ANDREA GLANDON:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Registration Data policy IRT session being held on Wednesday, the 27th of March 2024 at 1500 you know 1600 UTC 1630 UTC. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute. Now, we're not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And with this, I will turn it back over to Dennis. You may begin.
DENNIS CHANG:	Hey, Owen. Owen, you like my mouse. I have received questions about how do you get that big mouse? And I did say I'll tell you later and I never did. Anyway, let's get started, everyone. Thank you for joining. So, today is a IRT meeting and it's our first one we're trying this format is number one is only half an hour and only one topic on this agenda and that is the registration registrar abuse contact for registry operators' escrow. So, those that's the topic and we'll of course get into it. But before we do, I'd like to introduce Joseph Yee, who is our newest IPT member. Go ahead, Joseph, please introduce yourself.
JOSEPH YEE:	Hello, this is Joseph from ICANN. Hello, everyone. So, nice to meet you all. So, my name is Joseph. I'm based in Toronto, Canada. I started working for ICANN at the beginning of this year under the GDS technical service team with Gustavo. Part of ICANN, I actually work at Affiliate

slash Identity Digital for more than 15 years. So, with my focus mainly on IDN internationalizations and I also involved a lot in 2012 GTLD launch as a registry operator and registry service provider. And so, and now here I am at ICANN. Nice meeting you all. Back to you, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Joseph. Everybody, say hi, to Joseph. He's going to be with us until the end of implementation to make sure that all our implementation gets done technically correct, working with Gustavo and all of us, of course. And it is tremendously valuable resources as we get into our implementation phase. So, I will turn it right back to Joseph because he has this slide that he wants to present to you. So, take it away, Joseph. Go ahead and present the slides.

JOSEPH YEE: Thanks, Dennis. I'll wait for the slide. It's too low. Awesome. So, yeah, a bit about the background. ICANN published the registration data policies on this year in February 21 and that's the link to it. This policy revised the how the data being collect, transfer, and escrow. And so, this particular discussion is about the impact on the escrowing data from the introductions of this policy.

So, in the Session 8.4 of the registration data policy. Sorry about the typo there. It has two new items that registrar operator must submit to the escrow agent. One is in 8.4.8, the registrar's abuse contact email, and 8.4.9, registrar's abuse contact form. And for the registry escrow specifications in the base registry agreements, our registry operators must conform to the specifications under RFC 8909 and RFC 9022. And

RFC 9022 is specified how the registrar's objects and its relevance data being handled. And it's available in 5.4 for the RFC 9022 if anyone were interested to read more.

And with that new requirements from the registration data policies and the current specifications that actually we have identified a gap right now. Registration data policies 8.4.8 and 8.4.9 is the data for abuse contact information. However, RFC 9022 does not have the dedicated fields to store these two specific data. And with that, I'll pass on to Gustavo to talk about what's next.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Yeah, thank you, Joseph. So, yeah, just to explain, we have an issue. We have this RFC 9022. We don't have specific elements to escrow these two data elements, which are the registrar's abuse contact and the registrar's abuse contact form and email. So, the proposal that we have for you guys is there are two genetic elements right now within the registrar's object. It's important to mention the data escrow format for registrar's supports a registrar's object and that registrar's object supports already two genetic contact elements, email and voice.

So, the idea is we can use these elements to store those specific elements that are called by the registration data policy. As you know, we have two formats that are supported in this RFC. One is XML, the other one is CSV. So, email and voice, those are for XML. In the case of CSV format, then we're going to be using the elements that you have in your screen. Steve, do you want to talk now or should we wait until the end?

EN

DENNIS CHANG: Why don't you finish your proposal and then Steve, hold on and we'll get to your question. Go ahead and finish, Gustavo.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Okay, sounds good. So, what is the proposal? The proposal is to publish an advisory. The advisory is basically going to instruct the registrar's operators to use those genetic data elements for escrowing the registrar's abuse contact information.   And it's really important to mention this is the registrar's object, which is a particular object that we have in the data escrow format. This is not the genetic contact object used in EPP. And the rationale for this proposal, well, there is no need to update the current escrow format. Obviously, updating an RFC takes time.

It's going to be easier to implement compared to an escrow extension. And we have been thinking about this solution. We know that some registrar's operators may be using these genetic elements to escrow, like the genetic registrar's contact information. We don't think this is an issue. ICANN already publishes a public list with the genetic contact information. You have the link on your screen where you can access this information. And also, it's important to mention that registrar's operators and Ibero providers, which are the consumers of the data escrow format of the processes that we have, already have a specialized context within the registrars.

