
ICANN77 | PF – GNSO: RrSG Membership Meeting
Monday, June 12 2023 – 09:00 to 10:15 DCA

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Hello and welcome to the Registrar Membership Meeting. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud only if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair of the session. If you'd like to ask your question and make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace and mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure the transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. And with that, I'll hand the floor over to Ashley Heineman. Ashley, please go ahead.

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.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hello everyone. Thank you for joining us. For those of you in person in particular, welcome to DC, my hometown. So glad to see all you here. As usual, this is your opportunity to please participate, to engage, ask questions. We are a friendly bunch. Please do not hesitate. Come to the table if you would like. I'm happy to have you all here. So that was your welcome and overview.

We're going to actually start off today on a little bit more of a somber note which is not typical for us. But as you may have all heard, we lost a good friend and colleague, Pam Little most recently with Alibaba. And it was a great shock to all of us. She touched so many people in this community, not just amongst the registrars but in general within the community. And just wanted to take a few moments to remember Pam and also give the opportunity to those in the room if you would like to make some remarks about Pam, what you remember the most about her, what kind of an impact she made to you professionally or personally. And I wanted to first turn it over to Tom in particular because he actually has a wonderful, wonderful gift that he will be sending to Pam's family. So why don't I go ahead and turn it over to you, Tom.

HONG-FU MENG:

Hello, good day everyone. My name is Hong-Fu, and on behalf of an Asia-Pacific registrar called Net-Chinese and its affiliation, I'll be speaking. And our deepest sympathy goes to our dear friend Pam as we remember her.

Our first meeting happened in a humble status and the relationship deepened with our involvement in ICANN community. And dear Pam,

you have been the most active and most crucial member of the Asia-Pacific region. You were always at the frontline leading the Asia-Pacific community in policymaking and implementation with cross-cultural, neutral all inclusive in mind. Unifying the voice of Asia-Pacific region, and you doing your best to contribute to the world has always been your goal, and you have achieved it in a very unique and successful manner.

A few months ago, we were still at the seaside in Cancun watching the sunset together humorously having good jokes and joy about your retirement and how folks at Net-Chinese and Net-Talent have become more proactive in ICANN works thanks to you. And all thanks to your encouragement we are here.

I saw members saying that we'll meet again in DC and we'll celebrate the completion of the stage of work in your life and the coming stage of retirement. Regretting to say goodbye. Even till now we are still in disbelief in the sad news that you have left us for a better place. Dear Pam, we'll carry on your works and aspirations, carry on the works of the Asia-Pacific region and contribute to the global community. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you so very much. If anybody else would like to say anything, you're more than welcome. Please go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

I guess speaking personally, Pam was kind of my mentor on the GNSO and I think she represented something that's sometimes rare in the

ICANN community, is that she wouldn't open her mouth until she knew exactly what was going on, and it's something I really respected. And I just remember on GNSO, sometimes I would open my mouth with not knowing what was going on, and she kind of had this look. Like it was polite, but it was kind of this Pam look, and she motivated me to be better. I think she motivated a lot of us to be better and it was just someone that did the work but was also so friendly and so kind. So I'll really miss her and I think we all will. And it's a really a devastating loss.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Greg. I see James has his hand up. Please.

JAMES BLADEL:

They bolted down the microphone so they must have known that I was coming. I wasn't going to say anything until I saw the pictures. And very similar to Greg, my first introduction to Pam was when she was doing compliance at auDA. And whenever I saw her trying to reach me, just this this feeling of like being called into the teacher's office. It's like I knew I did something wrong and I knew she was right. So I was like, how am I gonna get out of this?

And I think very similarly to you, is when you went to a meeting or conversation with Pam, you had better done your homework, because she did, and she probably knew more about what you were going to say that then you did in most of those cases, or me in this case.

I also remember when she was with ICANN but then she left ICANN and came over to contracted parties. And it was like the sun had risen in her face. You could tell she was much happier and so much more at ease

and welcoming in the environment and everything. That was just such a great experience, and I just really treasure a lot of the interactions that we had with her. And we are a lesser community without her.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, James. Antonia.

ANTONIA CHU: I just want to express my feeling and also on behalf of the Chinese community and also my peers and also on behalf of Alibaba Cloud. Pam has been a very dear friend and mentor and also colleague of mine. I know that there's many Chinese people and also those from the Chinese community feel tremendous loss about her passing. Pam has been a very good teacher and a mentor for many of us. And as Greg just said, she has been inspiring a lot of us to take part in ICANN and also guide us and teach us how to get involved in this community. So many Chinese people don't have an opportunity to come here in person. So I just want to take this on this occasion and take this opportunity to express our feeling and also condolence to her passing. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Antonia. Owen, please.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi. So when I was hired by ICANN in March of 2012, Pam was my manager, which was quite interesting being in Los Angeles and having a manager in Australia. So I very early on learned about time zones and

including people in and wanting to make sure everyone was accommodated with her.

