
SAMANTHA MANCIA: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data Policy IRT meeting held on Wednesday, August 3, 2022 at 17:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Okay. Thank you. Hearing no further names, 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. Please note the Hand Raise option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar reaction section. 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: Hello, everyone. Laureen, thanks for joining us, and everybody else. We were just saying hi for those of you who joined earlier. Laureen, thank you for joining us. Shall we get started? Welcome and check in. Okay.

ICANN75, we have our one-hour time slot. You may ask, "Why are we having this meeting?" It's not going to be a typical working group meeting this time. This time, we're going to use the hour to present to the public our public comment and provide, I don't know, further explanation or contacts and maybe answer questions. This is going to be a tough one. It's a very complex and involved policy that impacts every

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

other policy, right? So it will take some, I think, handholding to make it easier for people to make comments on. Hopefully, we're probably going to do some like a pre-ICANN meeting week announcements to get the attention of those public commenters that are doing this sort of thing. We are anticipating a huge number of comments and much interest, and at the same time, probably some perception out there. That isn't really accurate at this point. So that's what you can expect then. I hope you can all join us at KL. As you know, we're quite used to doing this at hybrid fashion. The last time it went pretty well, and we'll do it again.

I do have an IRT Membership news. Sadly, Alex has resigned from the IRT and will no longer be participating. I wanted to make sure that he knew that we appreciated his support and services over the years. So those of you who are working with Alex, please let him know that we thank him and I believe that we'll probably see some comments from Alex when we do go to public comment. So it's not goodbye forever, though. Just so that you know that you're not seeing comments from him or replies from him and engagement. The IRT Membership list will be updated to reflect that. Before we go to public comment, I think it's important, this IRT wiki page for the whole IRT will be reviewed for consistency. So I'm not going to assign a task to you. But if you happen to notice on our wiki page, if there's anything here, especially this page is going to be referred to by the public comment. If there's anything here that you see need to be updated, please let us know. We would appreciate it. Now, I'll pause a little bit to see if any other IRT members have an announcement. Please share if you do. No? Okay. Then let's keep going.

So let's talk about the Drafting Error #2. This one is a one that Gustavo found. Gustavo, can I turn it over to you to do this presentation to the IRT? I think it would be better if you'd talk about it. I'll hold the screen and you can direct me.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Sure, I can. I think this one is pretty simple. So if you go a little bit down or you scroll down. According to the RAA 2013, the registrar WHOIS server is a must if. There is some language in there that port 43 WHOIS is required basically in registrations. So we're just trying to mitigate the discrepancy with the IRT language. So we added that note saying that the registrar WHOIS server is only required to be generated if required by the Registrar Registry Agreement or ICANN Consensus Policy. We believe that that note mitigates that discrepancy that we have with the RAA 2013 right now. And obviously the change propagates across the other sections that mention registrar WHOIS server. So if the registrar WHOIS server was a must in the past, now it's a must if because of this discrepancy that we found. So I don't know if there are any comments on this one.

DENNIS CHANG: We don't see any comments on the top. But I do have—I see Marc's hand.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Hey, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, can you hear me okay?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

MARC ANDERSON: All right, great. So I have to be honest. I read through the rationale but I haven't gone and checked against the policy recommendations or the 2013 RAA. So I read the rationale part but I haven't cross-checked any of your facts. I assume you're correct. But I guess I'm raising my hand because I don't quite follow what the—actually, I read the rationale twice and I don't quite get what the change is. Yes, sorry for my slowness here. Could you maybe just try to explain to me like what's the change in behavior in WHOIS impact? Is this registries, registrars, both? What was it before and what is it now?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Maybe this is going to be silly. We can also show the language from the RAA 2013. I put it in the chat but maybe you want to open the actual RAA. Or maybe if you let me share my screen, that could be easier.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: I made you a co-host, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Okay. Yes. Can you see my screen?

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Yes.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So this is a language that we were looking at in the RAA. So, if we go and read the language, it says, "The registrar shall provide an interactive web page, [inaudible] WHOIS and, with respect to any gTLD operating a thin registry, a port 43 WHOIS service." So, in theory, you're only required to provide this port 43 WHOIS service for thin registries. I know it's complex to know what thin registry is going to be in the future. But for now, this is the language that we have, right? So this opens the possibility of a registrar that is only operating new TLDs, for example, which I think will not be required to provide that authoritative WHOIS service. I mean, we don't know if this exists in the wild, like a registrar not offering thin registrations. But the language is pretty clear of what is the intent regarding the port 43 WHOIS server.

