MONTREAL – GNSO Registration Data Policy IRT 1 of 2
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

DENNIS CHANG: Andrea, do you want to get us started now?

ANDREA GLANDON: The recording has started, Dennis, so you can go ahead and start.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Welcome, everyone, to the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation. This is our implementation of the EPDP Phase 1 consensus policy recommendations. My name is Dennis Chang. I'm the GDD Programs Director. The Implementation Review Team leading this is #12. This is one of two sessions that we'll be holding at ICANN 66. Tomorrow's meeting will be at the same time but in a different room. I have the room information on the slide, so we'll get that done.

Agenda-wise, here's what we're going to do. First, we're going to go around and introduce yourself to everyone – all the members of the Implementation here at the table. Then I'm going to go very quickly and give an overview of the implementation project so that people who are here for the first time, [sitting] behind me, can have some context to observe and watch what we're doing.

Then, for the working session, I think what we would like to do is go over the analysis status map that I've introduced you to. The purpose there

is to find out where we are with our recommendations analysis. Then I'll introduce you to the [One Doc]. That's going to be where we're going to do most of our work. At the end of this session, maybe five minutes we'll leave for Q&A so that the public can ask us any questions.

Does that sound good, everyone?

Yes? Let's introduce then implementation team. On the left, we have the IPT Implementation Team. On the right is the IRT Implementation Team. The IPT is made up of ICANN org. As you see, I'm on that list. IRT are made up of the community. Together, we make the implementation team. When I say "policy implementation team," I mean all of us here.

Let's start by introduction. Rubens, would you like to start? Your name and your role. And I think you have an announcement to make.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl, the GNSO Council liaison for this IRT for the next 28 hours.

SAM LANFRANCO: Sam Lanfranco. I'm a temporary member of the GNSO and I'm here as an observer.

MARGIE MILAM: Margie Milam with the BC. I'm an EPDP member and I listen in on the meetings.

KAREN LENTZ: Karen Lentz, ICANN org.

ROGER CARNEY: Roger Carney with GoDaddy.

JODY KOLKER: Jody Kolker with GoDaddy.

AMY CREAMER: Amy Creamer with ICANN.

AMANDA FESSENDEN: Amanda Fessenden, ICANN.

AMANDA ROSE: Amanda Rose, ICANN.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am Sebastien Ducos, also know as Seb apparently in this community. Nobody calls me Sebastien. I'm the new [Rubens], basically.

DENNIS CHANG: To be more specific, that would be the role of the GNSO liaisons. Every IRT has a liaison to the GNSO Council. So there is a switch in that role at this meeting.

BETH BACON: I'm Beth Bacon with the registries. They call me Beth and I answer to it, Seb … astien.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN: Hey. Matthew Crossman with the registries and I'm from the Amazon registry.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Morning. Eric Rokobauer, Endurance International Group family of registrars.

SARAH WYLD: Good morning. I'm Sarah Wyld. I work with Tucows.

OWEN SMILGELSKI: Hi. Owen Smigelski with Namecheap.

[ALEX]:   [Alex] [inaudible] DNS registrar.

MARC ANDERSON: Marc Anderson, Verisign with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

LUAREEN KAPIN: Laureen Kapin with the GAC.

BEN WALLACE: Ben Wallace with Microsoft.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Brian Aitchison, ICANN org, #12 extended team.

DENNIS CHANG: So that you know, this list is short here on the slide. In the IRT, we have 35 members, but with the IPT, there are so many more ICANN org people supporting this policy implementation in a way that I've never seen before. This is a huge effort that involves a lot of support.

Now, is there anyone on the phone – IRT members or otherwise – who'd like to introduce yourself?

I'm not hearing anything, so let's just get going. Along with the IRT and IPT members who make up the implementation team – so that you're aware – we have 36 observers who have signed up to observe our work. They receive e-mails (every e-mail that goes to the IRT), but they do not participate in the meetings.

So what is this? We call this the registration data policy. It is the EPDP Phase 1 implementation that the Board resolved on the 15th of May to look at the temporary spec. It had 11 resolutions, 2019-5-15-02 to 2019-3-15-12. 27 of then 29 recommendations were adopted without any change. Two recommendations were adopted with some change. They were Recommendation 1 Purpose 2 and Recommendation 12 org field deletion.

The Board also put out a Board scorecard with the resolution that can be categorized in these three ways: recommendation adapted as is, recommendation adapted with comments, and recommendation not adopted in whole. So it was a rather complicated resolution

The first thing that happened is we put out what we call an interim registration data policy on May 17th. We worked with pre-IRT. Many of you were members of the pre-IRT. This was due to the recommendation from the EPDP that we get started before the Board resolution, in fact. So we did, and the effect of that interim registration data policy is that the requirements that were in the temp spec shall continue and we needed to do that because the temp spec was expiring on the 20th of May.

We are now engaged in the review and analysis of all those recommendations. There are a number of multiple activities that're going on. One of the notable ones is Recommendation #27 that has an extensive work plan of its own, which was shared with the GNSO Council. It has implications about an additional PDP that may be required.

The Rec 15 report was also provided to the EPDP Phase 2 team. What's interesting there is that this policy implementation requires us to coordinate and report our work products to other entities like the GNSO Council and the EPDP Phase 2 team as we go. So many moving parts to this implementation.

The project timeline will be determined upon the completion of our analysis so that we can determine what tasks are required. Then we

have to estimate those tasks and do what I call a critical path analysis so that we can determine the timeline of the implementation. So that's where we're at.

There are two meetings at ICANN 66. The next one is tomorrow. Let's look at this chart. This is what we presented from the beginning and you received some of the [days] here. The way we are approaching this policy implementation is in four stages. Stage 0 was when the temp spec was in effect before we provided the interim policy. The blue area here with the blue bridge is where we are now, Stage 1. The implementation planning, the first blue block that you see, is what we're doing. We're doing the implementation planning. The next thing that will happen is the public comment on that implementation and then of course, after the public comment, we will revise the policy and then put it out and announce it.