I provided one of the pictures on the slide there, and that's one where she's pointing there. That's at a compliance session at one of the ICANN meetings. I think it was in a Buenos Aires. That was the Pam I remember. As Greg, as James said, if she was coming to escalate something to you, you knew ... So I missed her when she left ICANN and I was sorely missing her when I knew that I would get an escalation from Pam because I knew she was completely correct, whatever it was she was raising. Compliance had screwed up and there was going to be a lot of work to fix what we had messed up there.

When I left ICANN and joined the community, she welcomed me with open arms and really helped me to adjust to being on the other side and again reaching out to me and helping me and mentoring still these 10 plus years on. She's really going to be missed. I see a lot of people keep talking about her as a mentor. I know other people who couldn't be here or won't speak up, said, reached out and said she always reached out to them too. So just the amount of time and effort and volume, she was dedicated to this community.

Somebody texted me here a line about Pam and I'm going to read it here. And I don't know if they want to take credit or not, but Pam was the one person in this community that wasn't full of shit. She actually did her homework and helped people get to the actual right answer. She'll be missed.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Owen. We'll end the queue with Jothan, so please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, I'll be brief. I'm fighting back very wet eyes right now. Pam was a vibrant representation and constantly championing the Asian Pacific region and representation, and this wonderful sleepless person would join our calls at horrible, horrible times of day, typically 2:00, 4:00 in the morning and still have an ability to speak very thoughtfully and intelligently about the things, the very detailed things that we would have to work with.

She was stubborn in a good way and frustrating in a good way in her representation. So as I remember her, I smile and I think about different times where we didn't agree on things, but I would find my way to align with hers because there was no possibility to be right when she was right. And I really hope that her legacy can be continued and that there is more representation that comes in to fill this great void that she leaves. She has my highest respect and she will be deeply missed. Thank you. And my condolences to the family.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you so much, Jothan. Thank you all. We'll be remembering her all week. We'll be remembering her our whole lives, I'm sure. But just so you know, we will continue with remembrance during the community excellence awards on Wednesday. I know the council will also, I'm not sure what day, but you can maybe let us know and chat. And Wednesday as well.

GREG DIBIASE: On Wednesday at the end of the council meeting, one of the council members was actually playing a song in her remembrance and then we're submitting a motion kind of documenting all the great contributions she left in the council.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And I also know that there'll be a condolences book that will be available for people to sign. And once I have more details on that, I will be sure to let you all know.

GREG DIBIASE: So that book is in the GNSO room. And so at the back of the GNSO room, you can just go at any time, any break and go and sign the book.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Perfect. Okay, great. Thank you. All right. Let's turn now to work, if we can. So if we go to the next slide, please. We have our special regular guest with us today, which is Andee Hill from ICANN. She just has an announcement to bring to our attention and then we can carry on with the rest of our agenda. Go ahead, Andee. Thank you.

ANDEE HILL: Thank you. Hard act to follow, guys. Just wanted to call out that we've announced a day of DNS abuse discussions that'll be held in Da Nang, Vietnam. And just really want to encourage you guys to come if you can. So I know it's a long ways for some and it is just a day, but it's going to be followed by the symposium for a day and then the OARC 41 will be two days after that. So it will be four days of content.

And our goal for this is twofold. It's to discuss what the DNS abuse contractual language that you've all been working on with us, what that means to registrars and registries and really to make the rest of the registrars and registries that aren't in the room in those discussions to be more comfortable with what it means and what it'll take to actually comply with that and just kind of make sure everyone's comfortable with what it is. And then also not just on the contractual piece of it, but we'll also be following up with mitigation and we're still forming the actual agenda, but it is really looking at what can you do and some case studies and just trying to share with the broader community, including ccTLDs, of what are some, not just best practices, but what does it look like and how do you manage it and how do you handle it?

So also looking for registrars and registries to step up if they want to participate. So please contact me if you have any questions or interest in that. We will be following up with the hotel. We're in negotiations and contracting right now, but it's pretty close. So we'll have the hotel location. Looks beautiful. And also visa and registration information and things of that nature. So that'll be coming to you soon. Thanks for the time.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Andee. I know I'll be fighting with my boss. Conveniently left the room on attending that meeting. So thank you very much. Owen, do you have a question?

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Yeah. When is it?

ANDEE HILL: Labor Day. Wasn't our choice. We were kind of piggybacking on the symposium. So it's the 4th is the day of abuse in September and then it's followed by the 5th, 6th and 7th.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks for that, Andee. All right. Let's get on with the rest of our agenda. So we have an update. We are lucky to have Michael with us, who has been one of our valiant representatives on the IDN EPDP. So thank you, Michael. He's going to be giving us an update and bringing us to our attention an issue for feedback at some point in time. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Yes. Thanks. As you probably know, we have just finished the phase one report, which is currently in public comment and Owen already responded to that or drafted a response. There's not much to say from a registrar point of view because it mainly only covers top-level registry topics.