So, reusing the genetic elements should not be an issue. What is the action plan?   Well, we will draft the advisory.   We will review the

EN

advisory with the IRT. We will publish this advisory. And obviously, we will communicate the existence of this advisory to registrar's operators, data escrow agents, and Ibero providers. So, that's the plan. And I think that now we can go to questions, right, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Steve, go ahead.

STEV CROCKER: Thank you. Would you go back to slide six, the one before? Good. The question, which I had when you started, and it's made even more pointed with this slide, when somebody retrieves the information out of escrow, will they be able to tell that this is the role that was intended for that information? Is there a flag or a way of distinguishing whether that was for abuse or for any of these other specialized things? What role is associated with that? The advisory says to the registrars, package up this piece of information and put it in this format. But let's assume that, well, even if everyone is fully aware of the advisory, you still wouldn't be able to tell, perhaps, when you pull the information back out of the escrow, what that information was intended for.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: That's correct. There is no flag or any element indicating the semantics of the data that is contained with those data elements. The idea, obviously, is to publish the advisory and make all the users, consumers, and producers of data escrow to understand that the semantics for those data elements is the registrar abuse contact. By the way, this is

for registry data escrow. One of the use cases, for example, for this information is registries are required to provide these two elements in the output of RDAP or RDDS. So, when we do an EBITDA restoration, so basically a TLD is restored within an EBITDA provider, the EBITDA provider uses these data elements to be able to provide that information in RDDS for the gTLD that was recovered, let's say, or restored. So, yeah, that's the answer.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, but listening closely, you said there's no way to tell that this is what that purpose of that information is when you restore it. There needs to be a flag of some sort in there. Now, you're already a good way down the path of saying, well, we don't want to make a change to the formal specification. So, we're going to use some space that's available there without having anything. So, what I'm suggesting is go the next step and include within that specific way of flagging that information, even though it's not defined in the ITF specification. So, for example, I'm just making this up as I talk here, you could include abuse colon or something like that, crowbarred into where you have a name field or something like that.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Okay, just to understand to be sure that I understand correctly, basically what you're suggesting is to add some kind of text within the content of the information, let's say, to flag that this information is for the abuse contact, right?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, and there are multiple ways to do that. And I see Gabe has put into the chat, to my point, how does one know when restoring from escrow whether the contacts are abuse versus admin versus technical, et cetera, would seem to be necessary to know in order to slot the data elements into the correct fields. So, this is straightforward technical stuff. And when you create the advisory, somebody should, some people who are completely familiar with both the storing and retrieving and restoring process should speak to this and say, okay, I can deal with this.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Yeah, there is some interesting things that we will need to take into consideration, right? For example, in the case of XML and also in the case of CSV, the email is called to comply with RSC 5322. So, basically, in theory, you should have an email address on that field, right? So, we want to add some kind of flag within the contents that could be an interesting challenge. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Marc Anderson for the transcript. To Steve Crocker's point, I do work at a registry and I did talk to people that are responsible at my registry for implementing and if necessary, restoring ESCO. And they looked at this proposal and are comfortable and supportive of it. The advisory should be more than sufficient to note the abuse contact and abuse email are set at a per registrar level.

So, escrowing this in this format makes it obvious to the person escrowing the data as well as the person restoring the data. It's an

interesting suggestion from Steve and Gabe in the chat, but in talking to my technical people, they did not have any concerns and seemed to think that this was a good path to go and are supportive of this approach rather than going down the approach of making a change or extension to the RFC. So, so thumbs up for me. And thank you. Thank you, staff, for taking a look at this and providing the proposal.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Marc. Anybody else from registry operator? I'd like to hear from you. Any other registry operators in the IRT want to speak up? Who? Can you call their name? Steve, are you a registry operator now? Just kidding. Just go ahead, Steve. I'm just kidding you. I know you are.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. So, Marc, thanks very much for that feedback from your people who are familiar with registry operations and the restoration process. It's good to hear that they're confident. It would be a bit more comforting if they said explicitly, yes, we can distinguish the multiple uses of this field or something along that line, just so that we know that this point has been covered and dealt with.

DENNIS CHANG: Was that a question to Marc? Are you asking Marc a question right now?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm politely, gently, and with empathy, challenging the answer for another level of certainty.