Then what's in Stage 2 is an implementation duration – the actual implementation of then policy that we have published. We call that then rainbow bridge because, during Stage 2, from the publication and legal notice of Policy 2, where the policy effective date is, contracted parties are obligated but also have the option to transition in part or in whole of the policy requirement. So however long that is – we have not yet determined that; it could be six months or twelve months – this is the challenge for the implementation team: to figure out the implementation duration so that we can determine what the policy effective date would be. In Stage 3, that's a steady state after the policy is all effective. At that time, everybody is using the new policy.

This is a reminder that we have wiki spaces for the IRT. In the community wiki space, you'll find instructions on joining the IRT, all the observers. That's the location of the wiki. This is basically what it looks like.

The IRT works in a collaborative fashion. We have our team drive, and the main documents that we're using is what we call the IRT workbook. We have multiple documents as we do our recommendation analysis and reporting.

So let's get into it. Let's look at our task list. There were many tasks that were due on the 5th. I originally them to be due on the 5th, but I have, as you see, revised that to the 15th at the request of an IRT member because I know, when you're here, how it can be. It's difficult to keep up with everything else that you're doing and trying to do this homework. So rest assured you'll have plenty of time, even after these two sessions, to go back and look at it and deliberate. Here are the task assignments until the 15th and then where you can find them. All these are linked to the maps.

Let's look at this analysis map. This is the way we're going to keep track of our first stage. Let me just remind you of the process. Remember this? I showed you some time ago. Actually, at the beginning. Session 1, right? This is basically the implementation process, and the #1 Recommendation review we are done with. Everybody has reviewed it. You know what the recommendations are and you know where to find them. So what we're doing is requirements analysis right now. In parallel, we're trying to capture the task list.

Based on that, we are going to use this process where we say, Recommendation #1 is a document that we created here. What I am asking the IRT is, do you agree that, because of Recommendation #1, it really does not create any additional policy language for the consensus of policy that we're drafting here? But it does create DPAs. That is a task that we need to do. So that's what I mean by, do we think that the analysis of Recommendation 1 is complete so that we know what tasks remain? That's what we need.

So these colors can change based on our finding, so don't feel like this is the last time you're looking at it and you can't change your mind. If you think of something that we have to do later – and we may – this color can change.

1, for the recommendation for purposes, I've colored green because I think that I understand what the recommendation is and we know that we got to create DPAs. If you look at the consensus policy language (the One Doc that we now have), there isn't any language there that's specifically driven by this recommendation. That's what I was trying to say.

Looking at #2, we'll be cleaner. Let's look at Recommendation #2. This is the one that said, "Additional purposes for Phase 2," right? So this is basically work for Phase 2 and there is no real implementation task for us. That's why I say, if you agree, the analysis then is correct here. You would agree that we would color it gray. Then we don't have to look at that anymore. We put it behind us and focus on the one that remains with [task landy] analysis.

I'll keep going here until you stop me or have questions. So 2 is easy. Let's see if 3 is easy as well. The #3 recommendation is again for the EPDP team to do, and they're doing it now, right? Many of you are on that EPDP team and you've been at it all week. We thank you for that. The one thing that's clear is that you don't have to talk about Recommendation 3 here in the implementation team, right? So #3 would be grayed out and that would be okay with us.

Let's look at #4. Bye the way, I have not seen any comments yet, but, when your task is due, you can make comments on these docs. If you disagree with the analysis, you can comment on this right here and say why you disagree and what policy language you would recommend.

Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Morning, everyone. Thanks, Dennis. If I understand this correctly, this is the analysis that supports the language that we've drafted for the consensus policy document. But if we make edits here, we're only making edits to the supporting analysis? If we think that it warrants a change I the actual language, then we have to go into The One Doc To Rule Them All and make the corresponding edit there?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Thank you for the question. Let's look at the One Doc. This is our One Doc. Say hello.

BETH BACON: [inaudible] Lord of the Rings music [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We're pretty excited about having the One Doc. I will talk about this – the structure. This has the complete text, meaning the language of the policy that we are considering. So, if you have comments on the language itself, this is the place you can make it, or you can go back and make it in the other doc, the individual doc. But the point that I'm trying to make is that, if you want to make a comment about language because of Recommendation #4, in One Doc you wouldn't be able to because there's no language. On the One Doc, you will not find any policy language driven by Recommendation #4. So the only way you'd be able to let us know is to make a comment on Recommendation #4 to say, "I disagree. We need recommendation language in the One Doc, so here is something I would recommend." But you have to let me know that you disagree with this analysis. I think we're going to get to those points. There are some examples where you have disagreed with that analysis. We'll talk about that. Maybe it'll be more clear then.

Basically, if you did disagree with #4 – that we would need policy language or there were tasks remaining because of #4 – then you would color this differently and not let it be gray.

Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Dennis. I think this is really helpful, but … I realize that we change the color if we have a different view on the status. I'm curious

as to what the overall life and function is of the analysis docs. Are we going to provide that anywhere? Or is that just simply for us so that we can have a shared understanding of where we are and we stop asking you stupid questions?

DENNIS CHANG: This is a very good question. In project management, I call it the working documents for the team to actually make the product. The product for this implementation team is this … where is it? This. The One Doc is our product. This is what will be published as a requirement for all of us to work under for a long time. This is the consensus policy that we're trying to come up with. This is our product.

All these other documents, these analysis documents, are for us to work with and coordinate and collaborate so that we can remember why we made such decisions and why we did it. We can always go back. All these documents – there's 29 of these, for every recommendation – will not go away. They'll always be here for the IRT, but for the IRT only. The observers do not have access to these, unless they're watching us working right now. This is for us. So you can write whatever you want on these documents to share your thoughts.

BETH BACON: I think these are super. Thank you. Dennis. Also, thank you for the One Doc, you and Amanda. We're going to get you drinks. It's very pretty.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, the pretty thing has to do with her.

BETH BACON: [inaudible], Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: You should know – you mentioned the two of us there – there were a lot of people that were pouring through this for many hours.

BETH BACON: You're just the two that I …

DENNIS CHANG: So, for Recommendation #4, there's no change to accuracy. We had thought about some potential policy language before and we determined at the end that there was no language to say, "Don't change the accuracy requirement." You don't need policy language to say, "Don't do anything." So we figure, "Okay, that's fine. Thank you for the reminder." We want to make sure that we won't, but there's nothing else to do. So that's why it's green.

