
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, again, WHOIS policy implementation, meeting with the IRT, on 20th of September 2016. Greetings everyone, welcome. We have an interesting agenda today, so we'll get right to it.

We'll start with the agenda. So we have a full plate of topics here. First we want to talk about the change to the CLD consensus policy, [inaudible] for the IRT consideration, and this in regards to the request for reconsideration we received shortly after we had published CLD policies in July.

And of course, we are going to continue on the draft document for the transition policy. And we have a couple of other items if time permits, Thick WHOIS conflict procedure, and the draft memo to the NCSNO counsel on the privacy.

Does anybody have an input on the agenda at this point? Suggestions? Is everybody okay with the agenda in this order?

Hearing none, we will proceed. So, let's talk about the CLND consensus policy. We published it on 26th of July, and then in August, we received a request for reconsideration, and the team has been looking at this. And it basically says [inaudible] just including [R-DAP?] in the consensus policy.

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.

And we have a proposal we want to discuss with the IRT today. And I'd like to give the floor to Krista and Francisco. Either of you want to start?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Hi Dennis. Hi everyone. Can you hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. We can hear you fine, Francisco, go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So the, excuse me, the request for reconsideration that Dennis was talking about, identified I guess one main point has been, is the issue, which is the inclusion of [inaudible] in the consensus policy. And they request for reconsideration was requesting to remove a provision number 12 in the CLD policy, which is the one that requires [inaudible], or the only one that [inaudible], but at least 50.

So I think, we intend to share an updated draft with you on how that would look like. But it's very simple, just removing provision number 12 from the CLD policy, as currently published. With that, we think that we would be addressing the issue raised by the [inaudible] group. And [inaudible] has been in communication with the [inaudible] and the registry stakeholder group on that issue.

So we, what we need to do now is to send... I'm sorry. We need to get input from the IETF, of course, on this. This is only a proposal and we would like to hear from you what do you guys think, except we are trying to address an issue of what was raised by [inaudible] group.

In terms of the mechanics of how we intend to do that, already mention that removing that provision number 12, and what we intend to do is send it in writing to you later in the day, so you have time to read it. And we intend to give you a couple of weeks for you to review it and let us know if you think that's something that [inaudible] into, is not correct or should be done differently.

And we intend to share this approach with all of the members in the community. For example, the technical community that may have an opinion on this regard. So that's, in general terms, what we intend to do on this. Did I miss anything Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG:

No, I think you covered it pretty well. Alan has his hand up. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I know nothing of the substance of what has been talked about, so I'm not talking to that. But I am somewhat confused about process. It would certainly be interesting for this group to weigh in on it, but ultimately, this is the result of a PDP approved by the Board, and the only way it could be changed is by the GNSO taking action and making a new recommendation to alter the outcome and having that go through the Board.

Unless I'm missing something, there is no way to bypass that process.

[CROSSTALK]

KRISTA PAPAC:

It's Krista Papac, [inaudible] for the comments, Alan. So the policy, just to say give a couple of high level [points?] about this, which might help address your concerns. So the policy recommendations, I'm going to paraphrase a bit here, but the policy recommendations said, for all gTLD registries to be thick, for them to have a consistent labeling and display of the output consist with the 2013 RAA specification.

And that we would conduct a legal review to see if there were any privacy issue, or any issues identified that the EWG had not identified in its previous work. Throughout the term of the IRT and the work that we've been doing with the IRT on this, on implementing these policy recommendations, while that was going on, the R-DAP protocol came in through the IETF.

And through discussions with this group, we talked about... One of the goals that we've been trying to, or one of the things that we've been trying to achieve as staff, and to put more predictability into contracted party technical implications is to, excuse me, to try to bundle efforts that were like and occurring around the same time.

And so one of the things that we did as IETF, the R-DAP protocol team through, it's a protocol, when that came through, we were working on this consistent labeling and display aspect of this policy, so we said, you know, it makes sense to align these two efforts and bundle them together.

And so, from that, there was a draft policy published for public comment. We got comments on it. We've worked with the IRT on it,

but subsequent to actually publishing that policy, following the public comment period, we received this request for reconsideration from the registries, basically saying that the inclusion of the R-DAP protocol in the policy is not consistent with the policy recommendation.

