teams within your stakeholder groups. And you may end up being assigned or volunteering to draft comments for our policies. So feel free to let me know, let us know what it is that we can do to help you make your job easier.

And what I'm thinking about is this is a main, I think, page that we're going to reference when we do our public comment and this is all inclusive. I think everything that is important for our policy implementation, and categories of reports, correspondence, and of course, policy language. And I don't know if we've alerted you to this, but we have a redline version which we worked on. But after that, Sam created a clean version of all the RedDocs for easier review.

And, of course, we have our new documents here, [inaudible] documents that we created. Just a reminder, we maintain our timeline on this wiki as a number one item for the reference material. And the next update, I expect, will be sometime like early January. So we don't have a regularly scheduled timeline update. But we will go ahead and repost an updated version if we feel that will be helpful to the IRT. But you can always find it there. And anything else that you would find useful for the public comment to be included, let me know in advance, and we can add it to this sheet that's available to everyone, as you're working.

Questions about that? No? And this is what the landing page of our registration data policy looks like and we'll probably update a little bit to make it current. Check your information about the membership. Yeah, you're all listed here. And your affiliation, I think we have them correct. But if you notice something, we have 37 members, and your affiliation. If you have any changes, let us know. So when we use this wiki site for our public comment, it'll draw a lot of views, we want it as accurate as possible.

That's enough for the 74 plan. Let's go to our OneDoc and talk about our changes. Let's see what was the OneDoc changes. 10.2.2. Yeah, let's talk about this. I want to hear more from the IRT about this requirement. We have some discussion on this last time. Tell me more. Who wants to start there? Roger, did you want to start? Alex? Oh, by the way, Gustavo isn't here today. He's on vacation, went to [inaudible]. So having a good time over there. And he will be back in a couple of weeks, I think. So unfortunately, he's not with us.

But the goal today is for me to receive all the things that are the information that you have to give me. And I would appreciate just any thinking that you have on this, give it to me so that we can later on come back with a decision on the requirements. This is particularly, I think, another one that is subject to interpretation. And I want to make sure that we are aligned with what was in the recommendations. Roger, go ahead.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Dennis. And I think that you know 10.2.3 kind of goes along this second item here and 10.2.2, the B item kind of go together. And I asked the question on 10.2.3 about where this requirement came in, and I think Gustavo did provide some comment back stating that the IPT talked about it and that he agreed to it, and that it needs to be put in as a drafting error.

But honestly, I did not remember the IRT agreeing to this. I'm not saying they didn't. I just don't remember agreeing that this was a requirement. And especially that this was a requirement that somehow the phase one group missed. I just don't think—and again, I can't support this language. Someone from phase one IRT EPDP can jump in anytime. But I just don't see that this requirement comes from anywhere in the final report. I just don't see how we jumped to this spot. So I am concerned about both of these items.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Roger. I think your point is that you do not see a direct link where you can point to as a requirement such as you shall provide a [inaudible] indication or something like that. I think that's your point.

ROGER CARNEY: Right? At least the proposed by the RDAP working group RDAP spec would happily provide this. But it still doesn't make it a requirement just because it does provide it.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I know. On your second point, I 100 agree. Just because you can do something, that shouldn't be a requirement. I think everybody would agree. The question really is, is it a requirement in the first place? And if it is so, can we find something in the requirements documents to interpret it in that way, is the question.

And let me see if you remember this. This is an RDAP working group question document that Marc Anderson and Gustavo presented one time in one of our IRT meetings, I don't remember when. But they lead us through a thinking about whether or not—why we are saying that something is redacted.

We're saying that something is redacted to let the request for information know that there is information out there, should they have the desire and the credential to get the information. So how do they know that? I think that was the argument that if it says redacted, this clearly indicated because it says redacted, okay, so then I know that there is something I can do if I want that information.

And I think the idea was if that was the requirement, if redacted then must be indicated as such, quote unquote, like saying with redacted. And I know that the registrars—I think I've seen registrars publish words like redacted for privacy or something like that.

So there's clearly an indication by looking at that, saying there's something, more information we can get. It's not like it's not available, but it is available. So there's the difference. That indication is there.

But in this case, anonymize contracted party, that example, if you have a contact email like this, how would you know whether this is a real email or it's actually redacted and it's not a real email? I think that was the question.