Let's go to #5. That's the collection. For this one, we have, indeed, a policy language that's very important because this is the collection. I don't know if you guys … Are you remembering all these numbers by now by heart?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: I have to constantly ask. "What was that again?" So #5 is the collection. Remember, we spent a lot of time on collection because this was the first substantive recommendation. We crafted the language. There were lots of comments. It's probably good for the public to know that, for the work that goes on, here's the recommendations. And, actually, I dealt with an issue that we struggled through. All these comments were made by the IRT that were resolved. So nothing gets lost. We are keeping track of all the work that we have been doing.

The analysis here is that we clearly need the policy language. That's the analysis. The task is to merge the draft language in One Doc. Now you guys all know what One Doc is, so I don't have to keep explaining. We toyed with the idea of giving it another fruit name, but I didn't think that you would like that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: So that's #5. #5 is collection and I have it yellow. Is there any disagreement on the analysis that we do need the policy language? Otherwise, I'm going to color that green. Are there any other tasks besides the policy language for this? There isn't right?

Go ahead.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN: Hey. Are you asking just that we agree that this is something that we need to draft policy language and we're still potentially commenting on … okay.

DENNIS CHANG: Exactly, yeah. So I'm not asking whether the draft policy in One Doc is all good. That's not what I'm asking. We are going to do that. All I'm asking now is that, other than having to draft the policy language, are there any other tasks we may have forgotten? Is there something else that you would expect or that the contracted parties would need? I think we can color this green and move on.

It's done, as simple as that. Also, you do know that you can make comments on this workbook, too, directly, if you so choose. We will all see that.

Shall we go to #6: consent? Again, this one requires draft policy language. We have captured some things in One Doc for your review based on our draft so far. Let's see if that one … It's already green, so you'd be okay with that, right?

#7 is transfer. Let me see if this one can go to green, too. We capture recommendations and there's a lot of comments. This one is going to be a challenging one for us to work with. This the one that I think I would say that there is a disagreement within the IRT on. So the IRT is split on this, the language itself, the requirement itself. But I think that our analysis – I didn't make an analysis box on this yet … So this is how I do

it. You can do this, too. Did I call to close this one? I don't remember now.

UNIDENTFIED FEMALE: [I don't think you did].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I'm doing it now. I'm calling to close. So this is for our analysis: we are going to have draft language. Our task is that we are going to merge draft language in One Doc.

With that in mind, if you guys all agree, then we can turn this one to green. You see what I'm trying to get all the yellows out, basically, because then I think we can conclude the analysis part.

Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank, Dennis. You mentioned there's a disagreement on what the language is. That resolution do we need to add as a task? So is the task not complete?

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, the task is not complete.

ROGER CARNEY: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: That comes with One Doc. This is what I want to do: at the end of these two sessions, when we leave here, we know where the points of this disagreement is. I call it the IRT split. If not all the IRTs are in agreement with the requirements, then we need to talk about that further. Then, of course, if the IRT cannot come to an agreement with some due diligence that we actually do – we have to work at it; we can't just give up – then there is a process that we need to follow. We've done this before when that happened. So we know what to do. So hang on there. So that's one that I know. #7 is one recommendation. I think there's a clear disagreement in the IRT on how we interpret the recommendation and what exactly the requirement is. I want to be really clear about what that is if we have to present that to others, like the GNSO Council.

This is where Sebastien comes in because you're going to have some work to do here. If we cannot resolve it here within the IRT, then you may have to be tasked to reach out to the GNSO liaison, like what Rubens did. He wrote a nice e-mail and made it very clear what the IRT's thoughts on the policy effective implementation date is, and now we are all in sync. Of course, our task it to come up with the timeline, now that we said that we can't do that. The obvious question that follow is, if you can't do the 29th of February, 2020, what can you do? Our answer at this point is that we have to finish our analysis so that we can figure that out. That's another challenge that we have and it would be nice if we could come to some sort of agreement on the timeline in these two days. But that is a challenge. I don't know if we can do it, but let's give it a try.

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. I guess I'm only bringing it up because I'm not sure that we change it to green if we're not sure what the resolution is. I'm not sure how the analysis can be done if there's a disagreement. So I'm not sure that we can change this to green, I guess, because something may come back and we have to do an analysis again for it.

DENNIS CHANG: Hmm. Go ahead, Beth.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN: I don't mean to move us backwards, but I'm a little confused now, where we've been talking now about 7 and the status we're going to leave that at, because I think, on 5, we also have some disagreement about where the Purpose 7 validation elements go. I know we went back and forth on whether that should be actual language in the body of the policy or whether it's in implementation notes. So my question then is, is that – in the One Doc, I noticed that it was take and put in the implementation notes. So at least that's still a discussion I would like to continue to have. So I wonder if that means that 5 is still yellow or whether that goes to just working on the language of the actual policy.

DENNIS CHANG: I think we should leave it as yellow so that we can remember that there is analysis that we haven't completed yet. So, based on where we end

up … So this can happen in parallel. It overlaps. Nothing is so clean. Like I said, we can actually come back later and change the color, too. But, at this point, I recommend that we leave it as yellow and make the point that you just made. That point you can make in Rec 5 so that, when you click on this and go to Rec 5, we'll see it right there. So go ahead and make your point, if you wouldn't mind, right now … Now. Thank you. Then the same thing with Roger, too.

Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thanks. I just have a slight concern. If we're making comments in the analysis map and in the individual recommendation analysis document and in the One Doc, how do we make sure we don't lost track of these continuing conversations?

BETH BACON: I have a similar question so I'll just pile it on. I guess I have a suggestion. I think the analysis map is extremely helpful because it shows the status of where we are still having questions. What I think might be helpful, because the One Doc is so great in that … for many reasons. But also because, for each section, it notes "for collection or registry data," it shows its Rec 5, it's green, and you can link to the analysis doc from it. So is it easier if we take the yellow issues and look at them in the One Doc and talk about them and try to resolve them rather than just noting …? Then we can make the corresponding notes in the analysis. That way, I feel like we could close the issues instead of just noting the status.

Or do you want to go through and just confirm the status and start going through? Really, whatever you want, Dennis. It's your party.

DENNIS CHANG: What I would like to do is go over all the statuses. Right now, I'm being helped by you, and you knew where the point of analysis is that we still need to pay attention. So this One Doc is helpful to visually recognize where the areas are that we need to work on.