So that's basically what we're trying to capture in that note. In the current text of the IRT without this change, obviously, it was a must for the registrar WHOIS server. But we have that registrar that is on your screen, new TLDs, for example, it appears that they are not required to offer it through WHOIS server. So this is what we're trying to capture in these notes, basically. I don't know if it's more clear now.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you, Gustavo. I got you. I guess I'm still confused. Maybe one of the registrars on the call can help me out. Even if you're not

offering port 43 WHOIS, you're still required to do web WHOIS. So wouldn't the registrar provide their web WHOIS address in that field? It doesn't seem to differentiate between port 43 and web. It just says WHOIS. I don't know. Maybe this is a question for the Registrars, what their behavior is.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. We've got the Registrars, sorry. I was also trying to find out that, but it appears that the current usage is that the WHOIS server is defined as a host name. It appears to be only port 43. I was also trying to find out if registrars always offer the web WHOIS on the same host name as the port 43. They found the example that is not the case. So I don't know. I mean, if that's the case it's not well specified, that registrar WHOIS server is in reality both the web WHOIS and the 43. I was looking on the Internet and it appears that some clients use that information, trying to find more information of the domain name from a 43 WHOIS server like redirecting the WHOIS query to that registrar host name. But that's what I found. But I don't have a clear answer to that. It appears it only refers to the WHOIS port 43. There's a reason why we have the note. But there is not like 100% conclusive answer based on certain text. So I don't know if someone wants to participate. Sorry. I cannot see the queue.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Marc has his hands up, and then Sarah. Marc put hand down. So, Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Thank you. Honestly, I am so confused and I don't know why because I don't feel usually quite this confused. But is this really a drafting error? Because a drafting error I thought should be a case where what we're implementing does not match the recommendation. And here, we've got the recommendation that says the WHOIS server is a must, and then we've got our implementation that says registrar must generate the WHOIS server. So, is it an error? I don't understand. Thank you.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Well, the drafting error, we can capture things that we believe are not following the recommendations. Sorry. I think that we need to change the name of Drafting Errors. Dennis has the idea of putting Implementation Guidance or something like that. Dennis, what do you want to refer to those drafting errors? But basically, this is one of those in which we'll leave that ... Really, the recommendations were not that specific, and there is some discrepancy with whether the requirements in one of the contacts. Currently we don't want to change what it's already implemented in the wild.

DENNIS CHANG: I think this is a case of an exception that was not noted in the recommendation. Here we are adding an exception where recommendation was not clear on that. So the decision here is, is this truly an exception that we want to go forward? Or do we not want to make this exception for the registrar? And if that's the case, then the

obligation will be upon the registrar that they must, regardless. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. I'm happy to be corrected if I'm wrong here. I think the registrar always has to provide a WHOIS server response there. I think the original language is correct. I think if the registrar isn't providing a port 43 service, then they're still providing a web service and that they would provide that value in the registrar WHOIS server field. So, I don't know of cases off the top of my head where a registrar does not provide a value there. I mean, I see Jody and Sarah's hands are up. I'm happy to be corrected if I'm wrong here, but I'm just not aware of that. As far as I know, it's always provided. But I'll leave it at that.

DENNIS CHANG:

Jody, go ahead.

JODY KOLKER:

Thanks, Dennis. I just wanted to add some knowledge or facts around the registrar WHOIS server. That registrar WHOIS server should be the URL of the port 43 server, not the web interface. Because the way that registrars or anyone using WHOIS will use this is basically for, programmatically, to go—you go the registry first using a program to find out who owns the domain name or where it's registered. Once you find out where it's registered, if it's a thin registry, you have to go to the registrar to get the contact information. So that if you're doing this over port 43, that needs to be a port 43 server that's in there. That's why I

think it's supposed to be the port 43 server, not just a web page URL. That's all I wanted to add. Thanks.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Jody, that's also my understanding. Unfortunately, a lot of things in this [industry], this is not specified anywhere, like this is only the port 43. I mean, it's abuse. My understanding and also when I was developing clients for WHOIS, my understanding was that that was the host name of port 43 server because it's a host name, right? The web WHOIS is a URL so it's a different thing. And because it's a port 43, then if we agree that this is the port 43, then the RAA 2013 is clear. It's only required for thin registrations.

DENNIS CHANG: So for the rest of us layman here, could you, Jody, answer to me clearly on as already far, do you need this exception in the policy, or you can do without this exception in this policy? Could you tell me yes or no?

JODY KOLKER: I'm not sure that I'm understanding the exception in the drafting error, because I had always thought that registrar WHOIS server was required, that it was a must and not an if. I'm as lost as Sarah and Marc are. I'm confused. Sorry, Dennis. I can't give you an answer.