At the moment, we are in the phase two, which is more related to registrar topics. And in particular, we just, in the last sessions, we discussed the same entity validation problem. As you might know for variants, we will have the same entity requirement in the policy, which means that whenever two domains, let's call them V1 and V2, are variants of each other, then the same entity requirement or principle requires that once they are managed by the same registrar, so it's not possible to have two variants that are managed by two different

registrars, and also those domains need to belong to the same entity, which means it needs to belong to the same registrant essentially.

And this principle is not only during the registration, but also throughout the whole lifetime of those domains. So when a domain is transferred, all variants need to be transferred at the same time because they always need to belong to the same registrar.

Now, the question we are currently discussing where we have contrary views as to who enforces this same registrant check. There are basically two options. The registry can do that or the registrar can do that, or a kind of combination of those. And if the registry is going to do that, then the problem is they have no knowledge of the registrant as a person because they have no business relationship with that person, but the registrars do, so that might be problematic.

But on the other hand, if registrars are going to do that, they will somehow have to know whether two domains, V1 and V2, are considered variants according to that registry. And the question is how we as a registrar find this out, or how do we know that we are obliged to check that those domains belong to the same entity, because certainly, we do not want to implement the IDN tables of hundreds of registries. That would be madness, at least in my point of view. I wouldn't want to write that code in our registrar software.

So one suggestion would be that the registry performs that check and enforces that and that they do this by checking whether the registrant contact handle is the same. So when you register a variant and you put in a contact handle which is not the same handle as the handle of the already existing domain, the registry will have to say, no, sorry, you are

not able to register that domain because it doesn't have the same entity.

My point here is to raise awareness of this same entity principle and to see whether you as registrars have any opinion about this, who should check this and how this should be checked. And if so, please, if we have the time now, you can voice your opinion. Otherwise, please contact me or Zuan and we can discuss this and so that we can present the view of the registrars in this IDN EPDP and not just my personal view and my personal preference.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much, Michael. I appreciate you bringing that to our attention. We are a bit short on time, but we did want to make sure it was flagged for everyone. We will take the people in the queue, but I'll be cutting it off at Jothan unless we have any more time to our... Okay. All right. Sure. So Crystal, please go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Thanks. And thanks for raising this, Michael. I will say on the registry side, it's also kind of a nightmare. And I think at a high level, registrars need to be aware that as the IDN EPDP and in general ICANN is trying to enforce on registries now certain upgrades to their IDN tables, which will be also changing their tables for registrars, it's kind of a nightmare to the extent where Google Registry launched eight TLDs a few weeks ago and decided not to offer IDNs at all because everything coming out of ICANN right now and this EPDP makes providing them very difficult in a way that I think none of us were really anticipating. And this is an

example of that, right? All of a sudden now registrars and registries have to coordinate IDN variants forever. And that's kind of a huge lift on both sides and I don't think people have really been paying attention. So to the extent that we should probably have some kind of small group that talks about this on the registrar side—because I know the registries are finally digging in.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you. That's very helpful. I can see we need a much fuller conversation. But Amadeu, please go ahead.

AMADEU ABRIL:

I just want to say two things. First as registrar, Corehub is a reseller-based registrar. It's not the only one here. Many registrars have also resellers even if they also sell names direct. In these cases, we have exactly the same personal knowledge about the registrant that the registry may have.

Now let me say the contrary to what CRystal has said. My experience at the registry level in 2006 from day one when I was managing .CAD, we implemented IDN variants for the same registry. Indeed, registrar and registrar. This is a policy set up by the [inaudible] the registrar. I think that the primary responsibility for compliance therefore on the registry side.

It's difficult. It's a nightmare, Crystal, perhaps. IDNs in general are a nightmare, especially to use them. But if you do that, I think it's basically the registry duty. Indeed, we find that many registrars use a different handle for each registration of the same registrant no matter

what. Because the system is set that way. There are ways around. It's a little bit more work, but we believe in IDN and we believe that we want to offer variants, which I think are necessary in many cases. We need to handle that.

Basically, it's the registry. If there's a problem, the registry should check with the individual registrar how to solve that, not the other way around. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Amadeu. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, thank you. This is great that you're reporting back, Michael, and thank you for all of the hard work you're doing to participate there. This must be quite challenging. My comment, because of brevity here just due to our time constraints, is my concern is where these start to become effective retroactively into existing TLDs. It's always much easier to do these when you have a plain canvas and you can establish these rules at the front end. I think as Crystal wisely identified, when you start to retroactively make changes, you can do things that can invalidate domains. You can make things no longer valid that were legitimate websites that have been in effect. It really penalizes people who are pioneering registrations and working to support these new technologies to bring in new languages. If you go through and then you change the technologies and the domain you had been using is no longer valid, those are probably bad experiences.