Then comments that you make are – I asked you to make it here because this is #4 on these docs … But, if it's easier for you to do it in One Doc, that's fine, too. We will not lose them. A lot of the times – I don't know if you noticed – we have a team watching these multiple documents all the time. Even when you write an e-mail, I would capture your salient points and put them in the collaborative docs. If there's a cross-reference that needs to be made, we're going to try to do that.

Go ahead, Matthew.

MATTHEW CROSSMAN: Thanks, Dennis. I'm not worried about staff losing track because I'm pretty sure they'll keep score. But I won't be able to track, so I think it'd be easier if we work from the One Doc. If there's no language in there, I think we could still just put a placeholder in there and make a comment for that. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, that's a good idea. Go ahead.

BETH BACON:	We should do these in the afternoon, Dennis. I don't think we're caffeinated enough because clearly we're challenged. For the yellow ones, that text isn't even in the One Doc yet because the green ones are. I did notice. Because the green stuff is in there.
DENNIS CHANG:	The yellow ones – the text is in there.
BETH BACON:	Okay. That's what I thought. I thought you said it wasn't in there. I was like, "Oh."
DENNIS CHANG:	So all the text that we are aware of that we have worked on are all in One Doc.
MATTHEW CROSSMAN:	Thanks, Dennis. I just want to make sure Beth understands what I was saying. Like, for #4, we said there was no language going into the document, but if we still have a question about it, we could still use the One Doc and just put a blank holder and talk about it. Thanks.
DENNIS CHANG:	Here's an example. Let's watch. Roger, if you did that, everybody will know. It's perfectly fine. So, if you'd rather do that, that's okay, too.

Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Thanks. Just a suggestion. Maybe, because there are recommendations that aren't reflected in the policy language, there could be a section at the end that just lists those and that's where people can make their comments. So there's a place where each of them is captured. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Karen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, but can we put at the top instead of the end so that – thank you. I would never go to the [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: I'm glad you're making these suggestions. Remember that this whole thing is for us. So it's our document. At the end, we're going to take this and make a public version of it that looks much prettier. But for now, we can add anything we want to remind us what it is that we need to remember. Per Karen's suggestion or your suggestion, it would be something like this. "The following recommendation does not have language." We can write two, three, four. Then you'll need to – go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I'd actually though we had previously agreed to do that for the initial draft that would go to public comment because, when it went to public comment, we wanted that to be clearly spelled out. It doesn't necessarily need to be in the final policy version because you don't need a policy that says there's no policy for these recommendations. But I thought we had actually agreed to do exactly what Karen suggested so that it would be easier for the public comment version of this. So I plus-one that, I guess.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we have and we plan to. Probably the confusion is that it will not be in the policy language document because we want to present the policy language document as it would be exactly the way it would be published. It would be in the public comment form, the public comment document, that is in addition. In that public comment document that people would say, it would actually have … It'll get really clear when I start this. You will see it. You will all see how it comes together. The public comment document, public comment form, has headers, the overview, the background, and it would have the implementation plan. It would say, "These recommendations have policy language. These recommendations do not have policy language. These recommendations have additional reports. These recommendations have tasks for the GNSO Council, the EPDP 2 team." It would lay all of that you would already know, but it would be in a different document and shared with the public for comment. Does that make sense?

Let me see if I can show you something. Let's see. Do I have the map? No? That's okay. I have drawn up a map of our documents. I'll show you later. I'll send it out. You will see the kinds of documents. We have multiple documents that we have to handle for public comment. It'll be clear to you how we handle that in the public comment.

Where were we? We wanted to keep this yellow (#5 and 7), right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mm-hmm.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay Shall we go to 8? This is the transfer to data escrow. We do need policy language and we need DPAs. So this one is full of action. Oh, this an important note. I want you to know this is our thinking: while there's a lot of action, some do not have IRT action. Our contracts with the data escrow agents I don't think were part of the IRT review, but you just need to know that we're doing that.

Do you think that green is the appropriate color for this one: transfer to data escrow?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. #8 is one of the ones that you previously had a November 5th date for last call and pushed it out to the 15th, I think. On this one, I do plan on providing additional input. I think there are some considerations we haven't gotten to yet and I just haven't gotten a chance to fill it out. So thank you for putting the due date out until the

15th. But on this one specially I do plan on providing more input and I'm not comfortable changing it from yellow to green.

DENNIS CHANG: That's fine. It's good that I know that. Let's do that. This one was the … So let's look at the transfer to ICANN. How do you feel about this one so far? Did I get this one right? Hold on. Rec 9? Yeah. I think you had agreed to this one before. I just made the call to … Let's go green on this.

Then publication. We need policy language and we were all the way up to Approach #3 that we were reviewing last time. You guys okay with green for now?

Okay. Registrant city. This one we do need policy language for. Small, but we do. I think this is then one that … I'm missing Theo. Where is Theo?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He's online.

DENNIS CHANG: He's online? Okay. I think this is maybe the one he sent over. Mm-hmm. Good. So that's green.

Org field. This one we have not discussed at, per your request. We postponed discussion on Rec 12. Does anybody want to talk about Rec 12 rather than me? Someone who's more familiar with that's going on, tell us. Maybe take on minute so we just know. Anybody?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I guess I can take a stab at it. I'm going off the top of my head, so please don't hold me against it if I get any of the details wrong. As I recall, the latest on this one is there's a Board/GNSO Council consultation going on over Recommendation 12. The Board sent a letter to the GNSO Council where they articulate what their concern with #12 is. They provided an example as well as suggesting a possible resolution.

My further understanding is that the council met, discussed the letter that they received from the ICANN Board, and generally they were – I'm looking over at Rubens here to correct me if I'm wrong – receptive the Board's suggestion for resolving it. I don't think it was unanimous agreement but there was general support for that.

During Saturday's meeting, Keith Drazek, as GNSO Council Chair, came and spoke to the EPDP Phase 2 group about this topic. Keith explains where they were with the letter. Essentially it's what I just said: the Board was generally receptive to the … I think I mixed up Board and Council. The Council was generally receptive to what the Board's suggestion was, but they wanted to get the EPDP Phase 2 group's feedback on it. We had a lively discussion on that topic on Saturday and some of us had also previously provided e-mail responses on this topic.

