
MARRAKECH – GNSO Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Wednesday, June 26th, at 10:30. This is the GNSO Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT in [Teechka] at ICANN 65 in Marrakech.

DENNIS CHANG: Hello, everyone. Would the IPT and IRT members please join us?

We'll get started here.

IRT members, please take a seat at the table. We're going to be introducing ourselves.

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the [gTLD] Registration Data Policy Implementation IRT meeting. Seated at the table is the implementation team, both the IPT implementation project team and IRT implementation review team. I will explain what those mean here soon.

We'll get started here. My name is Dennis Chang. I am the GDD Programs Director, primarily responsible for policy implementation. On this policy implementation, I am the project manager. This is the Implementation Review Team meeting #3 – we had two so far – and the first face-to-face meeting.

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.

What I'd like to do to start, since this is our first face-to-face meeting, is go around the room and introduce yourself. This is an opportunity to put a face to the name.

Let me see. Let's get started from that end. Amr, why don't we start with you? Introduce yourself and your affiliation.

AMR ELSADR: Morning, everyone. My name is Amr Elsadr. I'm a member of the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and was a member of the EPDP team for Phase 1. Thank you – oh, I'm still a member of Phase 2 as well, unfortunately.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl, GNSO Council liaison to this IRT.

MARGIE MILAM: Margie Milam from the BC and a member of the EPDP.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, member of the IPT and also policy support for Phase 1 of EPDP.

KAREN LENTZ: Karen Lentz with ICANN org, part of GDD, working on implementation.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Francisco Arias, GDD technical services.

AMY BEVINS: Amy Bevins, ICANN org.

ANDREA GLANDON: Andrea Glandon, IRT support.

BETH BACON: Beth Bacon. I'm with the Public Interest Registry, and I was both an alternate and a member of the Phase 1 EPDP, and currently a Registries Stakeholder Group alternate.

MARC ANDERSON: Marc Anderson, Registries Stakeholder Group, a member of the IRT and EPDP.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Susan Kawaguchi, BC.

CHERIE LAGAKALI: Cherie Lagakali from Fiji. I am a member of the IRT.

[LUKE SIFFER]: [Luke Siffer], registrar.

GREG DIBIASI: Greg Dibiasi, Amazon registrar.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Eric Rokobauer, Endurance family registrars.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Owen Smigelski, Namecheap, student of the Phase 1 EPDP and alternate for Phase 2.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Are there any other IRT members out there? Please have a seat at the table because you'll need access to the mic to participate. Introduce yourself and your affiliation too, please.

KRISTINA HAKOBYAN: Hello, everyone. I'm Kristina Hakobyan from Armenia. My background is country-code top-level registrations.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome.

BETTY FAUSTA: Betty Fausta, [just a member of] the GNSO.

DENNIS CHANG: Did we get everyone? Yes? Okay. Today, this is a 90-minute session, and it's an opportunity for the community at large to watch the IRT in action. What I would like to do is to give you a quick status and background of the project to give you some context so that you can relate to what we are doing here. At the end of the session, we are going to give you an opportunity to ask any questions to us who are working on the policy implementations. We'll reserve maybe five minutes at the end, so if you could remind me, Andrea, before.

Let's see. We just did the team member introductions, and we'll get our Board resolution. I'll give you a quick status. Then we'll tell you about the implementation process, what it involves, and we'll dive into the work, starting with the work assignments, and look at the working documents that we use to do our work. Then we'll talk about the next steps.

This is a quick status [update]. I provided this at the GNSO Council on Monday. I'll be brief here. You all know the EPDP Phase 1 final report was adopted by the Board on the 15th of May. There were a couple of exceptions, and we'll pay attention to them. This implementation team that you're seeing here has published the interim registration data policy on the 17th of May, 2019, two days

after the Board adoption. We were able to do that because we had been working in advance of the Board resolution as requested by the EPDP team per Recommendation 28. That policy's effective data is the 20th of May, 2019, and that was required because the temp spec was expiring.

Do we have a consensus policy for the registration data? Yes, we do, and it is in effect. What we're doing now is creating a second version or a Stage 2 of that policy per the recommendation, the full set. We did a call for IRT on the 20th of May, and we assembled an IRT quickly. Currently, there are 28 IRT members and 38 observers.

Now, unlike the EPDP team, the IRT is an open team, and anyone can join. So those of you out there, if you have an interest and would like to participate, please join us. Otherwise, you can sign up as an observer and track our work.

What we're doing, what we're engaging now, is of course the policy recommendation analysis and the requirements that it drives. This is a chart that we use to communicate with the community. This policy you can view in stages. You'll see Stage 0, 1, 2, and 3. Stage 0 was before we had our Board resolution, when the temp spec was in effect. Stage 1 is today, right now. That interim policy is in effect. What we are working on is a policy that

we'll publish for Stage 2. Currently, we're in the implementation planning right here.

Here are the members of the [IPT] and IRT. There's 28 members [and] observers that you see. The Board resolution details: there was 27 of the 29 recommended without a change. There's two recommendations with change. That had to do with Recommendation 1 and 12.