DENNIS CHANG: I think you just did, though. If they were trying to do this for the registrar but if the IRT members, registrar members in the IRT are giving

me feedback that they don't need this special clause, then I'm certainly not going to insist on it. Sarah, can you go ahead?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. So our duty here is to implement the recommendations. I think that we are all in agreement that there was nothing in the Recs to change the text that's on screen here. So if we go back to the other document—yeah, thank you. So the yellow highlighted text in the middle of the page I think is good. I think that reminds us that we are not changing what the RAA and Consensus Policy say on this specific topic. I do think it would be good if we rename the Drafting Errors document. And now that I'm saying that, I feel like we have talked about that before, so my apologies for having forgotten. So, Gustavo, yes, you were right on that one. But I think this is fine. I think the text on screen is fine and we should go with it. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Furthermore, Sarah, if you can indulge me. Are you supporting the actual movement from the other sections—if you can go to that, Gustavo—to show the movement of the data element from one section to the other?

SARAH WYLD:

No. I was not clear that it has been moved. Yeah. What is that?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I think that if we agree to that note, this change is required, because now you don't have a must transfer the form. It's only must if.

DENNIS CHANG: That's why I want to make it clear, Gustavo. Her agreeing to a note actually moves the data element from one category to another category of a requirement, and that is really the important thing here.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, I think that's a good update.

DENNIS CHANG: All seven and also, yeah, one more place. Section eight.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: It's the must from the must if.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. I see your chat also. Good. Chris, you have a comment.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks. Hi, everyone. Yes, sorry. I just got a bit confused. So what I heard Jody say was that he believed it was a must and it should stay a must, and there's no reason to put some green text in there. That's sort of my feeling as well. So we're effectively watering down what was agreed and making it a may. Yeah, I don't think that was the agreement in the main group. So I don't understand the need. If it's only required,

well, the policy, if it explicitly said don't do it, then that's fine. But if it's not mentioned, then the policy surely overrides it and keeps it as a must. That's what I think Jody was saying, but I'm not sure. Thank you.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: It's not the first time that we found something in the recommendation that doesn't match with the, let's say, technical practice of the Registry Agreement or the RA. So that's the reason why we have to do some additions to the [inaudible]. We find these kinds of discrepancies. I think this is one of those. I mean, for me, it's pretty clear what the RAA 2013 is saying, it's a must if and it's not a must. If the recommendation is to change it to a must, then you will get discrepancy with what we have in the RAA 2013. And obviously those registrars, I don't know if they exist. But if a registrar only offers new TLD registrations right now, purely based on this text, they don't need to provide that port 43 WHOIS service. If that registrar exists in the wild, I don't know if they are presented here. I don't know. Probably all registrars offer .com and .net. I don't know. That's a good question. But at least this is what the RAA 2013 is saying.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry. I hit the button twice. Thanks. Thanks, Jody, Roger, Sarah, everybody—or Gustavo, not Roger. Yeah, that makes sense. It took me a while to wrap my brain around that one. But I think I understand now.

I agree with Sarah's points about keeping the text. I think that that makes sense. I think I would describe it saying the existing practice prior to the IRT was that the registrar WHOIS server refers to port 43 WHOIS, and that in some cases may be optional per the further 2013 RRA. Then I would further describe that by saying that during the EPDP Phase 1 deliberations, at no point did we intend, did we discuss, intend, or even debate, making a change to that particular behavior. So I feel very comfortable saying at no point was our intent to change that existing behavior. It just wasn't something that ever came up. So yeah. So I haven't had that explained to me twice. Again, apologies for being slow there. I get the point and I think it makes sense. So, fair enough.

DENNIS CHANG:

So, just to bring it back to the possibility of adding exception with a rationale is the one option, the other option is not adding this exception and dealing with the consequences thereof. I'm thinking maybe we're just way too overly cautious on a case of what if. What if there is one registrar somewhere that does not do .com and then they run into this, and they have to change something that they weren't expected to change. And the EPDP team did not intend/expect them to change anything, but now they do. I can kind of go see both sides here. As a policy person, I would rather not have exceptions all over the place. It's harder to understand and execute.

So just asking one more time and maybe this is a different way to ask. I know that Sarah said you're okay with that highlighted text and Marc says you're okay with it. Are you okay with us not having it also? What if we didn't add it, now that we brought it to your attention and you

thought about it? What if we go back and say, “Okay, never mind, let’s not add this Drafting Error #2, and we’re going to go without it,” is that okay, too? No? Okay. Sarah is answering, “Clearly no. We need the text. It’s not like it’s an option anymore. Now that you know about it, you are convinced that we need it and it must be documented as an exception. And the data elements in the two sections have to move from one requirement category to another requirement category, clearly.” Anyone else? So Sarah says, “Must change.” “Not convinced,” Chris says. Marc: “Not strongly.” Any other registrar? Chris, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: I might be being massively slow. But I don’t see the problem of not having it there. I can’t see the implications if it’s not. Sorry, I’m not being very—

DENNIS CHANG: I think you’re speaking my sentiment. Sarah, can you speak more about the implication of not having this drafting error documented here? Can you talk to the IRT about the consequences of not having this exception, and what would happen to the registrar if we didn’t?