So, as I understand it, the ball is now back in the GNSO Council's court. So there's a decision for them to decided how they want to proceed with that. I think that's pretty much my understanding of where this one is. We can all look over at Rubens and Sebastien. I'll still call you by your

first name, if you don't mind. But if I got any of that wrong, please feel free to correct me.

DENNIS CHANG: I think you got it right. I'm going to depend on maybe Sebastien from now on to let us know when we can proceed with IRT discussion on Rec 12. For now, we're going to say postponing discussion. So, when you are ready – you have any kind of a direction – just tell us and then we'll proceed from then on. But for now, the IPT has done whatever we can in terms of preparation. Whatever language we think may be needed is all in One Doc. So One Doc is as complete as we can make it. So there's nothing missing.

BETH BACON: [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: Aww, thank you. Good for you. This is teamwork. This is a team. So that's #12. Obviously that one's staying yellow.

Let's go to #13. We need language for [web form and com]. We have that in the One Doc. So that's the analysis. Anyone disagree? I think that's a green.

Let's go to privacy proxy. We have some language on privacy proxy. There's no other task, other than adding some language there. That's already in One Doc, so that should be green.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

BETH BACON: Sorry to take us back. I think—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BETH BACON: Just 1 to 13. If I remember correctly, we still had some pending tweaks to the [com long] language.

                           I'm getting a nod. We weren't quite there yet. We wanted to make sure that it was –

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. We have lots of tweaks, if you will.

BETH BACON: Okay. It was a substantive tweak.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. There is going to be language review that we're going to be doing for 13 as well as everything else.

BETH BACON: Okay. If we know that we're still going to review this language and that we're not solidified on it, it'll be in One Doc that this should be yellow? Yes?

DENNIS CHANG: That's not the way I want to use this map. The way I want to use this map is to say the analysis is complete.

Now, you bring up a good point—

BETH BACON: Okay. So it's not a green. It's just that the analysis is [green].

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. You bring up a good point. The next thing that I'm going to do – maybe I should have done it already so you can see the comparison – is I'm going to create another map for requirement analysis maybe, requirement status. So the analysis part is done. Then the requirements part is not done, meaning that the language has not been finalized. Finalizing the language on Recommendation 13 is not really done until the whole One Doc is done because, when you see the languages together, even though it may look okay independently, by itself, when you see it all together, you may want to revise it. That's why I would say none of the language is done right now.

BETH BACON: I'm sorry. I feel like I'm just being a simpleton. He's like, "It's all right. I can work with this slightly-behind …" So we have a couple of these turned yellow, and I thought that we turned them yellow because we still had disagreement about the language in that that analysis is not complete because there's not an agreement in language. But now we're

saying we're going to turn it green if the analysis is finished. But for 13 I don't think the analysis is finished because we don't have agreement on what we need. Now I think I'm just saying words.

ROGER CARNEY: The way I saw it was, if we knew there was a disagreement that had to have something to help us along, I wanted it yellow. If it was words that we wanted changed, that was fine with the next phase. On this one, I don't know because I think we went around this one several times.

BETH BACON: So maybe the suggestion is: how about I put a little note in here in the box and I say that we still need to revisit this language for the coms and then we can turn it green because then we've analyzed it? Dennis can [move us along].

DENNIS CHANG: That's fine. I just created another map here on the side. This is what I'm thinking. I think this may be the reason why it's confusing. For example, #9: transfer to ICANN. That language is required and it's not done. None of the language will be considered complete until the One Doc is done. So this is where we're going to have substantive discussion on every word of this consensus policy language. This is the multiple comments and frequent comments: "It looks good now, but I need to see it in a comprehensive language to see the actual embedded language within a section with a proper title so that I can tell that it looks okay. That is a frequent IRT comment that we have been receiving. That's why I say we

really can't say we're done with recommendation language of anything until we're done with the total language.

BETH BACON: That makes sense, again. If I look at this, now that we have the language status map and the analysis map, I feel like the analysis map is just green because we've gone over everything. I think what we should – please stop me if I'm speaking out of turn for the group, but it makes sense to me if we can take the green and yellows from where the analysis status map is and make that the language status colors because I think that, on 5,7,8, and 12, it's yellow because we felt that we weren't there on the language and we need to review it. But we have certainly analyzed it. I think maybe 12 can stay yellow because that's pending input from other folks. But we've done this.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I think that's where I was. When I first put this together, that's what I was thinking. But I'm flexible. And this map is really to help you to focus. So we can use it any way we want, but I thought it would help you to see it in two ways. There are legitimately, like Marc said, analyses that we still want to look at because it may cause us to create new tasks. Whether or not we have policy language, if we haven't decided that and can't agree on it, then it should stay yellow because we have to pay attention to it.

Go ahead.

BETH BACON: Does it make sense to the team if we turn these green, except for the gray ones where there's no language because I think that's a really nice callout, and then 12 because it's truly out of hands for a little bit – sorry, I didn't mean to look at you with meaning – and then just go through on the language status map and say which ones we think to revisit? Because I think that's really the meat of what we need to get done. I think this is really, really helpful. I think the analyses are important. If we can go through the language status map, identify which ones are yellow, start digging into those on the One Doc, and then staff is going to take those comments and put it back in the analysis as it evolves, then I think we're going to have a super basis of analysis and a record, but then we'll also start actually finishing things on the language.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I agree with you. Let's look at 15. 15 is a good example. With 15, are we done with the analysis? I would say yes, but I want everybody to look at the analysis and agree with me. 15 is one of those recommendations that have multiple tasks. We need policy language but we also need to create reports. Reports for whom? Our analysis that we need to provide reports to the EPDP Phase 2 team, not to the GNSO Council, not to the Board. But the EPDP Phase 2 team is what we need to create reports for, and it would be the IPT who does that, not the IRT. So you have no action.

Do you agree with this analysis? If you do, then it's a green. Is there a different way we should implement this? Do you have comments or suggestions? Let me hear from you on 15.

MARC ANDERSON: Marc, this is – Marc? Whew, I need that coffee. Dennis, this is Marc. Sorry about that. Rec 15 is another one of those that the call to close was moved from November 5th to the 15th. Based on what Beth just said and what you're saying now, let's just get everybody on the same page. Are we saying the call for analysis is closed, everything is done, and we're shifting to looking at the One Doc? Or are some of these still open to comments on the analysis?