I think it's a collaboration between the registries and the registrars to make all this effective. I don't know that we always will need to say, hey, this is an entirely registry thing or an entirely registrar thing. Where that's a collaborative process, that's going to be really helpful.

This is an area that we have so much volunteer focus going into other places. This one is definitely thirsty for more volunteers to help make sure that what's coming out of these groups is going to be good, valid, and possible so that we don't do it wrong and that we make sure that it's something that can be forward compatible and think about the retroactive registrations and existing domains that are out there. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much. We're going to close the queue after Michael. Go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

I'm not super familiar. Sorry if this is a dumb question. If it is found that two different registrants have the same variant, is the group going to recommend what the process is to deal with that? Does one registrant win out over the other one?

MICHAEL BAULAND:

That's basically what [inaudible] just questioned and why I raised my hand and what I wanted to respond. There is definitely going to be a grandfathering process active. That means that any domains which already before this PDP becomes active belong to different registrars

and or different registrants but are considered to be variants, they can stay the way they are. There is no need that one of the domains needs to be deleted, removed, or transferred to a different registrant. The status quo remains. It's just not possible to add new variants if they do not belong to the same entity. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you so much. Michael, did you have anything else you wanted to raise? I think this is something we need to definitely take back home with us, for those of you who aren't home already, and talk about further and make sure that we're getting Michael the right input to represent ourselves in the EPDP. Thank you so much for bringing it to our attention and let's keep this conversation going on the list. We can schedule a meeting or time on our next agenda if needed to further discuss this. Thank you, Michael.

Next on the agenda, all right, this is going to get crazy, y'all. We're going to start talking about registration data policy. We're going to test your knowledge, so be prepared. But with that, I'm going to turn it over to Sarah and Eric to get this registration data policy party started. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi, everybody. So glad to be here. Okay, so the really good news here is that we are very close to finished with implementing this policy, and we will be able to use it soon and to follow this new policy. So I'm sure we're all looking forward to that. There are a lot of changes coming, which we are going to get into next with Eric, but I'm going to

take a moment to talk about two open issues. Okay, so these are both areas where the policy language has been set for quite some time, but after the final public comment period ended, that language was changed in response to those comments.

Now, just as a reminder, the working group makes recommendations, and then the implementation team has to implement those recommendations. There is a limit. We cannot make significant changes to those decisions. Okay, so first up, there's the question of the timeframe for responses to urgent requests for disclosure of domain registration data, which used to be public and is not anymore. Urgent is a defined term, so that's good. The recommendation left the specific response time to be determined. It said it should be without undue delay, but less than X business days, and so for a long time, a couple years maybe, X has been understood to be two, two business days.

Now, surprise, that was changed to 24 hours. So the problem there is that 24 hours is not X business days, right? It's hours. It's not business days. It does not properly implement the recommendation, and it's not really feasible for a variety of reasons, but even that aside, it doesn't implement the rec, so it's not okay.

The other issue specifically is the timeframe for implementation. So we had planned for what we call an 18-month implementation buffer window, during which time registrars and registries can start following the new policy, but also continue to use the old obligations and update our own platforms in the way that makes sense to us in the order of changes that make sense and coordinating across all the different TLDs that each of us offers, right? The registry might have to make changes

before we can update to match those changes, so we need some time to comply and organize ourselves, maybe roll out changes and then have problems, roll it back, do it again. So by the end of the 18-month period, everybody is supposed to be compliant with the new policy.

What we're seeing now, with a surprise also, is a proposal from ICANN to instead have a two-year waiting and preparation period. So everybody makes the changes in the staging platforms in our own self and wait, hold it until August 2025, and then in that month of August, everybody goes live with all the changes together. This is not a great idea. I could go into details why, but it poses a lot of technical concerns. Everybody has to coordinate these changes, and it's not really clear why this would be helpful, because I think we all want this policy to be implemented. We would like to follow these new obligations that are helpful to everybody, so I think we don't really want to wait two years before we can do that. So those are the open issues that we are looking forward to resolving during this meeting. Okay, happy to discuss. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Would you like to take questions now or wait? Okay, let's go ahead and do that then. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, thanks. So I'm kind of surprised that when the recommendation is X business days and it's now changed to hours. That doesn't fly from a policy process point of view. So I'm not sure how we're going to address that, but that doesn't fly in my mind.

On the August thing, I do not mind that there is additional time for registrars. I suspect that there will be registrars, especially the larger ones. They are desperately going to need that time for implementation. I mean, when I'm looking at a policy, there is a ton of significant changes which is going to hit on an operational level. Releasing all that in a one-month time period in August when everybody's on holiday, that is just crazy and that is basically going to break a lot of stuff and it is sort of unfeasible to sort of coordinate with like 2,000 plus registries and registrars to sort of get that rolling out in a one-month time period. I don't see how that's going to work and especially not from an operational point of view where you are competing with in your organization with different kinds of stakeholders, but you need to get a buy-in from development, management, etc. That sort of doesn't get all coordinated within that time period of a month. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Theo. Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thank you. So I'd like to plus one everything Theo said about the implementation buffer period. I can't say it any better, but it absolutely does not make any sense technically and will break the internet.