And so the way that question was asked, and maybe this was asked in a wrong way, we asked when you replace the original email with a different email, a valid email, is it considered a form of redaction? And what I've heard from the IRT at that time, and nobody disputed that, everybody said, yes, it is a form of reduction. That's what came back to us.

And of course, you can argue that point both ways. But that's what came back to us as sort of an IRT consensus. That's why Gustavo is saying IRT agreed to it. Does that make sense?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I can't speak for everybody. But I would agree it's a form of redaction. But that doesn't mean—and again, I still don't see the requirement that it has to be identified that it's redacted.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, understood. Let's give Chris a chance to speak.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, thanks, Dennis. Hi, everyone. Dennis, I think you've summarized what I remember quite well there. So thank you for that. And I think where we were was that within the requirements, there's a requirement to identify the redacted data clearly, what's not in there—I think this is why it went down the mis-edit, or whatever is the term, sorry, mind's gone blank, is that obviously, with the email section, we put something else in there instead of the form of words that we have for all the other sections. So when you have someone that performs a lookup, they're unable to tell whether this has been redacted or no. Obviously, if it's a webform link, then it's a little bit more obvious, but some of the others might not be obvious. And that could lead to confusion, or further steps or wrong people being asked the wrong thing. So really, what we wanted to catch here is something for clarity, for those that are performing those checks. And then really to reduce some of the questions that might come to registrars or registries based off of whatever is filled into the email address field instead of the real email address. And I hope that helps.

DENNIS CHANG: That's what I remember the discussion. Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:	Thanks, Chris. Thanks, Dennis. And again, I think that the document that Dennis was showing, I think asked that question, and you could see that the IRT said, yes, yes, no, no. So I think there's a clear indication that it was never decided that it should be indicated.

Now, I'm not arguing if it'd be useful or not, I'm just arguing the fact that there is no requirement for it. And my big, I guess, sticking point here is, when we do this, you're talking about it affects other things as well. So, Dennis, as you pointed out here, and I think elsewhere, that Gustavo has pointed out, replacement is a type of redaction, and I think that everybody agreed to that.

But then that gets pulled into the question of, okay, is privacy proxy a replacement that's redacted? So then we have competing issues of showing privacy proxy and it's full, but also showing that it's supposed to say redacted, because it's a replacement.

And again, I think the biggest issue is it's a happy coincidence that RDAP supports this idea. But WHOIS does not. WHOIS is a system that is trying to be sunset, and we're talking about having to update WHOIS for indications that it's redacted or not. And again, I can't find a requirement so that's what I'm looking for. If there's a requirement then, okay, we can work with that. But there's no reason for me to say, okay, every registrar, update your WHOIS, because there's no requirement.

DENNIS CHANG:	I think I hear you. I understand what you're saying. Let me say, does everybody else understand that you mentioned that WHOIS Is being sunset? Does everybody in the IRT know that?

And that's why I think Roger is bringing in a practical point, right. So part of our job as the policy implementer, is, perhaps balance the practicality with the strict implementation of whatever the recommendation says, and that's why we have things like this document, right, this is the document that represents the critical thinking nature of us, looking at the requirements and saying even though the requirements says this, we're doing the opposite because of this rationale, and that falls within our charter, that's fine. And even if the requirement is not clear, we still can put in requirements that may not be there or may have to be interpreted in such a way.

And in this case, I agree with Roger, there's not a direct reference. But this is a case of interpretation of the spirit, if you will, or the intent of the requirements for redaction. So that's why this is difficult. And for us to be creating a drafting error addition—and that was what Gustavo has offered to do—and add to this document, we already have how many? We have 12.

So he has volunteered to add another number 13 to resolve this issue. And he is saying because it's not directly referenced or it has to be interpreted, we need that explanation. That, we're willing to do, but I would feel a lot better about doing that if I had the IRT support so that we can at least see, those of us who are intimately involved in the recommendation and interpretation are seeing it the same way. Go ahead, Sarah. Help me.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. So yeah, thanks, Roger, for bringing this up. I did go back to the recs while we were talking. I also do not find this discussed there. I'm not sure why we're having this conversation not sooner. I don't know why we didn't already get into this. But glad we're talking about it now. Thank you for bringing it up.

I do share Roger's opinion that we should not be requiring updates to WHOIS. I think if somebody reading this does not know the goals for setting WHOIS, they can learn and we don't need to change WHOIS stuff.