That R-DAP is a different thing. That R-DAP is not contemplated in the policy recommendations. And again, I'm paraphrasing Alan and everyone, but it's not contemplated in the policy recommendations, and it shouldn't be included in the policy. So we've been discussing it here on staff, you know, in looking at different sort of data points. We've come up with a proposal, which, of course, we need to discuss with the IRT, because this is who we work with on this matter.

The notion of potentially removing the R-DAP requirement from the policy, so that the policy recommendations to have consistent labeling and display would still stand, it just wouldn't be leveraging the R-DAP protocol to do that, but they would still... There still need to be consistent labeling and display.

And then, assuming if the IRT were onboard with that, and seem to agree with that path forward, we would make an amendment to the policy, re-announce it to the contracted parties that are affected by it, and then this would affect the implementation date by, we would give them six months to implement from the re-announcement, if you will, the modification to the policy.

So I don't know if any of that helps, and I hope it made sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Theo? You have your hand up, go ahead, next.

THEO GEURTS: I'm going to pass for a moment here and let Alan speak, if you don't mind.

DENNIS CHANG: I don't mind at all. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Okay, I guess I am, subject of... One of the problems in ICANN is we tend to use the same words in multiple ways, and in ways that are not clear. We use the term policy to describe what the GNSO approves and passes to the Board. Then we also use the word policy to describe the actual wording that the implementation of the policy, so to speak, becomes the policy, which is what goes into the final rule book.

And so, the first policy does not change, because that didn't mention R-DAP. The implementation of the policy, which we then call the policy, is what is changing. So yes, in that case, clearly the GNSO does not get and it is an IRT issue.

Someday, I really wish we could stop using the same identical word in multiple ways, meaning quite different things. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Alan. I have been using policy recommendation, or what comes out of GNSO, and the Board adoption, and policy as we implement it for publication. Steve has his hand up, go ahead.

Krista, you want to go first? Go ahead.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Sorry Steve. I just wanted to add to what you just said to Alan, because this is, your point about the word being reused, it's a point of clarification that I didn't realize until just a few short years ago. So, I got an education when I started on staff here. I thought I knew a lot, but I'm learning how much I don't know.

Anyway, what comes out of the GNSO is policy recommendations. Those then go to the Board for approval. When the Board approves them, they approve the recommendations and ask the staff to implement them. And part of the implementation, we work with the IRT to come up with an implementation plan, as well as the actual consensus policy.

So they're only recommendations. We work to draft a consensus policy with an IRT, put that out for public comment, and then adopt the consensus policy, and at the time that we publish the consensus policy, we notify the affected parties, usually contracted parties, and usually there is an implementation timeline that's part of the consensus policy.

So to Dennis's point, policy recommendations is the GNSO Board bit, and consensus policy is sort of like the final product that usually has an implementation timeline. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one quick comment. Unfortunately, if you look at the bylaws and things like that, it talks about the GNSO recommending policy to the Board. In any case, clearly it's another one of these things that we have to be careful with the wording. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Noted. Next is Steve, go ahead.

STEVE METALITZ: Thanks. Steve Metalitz. I'll just say on that last point, I share Alan's confusion on this, as far as the wording and terminology, but I've been participating in this group long enough to know that, in the IRT world, nothing quite has the same meaning as it has in other parts of the universe.

So, but moving on, I do actually... I'm not sure if this is a procedural question or substantive. First of all, this request for reconsideration, have we, we on the IRT, ever seen that? I mean, do we know the reasons why registry stakeholder group asked for reconsideration? And second, who did they ask for reconsideration from? That phrase, request for reconsideration, usually refers to something that is going through the bylaws.

Reconsideration process is referred to the Board governance committee, which if that's what happened, then it's the Board governance committee that should be acting on it, and not us, but maybe someone can clarify what this request for reconsideration, what

it said, and I hope it can be shared with us, because it's not on the Wiki, that I could find.

And just where it stands procedurally. Thanks.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Dennis, I can take the question, if you would like.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So the request for reconsideration is public. [Inaudible] link here in the chat so you can see it. And you're correct. The request for reconsideration goes to the Board, and particularly the governance committee is the one that deals with those. What [inaudible], Krista thanks.

So the... What we're trying to do here is find a way to resolve this in an amicable way with the [inaudible] group, without having to go through the act of request for [reconsideration?] process. So in other words, we are trying to do as [inaudible] groups supposing that the [IFG?] agrees with that, so we can avoid having to go through that paper process and solve the issue. Does that make sense?