The Board also provided us with what they call the scorecard. It defined three categories. A) Recommendation adopted as is, and B) with some comments that we need to be attentive to because the implementation team receives direction from the Board resolution. And [C)] Recommendation not adopted as a whole; as I said, 1 and 12.

This is the interim registration data policy. You see the link there. It's online at ICANN.org. Here are the planning activities for those of you who are new to the policy implementation. In the beginning – well, Stage 1 and 2 – what we're doing is reviewing those recommendations and trying to figure out what implementation requirement those recommendations offer.

Of course, once we do that, we know what task we have in terms of implementation. We have to estimate those tasks' scope, time, and cost, and we build a critical path which fills, basically, the schedule.

As of now, we don't have a schedule because we have not finished our analysis of the recommendations yet. Once we do that, what we have is an implementation plan, a complete plan that informs you of the scope, schedule, and cost. That's what we'll be publishing for public comment. So all of you will have an opportunity to find out what this implementation is, when it will be done, what you have to do, and comment back to us so we can further analyze our plan and maybe revise it if we need to.

Of course, we'll put out a report for the public comment and then publish that Stage 2 policy for implementation with a clear, effective date for you. When that happens, the contracted parties will receive a legal notice from ICANN org. So you won't miss it.

I talked about IPT and IRT, and I'll very quickly tell you what they mean. IPT is basically the ICANN org or staff. You'll see us sitting up here. We're the ones who design, build, and draft the policy, and then we offer it to the IRT team (the review team) to give us feedback. So the work for the implementation planning is done by the staff.

IRT's job is to support the IPT with its expertise in that knowledge of the policy recommendation and perhaps the intent of those recommendations. When the policy recommendation is subject to interpretation, we want to ensure that we choose the interpretation that was intended.

We have an IRT wiki workspace. This is the workspace for us to interface with the community at large, and it's offered to you if you'd like to track our work. We have multiple collaboration documents. The work of the IPT/IRT is largely done offline, meaning that our meetings are every other week. So the real work gets done individually and asynchronously, and the tools that we use are these collaborative documents. We have our workbook. We have plans. we have the language in development. We have an FAQ.

Let's dive into our workbook. This is what the workbook looks like. Now we're going to start with our IRT assignments. Last time we met we had reviewed up to, I think, probably Recommendation 4. There are more assignments made. I even made one today for the IRT. You'll see it at the end here. That is the review of the definitions that we have come up with.

The way this works is that, if you click on the link there – for the IRT members, this a good time for you to get on the Zoom with me and get on the documents yourself. It'll probably be easier than watching the screen. If we look at the definition in the main document, it looks like this. This started out as a framework of the consensus policy document, but that we're trying to communicate to you is that you can view this as a final product being built. Please comment on the structure of the document as well as the comment.

Section 1 we intended to be the scope of the policy. As you'll see there, we added one item there about that more items will be added to help us get on the same page as what the scope is for this implementation.

With the definition, we start out with the key terms that we use. This is very important for the policy implementation. We have to use these keywords, like “must” and “must not” so that it's very, very clear what items have to be performed and what are the optional, as recommendation language would say to us. But, in the policy language, we do not use words like “optional.” We make it very clear that it's either a “must” or “may.” That's part of the work that we're doing in clarifying and translating the recommendations to the requirements.

You'll note that there's 20 terms that we've already defined. Please review this because I think it will help us because I've already noted that, when we were receiving comments, it was probably because we had not defined these terms in advance. Once we get synced on these terms, these definitions, I think it will make it more efficient for us.

Section 3 is intended to be the policy effective date. Of course, we were give the 29th of February of 2020 as the effective date as a target. At this time, we don't know whether we're going to meet that date, but the implementation team's goal is to try and build

a plan to see if we can meet that date. That's why we are working at a very fast pace. Normally, our implementation activities aren't this heavy, but with this policy, we're moving very fast. The reason is because we need to know whether we can meet that date or not. We are very concerned already that we don't have enough, and we'd like to get our hand around the scope.

The other things after the policy – the requirements such as that we're going to have requirements for collection of registration data. Section 5: We'll have transfer. In Section 6, we're likely to [have] publication. Then we'll have implementation notes along with those languages on top and maybe some background that we'll offer, as a policy language usually does.

We're going to be adding an addendum to the policy language. I think this was one of the questions from the IRT: whether or not we will have an addendum called data protection addendum. You'll note clearly here that that is our intention. We will have a document called data protection addendum.

With that answered, I think that you'll help us simplify the policy language as we go through them.

So that's the consensus policy document in work. I also want to go over this FAQ. Now, I have assigned this to the IRT on June 22nd. It's not due yet, so you're right, Beth. You can have your time until June 30th to finish reading this. The purpose of this FAQ is, when

we noted repeated questions from different IRT members, that it's a good opportunity for us to capture that and offer it back to you as an FAQ.

For the public, our intention is that we are going to, once the IRT is in agreement with the wording for question and answer, publish these on the community wiki so all of you can follow it too. For now, we have six FAQs. Some may be obvious to you, but we noted that what's obvious to us may not be obvious to some.