SARAH WYLD: Oh my goodness. Honestly, I feel like my understanding of this situation is so precarious that I am hesitant to try to explain anything to anybody. The RAA says that you have to do the port 43 service in specific circumstances. The recommendation said you have to do the WHOIS server, which sometimes is that port 43 service. So like the text that

says it's only required if the RAA requires it I think makes sense because the RAA requires it in specific circumstances, the EPDP team was not trying to change that. And so this makes our draft match the RAA and the recommendation, I think.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I would like to add that it is consistent with what we have been doing with other fields like name server, DNSSEC elements, and so on and so forth. So it's not the first time that we do something like this and it's consistent with the other elements that we have found to have discrepancies with the Registry Agreement or the RA.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we're finding these things as they go because everything's getting more clear and we are looking at the details. We are trying to ensure that we don't make unintended changes by the EPDP team. Chris, do you want to speak more?

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah, please. Where I am in my head and this is why I can't get around it is that if you're receiving this information, it's because you've had a response from a WHOIS server of some sort. So knowing where that response has come from is important to know. So having this as a must gives you sort of data validation around where it's come from, what service is provided, or what service provided that WHOIS returned. So yeah, I can't see why it wouldn't be a must.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. So this registrar WHOIS server is, as Jody was explaining, [inaudible] go to [Verisign's] WHOIS, right? That registrar WHOIS server is used by a WHOIS client to know host name of that registrar WHOIS server to get more information or to get the contact information, let's say. So it's not used to validate that the WHOIS server that you're querying is the same that you have there is not for that purpose. The purpose is to redirect the client to the actual WHOIS server of the registrar where more information can be found.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: I'll just jump in. Maybe I misspoke there a little bit. Sorry. Where is the authoritative results for that WHOIS information you've requested is effectively what you're returning, isn't it, rather than the source? Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I'll take a crack at trying to respond to Chris and I hope this helps. There are some cases Gustavo mentioned like the thick new gTLDs for the 2013 RAA, registrars don't have to offer a port 43 WHOIS server but they do have to have a web WHOIS server. But in some of those cases, there are registrars that their web WHOIS service is really just a front end for the registry's port 43 service. So when you go to the registrar WHOIS, so their web front end, it's really just querying the registries port 43 service on the back end. So in that case, there's nothing to respond to the registrar WHOIS server doesn't exist. I think

that's the scenario here that we're trying to address and what was contemplated in the 2013 RAA is that some registrars wanted to just have this front end point to the registry's back end. So I think that's the scenario and that's the situation where there wouldn't be an answer to the question, who is the registrar WHOIS server? There isn't one. So if we make it a must, then in those instances, there wouldn't be a value to provide there in that field. And that would get the sort of the scenario we're trying to avoid. I hope I didn't butcher that explanation. It took me a while to wrap my head around this one. But I think that's what we're getting at.

DENNIS CHANG: Chris, did you want to speak again?

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, please. No thanks but actually that might have made the penny drop a little bit. So with that then, I think maybe this language needs ever slight changing. Because what you all—tell me if I'm wrong here. What I've understood there is, realistically, it's not required for anyone to do, but they may do it or they may do it some other way through the registry. So I think what this language does for me, and probably what's caused me to think like this is, if it's not required in there, then they don't have to do it even if they do do it. Does that make sense?

MARC ANDERSON: I get what you're saying. But I think that's where the text on the screen helps. It says the value is only required to be generated if required by

the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. So I think that note there is important because it keeps in the existing obligations and doesn't create any new carve outs, which I think is the concern you're raising, right?

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah. What I want to understand is let's say you got two registrars, one gets the registry to provide the WHOIS server or whatever is the right word, and the other one does it themselves. Do they not have the same obligations under the RAA, and therefore, both are not required to both choose not to generate it while only one would actually need to?

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry. I think you lost me there. I think you're raising two scenarios, right? And in both scenarios, it's a registrar that does not have to offer a port 43. But what happens if one chooses to offer it and one chooses not to? Is that the scenario you're asking about?

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah. Then I think both would not be required to display it, although one should.

MARC ANDERSON: I think I would agree with that. And I think that's the existing ... Yeah, I think that's it. That's what exists today for the 2013 RAA.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think that Sarah’s chat is probably appropriate. This is not creating new exceptions but actually documenting that exception already exists, and we’re trying to be consistent with the current exception and making that clear. And with the support of the members, the IRT, where the EPDP confirming that they had not intended to remove that exception, then I think that we would be faithfully implementing by continuing to provide that exception and not making the changes. Not making the exception would actually be a misalignment with the recommendation. That’s how I view it.