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, I see now from the link that this is a bylaws reconsideration, and that the requester asked that it be placed on hold, pending requestor's

planned discussions with staff. So, the registry stakeholder group has had discussions with staff, and could you share those with us?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Correct. We had discussions with them, and like I said, the plan we think will solve the issue with the registry stakeholder group is to do this, and that's why we are proposing this to the ART.

KRISTA PAPAC: Yeah, and just to add to that Steve, so the initial discussion we had with them, which is to try to understand what, you know, what the issue was, and why they felt it was an issue. And then to Francisco's point, this is kind of a plan we've come up with, if people, the IRT and the registries are all onboard with that, you know, the request for reconsideration doesn't have to follow that path all the way through the Board governance committee.

It can, if people are not onboard with it, then it would follow its natural path, [inaudible] nothing else happened. But hopefully that helped.

STEVE METALITZ: This is Steve again. There is one other question, which is that you said, if registry stakeholder group and the IRT are okay with it, then it will solve the problem. So are you talking the IRT first? Or are you talking, has the registry stakeholder group signed off on what you're going to be circulating?

I mean, it wouldn't make much sense for us to consider it to satisfy them.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Sure. That's an excellent point, thank you. So we did get a sense from them... Krista again for everyone's benefit. So we got a strong sense from this from the initial discussion of what they were looking for, and they were pretty clear what they wanted, but that aside, what we have told them is what we just told you, except one other data point, which is, you know, this is what we're proposing, but we have to talk to the IRT first, so it's really sort of dependent on where that conversation goes.

So, we basically said this is what we would like to propose, but we do need to work with the IRT to see where that ends up, and then from there, we can you know, proceed on whatever path we end up on based on these conversations.

DENNIS CHANG:

What I would like to... Go ahead, Steve. You want to finish?

STEVE METALITZ:

No, that's fine. I'll just wait to see what is circulated.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. I think what I'd like to do is to give the floor to Marc, Alan, if you don't mind, Marc is on the registry stakeholder group, and he's very

familiar with this IFR, request for reconsideration. Marc, do you want to go ahead?

MARC ANDERSON:

Sure. Thanks Dennis. This is Marc Anderson for the transcript and everybody. So as I said, I am a member of the registry stakeholder group, and have been involved in the request for reconsideration. So I'm familiar with this topic.

You know, first I want to say, think Francisco and Krista did a very good job sort of explaining the background on this. You know, and I'm supportive of what Francisco and Krista have proposed. This is actually in line with feedback that I had submitted previously back on July 15th, in response to the draft of the CLD policy that was discussed and reviewed at the ICANN Helsinki meeting.

I will just re-forward that to everybody so that it's fresh in everybody's mind. But the concern among the registry stakeholder group was the inclusion of the R-Dap profile, inconsistent labelling, and display policy. You know, there is not concern with the consistent labeling policy itself, and sort of to Alan's point, you know, this isn't so much a change in the implementation of the policy recommendations that came out of the PDP.

It was how it was implemented and concern over the inclusion of R-Dap, which is sort of a separate initiative with CLND. So, I want to just sort of reiterate that I'm supportive of what Krista and Francisco have outlined, and I think to Steve's question, I can't speak for all members of the registry stakeholder group, but I think that this proposal Krista and

Francisco have outlined, addresses the concerns of the registry stakeholder group.

And I think also, Krista did a good job getting into this, but to answer Steve's questions, on the request for reconsideration, that was... The hope of the registry stakeholders group was that dialogue... This concern could be address without having to go through the entire request for reconsideration process.

That was a really considered a last resort, if you will. And so, we're attempting and hoping to resolve this through dialogue. So hopefully that answers the questions that have been floating out there. But I'd be happy to answer any other questions if anybody has them. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Marc. I would like to go to Theo next, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Thank you Dennis. This is Theo for the record. Thank you Marc and Krista, this is pretty useful. I'm not sure of, maybe somebody could answer me this, basically the IRT is going to look at the proposal, and discuss the consideration. That is sort of what we are going to do. Is that sort of correct?

And how does that influence the entire process there? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, Dennis here. To answer your question, what we will do is after the IRT meeting, as Francisco said, we will put out an email explaining exactly what we are proposing. It's basically removing one section that mentions the word R-DAP from the consensus policy. And we'll put it out for you, for your consideration, so you can look at it on your own.