One of the important points that keeps coming up is that the IRT is here and the implementation team is here to implement the recommended policy. We're not the policy development group. In other words, our job is to implement the policy that we're given by the EPDP team. We have no latitude to change any of the policy. If such an occasion arises where we must or we cannot implement the recommendation is given and we have to change it, we will have to go back to probably the GNSO. That's why Rubens is sitting here. That's his role: to liaise with the GNSO Council if we need such an intervention. So far, we haven't had that, and I hope we don't. I think our job is to be very diligent about finding ways to solve our problems so we can go ahead and implement what was intended.

That's the FAQ document.

Now, let's get to it. This is Recommendation 5.4: Collection. This is how we do our work. We have crafted the policy language that we intend to use for collection. This document [has] presented it in four parts. Part 1 is the policy language to be contained in the policy document that I showed you. When this collection language is almost done and [cleaned] up, we'll move it over the main policy document. The reason that we wanted to do this is because we believe this is more efficient. Trying to build then whole consensus policy language at one time is very difficult.

You will note that these people on top are on this document. This is how we work. The comments can be made and suggestions can be made by the IRT, and the IPT responds to those.

I especially want to encourage this to the IRT. Please, if you can answer another IRT member's question, please do. If you have facts, please offer them. In the IPT, we have expertise here, but we are dependent. Part of the IRT role is to provide that expertise based on your background and your field. So feel free to comment and reply.

We have Part 1. That is the policy language. Part 2 is the implementation notes. In Part 3, we have a special section, where we had considered different approaches. This is where, as I said, interpretation comes into play. There's more than one way to implement a recommendation. What we wanted to do is fully

offer to the IRT the consideration that we had made and the decision to choose a direction. We want to make sure that the IRT is in agreement with the approach that we're taking. If there's a better approach, please let us know.

Part 4 is something that we created here as we resolve our comments. Some of the substantive comments we want to keep track of so we remember what we agreed on or what we've decided. We created Part 4 at the end, and you'll see a collection of resolved comments.

Let's start on the top. IRT members and IPT members here, those around the table with the mic, please feel free to interrupt. This is a collaborative session. We would like to have it as much as a conversation than just a presentation from me to you.

Look at this comment. Let's see ... okay. When you see something like this, [inaudible], we need to be careful it's not mentioning which data is optional in the policy and to let registries decide which one is and which one isn't. Otherwise, we may not have a policy is that is [in sync. This] is advice for us, and I think it's good advice. Now that we have all seen this, I think we're going to resolve it.

Next one is from Eric Rokobauer. Eric is here, right? Nice to see you finally. Let's see. Thank you for this comment. I like this comment it. We appreciated it. What we did in response to this

comment is we acted pretty quickly. Instead of changing the title, we wanted to keep the title simple. But we did add this statement here. With this statement right below the main title, we are able to simplify each one of the section titles like this. So watch this. We're going to accept this change, and we're going to accept this change, and we're going to resolve Eric's comment here, and so on down the line, except that change –

BETH BACON: Hey, Dennis. Can I hope in the queue?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: We are zipping through this.

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry. Am I going too fast?

BETH BACON: Yeah. Can we just maybe go a little slower as we accept, accept, accept, accept because I know that there's some of these – we did put these in but we wanted to discuss them with you guys to see

if you agreed. Then there were some overall comments that I think we didn't actually enter. We just had some questions.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Please stop me, just like you did here. The thing that I'm accepting right now is the phrasing change based on Eric's comment. It's the same changes, and it applies to all the sections. That's why I was going pretty fast there. Maybe that wasn't obvious.

BETH BACON: Okay. No, thank you. I was just trying to catch up and it was just less of accepting. So I just wanted to make sure we what we were doing. Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: This is the expedited mode of implementation, Beth. You asked for this. You got it.

BETH BACON: Did I? Did I really?

DENNIS CHANG: Maybe you didn't, but Recommendation 28. Remember, you guys wrote Recommendation 28 for us. Well, maybe not you, but we are responding accordingly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll getting Google Docs. I'm not familiar with it. Is there a history of all the changes from original documents? Where would I find that?

It's going to be a little bit difficult to manage. Also, the question is, as we're working in these documents – not in a meeting – are you the only one that can control the resolve? Or if I go in and answer a question and go, "Okay. I answered that question," I'm going to resolve it?

DENNIS CHANG: Good process question. Please let me resolve the comments, even if you asked the question. Let me resolve it because I really want to see that you asked it and you're okay with it. You can add further comments or reply to your own comment by saying, "Okay to resolve, Dennis." That would be helpful. But I would like to be the one that resolves all comments.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So there's not a mechanism with Google Docs to prevent anybody else from resolving?

DENNIS CHANG: No. We wanted to ... yeah, that's fine. But I can get the history.

Other comments?