I remember—this is probably a good time to remind you as you see the blue linked—parenthesis “See Drafting Error 2”. Those link directly to the Drafting Error document or they can read why we consider this statement a drafting error and they can read about it. This is of course going to the public comment. All the registrars will have an opportunity to comment on it, we’ll get feedback. Based on the public comment, we can keep or remove this particular exception then, too. So let me close this topic here. I think that we spent a bit of time discussing, and then move on to our next topic. Can we move on?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA:

Oops, sorry. Do you want me to keep sharing my screen?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, if you don’t mind.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Okay. You can you if you want. What is our next topic? Sorry, because I have—

DENNIS CHANG: We're going to One Doc next?

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. I mean the One Doc.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: I put it in the chat.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Sam. Task 221. So, DPA Section 5. Okay. So, first of all, let me just thank you again. Thank you for your comments. Sarah, in particular, I know that you gave us some good suggestions and particularly the rationale to give an insight on why you were suggesting what you were suggesting. Really useful because we ended up accepting all of your suggestions. What we were concerned with, we instead—and Beth is not here. Beth's approach is to merge the statement, merge the documents, merge the requirements so that we have maybe a more lengthy requirement that is more descriptive but of what we need for this requirement under Section Data Protection Agreement. I did not receive any further comments. So let me just hear from you if you are satisfied with where we are with this, and then, of course, the next step with this Section 5 is we're probably opening it up

for the public comment and see what the public thinks about it. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you, Dennis. I just wanted to thank you and the whole team for your thorough consideration of my suggestions. I know it's been sort of a very complicated section for us to work through. So I really appreciate that. I will say there's a couple things in the text on screen that I still think are a little bit weird. But I am ready to just leave it for public comment and move on. But I do just want to mention I'm not looking for changes, just some of the things that I noticed this time around. In the second paragraph, it says, "Enter into Data Protection Agreement or Agreements"—plural—and it's been like that the whole time. I just didn't notice until now. And I kind of wonder, why did we do that? But it's fine. It's fine. I think perhaps the third paragraph should be the second one, but also not a big deal change. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Sarah. Thank you for your support again. Yeah, I know. If our opening public comment wasn't like—the 17th is coming up in a couple of weeks, maybe we want to wordsmith a little bit, but I think it's certainly good enough for the public to understand what we're trying to say here, and then provide us helpful comments. Thank you very, very much, everyone. So Section 5 is done. Let's go to the next topic.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Sorry. So we had the Drafting Error 2 changes which we already covered. After that was review corrections in Sections 6.4, 7.2.4, and 7.4. So I'll put that in the chat for reference.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So this is 6.4 you see on your screen? Yeah, there are some comments there.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Who made this comment? Jody. Hey, Jody. Do you have anything more to add here? Of course, maybe I'm just hypersensitive about this and trying to take in every single word on your comment, but when you said that the Registrar Stakeholder Group, for the most part, agrees and you just didn't say "agrees". So now I'm left to wonder if there was some registrars who did not agree and maybe we need to be cautious for those registrars and what that will be. Go ahead, Jody.

JODY KOLKER: Thank, Dennis. We just discussed this in our Monday morning meeting, and Sarah wasn't there, so I didn't want to put that we all agreed to it. So I guess I'll leave it up to Sarah. I didn't want to speak for her.

DENNIS CHANG: Now I know. Okay. Thank you, Jody. And thank you, Sarah. I see your chat. So we have an agreement. So I think that removing the "collect" there is never going to be the case, which is going to make our policy language better and clearer. And nobody's going to ask, "How is it

collected in the future?” Thank you very much. And of course, these things happen because at one time we had our data elements that combined in different mix. At one time, it made sense. But now, we’re only dealing with one thing here. We can be more precise with our requirements. Thank you very much. Next item.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: I see a hand raised.

DENNIS CHANG: Chris, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: I just missed some of that. Any recollection I have of the discussion about the “collect” was where there were more than one reseller, and whether you would have to collect it from your primary reseller you know about rather than generate it.

DENNIS CHANG: Can a registrar answer Chris? Because I’m not equipped to. Jody, please explain.

JODY KOLKER: Hi. Chris, I’m not sure what you mean. Usually, there’s only one reseller associated with a domain. I think that that’s what we’re talking about here is just on a single domain basis. Like GoDaddy can have multiple resellers but usually only one reseller is related to one domain.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: I was thinking if it's sold on to someone else, and then there's a reseller underneath them.