As for the 24 hours, agreed, needs to be business days, I had a kind of off-the-record conversation with ICANN and I told them bluntly, Namecheap will 100% not comply with that time period if it's at 24 hours. That's impossible. And their response was, "Well, you can respond to law enforcement for abuse complaints." That's not the same

thing. We've got a team who can do that. They look at it and they say, "Thank you, law enforcement. We're looking into this." And then they start processing it like an abuse complaint. That's a lot different than doing the balancing tests and all reviews and everything like that, waiting to disclose data that if you do it improperly could subject you to significant fines. So there's a huge financial risk and there's no way we can do that in 24 hours over a weekend or something like that. I would like ICANN to go on the record and say they can get an answer from their legal team in 24 hours anytime. I know that will never happen and we're not going to do it too. And I said, I will say in public, we will not comply with this if it's 24 hours. It needs to be the two business days. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Owen. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, thank you. So I understand, I think, the rationale behind the 24 hours was really driven by what would be believed to be urgent circumstances where there might be problematic scenarios, potential loss of life, blah-blah. Don't mean to blur that in a dismissive way. But it is really challenging to address these outside of hours.

I know that we're addressing where these types of matters are treated urgent. Like every requester, every reporter believes that their particular thing is urgent. So the definition of urgent is there to help kind of carve this out as being what circumstances urgent might be. I own a very small and operate a very small registrar. This is something

that would be quite challenging for me to implement, quite expensive for me to implement. And gratefully, I don't have these types of issues coming in on the registrations at my registrar. But I'm thinking of people where they have less resources than me that might be in an emerging country. Even some of the larger businesses are talking about how this might be challenging to actually comply with if it is changed to 24 hours. If that happens during business hours, that's perfectly reasonable. And it sounds like a good compromise. So that's my comment there.

The implementation buffer period, I can plus one what Theo said. I don't know what particular benefit might be there or what the rationale was to do sort of an all at once or a party month in August of 2025 to roll these out, other than that perhaps those who are trying to actually use these systems that would be using the new systems want some sort of magic date that they can count on things being consistent up until a certain point. That's the only practical thing that I can think of might benefit this. But it seems problematic to have us all doing that all at once, especially considering there's not a lot of thought about if you're a project manager how all this would look on a Gantt chart, because we can anticipate there will likely be other things that we will have to deploy in that timeframe that may be problematic or conflict with that.

So the all at once thing, it sounds like it's an interesting idea, but I don't think it's a good idea. I think we should continue with whatever the path has been with the 18 month is that's what the federal commission of Jothan proclaimeth. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you Jothan. And we also need to think how we're going to communicate this back to ICANN, like taking a more formal approach. So please keep that in mind as we discuss this. Closing the queue after Jody. If we have more time, we can continue this conversation, but let's carry on. Reg, please go ahead.

REG LEVY: Sorry, I thought I put my hand down because Theo said everything perfectly.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Reg. Catherine.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thanks. I think, Ashley, I'm kind of going to hit on your point of, Sarah, what do we do now? I think we all know this is bad. We also don't seem to know really where it came from because we know that we have the recommendation on X business days, which does not say hours. And ICANN proposed this redline. And as I understand it, there is one meeting of the IRT this week, and then that's kind of it. What's the go forward plan for this and how can we help?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. So where this came from for the urgent responses, I think it's the same concerns that we have heard the whole time, which is that sometimes there are really urgent issues that need a response right away. They will get a response right away because it's without undue delay, right? For the implementation buffer period, I think what Jothan

said is a big part of it. It's easier to hold contracted parties to one set of obligations than to figure out where they are in between or on the transition of two sets, right?

But how do we approach it now? I have hope that at the meeting on Wednesday we'll just resolve it and it'll all work out fine. You're all laughing at me. We have expressed these concerns. I have a list of like eight reasons why each of these is wrong, right? So maybe it'll work. Maybe we'll just tell them again and then everybody will agree that we should do it the way that we plan to do it that everybody already thinks is a good plan. I guess not everybody.

So I'm really not sure because this is kind of a new situation, certainly for me, maybe for all of us. I don't know what we do if it turns out that we don't get to implement the recommendation as written. Like that doesn't make any sense. I don't know. I'm really not sure what we should do if it doesn't work on Wednesday. So I'm very hopeful about Wednesday's meeting. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Sarah. I'll have a few words on this, but let's get to Jody. Jody's been waiting patiently. So go ahead.