Amr, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Dennis. Just another process related issue, and maybe specifically for this meeting. Some IRT members are not present, and some of them have contributed comments to some of the proposed consensus policy language. So I would ask that we not resolve the issues they weighed in on before they have an opportunity to provide feedback. We can discuss them today. That'd be fine, but I think we shouldn't resolve any of these until they've had an opportunity to weigh in as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Good comment. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Amr, I think that's a good comment, and I think that, perhaps, in the doc, maybe we just respond to their comments and let them know because I know that a couple of people tried to dial in but it's, like, 2:30 in the morning for them and they weren't able to travel. So I 100% and I think they shouldn't miss out on this. Maybe instead of just resolving everything, we just put a quick note to respond, saying, "We will resolve this," or, "This was the discussion."

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's try that. This particular change is resulting from Eric's comment, so I think it's okay for us to resolve this one. Do you agree? Something like this.

Let's see. Was there any other ... yeah. Here's another one. These are the edits that I made based on Eric's original comment. There you go. This is for efficiency that I'm doing this, of course. Now, what you will also note that I mentioned in Part 4 ... here's Eric's comment. I captured it as #3. I'm trying to make a note of substantive comments that results in edits down here as well for our future reference.

Okay. Now let's see. Thanks to Eric, that made it a lot cleaner. We'll go find our next comment here, I think. Marc's comment. Okay. There's a long comment from Marc about distinguishing natural and legal person. Amr had a follow-up. I am proposing

that we delete this section and move the registrant organization to 5.3.

Since Marc and Amr are both here, can I hear from you to see what you think of my proposal?

MARC ANDERSON: Dennis, yeah, I'm good with deleting that organization. I think that was what my suggestion was intended to get to, so it makes sense.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks. Yeah, sure. I don't mind moving it and deleting it from this section, but I also wanted to stress that there are no additional obligations that are placed on contracted parties as a result of them choosing to differentiate between natural and legal persons. This is a point that I wanted to really put across in my comment because it felt to me like the proposed language was suggesting this. So I just wanted to flag this. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dennis, I just wanted to note. Amr, I support the change to supported as opposed to provided. I think it's clear and more in

line with the recommendation. So I like that change quite a bit and I think it makes more sense when you're reading the policy for implementation.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you. I will make the change right now, but I'll have it noted that IRT has agreed to the proposal [inaudible] here. That's good. Let's see.

Comment?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I think there's a lot of comments on this document.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: I was looking for it and I couldn't find it quickly, but I think there's also a comment in there noting that other recommendations later on also deal with the organization field and that we may have to circle back to that when we get to the later recommendations. So just something to keep in mind as well.

And I think somewhere there's a comment from Sarah Wyld on that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's keep that in mind. As we go down the list, maybe it'll come up. It should. So we address – oh, maybe this one? Sarah? Sarah's not here, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dennis, there's one from Theo that ties to the future recommendation about the redaction of tech info. Marc, is that what you were talking about?

If you click on the part that's highlighted in 5.3, that's Theo's comment.

DENNIS CHANG: This one?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 5.3. The highlighted part.

DENNIS CHANG: Highlighted part?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right where Jody just popped out.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Welcome, Jody. Okay, Theo – oh, okay. “So while this is fine for now, we need to keep in mind the recommendation which deals about redaction of the tech info. Might want to ...” Yes, we’ll park this. I agree. So, when the redaction recommendation is in review, we’ll circle back and look at this again. That’s what I meant by “agreed.” Okay? So we’ll leave that as there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dennis, can I ask a procedural question? Once we do resolve a lot of these comments, which I think we’ll be able to do, can we make another task for ourselves to take a look at the clean document and give it one more pass? I think it’ll be helpful because we’re chopping at it.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah. Right. So let’s talk about that process. What you are looking at is our initial draft, so [we expect] comments. What we expect is an intent-of-the-language comment, maybe choice-of-the-interpretation comments, and structure comments. This is not going to be done any time soon. What will happen is, as we clean this up, we’ll try to clean it up again and again and again. When we think it is clean enough, we’ll move it to the main

language document, this document. It'll go right here, under ... what is it? Section 4: Collection. So, when it's clean, I'm going to copy over the collection here to this document because it'll be surprising. When you see it in pieces, it looks good. Maybe it's fine, but then when you see it all together, you may have other ideas and it may look different. So be assured that we're going to be looking at this multiple times.

Our probably first time that we'll have to be satisfied that it's good enough is when we have to publish it for public comment. It will go out for the public comment, and when we receive feedback, we will have to look at it again. So we're just getting started. So I know that it may look like I'm getting [inaudible]—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, no. I just wanted to flag it. I just wanted to make sure that we would loop back. That's not a big deal.