15 is actually an interesting one. You had a nice summary of it, but we also just recently got an e-mail from Karen, where she provided some additional information and context. It might be worth hearing from her, as I don't recall that the IRT has ever talked about this particular recommendation. I don't think we've had a chance to talk about this particular one in any of our calls so far. So it might be good for us to talk it through a little bit and make sure we're all on the same page.

But I do think we need to be clear. I think, echoing on what Beth said, there's certainly an opportunity for confusion if we have the different maps going with some green and some yellow. It seems like we're doing two different things in two different places, and that seems to open up the opportunity for confusion. So I think we need to be clear on what we're working on with the status of what these things are.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So would you recommend that we do not have two maps but just have one map? I think that's what I'm hearing. The two maps is actually more confusing than just one map.

Yes? No? Okay, let's continue. So #15, yes, is not due. Your analysis call to close is not due yet. One more time: After the due date of the 15th of November if you should find a reason to say that this analysis is wrong and we need to revisit it, then we can. We'll change the color from green to yellow again and then we'll have a discussion.

Now, you're right, Marc. Not all the recommendations were actually discussed as an IRT team. Some of these recommendations we really didn't discuss, but it was handled online with documents. If you have a need to bring up a recommendation for discussion, then we will. Rec 15 may be a good one. We'll do that.

Let's leave it as yellow for now and maybe we'll come back right after we go through all the analysis and talk about 15 and see if we can turn it to green with some discussion. So we'll leave it for now.

Geo-basis. On 16, I think this one is a … I didn't create a call to close on this one either, it seems like, right? So I'm going to do that, add a box here. On 16, what do we think? We need policy language, right? Is there anything else?

This one we added to the One Doc already and you will see it One Doc. I'll introduce you to it. So I think that's some language, and that's the analysis for this geo-basis.

Legal versus natural. It's exactly the same status – Approach 2 –we had. We were going to add to the policy language. That's green.

Let's look at disclosure request. This one – hmm. Okay, I would venture to guess you wouldn't want to close the analysis on this one, but let's see. Table. Insert. So our analysis is that we do need policy language. Our task her, for the moment, is to merge it to … That's is our analysis, right? We're going to have policy language and we're going to add it to One Doc as one policy.

You okay with me turning this to green for now? We can change it if you want later. It's now green?

[18] [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry. I'm relatively newcomer. I thought, since this is still going to be subject to discussion – why would it be green?

DENNIS CHANG: I see what you … All of this is subject to discussion. That's what I mean by language status map. If you look at this, it's yellow. All these are subject to discussion in One Doc here. What we're trying to do is agree that the analysis of this recommendation says we need a policy language, which we have. We are going to merge to One Doc. That's the analysis. The analysis part is done. The recommendation requirements is not yet done, and it won't be done until we're done with this One Doc review, we're trying to say.

Does that make sense?

We had a lengthy discussion, and this one is, I believe, another one we identified as an IRT split.

DPA. Let's look at #19. I captured this from an e-mail I think I saw that Marc wrote. That's why I said "add to policy language and create DPA here." Marc, I think, had written an e-mail somewhere that he's not sure that we need policy language at all. So this is a case where, do we need policy language? Do we not need policy language? We have not agree on it, so that's why I think this one needs to be yellow. I'm going to leave it as yellow.

#20. We don't need policy language for his. We will produce DPAs. So I think that's green.

Let's look at 21. This is a recommendation that says the GNSO Council to instruct the RPM Working Group. So not tasks for us and we're basically done with 21. That's why it's green.

22. DPA with dispute resolutions provider. We are going to create DPAs with the RPs, and we don't need policy language on this. That's why it's green.

URS/UDRP. Was there an okay to close? [Betty] said okay. I guess she made a comment here. So feel free to do this if you like. You can see what we're all thinking in terms of closing this. So, again, no policy language. And then there's no other task. We – actually, there is a task for URS/UDRP. So, update. [inaudible], let me think about this. I think this is one of the ones that you would disagree with the analysis. I said

that we are going to have redline URS/UDRP documents and publish them at the point of the policy effective date because our service providers need to know how they're going to continue to provide their service. But I think I had seen an e-mail from you that said we shouldn't do anything. So you would actually object to this analysis and you have a different opinion. Do you want to talk about this?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Dennis. Yeah. I think the recommendation is fairly clear. It's a nice, long recommendation and gives us a lot of information. It says, "Until such time as the RPMs are updated, use this criteria." So it doesn't say to go change all the RPMs. It says to use this criteria until those are changed. So the redlines may be helpful for the RPM Working Group, but it's not something we need to produce or put into policy. We just need to put the recommendation into policy, which states what to do until those policies are changed.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Perhaps it would be helpful to have separate [inaudible] section. And did you just say – I wasn't listening -- [inaudible] in the policy, where we have these sections that standalone and then they can drop off when we're done with them? When the actual UDRP gets updated, then what we're implementing goes away. A mini-rainbow bridge.

ROGER CARNEY: I did not say that, but that's a really good idea.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm not getting it, so, Marc, maybe you can explain?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I wasn't going to try and explain what Sarah said but rather I just wanted to raise a point. With this one, it's a somewhat-new-to-my-knowledge situation where a policy recommendation is changing an existing consensus policy. This is, I think, an area where we have to be careful. I think Roger and Sarah both made some good points. I think want to make sure that we all agree on what process we're going through to get that recommendation implemented. Seeing as how this is impacting existing consensus policy, we want to make sure it's right. I think this is also something we may consider reaching out to the Board here for. I'm looking at our new and future liaisons here to make sure that they're communicating and coordinating with the Board on this point.

All right. Sebastien gave a checkmark there. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You meant the council.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes. For the record, I said Board but meant council. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: [Unmarked] coffee is coming soon, so … Again, I think it's pretty clear by the recommendation. It doesn't say to update any policy. It says to use this until the policy is updated. So I think on this it's very clear it doesn't say to update any policy. It says just to use this criteria until the policy is updated.