So setting aside the question of RDAP, for WHOIS, we should make sure that no changes are needed. But the addendum that's on screen here only tells us about the email fields. That's what's mentioned in 10.2.3 (II). So we should maybe adjust something so that it's broader than just those fields. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'm not sure if I'm tracking that. You're making a suggestion to change the addendum to something. Let me let Roger speak, see if I can catch up with you. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. And again, as you mentioned, Gustavo suggested making a drafting error section for that. And again, I have to say that I'm opposed to that. I don't think we have any place to jump from to says that that's an error. Again, we had a working document that you pulled

up a while ago, that asked a fairly similar question. And the IRT was completely split on it, at least the ones that responded. So I just don't see how we can say that it's a drafting error when it doesn't—from where do I jump that says it's a drafting error? Yeah, that's my thoughts. Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I understand your thought. I think I read you clearly, I think what you're telling me—so that we were very explicit and communicating clearly—that what you're proposing is deleting this as a requirement, period. Did I get that right? Just delete it.

ROGER CARNEY: There and in 10.2.2(b).

DENNIS CHANG: 10.2.2(b)?

ROGER CARNEY: Right there at the bottom. And B there.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, so the indication, that's what you're proposing to delete?

ROGER CARNEY: Correct.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, let me capture that. Okay, I get you. I hear why you're saying this, and I understand what you're saying. So I'll take that under consideration. Berry, go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Dennis. And kind of building on what Roger and Sarah— what their points are. So it's kind of like Schrodinger's cat, the cat is in the box and the cat is out of the box at the same time. And I agree with Roger that this really isn't an error, but it kind of is. And the reason I say that, so recommendation 10 and the table that is included with recommendation 10, the reason why these two email, data elements show up there is basically confirming what is already or what is or was already in the temp spec, that by default, the email address should be redacted.

And where the potential error or omission may be is that in this table, just like on the city field, there probably should have been a footnote or two. And the footnote should have said, one, for registrant and tech email fields, go see recommendation 13 because there's additional requirements there. And it doesn't do that.

And wherever else in the report that confirmed that if the registered name holder chooses to have their data published, then that's where it trumps the default rule of being redacted. So if that rises to the occasion to document in our implementation interpretation document, so be it. But I think we're at least getting clarity exactly around what was being discussed during policy. And I'll stop there. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you. Chris. Go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks. So first of all, what Berry said, I think I agree with. What I'm not clear of in my head, though, is what Roger is suggesting. And that might just be me being low. So is he saying that we don't mark the fact that it is redacted by deleting that text?

DENNIS CHANG: I don't think he's saying that at all, but I'll let Roger explain.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Thanks, Chris. And again, we're making a policy document. So these are requirements that contracted parties have to follow. So again, to me—and I appreciate what Berry said, but I still don't see a jumping spot for me to get from somewhere to having to provide an indicator that this field has been changed and changed as redacted, replaced, whatever, because that's what we're talking about.

I don't see that base that I can make a leap from that says there was an error, that it was missed, whenever it was. I just can't see how we move from what Berry mentions in recommendation 10 to saying every field that's redacted or been replaced has to indicate that it's been redacted or replaced. And that's why I don't think B or III can be a requirement, because I just don't see how that is tied to anything. Thanks, Chris.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, Chris, let me just try to answer maybe. And Roger, if I get it wrong, you just let me know. But Roger is saying redaction must be applied, redaction requirement is there, is not going away, we are absolutely going to do the redaction and that policy stands.

What he's saying is when the redaction does happen, we're not going to levy another requirement that says somehow, there needs to be some indicator along with a redaction that must be provided. That's what he's saying.

Now, to make things a little more nuanced, this actually originated from the RDAP working group, and we're kind of fortunate, very grateful to have the RDAP Working Group alongside with us, because I see them as a policy implementation team that is tracking our policy. And they will implement our policy, that's their job.

But at the same time, they're providing information and feedback to our policy as to not to make any confused requirements. And the original question that came to us was, RDAP working group thinks it's useful to have this indicator, and we'd like to do that, but when we do that, we don't want to be in violation of a policy because there's no requirement in the policy that does that.

Now my answer to that is, if you're doing more than the policy required, please, you're doing it for the public interest or to help the business run better. That's a great thing, I don't need to be putting into the policy everything that you're going to do that helps the business. We don't need to do that.

So to me, it's not something I needed to do. And I was, in a way, try to make sure that it's accommodated. And the working group worked, since they asked the question, I need to go back to them and say, yep, it's clear, we hear you, we actually put it into the policy requirement, and there is your clause that allows you to check the box and saying, oh, we're doing this, and here's the policy link that we can have.