DENNIS CHANG: Rest assured also you can comment any time on any language as you like because you may have colleagues that will provide you more comments, too.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Dennis. This is just a kind reminder for anyone speaking to please identify yourself for the remote participants. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Dennis. On the registrant or – I’m not sure what happened there because ... and I apologize if I’m just not following this. On the registrant org, was that – the whole section is being moved to 5.8, or is it just being deleted completely? I missed what the action is.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. Let me clarify. The proposal that I have made is to delete this section and move the registrant organization, that data element, to 5.8, 5.8 being here. That’s the proposal. When I actually make the change, you’ll see it there, and it’ll be cleaner, which I can do now. Should I try to do it now, you think?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Well, let me just ask another question. 5.8 is saying, “The [registrar] must offer the following data elements. But if provided by the registered name holder, the registrar must collect the following data elements.” So, if we move registrant org into 5.8, does that mean – am I reading this correctly? – it was optional if a registrant is going to provide an org? It’s just not clear to me: 5.8, the language.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Dennis. Beth and I were just talking about that. I agree with Susan. It's a little bit oddly worded there. Maybe a little bit of context from the EPDP perspective. We looked at the types of data in three different buckets. One type was data that, for any domain name registration, it must be collected. You don't have a domain name registration without that data. Then you have another bucket, which is this particular bucket, where the data is optional. Nameservers is the classic example of that. It's completely optional for the registered name holder to provide the nameserver data. However, the registrar must support that field. So it must be supported by the registrar, but it's optional for the registered name holder to provide it.

The other type of data – you've got the field a little bit higher up – is optional for the registrar to support. If the registrar does support, it's optional for the registered name holder to provide.

So I think we're really looking at the data in those three buckets. The way it's worded here I don't think clearly conveys it. I think that's what Susan was getting at.

Along those lines, I'll note that you've divided it into four different sections in the document. A particular section, 5.7, says, "Registrar may generate or collect the following data elements."

I think there's not really a distinction there, and those fields can go into one of the other three buckets.

So a couple things there. Sorry to be so long-winded.

Dennis, I just asked Susan offline if that helped, and she wasn't sure. So maybe it'd be helpful if I just followed up with an e-mail to the group, trying to explain that in text. Maybe that would be easier to review and comment on.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Thanks. Susan, I want to maybe the IRT's attention to this document. This is a data elements matrix document that we are using to identify and define the transaction for every data element that we are aware of. If you look at this, you'll see there are ... let's see ... more than 60 data elements that we have to look at. For each of those data elements, we are trying to determine if the RNH provides it to registrars and whether that is a must provide or may provide and for the registrar to offer to collect, meaning, do they have to offer to collect? Yes or no? That is different than the registrar collects from the RNH.

Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Dennis. Sorry, Caitlin. I kept forgetting to say who I was. The offer to collect I think we should maybe clarify a little bit, and I think that goes to Amr’s point of supporting. It can support the collection, but it’s the must and may. There’s a difference between offering it and supporting it. So I think that we should maybe clarify that a little bit because I think we go back and forth in the document a little bit. So you can support the data element, but they won’t necessarily say, “Please, I offer you this field.” They may just be able to technically support it. I’m making no sense?

DENNIS CHANG: Do you have a comment, Amr?

AMR ELSADR: I think you are making sense because supporting data elements or field for specific data is one thing, but I’m not sure that we’ve actually used the word “offer” before in consensus policy language. That suggests a proactive approach on the part of the registrar. But this is something we would have to discuss, I think, in a policy development context, not an implementation one. So I think “support” is more straightforward. It’s something we all understand and have used before, so, yeah, I would go with that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we are interested in the reaction from the words we are using. So if “support” communicates more clearly, then we need to use that word: “support” instead of “offer.” What we were thinking here is that the registrant needs to have the opportunity to provide us data, and it is not up to the registrar to decide not to do it. They have to do it. This is a clear requirement to the registrar, and we wanted to communicate that clearly.

AMR ELSADR: I guess that’s where use of the word “must” versus “may” would come in, but you could still use that in conjunction with “support.”

RUBENS KUHL: There is one thing that I can correlate to other policy implementation issues: sometimes there are things that are mandated to be supported but end up being supported by manual procedures. So [that’s why there’s no other] feature available if you open a support ticket, but in fact, many people thought that this would be a requirement for that service to be automatically provided for registrants. So we might be conscious of that when we say “offer” or “support,” whether there is intended to be a default option or something that could be relegated to, “Hey, if you need that, just open a support ticket.”

That's two very different things, and we might want to consider [for] implementation: whether we are asking for one or another.

DENNIS CHANG:

That's a very good point. And there's a decision there: whether we need to prescribe the policy language in a very clear manner, that we do not give the registrar the option to choose a method or we just make the policy language at a higher language. So they may implement differently but still meet the policy.

Let's go back to the top and see where we were. We dealt with this comment, and we said that we were going to delete this. So I think this comment is taken care of. So we are here. Everyone with me here? Okay. Theo made a comment to park it. We agreed to park it. Tech name ... We added a tech name based on somebody's comment, I remember. Maybe we'll get to the comment. We moved over the tech – oh, yeah. It is this comment, Sarah's comment.

Sarah's not here. Marc is here. Marc commented on this, too, and agreed with Sarah's point. Maybe Marc can comment on this here [inaudible]. What I meant to reply to you, Marc, is that we agree and we'd like to resolve it at this meeting here.

Go ahead, Marc. Do you want to say something?

MARC ANDERSON: I guess, if you're agreeing, there's not a whole lot for me to say, so I'll just give you a thumbs up.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you. Beth, I'm going to resolve it ... There it is. Thank you. Here, Sarah made a comment – renumbering. I'm going to resolve this. I think this is a simple edit. Oh, here. This is substantive. I want to maybe talk about this a little bit. Basically, Marc, you asked the question, “Why didn't you use the policy recommendation language?” and we said, “The reason is we tried to make it more clear.” I recognize that, since you've worked on these languages yourself, maybe it's super clear to you. But for [dozens] of us, it wasn't, so we thought we would make it more clear.