I like Sarah's idea of knocking this off into a different section that says, "This is the rainbow above the rainbow kind of thing," because this is going to disappear as soon as the RPMs finish their work. They're going to replace this with something new. And I think that'll hold true for the transfer discussion we're yet to have.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand your point. When we looked at it and thought about when the policy goes into effect – certainly, the policy change has to be done with the RPM Working Group. They're working on that now. Certainly, we have to wait for that. But until that time happens, we thought that we needed to make it clear what the service provider needed to do until that new policy comes into this. So that's why we thought that, with these redline changes, what they would have to do is clear because one thing that we cannot do is expect the URS and the UDRP service provider to read the consensus policy and try to interpret what they have to do. That is different. So we were trying to narrow down very, very specifically only those items which could be inconsistent, as is now, with this policy implementation. So we're trying to give them direction that is specific and consistent with the policy implementation. I thought, when they said, "In the interim, we have to do this," that's

what these redlines for. So it's very narrow and small. I don't know if you've had a chance to look at it. But this one I think we have to do for our service provider to let them that they have to pay attention because, when this policy goes into effect, we want all of them behave in the same way. These are the specific instructions that we must give.

Now, we can give that instruction in many different ways, but there's only one way we can be assured that they received this instruction, and that is through the documents that they're obligated to use. So this is why I think we still need to do this. We may have to get into a more detailed technical discussion of why that is, but let's not do that now. I'll just highlight it as yellow, noting that, on our analysis, we're still not in agreement.

BETH BACON: Because this one is a thorny issue and we're relying upon the GNSO to take some action, I think that, if we could ask Seb to flag this for the GNSO and actively ask them if this sounds like a reasonable path … because I think it just makes sense, if we rely upon this plan, which I think is perfectly delightful … And then we get to the end and GNSO goes, "No." That's not good. "This is now how that works." I think that's not efficient. So if we could just task you with that. Welcome to the team.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. It would be good to get our liaison with the GNSO to now rather than later find out. One of the reasons for the public comment is so,

when we put out this document, the service provider and everybody who uses this service have a chance to look at what exactly is changing as of the effective date. Also, we will get comments back from the public saying we shouldn't change anything if that was meant to be.

So point of disagreement on the analysis on Recommendation 23. Let's go to 24. No language. No task. So this one seems to be an easy one.

SARAH WLYD: I would say, again, I don't think we should redline the transfer policy. I think we should have a separate section in our one new one policy that modifies the transfer policy in the way said in the recommendation until such time as the transfer PDP that will soon be scoped out gets to change the policy itself. So I don't think we need to change the transfer policy here.

To your point about the other providers having difficulty knowing what policy changes to follow, I think we already experienced that with the temp spec. The temp spec sits on top of consensus policy and modifies it. We are all accustomed to that as a community and it's our responsibility to keep track going on here. So I don't think that's a reason to modify the transfer policy. Thank you.

[ROGER CARNEY]:   I agree with Sarah. I think this is just the same as 23 and it's the same issue as … I don't think the policy should be updated. We should put the nice text that the recommendations came within our policy until they're superseded.

DENNIS CHANG: That one is clearly yellow again, so that's good. Let's move to 25.

SARAH WYLD: I'm sorry. Can I just ask a question?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: So now we've discussed that we have this disagreement as to how to proceed on these two. How do we come to a decision on that? Is this what we're now going to go back to the council and ask? Is that how we make a decision?

BETH BACON: My understanding was that we could create the other section. We'd move forward, not redline, with our plan. But Sebastien will say to the GNSO, "This is what the plan is. This is what they're doing," so that we don't get to the end and they say, "Hmm." Does that make sense?

SARAH WYLD: So it sounds like we agree, but do we agree about that?

BETH BACON: [It's like us agreeing]?

DENNIS CHANG: I don't think we agree because I have to think about it again because I was thoroughly convinced that we have to do this for – it's extra work for us. Why would we have done that? We consider very carefully, do we have action or do we not have action? This is the first question that we asked ourselves (the IPT), and we convinced ourselves that we had to do this extra work, and we did now.

Now, maybe we shouldn't have, but before we say we don't have to do it and do something else, I think we need to have another discussion. So to answer your question about when do we do this, it's after we go through the whole analysis. We're going to highlight those areas where further discussions are needed.

So what I'm doing right now is to find out where the further analysis and further discussion must happen with the IRT. So it may not be this week, but in the future I know that 23 and 14 we have to regroup and reconsider, and the IPT will take under consideration what we've heard today. If we are in agreement, then I'll just send you an e-mail and then we're agreeing. But if we are not and we have to convince you or share with you why this must happen – otherwise, policy implementation cannot be done, without these documents being done – then we'll have to let you know and we'll have to have further discussion. If still there is no agreement, then we'll have to go back to the GNSO Council for guidance. That's how it works.

[ROGER CARNEY]:   That's right. I just recommend that Sarah actually creates a section in this one document that has these two items in it. That way, staff can use it as a reference as well, saying, "This is what the IRT thinks and this is what the IPT thinks," so then they can balance those things.

DENNIS CHANG: Sarah, are you okay with this?

SARAH WYLD: [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. I really like that idea because I'm trying to interpret what you're saying and I'm a little fuzzy about where it would go in the policy language and how we can publish a policy language that has a section that will drop off in the future, having published many consensus policies. I've never seen this, but, then again, I've never seen this kind of implementation, either. So this is all uncharted ground, and we can be creative here. So let's try it.

Let's go to #25. This one is a GNSO Council action on transfer policy. This clearly has no work for us. We're not going to do anything. If you agree with this – and this one is not only green but its gray. Like that.

#26—

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]: Do we maybe just have an error there? Because it looks like in the chart is said Council RPM but then the document talks about transfer. I just want to make sure we're being consistent.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALEL [inaudible]

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That's right. So fix it for us.

So here's a recommendation below. It says, "The EPDP team recommend that the GNSO Council, as a part of its review of the transfer policy …" So this is telling the GNSO Council to review the transfer policy and do it this way. That's how I read it. I lose interest as soon as I get to that blue line. At those blue words I lose interest and said, "Move on. It's not our job." That's what the analysis is trying to say. If you agree with that, then it's gray.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]:   Okay. I was just commenting on the inconsistency, and I think it's the chart that's wrong.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mm-hmm.