That's the background. I think maybe not everybody has an understanding of in the same way. Of course, I have the benefit of talking to Gustavo at length. And I don't know if Marc is here, but he was educating me on the side too. So I hope that's clear.

So what we were attempting to do is this. We were attempting to satisfy the RDAP working group and their effort and support them by producing a clause requirement that enables them to say why they're doing this. But at the same time, we saw the practical nature of WHOIS being sunset, and I 100% agree with Roger that I do not want to obligate—I want to try to avoid obviously the best I can to obligate new requirements for something that is going to be sunset. That seems like a waste of resources for all of us. And I wanted to avoid that.

That's why Gustavo came up with this idea. Yes, we're putting the requirement for the indicator. And also make sure that you don't do it for the WHOIS legacy. So we're getting the good side of both requests. It's an attempt. But now that I'm looking at it, our good intention, I think, we were trying to—I have to thank Gustavo for being creative and coming up with this solution.

And we have discussed it, but I think it may cause more confusion, more discussion, and we have to do it one way or the other. Either we do it or we don't do it. And right now I'm leaning towards more of a face not directly related, directly connected to a requirement language. And then I had the support of the IRT providing rationale for a drafting error, or interpretation like I have here with all these. And I know that you have helped me do this. I think that maybe we ended up with. But let me take this back. And when Gustavo comes back, we will discuss your inputs with him and come back to you. But Roger, I know you have your hand up. I wanted to make sure that the RDAP working group's work up for providing draft profile is not impeded in any way. Can you also give us a little bit of status there? How are you doing?

ROGER CARNEY: Great, thanks, Dennis. Yeah, and just let me start, just sort of maybe help Chris, any anxiety, I guess, he may have on it, that happily, RDAP does what the text is suggesting. But again, to me, it's a happy coincidence. And it gets to the point of anybody that wanted to be able to identify a redacted field, RDAP handles that, and again, just out of coincidence, how it was implemented and everything.

So again, I don't think removing this changes anything in RDAP at all. So you're still going to get the same functionality. It's just, there's no need for the requirement since there is no linkable requirement to it.

So anyway, to your point, Dennis, on the RDAP working group. Yeah. And honestly, the RDAP working group has worked on the fact that this OneDoc is I think, the group has said more than 95% complete and

closer to 99% complete on substances items. So as far as RDAP is concerned.

So the changes we've been making over the past month or so really haven't affected the RDAP working group. And the changes we're talking about won't affect them either, and then they continue to make good progress. And they have markups of both of their implementation guide and their profile in progress. I know it's not done. But it is in progress. So they'll have those ready fairly shortly. So I can't say a date. I'll leave that to Rick. He's the one that runs that group. But they continue to work and continue to update their two draft documents as well. So they're making good progress. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: So Roger, take this back to the working group team. Let me challenge them. You know that we use the ICANN meetings as flags to rally activity and deliverable. So it'd be great if we can show the public the RDAP profiles at the ICANN 74. So let that be an inspirational objective for the team. So even if it comes right there, that will be helpful. But obviously, we have couple more meetings. We have 18th and the 1st. So if they're delivered earlier, it will give us a chance to look at it before we have a public meeting. So thanks, Roger, and make sure you [thank] the team.

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. I'll take that back to them. And they do have a couple of meetings as well in between now and ICANN. They have some time to work as well. So I'll definitely take that incentive to them.

DENNIS CHANG: I don't know what I can do for them. I will do something. It's just wonderful to have that team alongside and you know, it is such a pure luxury. I've done policy implementation for many years now but to have an implementation—real actual technical implementation running alongside of you is kind of a dream come true. Thank you very much.

So that is the agenda item for the addendum two. Let me look at addendum two. Prior to deleting, Alex had this comment. Is Alex here?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, he's not here, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I wasn't sure what he meant. Does anybody know what he's getting to here? Where's the Alex whisperer? Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Well, I think what he's pointing to is what does it mean by the registration contains registered name holder contact information? I think that last part of the sentence, what does that mean? Does that mean there's a first name and that's good? Or is it full contact information? I think that's what he's trying to drive to.