After having thought about this more, what we wanted to do is maybe offer a whole new set of language which is simpler. So I would like the IRT to review this set of language and see if you would agree for us to just replace this with a simpler language that I proposed here. It says, “If the registrar permits the RNH” – by the way, RNH is another acronym we adopted because that RNH is repeated so many times it really saves on the real estate here and makes it efficient. So, “RNH to provide a technical contact. The registrar must advise the RNH that RNH may, one, designate the same person as the registrant or its representative

as the technical contact, or, two, provide contact information which does not directly identify the technical contact person concerned.”

So it’s an offer of new language. You can look at that and give me a thumbs up or revise it further. I think there’s no change in the intent of what we’re trying to say here. It’s just wording, so we can take our time doing that.

I’m going to move on unless you have questions here or further comments.

Okay. We’ll move on. I added, “generate or collect” here. That I think is okay to accept. That’s just my comment to add. With these two fields, we’re saying that a registrar may generate or collect.

Let’s look at your comments. Marc has made a comment here. “Intent is fine, but I find the wording awkward.” So you’re finding the wording awkward. You wanted to combine it with 5.3. I offered an explanation why we should not combine it with 5.3. I don’t know if you had a chance to look at it, but please do and let us know if you agree with me because that one I think we shouldn’t be combining. There was a reason why we had to separate.

I'll just read it here, "It shouldn't be combined because the registrars don't give the RNH the option to provide [reselling] for all registrars' registration expiration dates." Those are handled between resellers and registrars or are all in registrars. That's why these are in a different section, basically. RNH doesn't have an action here. Intent of ["may"] is that not all registrations needs to be collected. The reseller isn't always present. A separate expiration date isn't always created. So that's why it's ["may."] Do you agree?

MARC ANDERSON:

Dennis, I get what you're saying. I'm not sure that's the right place to make the distinction, though. If you look in Section 5.1, some of the information in there is generated data and some of it is collected data along the same lines. I think maybe I can take it offline and respond to your suggestion, but I think this is creating an extra section where maybe an extra section isn't needed. I'm happy to respond with a suggestion offline.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. That'll work.

MARGIE MILAM:

On the reseller option, if the reseller doesn't exist? That's the concept. So I think that should be reflected in there.

DENNIS CHANG: Do you have a suggestion on how to reflect it better? We use the word “may” to say that, if it doesn’t exist, you can’t do it. So that’s why it’s “may.”

MARGIE MILAM: I think you say “may” if it doesn’t exist, so maybe you have to break out the reseller ... right.

DENNIS CHANG: I’m sorry, Margie. Are you saying that reseller should have its own section with a different requirement?

MARGIE MILAM: I’m not familiar with 5.7, but the concept is that the reseller is optional if it doesn’t exist. So, if there’s a reseller, it’s in there. If there’s no reseller, it’s not in there.

DENNIS CHANG: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But “may” leave it very ambiguous, like, “I don’t want to put it in, so I’m not going to.” But I think it’s a requirement to have the reseller in the record if one exists. I just find that very vague and

have been involved in long discussions in “may” or “might” or “should.” So we need to be very, very clear on that.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Dennis. We have talked about this before on our calls, where this seems very complicated, just in the drafting. I think that this might be a spot, again, where it’s “support.” Some of the complications of these sections are that, in the EPDP, we discussed the nature of personal data, but we recognize also that, if we’re going to make a consensus policy on registration data, you can’t leave out the technical stuff that actually registers the name.

So most of this should codify what exists today technically because this is not personal data. This is the technical stuff that we included in the aggregate minimum data set in the recommendations. So a lot of this I think would benefit from another look from us when it’s a little cleaner and seeing if adding “support” to those technical items makes it clearer.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. I take that to mean that you’re going to look at it and offer suggestions, right? Later.

BETH BACON: Yeah. I can write that down and put it in a comment later.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you.

AMR ELSADR: I just wanted to see clarity on this because my understanding of the reseller field is that, obviously, as Margie said, if there is not reseller, then that field will not be populated. If a reseller does exist, my understanding of the recommendation is that the registrar still has the option of providing this data or not. If it is provided, then it must be processed. My assumption was that this would also apply to the registry operator, for example. But I'm not entirely sure, but that is my understanding. Maybe some of my colleagues on the EPDP team could help. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We actually didn't talk about that in the EPDP. Maybe we hear from staff. How do they interpret now under the existing contract? Because we never spoke about whether we were going to change how reseller was treated. So I think that was probably the assumption. I think it's the opposite from my perspective, but maybe we just get staff to clarify that.