JODY KOLKER: Oh, I see what you're saying, if you have a reseller-reseller. Usually we would only—and Sara maybe can speak more to this—but I would say we would only have the reseller who sold the domain to the customer, and that's it. If they are a reseller of a reseller customer, we just talk about the reseller that sold the domain but not the chain of resellers. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. So I think there might be any number of types of account structures that can have different resellers at different levels. There could be official resellers that actually have an account and unofficial resellers who are just buying a domain in my account to give to somebody else for some reason. But the registrar only knows limited things about that, and so they're either going to generate the reseller value because they know who the reseller is or not. But they don't collect the reseller value from the domain owner as part of the purchase process. That's just not how it works, I think. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Chris.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks. I was just trying to cover off with we collected from the reseller its reseller because obviously the point of that is so we don't spam someone that has not got the correct information that we're looking for. However, if that's not how it's done and that's not what we're trying to cover off here, then I'm happy to remove "collect".

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Owen put in a clarifying text there, too. Thank you, Owen. Okay, next item.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: That's 7.2.4, I believe.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yes. You have a computer screen and the idea is just to remove the describing the RFC. And the rationale is that we are talking about DNSSEC elements in the policy. We are not being specific about certain elements in other sections. And in this case, which is basically are described in RFC, which is already covered in the RAA, which says that the registrar messages that are received to communicate that information to the registry. So we believe that to have consistency—sorry for the DNSSEC elements we usually say. DNSSEC elements, that's the logic.

DENNIS CHANG: I see plus one from Chris, Marc, Owen. Yeah, I think you got your support, Gustavo, as much as we love the RFCs. Thank you for the suggestion to remove the reference where we don't need it. And yes, you have your confirmation from Gustavo that it is in the RAA here, and we have other registrars speaking point. So I think we're good to close that. Thank you. Next.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. On 7.4, well, these data elements appear to always be collected so there is no need for it to be generated.

DENNIS CHANG: This is the other way. So can somebody think about a case? It could be generated at any time by anyone ever? I see a plus one just now from Chris. I think he's referring to this one, deleting the "generated". Okay. Anyone else?

SARAH WYLD: I'm still looking through the fields. One second.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Sarah. Let's give her a minute to double check.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. None of those have the asterisk that means generated. So that seems to me to be a correct change.

DENNIS CHANG: Confirmation from Sarah. So I think we have a IRT support to delete the “generated” from Section 7.4. And we’ll move on. What’s next?

SAMANTHA MANCIA: I put in the chat. It’s 11.1.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah, this one.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. This one, let’s see. Eric wanted to discuss it. I remember Eric’s comment. Can we discuss it? Is Eric here? You’re here. Hi, Eric.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Hey, Dennis. Can you hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. I give you the floor. Go ahead.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Thanks. Gustavo, I appreciate the follow-up, the rationale. I think that’s where I got initially hung up, looking to clean this up and simplify makes

all the sense to me and referring to a section that's already laid out in the One Doc. I think I just got confused when I looked at your rationale initially with web form not being defined but we were using it previously. This is not nearly as Holly contested like the rest of the earlier discussion. So I'm fine with this. I don't see an issue with this change. I just want to make sure we kind of talked through that, your initial rationale. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Eric, for making it clear for the rest of us, too. So that was a good follow-up comment from Gustavo, and that probably is useful for all of us anyway. So please don't hesitate to ask questions at any time. Oh, Sarah likes the change. I'd like to change a lot because I'm an engineer. Gustavo speaks my language. So three subsections with clear must, must, must. I really like the way it's laid out. Compliments to Gustavo. We can then agree to support this change as well.

Let's go to the next. It's doing a little bit of a time check. I am both hoping to end this early but I don't mind going the full 90 minutes. I thought we would move faster. But thank you for the good discussion. 10.2. Eric, would you like to discuss? Eric, do you want to take the floor again?

ERIC ROKOBAUER:

Sure. I certainly want to help where I can to make the meeting go efficient and get us all out early. Again, this could be just me reading it and I get Gustavo's comments and needing to avoid making the language seem like it's a requirement to the requester. To be honest,

when I first looked at it and I saw the reference in 10.1 (a), my mind went to, all right, let me find the next subsection, and I didn't find it initially. That's really small. I don't know if we want to look at 10.1 and maybe we do make that sectioned out. So it's like 10.1.1 of the elements of what the mechanism and process must specify. If not, the other thing I was thinking, I got caught up in 10.2 "Registrar and registry operator must include the following contents." Would it be better or more appropriate if that was "must collect the following contents"? Again, just food for thought. I'm not hung up. I mean, I'm not stuck on either way, it's just something that just seemed easier for a registrar or registry operator to implement when it says these are things we want to collect when it comes to disclosure requests. But I can be corrected if others feel differently. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Eric. Any other comments? Sarah has a comment. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. I'm still not convinced that we should make this change. I feel like the new language is a little bit confusing to me. And the registrar must include these contents. But I feel like this policy should tell us what the disclosure request should include, not what's in the form that the requester fills out. Because now it sounds like the registrar is going to make a form for disclosure requests but it doesn't say that all of that information has to be provided now, right? Thank you.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Yeah. Amanda, can you help us with some text on this one? I think you are the [inaudible] on this one, please.