DENNIS CHANG: Ah. Okay, that is not clear. Okay. Contact information. To me, first name and last name doesn't really provide me contact information. Maybe we

need to be thinking about that. So [inaudible] value. Yeah, maybe. Info to contact them, info about the content. Maybe that's a better word. Sarah, speak to us.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I think the way those words are supposed to be read is that registered name holder contact all goes together and then information. So before you delete the organization, you have to make sure that their registered name holder is someplace which would be in the first and last name fields if not in the org field.

So I guess it might be clearer to add in, as Jody was saying, first and last name, registry at name. But to me, it seemed reasonably clear as it is. I guess that's not true for everybody. And I thought this is a direct quote from the Board or Council. I forget who. But the updated resolution. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: I think we did copy it without thinking much about it, because to us, of course, it's clear, but Alex is questioning. So let me look at that, with that view, to see if it'd be any clearer. And we'll all ask Alex to help us with that, too.

So that's addendum two. We're almost done with addendum two. Addendum one. Sarah, I think you had a point somewhere. I think I missed it. But you go ahead. And if you want to write in your comments about suggested changes, or addition, that will be fine. Or you can just

maybe try again. You have a suggestion for changing some wording or language here, if I understand this correctly.

SARAH WYLD: I'm not sure what change you're referring to. I don't see it on the screen.

DENNIS CHANG: No, that's what I mean. You spoke to it.

SARAH WYLD: When I was agreeing with Roger?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, but I didn't catch—maybe go back and listen.

SARAH WYLD: I think I was just supporting Roger.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, good. I understand Roger very clearly. He did a good job explaining himself and the rationale. So I understand him. Okay. I think that's all I had to talk to you about. I already talked about the IRT wiki. So you know where it is and know how to use it. Roger, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Can we go back to addendum one, that second bullet?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. We'll do that. This one had an Alex comment. Yeah, go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: I wonder if that language shouldn't be tighter into what the temporary spec says. I guess I didn't read Alex's comment there. Oh, Samantha's.

DENNIS CHANG: Samantha's is quoting Alex.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Yeah, it was a comment that accidentally got resolved so I [inaudible].

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. Thanks, Samantha. Because this doesn't match what's in the temp spec, because the temp spec allows something like redacted to be placed there or nothing at all.

DENNIS CHANG: What you're saying is point number one, right?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. But sounds like bullet two is trying to override the first bullet, right?

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, does it?

ROGER CARNEY: Oh, no, one is just about collected and two is about redacted. But, yeah, the temps spec allows us to say either redacted or not even provide the key value pair if it's redacted. That's the difference, to me, between one and two, is one is not about redacted data. It's just if it exists or not. And two is about if it's redacted, then you have to use redacted. Is that how you read that, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. And that's how I was reading there. And this particular language was actually developed with the IRT way before when we were working. This used to be in the policy section and we put it down because of this legacy WHOIS, we wanted to isolate it.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Which makes sense. I think two needs to add in that option of no key value. Because that's what the temp spec allows. And that's what a lot of registrars are doing right now, is if it's redacted, they don't return the street field or whatever.

DENNIS CHANG:	Yeah. Yeah, exactly. Yeah. No key or value must be shown. That kind of thing. That's where we went to. Okay. So Roger suggests—Yeah, okay. Thanks for that. Chris. Go ahead.
CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:	I think what Roger is saying there is for data elements with data effectively. If there's no data there, then you don't put redacted over an old field. So it's the data elements with data subject to the requirements. Is that what you're trying to get at, Roger?
ROGER CARNEY:	Thanks, Chris. Yeah, so if there is data, which is different than number one, if there is data, but it's subject to redaction, the temporary specification allows to not return anything or to return the field with a "redacted value."
DENNIS CHANG:	Yeah, I think we can rewrite that a couple of different ways to make it clear, but I take your point. Thank you, Chris, for your help there. For data elements with value is the clause that we may want to use there. Thank you. That was helpful.

Anything else? Roger, Chris, Sarah? Who haven't I heard from? Beth? So just a quick show of hands. Raise your hand if you're going to or you're planning to be at ICANN 74 in person. We want to track you in advance so that Andrea will be up to make sure you register. Because you may not be permitted in the room. And we want to have reservations for IRT members as a priority, of course.

And what I'm hearing is because of the distance requirements, that they're going to reduce the number of capacity at the table and the mic. So it's good to know. Andrea, you've taken notes, right?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Excellent. Thank you so much, everyone. Unless there is anything else, we'll wrap this up. And we'll see you again in a couple of weeks. Bye now.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. IPT members, please stay on.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]