And we can discuss it again at our next week's meeting, and also give you time to fully digest it and we can maybe, in a couple of weeks, we can decide if it's acceptable to IRT as well. By that time, we are hoping that we will hear from registry stakeholder group and other sources.

Theo, is that good? Or do you want to speak some more?

THEO GEURTS: No, that sounds actually good. Let's just see where we end up there. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. Sure. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I'm trying to understand the overall process. When I look at the item on page five of the request for reconsideration, item D which says consensus calls in the IRT were dubious, and I, as I said a few weeks ago, I did not attend these meetings for several months, so things happened that I wasn't aware of.

It sounds as if the registry group brought it up with us, we basically ignored it, stonewalled, whatever, and they either then filed the IRT as a recourse to try to fix the problems, since we hadn't listened, or perhaps filed it because the filing deadline, and they just wanted it in their back pocket in case our discussions didn't go...

The whole thing implies though, that we were not fully responsive to the original request that came from them. Perhaps that doesn't really matter, but I'm troubled that someone who is participating in this group, feels they had to resort to an IRT because we were not sympathetic, perhaps is the right word.

And the request sounds completely reasonable, since R-DAP itself is a major technical implementation and was not mentioned in the policy. So, the whole thing is troublesome. I have no problem with the end result. Thank you.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Hey Alan, it's Krista. I just want to say a few words on that. I don't know if Marc wants to speak to it, because this is something coming from the registry stakeholder group. You know, for what it's worth, R-DAP has been discussed in the IRT for the better part of a year and a half?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Last year, yeah.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Yeah, a year and a half, we've been talking about it. And the inclusion of R-DAP was in the draft policies we've been sending to the IRT. It was also in what we published for public comment. So, I don't think, from my perspective, I don't think the IRT ignored any specific request for registries at all.

I just think that there is... When the staff... When we staff looked at the comments that came in through public comment, and discussed people's concerns with them, we felt we had gotten to a place where the policy that had been published for public comment, needed a few tweaks, not necessarily to this provision 12.

We felt like we had people onboard with moving forward with this inclusion of R-DAP, because it really is just a mechanism by which you can, it can, you don't must, but you can achieve consistent labeling display.

And you know, somehow didn't realize that there was such strong sentiment opposed to including this in there. So, to your direct question about the IRT and ignoring every question from the registry. From my perception, I don't think that is the case at all, but again, and Marc, I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but if there is anything you'd like to add on behalf of the stakeholder group, and if not, that's fine too.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks Krista. This is Marc. Alan, I agree with most of what she said. And I'll sort of, and Krista as well, if you look at the email I re-forwarded, the last paragraph I recognized that this is a proposal that staff initially

presented to the IRT as a result of community feedback and frustration over the large number of RDFs related initiatives. And this proposal was actually in response to community feedback, and as an attempt to combine initiatives and make things easier.

And the IRT, myself included, reported that, initially, and it wasn't until we got further along in the process that I changed my stance on this one, and other members of the registry stakeholder group started expressing concern with that. So I think what initially we thought was a good idea and supported, sort of as we get further along in the process, there was concerns raised about it, and members of the registry stakeholder group felt that maybe that this was, it was inappropriate to combine these two things and put a R-DAP requirement in consistent labeling and display policy.

So I hope that helps. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Theo, you're up next.

THEO GEURTS: Thank you Dennis. Just to make a few things clear here, and there is probably a question in there. I mean, this is sort of new for me also. I've been attending a lot of calls here. So I think I understand Alan here. I mean, we talked a little bit about it, but this is basically new stuff for us.

This whole process of reconsideration has been... I sort of get the sense from Marc that has been discussed with the registry stakeholder group.

Can anybody confirm that? That we are going to do this process and everybody is happy with it? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Marc, maybe you should take that?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, this is Marc. Theo, I'm not sure I followed exactly... I think you're asking for confirmation that this change is in line with what the registry stakeholder group is asking for in their request for reconsideration? Do I understand that correctly?

THEO GEURTS: Yes. And using this vehicle to consider it and discuss it, that's basically what I'm asking. I may be behind a few emails here or memos. I knew about the request for reconsideration. I mean, that was pretty obvious to me. But using this IRT as a vehicle for consideration and discussion, that's kind of new for me. And I'm kind of wondering if that is what the registry stakeholder group is sort of envisioning here.

