

Session

ICANN79 | CF – GDS: Registration Data Policy IRT- Collaborative Planning for Transition Work Session
Saturday, March 2, 2024 – 4:15 to 5:30 SJU

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, and welcome to the Registration Data Implementation Review Team Collaborative Planning for Transition Work Session. My name is Nathalie Peregrine, and I am the Participation Manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I'll now hand it over to Dennis Chang. Dennis, please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you and welcome everyone. All right, so let's get started. Karen, would you like to say a few words?

KAREN LENTZ: Sure, thanks Dennis. I didn't have anything prepared, but I'm really happy to be here because we have really together accomplished a tremendous milestone having the policy published and everybody getting ready to move over to the new way of doing things. It's been a really long, difficult journey, I think, and really can't thank you enough for all of the IRT volunteers, IRT members who have been here the

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.

whole way or part of the way with us helping to do this. So can we thank you at least by applause?

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, thank you so much for hanging in there. There's a few members who couldn't be here because of conflict, but this is probably a good time to remind everyone. At the same time, we're thanking you for the past five years, I need you for another 18 months. You know why, right? Because you have said collectively it would take 18 months for us to successfully implement this policy because of its complexity and the sheer magnitude of what we're changing.

So first, quickly, let me go over this for the IRT. I think you've all seen it because I sent you emails as soon as this happened, you were anticipating that this was coming. I said 21st of February and we delivered on the 21st. Behind the scene, a lot of work by a lot of people at ICANN Org, I think you can probably imagine how that would happen. So this is the announcement. It's on the ICANN.org. This is the blog from our CEO, Sally, basically going back some background.

And then in the blog, please note that there is a link to a resource page here. So this is a registration data policy the resource page where you can find some more information, including this set of slides. I think I've been getting good feedback on this, saying this is very helpful in looking at, along with the policy, right, it gives you before and after picture of what really changes, the timeline, as you saw. Those of you who are not familiar with the policy outline, what it looks like, some details. IRT knows this very well, of course, because you're the one who did this. But

I am pointing this out for the community who have joined us in the back here. So there's a wealth of information that's already on the ICANN.org now that we have published the policy.

So that is the background and overview for example. And then what we want to do is, today, let me just ask this question first. Before we get going here, did you collectively at the IRT, did you receive any feedback on the policy itself, publication, what are your stakeholders saying? Are they understanding of this? It's not a big deal, all clear? Any feedback? Do you have anything? Go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, I don't think this is representative. This is Thomas Rickert speaking. But actually, a couple of folks came to me and said, well, it took you that long to deliver that? And that made me wonder. I think Sally's blog post is great because it gives an overview of how we got where we are today. But maybe we should consider, and I guess maybe not only this group but maybe the GNSO Council, to communicate a little more about the genesis of this document so that folks can better appreciate what went into this and what this big achievement that it truly is, is about, because I think that some folks were under the impression that was, I guess, triggered by the way ICANN Org has originally phrased the scope of the exercise when the temp spec was announced by saying we just need to subtract a little bit to the existing process to be compliant with the GDPR. And, I mean, let's face it, GDPR was the main driver for this entire thing. And I think this is far from the truth. But that basically created a mindset in parts of the community that we would just need to do a few tweaks to make this work. But

Session

actually what we did is we started, as you would need to do under GDPR, with nothing, and examined all the processes on a need-to-know basis. And what we have with this policy is something that truly honors the principle of data minimization and privacy by design, right, to get where we are. And maybe this needs to be explained a little more, maybe in another blog post or something that folks understand that we've basically addressed all the concerns that the privacy authorities have written about to ICANN since 2005.

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent point. Karen, you're going to talk with GNSO tomorrow, right? Yeah, probably that's a good opportunity to mention that. Thank you for that feedback. Anyone else? Sarah?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. So the question was what have our constituency groups said about the policy? I'm hearing a lot of this is a huge change that requires so much coordination among registrars and registries. And then also there's a lot of work just for registrars within ourselves to do. The registrar stakeholder group is working on providing supporting explanatory information, which I think we've shared also with you. So there's some info sheets about like the changes to the org field, what is redaction. So there's a lot of questions and people are really digging into the policy now. Thank you.

Session

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent. Exactly the kind of reaction I am wanting to have. I want that recognition that there is a lot of work here and there is a lot of coordinated effort that's required to be successful for all of us. And that is going to be our main agenda today. This is going to be a cross-community working session where we will be asking one another. So I want to actually hear from you. What have you done so far? And what do you plan to do in the near term?

Specifically focusing on our next milestone, that is 21 August 2024 is coming up. We designed this for a six-month coordination, collaboration, preparation phase so that we can begin to transition to the new data model on the 21st of August. And what's really interesting about our policy is that after the six months, we begin the transition for 12-month period. So during that 12-month period is really going to be challenging because our policy says you may implement either the interim registration data policy as is today, what we have today, or the new registration data policy that we just published, or elements of both.

That will be a challenging thing for, I think, all of us. So it would require us to stay together and coordinate closely so that nobody is surprised or out of step. So thank you for being here still and then being with us for the next 18 months.