JODYK OLKER:

Thanks, Ashley. A big plus one to what Theo was saying, but I also wanted to add in, there are plenty of legal contracts that are going to have to be signed between the registrars and the registries. Those also have to be signed at the same time. My most pressing concern, though, is that when registries and registrars are all implementing this at the

same time, there are going to be problems in the system that will last for weeks, if not months after that, that we'll have to debug between all the different registries and the registrars. And I was hoping that it's great to get another six months on this, to do this within two years, but hoping that we can have some registries go a little bit, how do I want to say, sequentially instead of all at once would help registrars greatly. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Jody. So moving forward, let's see how it goes on Wednesday. Miracles do happen. But let's be prepared to discuss, one, as Crystal recommended, working with the registries. And I think probably the best course of action is going to be an official public communication that at a minimum cries party foul here, because this is going against standard practice. Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

And just one point, I think Jothan's right and Sarah's right, that's looking at ICANN compliance and looking at customer use of this. But I mean, WHOIS is already not very usable. So it's not like we're blacking out. And for those of us that were around when GDPR revealed, I mean, that went terribly wrong. ICANN was behind on it. We all implemented right on the same kind of date within a day or two. And it went really poorly. And this is a much bigger lift than redacting data. So just remind ICANN, they have enough folks that were around, Dennis was around five years ago, that we should not repeat the same mistake again. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY: Thank you. Also feel free to remind ICANN that I have usage statistics.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Okay. Thank you, everybody. Fingers crossed for Wednesday. Thank you, Sarah. Should I be turning it over to you now?

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Yep. What we want to do, a little change of pace. Obviously, we have our action items of what we're going into the Wednesday meeting. But we decide we want to do here is have a little bit of a quiz in the registration data policy and test all of your knowledge to see if you've been following along with the policy language. And so some of the members of the RrSG IRT put these questions together. And so we'll go through them one by one, I'll read them. And then there's a different variety of question types, true or false, multiple choice. So we'll go through those one by one. I think Zoe, is it going to be in the Zoom? Okay, excellent. So you'll be hearing my voice for the next few minutes reading the questions aloud. But let's get started.

All right, so this question is in regards to the section of scope. Who does this policy apply to? So hopefully, this is an easy one. You got gTLD registrars only, gTLD registrars and registry operators, ccTLD registry operators, emergency back end registry operators, or EBERO, and

escrow providers, or D, all of the above. We'll give you 30 seconds. Unless I see all your eyes up, then I'll know that it's time to move on.

All right, we'll go ahead and see the answer. Oh, so you see, yes, the majority of you, nice job. It is B, gTLD registrars and registry operators. Jothabm I apologize, but hopefully you can spring back and to the next questions. Let's move on to the next one.

So question two is in regards to section 6.1 with the collection of data for registrars. So which of these fields is not mandatory to collect? Is it registrant name, the registrant city, the registrant fax or the registrant email? Let's see the answer. And yes, the answer is C, the registrant fax. The correct answer. Not mandatory. It is a may, I believe. Yes.

Okay, question three. We have a true or false question. The state, province, and the postal code must always be present even if not used for the relevant country. Again, for collection of data, state, province, and postal code must always be present. 50-50 shot. Let's see the answer. I almost said 50-50 split. The correct answer is false. They're only required to be collected if applicable to be collected.

All right, let's go to question four, five, and six. A little speed round. So we go to question four first. Which fields make up the new technical contact in the collection of data? Multiple choice. Is it the name, the org, the country, the phone and the email, or the name, the phone, and the email, or the organization, city, state, province, and country? Don't select submit yet, because you're going to do all three first.

Question five. The registrars may allow the registrant to define a technical contact, but are not required to do so. True or false? Question

six. If the registrar allows for the collection of the registrant fax, and the registrant decides to provide that information, the registrar may decide not to collect it after all. True or false?

Let's see the answers. We went down almost the middle of the first two for the tech contact. The correct answer is the middle, the name, the phone, and the email. Then as for question five, we see overwhelmingly true. Well done, team. That's correct. And finally, for question six, oh, slide down. We've got true, 75%, false, 40. The answer was false. Let's move to the next slide, go to question seven.

So again, still collection. What options must the registrar provide when the RNH provides a technical contact? Select all that apply. The registrar can designate the same person as the registered name holder to be the technical contact. The registrant can provide the non-personal data contact info for the tech contact. Or C, designate the registrar as a tech contact. Select all that apply.

So as you're going through this, what you can tell, what we've done in the slides, you can see later is that following the question, we then provide a slide that has the policy language that explains the answer and, again, shares the true response. All right. Let's see the answer for question seven. So it is the first two, as you can see in the collection of data slide, marked A and B. They can designate the same person as the RNH to be the tech contact or provide the non-personal data contact info for the tech contact. That does not constitute personally identifiable information of the tech contact, with examples shown in the policy language itself. Next slide, question, please.

All right. Under the new policy, accepting DNSSEC is no longer required. Try and only select one, please. I know how eager all of us are to hit the buttons. All right. Let's see with the answer. 80% with false. That is correct. Well done. Yeah, look at that. Good to be everybody. All right.