DENNIS CHANG: Very well done. You kind of lost me there.

STEVE CROCKER: I mean, it could easily be that there is enough information to distinguish, but it is not evident from this presentation that that's the case. And it's our responsibility to try to make sure that everything works when tested.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah, if you can hold one minute, or Laureen, let Marc come back. Go ahead, Marc. You first.

MARC ANDERSON: So, this is Marc Anderson again for the transcript. And I think Gabe is basically asking the same thing in chat. And I'll take a stab at answering that. I'll go sort of one step further, I guess. I'll say I looked at it myself, and I have some familiarity with the escrow specification itself for background. I do have some technical background, and I was the product manager responsible for implementing it at my registry's new gTLD program. So, I have that sort of level of familiarity.

I looked at it, and I have familiarity with the specification, and I looked at the proposal, and I thought it was okay. But much like Steve and

Andrew or, sorry, and Gabe, sorry. I wanted an additional level of certainty. I don't think that's exactly how Steve put it, but that's the idea, at least. So, I went to our technical folks and said, hey, we've got this proposal from ICANN. org. Can you take a look? Are there any red flags? And they took a look and assured me that this makes sense, it's fine to implement, and they didn't have any concerns with me being supportive of this proposal.

So, I hope that, without getting into the weeds, I hope that that sort of double confirmation is enough with my understanding, which is not tiny. I was okay with it, but I confirmed with our technical folks, and they assured me that this approach is fine and they're supportive of it.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Excuse me. If you look at the last bullet there, it says registry operators and Ibero providers in their role as registry operator already have specialized points of contacts within the registrars. That paints a picture for me that that field, which is otherwise unspecified and is just being used, might have points of contact for other roles.

Now, perhaps that's the wrong, I'm reading that wrong, or perhaps there's more information that says, no, it will be easy to distinguish that that information was precisely for register abuse, abuse contact for a registrar, or not. And that's the detail that putting on a system implementation hat. If I were trying to build the back end of this that interpreted received a stored file, how would I know for sure what to do with that information? That's the technical question.

DENNIS CHANG: Let me just stop for one minute. I know you want to answer, but Laureen's been waiting for a long time, and I want to have her speak.

STEVE CROCKER: Sure.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure, and I'll give the disclaimers. I'm not a technical person. I have no expertise in this area. So, lots of people know a lot more than me, but here is my on the outside question. I'm confused as to how, first of all, is the, who is the audience for this information? Is this just a resource for registry operators? So, that's my first question. Or is it a resource for the greater community when they need to know who the abuse contacts are for? I'll stop there because the rest of my questions depend on the answer to the first question.

DENNIS CHANG: That's very, very good question, Laureen. Don't hesitate to ever ask the questions like that. And you have to know, not every IRT member are technical and Gustavo is going to answer your question as long as well as Steve's question. Go ahead, Gustavo.

EN

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Yeah, thanks. So, the registrar abuse contact email and phone, those two fields, as I explained before, they are currently published on the RDDS, right? So, if you go to a registry and also to a registrar and you query the RDDS, you're going to get those two data fields, which are basically the generic abuse contacts that anyone in the public can use to report abuse. Now, the registration data policy calls for the registry operator to escrow those two data fields or data elements.

In the current specification, we have, as I was mentioning, those generic elements, they are optional. To be honest, we don't know if registries are using them or not, or if they are using them. What is the semantics? Because as I was explaining, those are generic elements. They basically, in the format, just says phone and email of the registrar. So, the idea with the advisory is to define the semantics for those two optional elements, make them required, and the semantics will be that they are for the registrar abuse contact email and registrar abuse contact phone. And obviously, they are going to be required elements. The audience of the advisory is the registry operators.

They produce the escrow. The consumers are the data escrow agents. They need to consume these deposits and verify the content. So, now they will need to verify that those elements are there because now they are required. And the other consumer is the Ibero providers, in case there is an Ibero transition, they use this information to restore a GTLD. So, that's the audience.

DENNIS CHANG: One moment. Ibero providers are registry operators. Am I not, correct?

GUSTAVO LOZANO: At this point, yes. The three Ibero providers that we have with Contra, with ICANN, they are also registry operators.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, just to make sure I understand it, this doesn't impact the RDRS. There's still going to be whatever obligations there are to publish abuse points of contact.   That doesn't change.   It just relates to what information the registry operators have to escrow.   And I assume escrow means you keep it in a safe place for when it's needed. I'm dumbing this down a lot, but that's my sense of things. Is that correct?