So they're okay with this procedure that we're going to use for this IRT here. I can't imagine that it's somewhat strange to use this IRT, you being the only registry here. [Inaudible] is a mixed of registrars and other stakeholder groups. So I just want to, yeah, I'm just asking you, is there [inaudible] group okay with this proposal, what's on the table now, what we're discussing here? Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON:

Got you. Thank you. This is Marc again. Yeah, that makes sense. So the first part of that, you know, so this basically we're talking about removing section 12 from the consistent labeling and [inaudible] policy. And that's very specifically one of the requests of the registry stakeholder group.

So removing section 12 from the policy would absolutely meet with what the registry stakeholder group is asking for. And as far as the vehicle, my two cents here, I think this is the right vehicle here in the IRT, I mean we are the IRT that advised, provides input to ICANN staff in drafting that specific policy.

So I think, I guess I'm speaking for staff a little bit here, but I think staff felt that they couldn't just make the change. It was important and necessary to go back to the IRT, and I agree with that. I think it's the right thing to do. So I think in line with what the registry stakeholder group is asking for, and I think it's a very reasonable approach, and that I'm comfortable coordinating with the registry stakeholder group and keeping them up to date with what we're discussing here within the IRT. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Theo. From the ICANN staff perspective, IRT who is we count on to make sure that the policy that we put up is in line with the policy recommendation that the Board has adopted. So if we're going to change something in however minor, we felt it was our duty to come back to the IRT and advise you to make sure that you agree, whatever

change or revision we're making is still in line with the policy recommendation that we have received.

Any other comments on this topic?

Roger typed, it sounds like a smart update. Looking forward, okay. The draft is going to be very simple, just so you know. It's going to remove one section at one point, an only session where the word R-DAP appears.

No other comments?

Let's move on. So, let's get back to the topic of the policy of the transition. And just a reminder, this is a complicated process so we all have to look at this again and again to remind ourselves. So there are two paths, new registration and existing registration. And two, effective dates, policy effective dates on new registration and policy effective date for the existing registration, having all of the data migrated from thin to thick.

And then there are some inter-milestones that we need to track, and that is one of [May?] 2017, and one of August 2017, a long way out, policy effective date. So let me go to the policy itself.

Let's see. Okay, so bringing you back to where we were last night, we considered a new definition for thick registration that Roger, and Marc, and Theo supported. And the first part, here we have our original definition, and we have our new definition.

So we took the action to go back and see if we can take the requirements that we intended to put into the definition, the original

definition, and move it to the requirement section below, and that's what you will see.

Go ahead Marc, you want to speak?

MARC ANDERSON:

Yeah, thanks Dennis. [Inaudible] through the changes, I didn't get a chance to really delve into it in detail, but getting through it just in general, and I'm a lot more comfortable with the way it reads now. So I think I'll give it a more through read after the call, but I think at the very least, you're on the right track here, right? I like these changes. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Well, that's good to hear. One of the concerns was that I specify the requirements into the body of the policy here, it's in 2.4 and 2.5, it does become more expansive, because we were putting in a lot of details and we were concern maybe it would be more difficult to read as it contains more words in the document.

Any other comments from anyone else?

So 2.4, 2.5, we specify more details. And 2.6, 2.7, let's see, on 2.6 we delete... Or, prior to 2.6, we deleted. So we didn't need that section. So the new 2.6 is fine, that hasn't changed. And let me go to 2.9. This one, for starting 1 May of 2018, registry operator must comply with the WHOIS [inaudible] 43, and web page directory service requirements described section one of the specification [poll?] of the base registration agreement or closed on 9 January 2013.

And the registry registration data, directory service consistent labelling, and display policy for other existing domain names. So any comments on that paragraph?

If not, we can continue, and we get to the registrar session. We haven't reviewed this as a team yet, so let's start now. So, 3.1, go ahead Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Sorry, Dennis. This is Marc again. Before we get to section three, I do want to... I think 2.10 probably will be an appropriate place for this, but I would like some mention of billing contact. I think we ran out... I brought this up on a previous call, and we sort of ran out of time to delve into it.