DENNIS CHANG: Right here?

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]:   So we'll fix it, yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Fix it. Thank you.

#26 is DPA with third parties. We don't need policy language but we do need DPAs here. I think we agree. If you do, then it's green.

#27. This is a good case where you all know we have a ton of work to do. There's a whole big workplan, but in terms of analysis, I think we're done. There's no disagreement on how we are approaching this.

28. This is the first recommendation we worked on together in terms of analysis. How do you want to look at this? To me, it's green, but some of you were saying, "Well, until we know the policy effective date and the timeline, it's not green." But that is just work that we have to do. If we agree that analysis says that we have to do this work, then to me I

don't need anymore analysis. I just need to do the work. That's how I'm looking at it. Do you guys agree.

Okay. Admin contact. We created draft language and we['ll]merge it. That's how we're going to handle this. This is where I realized and decided I'm going to go ahead and create a document for every recommendation because we needed somewhere to document and record what we decided and how we did our analysis. So that's the note for you.

So we went through all 29. Let's look at the way we're looking at collection. Still we do not agree on the analysis part. Let's see. We have to resolve Purpose 7. That's why we have it turned yellow. A transfer – #7—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DENNIS CHANG: I'm just reviewing why it's still yellow. 7,8 … this one is yellow. We don't agree on the analysis here? Hmm.

MARC ANDERSON: Dennis, that was one I'd raised my hand for earlier. Not that we didn't agree with it. I think there's more analysis to consider. I promised an e-mail follow-up.

DENNIS CHANG: That's fine. 12 is obvious. We know that. #15 was something that we needed to consider further. And DPA/ICANN … okay. On 23 and 24, there's clear disagreement on the analysis part, so we'll have to look at that again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] five minutes.

DENNIS CHANG: Five minutes? Oh, my goodness. Well, that's something that we accomplished. We have our status map. For the language map, let the IPT look at this and see if it's useful or not. I don't know if you find it useful, but as far as I'm concerned, I can't say any recommendation language is done until One Doc is completed. So it's not very useful to me.

Go ahead. You have a comment?

BETH BACON: Yes. I think, if people agree, we could just scrap the language status map now that we have a better understanding of what the analysis was. Then we can just move to the One Doc and live our lives and get some work done. I think that's fine.

DENNIS CHANG: Everybody agree?

BETH BACON: Everyone nods, yeah. We just have to go through our emotional process here, Dennis. We didn't really understand what you were doing. But I think this is really, really helpful. Thank you for all the work on it.

DENNIS CHANG: I better be careful. I promised the public that I would leave some time at the end. If anybody has any questions about the way we're doing this, what this is, or where this is going, this is your time to ask us. We're going to resume tomorrow at the same time in a different room. But probably tomorrow we're going to be looking at One Doc. Anyone have questions?

No? All clear? Beth has a question – no? Roger has a question.

ROGER CARNEY: Not so much a question. I just wanted to throw this out there so people can start thinking about it. We've resolved this implementation date for now. It'll come back up. One of the issues I was thinking about is, how do we create an implementation date when there's recommendations that're not in our control? So DPA agreements, contract updates, and other things like that. How do we create an implementation date when some of those things may not be resolved before that implementation date? Again, I don't want an answer. I just want people to think about those things. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: We'll discuss it tomorrow. Actually, we have to discuss tomorrow. That will be time well spent for the IRT discussion – how do we deal with the timeline – because there's a great deal of interest out there because they've now heard that the 29th of February is not feasible and they all want to know what is the new date. So we'll talk about tomorrow and we'll work on it, actually.

Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Dennis. May I ask if we could do an agenda for tomorrow? I don't think we're going to go 1-2-3-4-5 through our recommendations. If there are ones we want to focus on and tackle tomorrow, let's maybe list them out in priority order. If we want to start with the easiest or the thorniest, I don't know. Because I don't think anyone has had a chance to fully go through the whole doc.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand. What I was thinking is I'll introduce you to the One Doc table of contents, the way we're going to talk about the structure of it, how we merged the sections, and what ideas we had adapted from Marc Anderson's proposals and maybe highlight those areas that I know to be of disagreement. I'll go through it using the One Doc while referencing the original individual doc. So it'll be from the beginning to the end. That's how I was going to do it.

BETH BACON: While I think the orientation is appreciated, does that mean we're not going to talk about resolving some of the issues? Because we got a lot of yellow things, and I think that the face-to-face time is super duper valuable for discussing those items and maybe less on the logistics of how this doc came to be just because it's great. I like how it's structured. Maybe if we could just make sure that we do the orientation part and make it tight and then start digging in.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, agree. We're going to dig into substantive discussions tomorrow. You're welcome to point out which ones you want to discuss.

Go ahead.

[MATTHEW CROSSMAN]:   I was going to say, could we not maybe caucus here for a couple minutes and decide here are the three yellow items we think we could tackle tomorrow so that we then could walk away having those complete? Does that make sense to people?

DENNIS CHANG: I'm okay with that. Do you guys want to propose those areas that you want to discuss in particular order.

BETH BACON: 12.

DENNIS CHANG: #12?

BETH BACON: I would suggest transfer because that's something that is – not transfer policy but #7. Transfer—

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, transfer #7.

BETH BACON: Transfer #7 and maybe transfer #8 so we can get that whole suite of things.

[ROGER CARNEY]:   I agree with Beth, but I think maybe doing 5, 7, and 8 together because there's a cascade effect from collection through transfer to escrow. Maybe due that as a group.

DENNIS CHANG: That's true. Let's do that. 5,7, 8.

BETH BACON: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: 5,7,8 it is. I want to talk about 15, too, if we have time. 23 and 24 I don't think is as critical for an IRT meeting because you guys all seem to agree. So I have to do some homework and come back to you.

BETH BACON: I think 5, 7, and 8 I would agree on, and we've got two hours. So if we've got those three or least part of them done, I think that's pretty nice. That'd be great because they've been lingering for a bit.

DENNIS CHANG: They have. Are we out of time or do we have more time?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [No]

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry. If you want to keep going, I can. I'm here. Okay, so tomorrow at 8:30 let's start again. Thank you, all.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Thanks, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Bye-bye. Bye, Andrea.

ANDREA GLANDON: Bye. Thank you. See you tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019