GUSTAVO LOZANO: That's correct. It relates to registries escrowing this data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, that's very useful. Okay. So, then I guess my real question is, given that the audience is just the registry operators, is it useful for them to have any more specificity concerning whether this data field is an abuse point of contact or something more general?   That's my question.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Yes, they need this information because they need to implement the traditional data policy and traditional data policy requires those two data elements to be escrowed.   So, the registries, they need to

understand when they're going to put that information within the deposit.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, my question is, if there, and as I understand this, and I may be misunderstanding it, but my sense from this is that what's going to be entered is a more generic type of contact, not necessarily an abuse contact, but just a generic contact. Just let me know if I'm misunderstanding this.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: No, the idea is to define the semantics of the generic information that we have right now in the deposit. So, the deposit right now contains two data elements, pre-generic, voice and email. There is no definition of what they mean. So, it could mean abuse contacts, it could mean generic contacts, it could mean marketing contacts, who knows. So, the idea with advisory is to define the semantics of those generic elements to be the abuse contacts. So, there is no question when someone is restoring this deposit that information contained within those generic elements refers to the abuse contacts.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I guess my concern is that, is there something less useful about identifying a generic contact as opposed to a more specific abuse contact, which seems to be the intent of the specification in the first place?

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, maybe you can speak, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Marc Anderson. I guess I'm surprised by the amount of discussion on this one. I see this as pretty straightforward. So, this is only impactful, as Gustavo said, this is only impactful to the registry operator, the escrow provider, and whoever would be restoring from escrow, as Gustavo pointed out. Currently, there's three bureaus who are also registry operators. So, these are the only entities that are impacted by this. There isn't any operational impact otherwise.

It doesn't change anything external to the public, there's no change to RDAP, there's no EPP change, there's no impact to registrars, there's no change to DNS. So, there's no other otherwise impactful change to the entire ecosystem. This is just an advisory that provides additional clarification to registry operators and escrow providers on how to escrow under the registration data policy. Getting to Steve's question or point he's trying to make, the fields that Gustavo is proposing to reuse are undefined currently. And if we were restoring a registry based on an escrow deposit, and there were values in those fields today, we would drop them on the ground. These are fields that have no defined use today. So, in restoring a registry, if there were values in those fields, because they're undefined, and they're unneeded, we would drop them. They wouldn't be used because there's no definition for what they are and what they're used for.

Staff is proposing to create an advisory that details how these fields must be used. And so, this would be a must because under the new

policy, escrow of abuse contact email and phone is a must. And so, this advisory says you must use these fields to escrow this data in this way. And so, registries would, escrow providers would validate and ensure that data is present and valid. And Ibero or anybody else restoring this would know to restore that data in that way. So, from my perspective, I think it's very straightforward. There's limited impact. We have these unused fields which line up rather nicely and don't seem to present any issues or conflicts from my perspective.

DENNIS CHANG: To answer Steve's question for myself, the registry operator would know when they restore it because they have the advisory as a registry operator and there'd be plenty of communication to them when these advisory goes out and the reminder. That's how they would know. This is an instruction to the registry operator saying, hey, let registry operator, let's do it this way. And if the registry operator all agrees, then that's it. And right now, there isn't clarity, but we're providing clarity. Anything else? Let's see. We are at the top of the hour. 30 minutes seemed really short, but we tried this way.

MARC ANDERSON: That's a new hand for me. I know Steve dropped, but on the chance that he's listening to the recording later, he's concerned that he has not heard how the necessary detail of how the restore process will know. I'll just say ICANN has issued advisories in the past. This is a standard process that we are used to and comfortable with. The advisory is the mechanism. As Gustavo was saying, the advisory is the mechanism.

This is something that's done before. I would dare to say a standard practice for how to deal with something like this.

DENNIS CHANG: It is, most definitely. We're using the tools and the vehicles that these are already available to us. And we have used this tool many times. There're many advisories that's already been done. So, this is not new but to some people I understand this is a new thing, so we need to take the time to explain these things, and that's part of our purpose for the meeting. Anything else from anyone? Thank you so much, then we'll close the meeting. Thank you, Andrea.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Connect all lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you all.

GUSTAVO LOZANO: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]