AMR ELSADR: I don't think we did actually single out each data element and discuss it, but there was a footnote under the recommendation that clarified how data elements that may be collected would be dealt with. The footnote said that, if the data was provided, then it must be processed. But there was no obligation on any of the data elements that were color-coded in yellow that they must be collected or provided. That's where I'm coming from. Like Margie said, there was no clear discussion on the reseller field, per se. It was just my assumption that this applied to all the data elements that were color-coded yellow. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, I have a remote comment as well from Volker. "Making the reseller a requirement is impossible, as there may be chains of resellers. So registrars may not even have the data, which entity the domain was ultimately sold by to the end customer. "May" is the correct word to use here."

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that comment. That's exactly how we have drafted the language: to leave it as "may" and not impose any "must" requirement on this reseller.

ANDREA GLANDON: Another comment from Volker. “While registrars can put information on who their direct customer is in that field, this data has the potential to be highly confusing to anyone looking at it, as it does not tell anyone anything.”

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Volker. This data elements matrix is offered to you to communicate how we as a team are looking at each data element and how we’re interpreting the requirements. So please make use of this data element. You will see that it treats the collection. We flagged things for the IRT in blue. Also, further down, you will see how we’re treating the transfer to the registry, to the escrow provider. We will also add the publication when we get to it. That’s how we’re using this data elements matrix. It was a laborious task for us to put together these data elements at this level, but we thought that this we required and it would serve us well in the long run to know why we drafted the policy language in such the way that we did.

Let’s go back to our Rec 5 document. Where were we? We were down to here. Then Rubens added the word “DNSSEC elements.” The recommendation that came to us did not have this word: “elements.”

Is there any objection from the IRT? It seems okay to me. This is not considered adding or deleting or changing the data elements,

but let me hear from you before we make a decision. Any comments?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I always have comment. I would just like to have, Rubens, your description of that. What is “elements” in your opinion?

RUBENS KUHL: My point here is that, if you enumerate this originally, that would make DNSSEC a single element. This is not how DNSSEC works. DNSSEC is not just a tool or false attribute. It’s displayed as this in WHOIS. So, if people look at WHOIS, it says DNSSEC signs it or doesn’t sign it.

The way it actually works is that the name holder provides a series of elements – key materials or hashes or [inaudible] numbers – and this set of elements is then transmitted to the registry and then published by the registry in the DNS. So DNSSEC is not just a single atom. It’s a series of elements.

The way this is written – there was another reference in the text that I also added this to – is as a single token, and that’s not it. DNSSEC is a set of information that is more adequately described in the technical references, like the RFCs and the data escrow drafts.

The point here is to fix that single-attribute issue that the policy seemed to overlook and possibly do – because the way it's displayed in WHOIS. So may people not wonder the difference between one single element and a set of elements.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: But you're not advocating to list out those elements in the WHOIS, are you?

RUBENS KUHL: No.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Anyone else have a comment on this?

Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I think Rubens makes a good point. That field is based on the display, which is very different than the collections. So Rubens makes a good distinction.

I'm thinking, though, that a comment or a note in the policy document as to why that change was made might be useful for somebody reading the policy later.

For Rubens, suggestion, I think that's a good point, but maybe a little clarifying text would be helpful.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for the suggestion. I think it's a good one. We'll leave it as a comment for now and maybe circle back with the IRT later and make sure that there's no objections. This is the first time we're changing the "name" of the element, so I want to be a little cautious than just going ahead and changing it. We are trying to be precise about the name of the elements that we use to be consistent with the recommendations here.

Okay. Next ...

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

I'm still confused on the org. We were moving it into 5.8 or we're not moving it in there? There was a suggestion to – it shouldn't be in 5.2.1. Or are we leaving it in 5.2.1?

DENNIS CHANG:

As my note indicated – maybe my proposal needs to be more clear here. Maybe I can add to it. We're deleting this section, so

that section will disappear. The element itself, “registrant organization,” is going to be added to 5.8. And Marc said he’s going to add some more suggestions on maybe a different category of these data elements. We can always do that as a follow-up. That was the recommendation. It would make it simpler if we delete a section and are able to combine data elements. In one case, where I said that we shouldn’t combine them, I provided rationale. In this case, we agreed that it should be combined.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I’m just having a hard time reviewing the wording, reviewing the notes, going back and forth. So I appreciate that. Let’s just not lose the registrant org information. That’s my concern: “Oh, wait. We deleted it but it didn’t get somewhere else.”

DENNIS CHANG: I think we have a Board direction not to delete the registration org, [don’t we]? Yes, it’s an important field and we’ll probably talk about that later, too. I think Rec 12 is in question, right?

Okay. Amr, this is a comment from you. What I replied was that maybe we should discuss it when we’re reviewing Rec 10 (publication), if you’re okay with that. We’ll just park this for now.

AMR ELSADR: Yeah, sure. That's fine by now: parking it until we get to Recommendation 10. Yeah, that's fine. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Next item – oh, this one. This is an important one. I want to take some time to discuss this thoroughly, Marc. This has to do with the intention of the EPDP team in making this recommendation. It could be interpreted in different ways. The implication and the difference of how we implement that is a big impact. I take your meaning. The EPDP should support the policy, not drive it. Of course. I think everybody would agree with that. Policy is [formed]. Consensus policy is published and given to the contracted parties, and therefore are required to perform under the policy. EPP is just a tool that needs to do what it does to make things easier, right?