My concern on billing is that it's sort of unclear if it's required, optional, you can't have it, up to registry policy. It's just not really specified anywhere. And so I would like to have some clarity on there regardless of which it is. I think, I guess that's what I'm looking for is somewhere in the policy to specify explicitly, is it an optional field, is it a required field, is it a not allowed field, or is it left up to registry policy whether or not you have billing contact. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Marc. I think Francisco has an answer for you there. Go ahead Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you Dennis. So Marc, the billing contact is sort of referencing the CLD policy, which is specified as optional in the CLD policy. And as you can see in the current draft, it's... Requiring to implement CLD, so in that sense, I think it's [inaudible] but please take a look and let me know if you think if this is not, and we will find a way to update.

And I guess on our way to say, the intention here has been to say that the billing contact is an optional element, since the time of the [position?] of the WHOIS advisory. It has been [soft?]. So if we need to address it, please let me know.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, the request is to take a look at the CLD policy one more time. We feel it was adequately covered, but go ahead Marc, you want to speak again?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, thank you. So I think that's basically where we ran out of time last time, but I did, in the meantime I did go back and look at that, and my read of the CLD policy is that it says, if the registry has it, it has to display it, and this is how you have to display it. And I think that's fine. From that perspective, it makes sense and it's consistent with how things are worded in other areas.

So I think that's good, but what it doesn't address is whether or not the, or at least from my read, I don't think it addresses whether the registry has to collect it or not. So, you know, I think it's clear, I think the way it reads is it's an optional field, but the registry has it, you have to display

it and this is how you display it. As far as collecting it though, is the registry required to accept billing as a contact? Or can they can decide not to accept a billing contact, for example?

I think today, by default it has become sort of up to registry policy, whether to collect it or not, but I don't think I can really point back to any policy or contract that states that. And so, if I'm missing something, please point me to it, but I think it's just not clearly spelled out anywhere, and that's what I'm looking for. Thanks.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Marc, this is Francisco. Yeah, so again, the intention is, as you said, that this would be something that is up to the registry to request or not, and that's what we meant by optional. But if you think we should clarify that, then by all means.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you. Do you want me to propose language?

DENNIS CHANG:

That would be helpful, yeah. I would like to see your language if you don't mind.

MARC ANDERSON:

Absolutely. I will do that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, Theo go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Thanks. This is Theo for the transcript. From a registrar perspective, at least, the one I look for, we don't use a billing contact anymore, since it became optional, but Marc just raising an interesting question. If they are required to collect it or not, and if that is required or not, but indicate it is required, they collect it, and it's not being transmitted, or the way around, it's not required but some registrars still haven't been in contact.

Are we looking at errors here? Do we suddenly notice that somebody is trying to migrate 100,000 domain names with a billing contact and the registry doesn't accept it, that the migration will fail there? What are we looking...?

I think there is some clarification required here. So if we can get that clarified, that would be great so that everybody knows where to go during the migration, or when there is a change to the Thick WHOIS anyways, on the registry side. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead. Okay next, go ahead, let's see, who was it? It was, oh, lowered the hand. Okay then, let's move on to the registrar side, 3.1. So probably anyone have comments about 3.1, 3.2? It pretty much tracks the earlier period, registrars have to do something and registrars have to do part of the task. Go ahead Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: This is Roger. Thanks. I think that 3.1, it says starting on. I'm concerned that that means that registrars have to start transferring that day. I'm not sure that's what the language meant to say, but that's how it can be read.

DENNIS CHANG: I see.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Good point. The addition certainly not to say that the migration has to be done by then. The addition was to say that [inaudible] the registrars have to do it, and I guess we should... If you have a specific proposal, I would be more happy to...

ROGER CARNEY: This is Roger. I don't have anything. I can think about something, I don't have anything off the top of my head right now.

DENNIS CHANG: You make a good point, between or in the period between.
[CROSSTALK]

ROGER CARNEY: I can try to work on something, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Great, thank you. Theo, did you want to speak?

THEO GEURTS: No, I just got solved itself. I see where Roger is coming from, I mean starting [CROSSTALK], everybody starts to migrate, that's exactly what you don't want to do on this one.

DENNIS CHANG: All right. And 3.2? This is the May, right? And 3.3. Little split on the screen. This is the [inaudible] must provide Thick registration data to [inaudible] after that has enabled it to comply with the WHOIS.