DENNIS CHANG: I think initially when we were looking at this again, you know how we have all the other sections start out with registrar and registry operator should do this. Registrar and registry operator must do this. Registrar and registry operator may do this. So that is sort of the way we're laying out the requirements. And in this case, we thought, "Hey, maybe we should just make it consistent and make it clear registrars and registry operator must do this this, da, da, da." So I think that's where we started. Oh, an enforcer. I have a hands up. Go ahead, enforcer.

AMANDA ROSE: Thanks, Dennis. Yeah, I think you pretty much captured what I was going to say. The enforcement of the policy would be between ICANN and the contracted parties and not third-party requester. So we couldn't enforce a provision that's putting requirements on the requestor rather these are the minimum requirements of what must be in it. So that has to be part of the registrar/registries mechanism process for processing these requests for access. So we attempted to modify the language to put the requirement where it should be, which is including those in their minimum required contents of their internal policies rather. So I'm happy to consider modifying the language or tinkering with it, but ultimately the language should be directed towards the parties that are involved rather than third parties, if that makes sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah and Chris next.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Okay. Thanks for your time as I thought through this one because I had a couple days off until I hadn't actually looked at this before today's meeting. I am now turned around to disagreeing with the thing I said previously and I'm okay with the change.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Chris, tell me you're okay, too.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: I am. But I can see why Sarah was and that's just around that I don't think it reads very well. I just wonder whether replacing the word "following contents" with "following requirements" makes that a bit clearer so it doesn't read as much as the obligation on the registrar and registry and more on the requester. I don't know if that is helpful or not.

DENNIS CHANG: So instead of "must include the following content," you want to change it to "must include the following requirements". I think that's your suggestion.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: That's right. Keep at a minimum as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah is making another suggestion. What if “must include the following”?

SARAH WYLD: I don’t feel strongly about including or not including the “at a minimum,” but I do think if we just take out “contents at a minimum,” then the whole phrase becomes a little bit easier. And nothing says that you can’t include more. But we could just take out the word “contents” also. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone else? Okay. Eric likes Sarah’s suggestion.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Shall I do the change, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Didn’t you? Yeah. Make the change.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: So it will say “must include the following”?

DENNIS CHANG: It’s hard to see but I think that’s what it would read.

GUSTAVO LOZANO IBARRA: Oh, there is new comment that we shall keep at a minimum.

AMANDA ROSE: Dennis, this is Amanda. I think that maybe a little bit ambiguous, like do they have to copy and paste this exact word? Like, “include the following,” it’s more like include the following ... There’s like a word missing there, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Following content or following requirement?

AMANDA ROSE: I put this together kind of trying to shift it, but I’m definitely open to suggestions. But I just think it needs the following something. It needs a word there what it is they need to include rather than—like, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Content feels like the actual information. Okay. Again, this is going off for public comment. I can see Chris’s point. That’s good feedback. Thank you so much. So we’ll take the changes as is and maybe work on it a little more. And if we have time before the public comment, maybe we’re tweaking a little bit, but I think we’ll be okay going to public comment with this. Okay, any additional comments? Or can we move on on this one, 10.2? Let’s move on.

SARAH WYLD: I put some suggested text in a comment that might be helpful.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sarah. I appreciate it. Format and content. Okay. I think this could be a winner. Thank you, Sarah, always so helpful. Next topic.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: So that was everything we had in terms of tasks. I know we also wanted to note the implementation note tags and the drafting error tags which you touched on.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, let me just take—

SAMANTHA MANCIA: I think you went back on mute, Dennis. Oh, did he accidentally drop? All right, we'll give him a second to come back in.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's do this. How about if I take over—

SAMANTHA MANCIA: There you are.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, thank you. How about if I take over the—well, just hang on one more minute. Thank you, everyone. Let me share my screen. Because I do want to get this done while I have you here. Okay. Let me see. Okay.

We're not over and I do want to go over some more stuff on the One Doc, but on the RDAP Profile status—Roger is not here but Marc. I already wrote to the IRT of what I heard. Do you have any more information for the IRT? We're hoping to get it Thursday or Friday this week, get the profiles.