Now, having said that, what's important here is to know what the intention of the EPDP team was, [and to ask] my question there back to you for your clarification would be appreciated. Could you talk more about what you meant when you wrote this?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I think I had two things in mind. First, this and some other points you made dealing with EPP I think really were

more appropriate for Recommendation 7, which we'll get to later, because EPP doesn't really come into play until you're talking about the transfer of data. Recommendation 5 is really focused on the collection of data by the registrar. So I thought some of the points you made were good and good for the IRT to consider, but really, Rec 7 was a better place for them.

To the first point, I got concerned about the language that says, "EPP may require the collection or generation." I think, for me, hearing "EPP may require" threw up a red flag right away. EPP shouldn't require. The policy should require, and EPP should support that policy. So that was just something I wanted to flag for the IRT.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you for that clarification. Yeah, we thought that's what you meant, and we wanted to make sure that we heard that from you directly. What you don't mean is that, in any way, you meant to provide a policy that will require an EPP change, and therefore the implementation must wait for the EPP changes to happen. We just wanted to make sure that we are interpreting it in the same way.

What we'll do as an action here is reword this but not delete it because it think it's important to alert the implementers that there's other data elements that are not mentioned here but are

also very important in performing the operation. Therefore, some of our technical folks were worried that somebody may be confused or misunderstand what we are trying to do here.

RUBENS KUHL:

Just as a practical example of what Marc mentioned, one of the mandatory parameters in [EPP]/RFCs for contact transformation is the contact name. We have one specific extension in .br, not a gTLD. That doesn't require a contact. So what we did is, in our policy, we specified, "Hey, when you send this comment, we will ignore everything that's in the contact." So the RFC says that parameter is mandatory, but our policy says it's not. Our policy says, "Hey, just send anything. Send dumb information. We'll just ignore it." So it can be done on a policy level to override anything that's [written in] in RFC, as long as you keep interoperability.

MARGIE MILAM:

I think what we're talking about here with these additional data elements in B are things – at least the report itself actually talks about elements identified by the registry operator in its registration policy, such as affiliate or trademark licensee. It's actually in the final report. So that might be what we're referring to in 1B.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I'm not sure if I'm following what is being discussed. I think I heard Marc saying EPP should be updated to follow whatever the policy says. Is that what you're saying, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Can you repeat that? I'm not sure I heard that.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I'm asking if what you said is that EPP has to be updated to match what the policy says. Just wanted to confirm. I think that's what you said.

MARC ANDERSON: No, that's not what I said. I think what I heard from Rubens was that he was suggesting placeholder value. Right? So Rubens was suggesting a path forward with implementation, where the policy recommendations could be met without changing the RFCs. I think that's one option.

I'll point out again that we're having a conversation about Recommendation 7: Transfer of data from the registry to the registrar. That's fine to jump ahead, but I think there are different ways that this could be tackled. It could be done with a change to an RFC or a new RFC, but it could also be accomplished with existing RFCs, which is I think what Rubens was suggesting.

So just to clarify, I guess the short answer is, no, I wasn't saying that a change to EPP was necessary. That could be one option, sure, but I wasn't saying that was necessary.

DENNIS CHANG: Was Jody online? Can you talk, Jody?

JODY KOLKER: Yes. Can you hear me?

DENNIS CHANG: Excellent. Yeah.

JODY KOLKER: I guess my concerns – I think it's always been covered by Marc and Rubens – is that, if we are changing the policy to not require the city and the country code to be sent in, that is going to require either updating the RFCs or require all of the gTLD registries to change their policies to not require it. We may have to basically give those two options to the implementers – the either/or – so that this can be covered. I'm not sure how long that's going to take to get that done. I just think we need to keep that in mind. This may be more than a six-month grace period in order to make sure that everybody's on the same page. That's all I wanted to bring up. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:

I promised the audience some time for Q&A. It's already 11:50. I'm sorry. So let's stop here. I think that we did get to a very important point that we were very anxious to find out. And I think we heard your answer, so thank you for that clarification.

Now, anybody out there have questions to the team? You're free to ask us questions now. If not, that's okay, too.

What I'll do is cover the next steps. We will continue to do the recommendations analysis and requirements for you to review. We haven't done it here, but we do have Recs 7 and 8. In the same manner, we're making comments and responding to it, and we'll continue. Then we are going to provide you with Rec 10 next. So that's coming. Then what we do is we keep going until we're done and we have our implementation plan for public comment.

Our next meeting is going to be on the 10th of July. Please note that I have changed the meeting time from 60 minutes to 90 minutes. I think, as we get into this substance, as you saw here, it is taking a lot longer than an hour. We do want to make 90 minutes as a standard call. If we're done earlier, of course we can cut it short.

Until then, please do your homework. We'll continue our discussion online. Any final words or questions from the IRT?

Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just wanted to say thanks to ICANN staff because you guys have herded some really annoying cats – we’re the annoying cats – and made it really easy. The task list is great. I just really appreciate it. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: With that, we will conclude this IRT session. Thank you very much for your participation and continued support. Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]