Question nine. Still on the collection of data section. Oh, nine and ten. Okay. So if both the registrant name and registrant organization fields are populated, which field indicates the domain owner? Is it the registrant name or the registrant organization? And then for question ten, under what circumstances is the registrant organization data published in the Registration Data Directory Service, or RDDS? If the registered name holder agrees to that publication or as soon as the field is populated with data? Select one for each question.

All right. Let's see the answers, please. 85% with the registrant organization. That is the correct response. So well done, folks, for those that answer. And then for question ten, we almost have 50 splits. A little higher than 100, but that's okay. The correct answer is the first, if the registered name holder agrees to that publication. And again, after this, you'll see the slide with the information if you're curious to challenge. All right. Next question, please. The next slide.

Section 6.8, collection of data. Can the registrar delete the administrative contact data? Yes, under any circumstance. Or yes, as long as the registered name holder data is fully populated. Or no, are you kidding me? Of course not. You can't do that. Select one, please. All right. Let's see if we total the 100%. Oh, boy. Wait a minute. No, a little over. The correct answer, half. Yes, as long as the registered name holder data is fully populated.

We move on to the next section, the transfer of registration data. So we've got a question. Select all that apply. What conditions must be in place for a registrar to transfer the registration data to the registry? The registry must permit the data element. A data processing agreement must be in place. The registry must have a published data classification policy. And the registry must establish a legal basis for requiring the data element. Again, select all that apply for conditions that must be in place for the registrar to transfer the data to the registry. Let's see the answers, please. We are so over. I can't count the math at all. All right. So we've got the registry must permit the data element. That is correct. A data processing agreement must be in place. Overwhelmingly, 100%. Almost there. Yes, that is correct. And the registry must establish a legal basis, the last one for requiring the data. Those are the three. No data classification policy is necessary. Not in the policy language. Let's move on to the next one, please. All right.

Next two questions in regards to transfer of data from the registrar. True or false? If the registrar collects the registrant organization data, the ever special organization data, they must always transfer that data to the registry. True or false? Since I know you all answered that so fast. The next question, true or false? The registry may determine if they will collect the technical contact, and if they do, the registrar must transfer it to them, provided, of course, an appropriate legal basis exists and a DPA is in place. Is that true or false? Zoe, we also should have had music. That would have been a good thing. Lesson, another note to take. All right. Let's see the answers, please. Well, so we've got almost half the answers for each, so the correct answer is false. They only have to

transfer it if the registry also collects that data element. And then for 15, we had three quarters with true. That is the correct answer.

Yeah, so there's a slide with the details there of that Section 7.4. Let's move to the next question. We're almost done, folks. You guys are doing so well. What a way to start ICANN. Yeah, hopefully you're all taking notes for the honor system. We'll look at all our scores after. All right. Section 7.5, the transfer registration data. Again, is the reseller data element a must or a may transfer to the registry? Please pick one. Is it a must or a may? Oh, that's, yeah, that could be. Is it a trick? Yeah, I just realized, Jothan's pointing out one of them is all caps. Is that a hint? Oh, okay. Yeah. Oh, see, that's hard. I've got so many windows. All right. Let's see the correct answer. Well, let's see the answers. Sorry. Wow. Are we sure, everyone? The correct answer is may. Well done, team. Look at that. 100%. All right. Two more questions to go.

This moves on to Section 8, the transfer of registration data to data escrow providers. Excuse me. If the registrar collects or generates any of the following, which data element is the only one that must be transferred to an ICANN approved data escrow agent where the others are all optional, which means may be transferred? Again, which one of the four must be transferred? The reseller, the registrar organization, the technical name, or the technical email? All right. Let's see how everyone did. 83% of the registrar organization, that is correct. That is the only one that must be transferred while the others are may's. And of course, we have the policy language there for those that need to just freshen up a little bit on their policy knowledge.

All right. And let's move on to the final question of our quiz. Section 9, the publication of domain name registration data. It's a multiple choice. Under the new policy, which of the following data elements must the registrar redact publication of if they determine to do so to comply with applicable law? Is it the registrant name? Oh, I'm sorry. Select all that apply. Registrant name, the registrant street, the registrant city, or the registrant postal code? Again, out of the following data elements, what must the registrar redact publication of if they determine to do so to comply with applicable law under the new policy? All right. Let's see how we did. So if you selected the name, the street, and the postal code only, you are correct. The city is not a must to be redacted.