MARC ANDERSON:

I'm hoping you get it Thursday or Friday of this week as well. We are meeting tomorrow. I think the hope is that that is our final meeting on that. I think that's very reasonable and realistic, both documents, the Response Profile and the Technical Response. I think both are in very good shape. There's just a few minor remaining redlines that need to be addressed before we can send it to the IRT. So I think it's in good shape, and hopefully we can wrap it up during tomorrow's RDAP Working Group meeting.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you so much. Sometimes I hear what I want to hear and it's good to have you confirm what I was hearing is what's actually the reality. So that would be exciting. I think that will end up as our final two deliverables for the public comment. And the way I'm thinking about this now is that next week we have one more meeting on Wednesday and we'll just spend the whole time on the RDAP Profile document. So if there any questions or feedback, we just get through it and be done for next Wednesday. We are completely hands down, and then turning it over to our Public Comment team to go ahead and publish on the 17th of August. You haven't seen this for a while but I just wanted to remind

you that this is our plan and we're keeping to it and we've been tracking to it. So RDAP Profile gets drafted, we have a quick review. And with that is the end of One Doc, and everything else we need. Then we open public comment on the 17th. The way I calculate this, if we open on the 17 and spend 60 days, it will be done by August 16. Right now, that's what I'm thinking. 60 days is the public comment period we will offer to the public. Marc, did you have a hand up? Did you want to speak?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. Yeah, I raised my hand when you were talking about review of the RDAP Profile. I just wanted to note for anybody taking the time to review that probably the most substantive changes are around redaction and how redaction is done. There's some other changes throughout the document, obviously. We took the opportunity to clean things up and update RFC references where applicable. But really, the heavy lifting, the bulk of the changes are around redaction. But also Gustavo hopefully suggested some changes around how the format of the publication sections are covered. His suggestions make him more in line with how the One Doc is structured. So, hopefully that review will be a little familiar for those of us looking at the One Doc, but I do think the bulk of the changes around redaction and that's maybe where I would suggest focusing in a review.

DENNIS CHANG:

You know, that's an excellent input. When we issue an IRT task, which I will do, when the documents are available for IRT, I'll make sure to mention that to get the focus on, the most efficient way to review it. I

think the purpose of the Wednesday next week meeting would be so that just in case it was not clear, that would be an opportunity for those of you on the working group to personally share with us what to highlight, some key things, especially in terms of any changes that we could expect I think would be good. Excellent. I think we're on our way. So one more thing on the timeline. So this slide shows you the timeline. So that's done.

Now, one more thing was we have one more task and still by the end of this week, and I just wanted to just do a very quick or just a couple of minutes here. We're doing these kinds of things, right? So we're trying to format this in a way where we would actually help the reviewer as much as possible. Thanks to Isabelle for going through every language and adding the link to the implementation note. This was another suggestion that we received that we're getting internal reviews from people that have not been seeing this in a while. And they suggested that "Oh, I wish I had known that there was an implementation note on this when I was reading the body even though it was below in the same document." Especially the way we were going to talk about the "Drafting Error" document like this. Initially, we thought we would just present the document independently, and we probably will point to the document that we have this reference document that the reviewer should read or at least take a note of. But I think it would be particularly helpful when you're coming across individual data elements where they would be questioning, "Wait a minute, the recommendation didn't say that. Why is it this way?" Then that's probably the way where the drafting error information is most helpful.

By the way, that we might need. The Drafting Error document was renamed to an Implementation Explanation for the Selected EPDP Recommendation. This is the former name. So we have decided to combine Drafting Error and Implementation Explanation. So not to have a debate about which it is, but it is everything that will be helpful to the reviewer that will require further explanation.

The other thing is I think most of the substance changes have already been gone over today with Gustavo. Other things are things like this. I added some more explanation for you here why I think this is a good change and within we are trying to avoid any implications that wasn't intended. I know that a lot of people are going to come over every word carefully. We talked about this and talked about this. I think we didn't talk about this. Same, it's readability. We know what we mean. Those of us who are here, we all understand what this means. Spelling it out a little bit more will be helpful and of course making some correction on. I apologize for this one. This we should have never deleted, but somehow within when we were updating our One Doc and accepting comments, I probably inadvertently accepted something in the change and that took out the number three that was there.

By the way, as you noticed, we changed this to 123. It used to be ABC but we're changing it to 123. It's just not a good practice to have letters typed on letter. So we're trying to switch back to numbers after using a letter, and I explained that.

This is amazing how we can go this long and not realize, not see things that are so obvious, and that is a—okay, Chris, thank you so much for your help today. I'll be done in a minute here. So this is obvious, right?

The data is going from registrar to registry operator, not the other way. We didn't want to imply that the other things were happening. And we took out this clause that wasn't necessary. Then the thing about controllership is a sensitive word and unnecessary to have it in this document anyway.

Yeah, those of you who remember GDD, we don't have GDD anymore. We kind of do but you know I really belong to GDS now. It doesn't matter. The most important fact is that ICANN Org is the one who developed this Consensus Policy framework and you have GNSO adopting it or working to. That was the message.

So I just went through all of it. I gave you until this Friday. I apologize for the short turnaround, but this one is an easy homework. So, thank you so much. I'll go ahead and leave. I'll go ahead and end the meeting five minutes early. How about that? Thank you so much, everyone. I'll see you all next week.

SAMANTHA MANCIA: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]