And this is effective basically 1 May 2018, any new registration has to be thick. 3.4? Go ahead Steve. Steve, did you want to? Oh, Steve is out of the room. Let me get him in.

Go ahead Roger, you have your hand up.

ROGER CARNEY: Right. This is Roger. On 3.4, I think this is just duplicating what's said in the R-DAP profile, but I don't think that this is needed in here.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah Theo, go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, I agree with Roger there. It sounds like redundant there. I would actually advise to have that kind of language in there, which also is already in a different policy whatever, I mean, most likely they'll

conflict. We have seen it with the RD, the specification which is causing a whole lot of issues right now.

So, I would remove it.

DENNIS CHANG: 3.4. Francisco?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you Dennis. So, 3.4 and 3.5, as you can see there, bracket indicate that they are out of the discussion regarding the request for reconsideration, and I think that is useful, there is another... So, if [inaudible] the discussion progresses, and in the [inaudible] regarding the proposed revision to the TLD policies, then it is correct that we would have to remove 3.4 and 3.5, but since that issue is still not resolved, that's why we maintain this language here. Does that make sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Theo.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, and actually I was just going to follow up on Francisco there. I think you're right there. I mean, it's already in the RDAP, in the R-DAP operational profile, how that should go down, so I think we should stick with that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you. Thank you for your suggestion. So that's the end of the document, and as you see, I have gone ahead and added a link for the procedure for the conflict law, handling the conflict law. And what I'd like to do is, in the remaining five minutes, like to look at the future and we're basically done with our document, and we'll go ahead and update it.

And we probably should publish it for you. And let's look at the next steps here. So next step is, when we get our policy document done, we'll of course be distributed, and we're going to go for public comment next, and hopefully we'll do that before Hyderabad.

And the... That's what we've been doing. Let's just go to the last page. The other two topics, we ran out of time again, so we'll pick it up on our next call. So, next call is 27th of September, same time, on Tuesday. And what I would like to do is propose that we continue meeting throughout October, maybe not the last meeting just before we have to travel to ICANN 57, but I'd like to go ahead and schedule those maybe three weeks of meeting.

And we will have a session in ICANN 57. Go ahead Steve.

STEVE METALITZ:

Yeah, this is Steve. Just to be clear on what the next steps are on this document that we've been discussing. You're going to send that around to us again with a deadline for any last points that need to be... In other words, just to confirm that this is the document, and then it would be posted for public comment. So what's the timetable? Should we expect to see it and when will it be posted?

So, we'll probably get it to you fairly quickly, and you'll see it before your next meeting, or your review, and I'd like to get a consensus from the IRT that it's good to go, and after that, we will do the internal process in ICANN process thing for public comment. So we're shooting for this month, going up for public comment.

And it's a 40 day standard period that would cover the ICANN 57 period, which is good because when we're at the ICANN 57 Hyderabad, when we are having the meeting, we will put it up for any other public comment from the attendees there. That's the plan.

And then following that, we'll do our normal summary and analysis report, and then post it for announcement on 1 February 2017. That's the goal.

STEVE METALITZ: Okay, thank you.

DENNIS CHANGE: You're welcome. Other comments, questions?

KRISTA PAPAC: Hey Dennis, it's Krista. Sorry, I see Marc is in the queue. I just think when you said we were trying to publish this month, I think you're referring to early October, because we still need to get the draft back to the IRT and give them time to look through it before we publish.

I don't know about you, I'm already thinking it's October, which is sad, but...

DENNIS CHANG:

Sure. Yes, we'll go as quickly as possible, but like we're in good shape. And yes, it could be the first week of October, which works.

Marc, you want to have the last word here?

MARC ANDERSON:

Sure, thank you Dennis. This is Marc. Just to respond, I agree with meeting throughout October, so thank you for that. And just a request for an agenda item for next week. I see you added in the reduced validation rule language, that was an item that we discussed last week, but could we just add that to agenda item just to review that language and make sure registries and registrars are on the same page as far as what that means and how it will be implemented?

I think it would be worth just having a little bit of time for that next week. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes, next week we'll look at a clean version together including that language, and I would encourage the IRT to look at that before the meeting, so you come with any questions that you might have.

Anybody else? That will conclude this meeting. Thank you very much everyone. I'll see you next week, and please expect the meeting invitation for our October meeting from our colleague [inaudible]. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]