So that's the end of the quiz. I hope you all enjoyed it. And I think what we want as a takeaway here is that obviously this policy language, if you haven't truly engrossed yourself in it, there's a lot of changes coming. There's a lot of new language that you need to review for a registrar. And so again, we've got this here. If you have questions, I think if any of the registrars or IRT members can just raise their hands that are in the IRT. If you have questions about the policy, you can reach out to those members. They're the ones who helped put this together. So again, if you have questions and you think it's a no and no, this was stolen from me, I got the questions right, you're wrong, please let us know and we'll be happy to chat about it.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Yeah, as said in the chat, I think we need a curriculum now. Oh, go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Just want to add the communications and outreach team is putting together helpful materials that we hope will be helpful to help everybody understand what the requirements are. We just have to finalize them first. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay, so thank you all for that. Oh, we have a question. Go ahead, Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, just an observation. I mean, I think it's a good point that Eric raised and I thought this was a good exercise to help us understand. We probably have implemented or followed this as it's been evolving and it's gone through some crazy evolution. So there are different points in time where we were answering correct based off of what we knew at the time. And it's ultimately how the policy ends up that we really have to enforce and follow. So this is a really good idea to use the resources of our new comms team that'll be doing some sort of, I guess, a 101a about how this works and let us understand it. So for those of you who are watching remotely or sitting in the audience who were like, hey, the registrars just don't get it, that's actually we do get it. But it's based off of when we could pay attention to all this rapidly evolving policy. So thank you very much.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, thank you. I have to say, how did we survive before the comms and outreach group? I just don't know. Anyway, well done. Thank you, everybody who participated. I think this was very useful exercise.

Hopefully opened up a bunch of eyes. So we have on our agenda one very important matter of any other business. So please pay attention, all of you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: So people may notice that Essie is not here because on Friday, she welcomed her new baby Maeve, and I heard she's big, almost eight pounds. I didn't convert that to metric. I'm sorry. Very big. So her older sister is doing well and they got out of the hospital yesterday.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: What a fabulous way to end. Sarah, what have you got for us?

SARAH WYLD: This is Sarah. I have a much less exciting AOB. Maybe not. I mean, it depends on personal perspective. The next meeting today is the communications and outreach team hosting a sort of two part meeting. So first, we'll hear about becoming an accredited registrar. And thanks to the ICANN team who will share a lot of helpful information there. And then we will talk about engagement with the registration data request service, what that is, why we should all care, and how we can participate. So please come to the meeting starting at 10:45. It is not in this room. It's in a different room and you can find it in the schedule or just follow me. Marquis 1/2/3. That's the room.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'd also just make one more request. So the first part of the agenda of that session is really intended to reach out to either registrars who are

not members of our group or are looking to become accredited by ICANN. So if we could, of course, you're welcome to help with that. But if we could just keep things focused on that particular audience. But on the RDDS part, please do engage. That would be important. So the first part is 30 minutes and the rest of the hour will be for the RDDS. So please do join us.

We have a couple more minutes. So if anybody has anything else that they would like to raise. Amadeu, please go ahead.

AMADEU ABRIL:

Okay. I think it's becoming sort of a fixation for me. But is there any way we can tell ICANN, the mail that they sent to say that the RDAP amendment was approved, is the contrary what any decent person would do? They didn't say how the thresholds were met. It comes two months late. And if you read that, you don't know what to do. Just read the red line. And there are many paragraphs to say absolutely nothing regarding what has happened or what will happen for registrars and registrars. I think that it's not that difficult to do some kind of at least half meaningful communications and half timely communications. And I repeat, this is especially true for all those people that don't come to ICANN. We follow blogs, we read emails in the constituency, but many people in our group is not member of the constituency or of the stakeholder group. So they don't follow the news. And receiving that email is like ancient Aramaic translated into Klingon or something like that.

ANDEE HILL: Thank you for that feedback. Are you speaking directly of the legal notice? Yeah, we struggle with that a bit, to be quite honest. The legal notices, there's perimeters around it of what we have to say. But let me go back and look and I'm sure we can do a better job if it's confusing. And legal notices are not in plain language and we try to work with legal on making them a little bit better to understand, but I hear you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, thanks for that feedback, Amadeu. And I think that the good news here is that ICANN is working with us in terms of making things more clear. So thank you, Andee, for being here to respond. Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: On top of that, I understand the legal stuff. It also wasn't very helpful in terms of, like, here's the updated RDAP profile and, like, the actual operational issues. Like, typically, you forward this to your engineers and you're like, here, this is the package. But instead, we each had to, like, go dig it out. And so that, I think, makes it harder. And to Amadeu's point, at least I know where to go look. There are a lot of registrars that are like, okay, great, now what does this mean? So it could have been a much better package. And especially as we're looking at, like, reg data information and you're putting that together, try to include as much information, as many links, all the info that an engineer would need necessarily. I mean, it makes sense for some of us to translate it all to that. But at least having that data on our fingertips would be great. Because it is on the ICANN website. Just don't make it hard to find.

ANDEE HILL: Really good feedback. Thank you very much.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much. Anything else anybody wants to raise in our last four minutes available to us? If not, thank you all so much for being here. It's great seeing you all in person. Please join us for the next session on Outreach and RDRS. Please join us. And also again, as a reminder, the GNSO session, remembering Pam as well, sorry, the council session, remembering Pam as well as a Community Excellence Awards. And other than that, I will see you around and we are officially done. Let's end the recording, please.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]