So since I bring this up, I'm going to ask a question. Now, I have a gift for you. I only have one of these. Another collective limited edition ICANN Org clock. Okay? The first person who raises their hand and answers correctly gets this. Okay, RySG member. I have been giving you a lot of tasks, right? I really put you to work, didn't I? Many tasks, many, many tasks. How many tasks do you think that you have received? If I click on

Session

this tab, one number comes up. How many tasks? Let me see your hand.
53. 120. 171. 213. Beth. 117. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Feels like 10,500.

DENNIS CHANG: Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: 255, 260.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, let's look at who wins this prize. And the number is 248. Okay, who's the closest? Volker, is that you? We're going to start the cross-functional discussion, but I want to know before I forget, this is very important, let me know, do you know where registration data policy implementation is going to be discussed this week? Where and when will the conversation happen? Tell me if you know. Where are you guys? Anywhere? Okay. Go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I raised my hand actually before you asked the question, so I'm not going to provide that answer. So I would just defer to letting you finish, and then I'll ask my question.

Session

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. My question is, I'm looking at you, Marc. Tech ops is in my head right now, in my mind. Because I know we talked about implementation of this policy at Tech Ops, right? And what we've been discussing, I've been chatting with Gustavo on what would be the appropriate place, if not the IRT, to have this in-depth, detailed, collaborative, cooperative discussion? Where should it be in the most optimum sense? And I thought about Tech Ops where registry operator and registrars are talking, right? That's the purpose. And yeah, I know it is technical, but is that the right place? So I want to hear from you. Sarah, I think you're first.

SARAH WLYD: Thank you. This is Sarah. So you're asking where should it be discussed or where will it be discussed?

DENNIS CHANG: Both. I want to know first where will it be discussed this week because I want to be there. We are interested. We want to participate.

SARAH WLYD: Okay. So the registrar stakeholder group has some sessions on it. I know there's a GAC discussion that involves it. There's a couple others in my calendar, but where should it be discussed? I think all of our groups should be talking about this policy because it affects all of us and because I think we will all need to work together for the transition to go well, but especially registrars and registries. Thank you.

Session

DENNIS CHANG:

Beth?

BETH BACON:

Just FYI, we have been talking about this already for, I think, a while and coordinating because it's not as if this is a super surprise. We've been running up to it for a little while. So the registries and registrars are having a closed session just to brainstorm and talk about what those pain points might be because you started us chatting and saying the last year is going to be tough. I think it should possibly be the easiest, smoothest time if we use this six months wisely. So I think for sure we're going to hear about it in Tech Ops. I think some folks, and by some folks I mean PIR, we've been talking a lot about kind of a phased approach, and we've been doing that since before it was already out. So I think there are ideas on the table, and I think Tech Ops is going to talk about it, registries are going to talk about it, registrars are going to talk about it. And so I don't think that it can all or should all just happen in the IRT. So I think don't worry, Dennis, we're talking about it. We're coordinating. Don't be nervous.

DENNIS CHANG:

I know last thing I remember from you is that "It's time to panic" slide you showed me. Go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Yeah, I think first of all, it's important that the registries get their act together and give us an indication of where to go as registrars, because if we as registrars start coding today and say code, code, code, code,

code, code, done, and then the registries come along with their implementation and it's all wrong, then we haven't gained anything. So I think the registries have to lead and provide basically a barebones implementation guideline that we as registrars can follow as soon as possible. And it would also be helpful, taking off my CentralNIC registry backend provider hat and putting on my registrar hat now if all registries follow that same basic scheme and logic in that, because there is an opportunity, even though it's very easy and very simple as a concept, to make it difficult by having differences in implementation, and these should be probably avoided as much as possible. And therefore, if registries can coordinate first and say, this is how we envision that, and then the registrars can follow and maybe comment on that and then have some time to implement that, that would be helpful.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thanks Dennis. I'll just expand on what Beth and Volker just said. First as Beth pointed out, Tech Ops will be talking about it. We have a closed session tomorrow. It's closed just to registries and registrars to give us an opportunity to have some of those frank conversations that Volker just talked about.

The challenge with parts of this policy are that registrars are very much dependent on what registries do, and registries need to go first, and registrars are very much dependent on what registries do, and registries need to go first, and registrars will need to adapt to what registries do and the direction they get from registries. And so this is something we put on the agenda as a closed conversation so that registries and

Session

registrars can have some very frank conversations about what registries are planning to do and what registrars need from registries in order to do the work that registrars, the follow-on work that registrars need to do.

I'll also point out that our own Rick Wilhelm, who's hiding over there in the corner, is leading that particular session, and he probably deserves a sticker for his work in this area.

DENNIS CHANG:

You're right, because that man over there brought us the RDAP profiles, right? He delivered right on schedule. Come on, Rick. RDAP profile has two documents. One is the profile document and the other is the technical document, right? Yes. That's just wonderful to hear. Exactly what I wanted to hear, that these open-frame conversations are going on and is happening not just here, but actually where it needs to happen.

So I'm trying to design this IRT as we go for the next 18 months. And I think that our kind of a conclusion is that IRT session, I want to reserve the IRT session for policy, kind of policy language-related items and drive the more of a technical detail conversation into the Tech Ops-light group conversation and registry stakeholder groups, registrar stakeholder groups, and other groups that I may not be even aware of.

But as long as those talks are going on in all those sessions and there's coordination, collaboration happening at the appropriate place, we shouldn't be depending on the IRT for that anymore. Does everybody agree with this?

Okay, I see General nodding of the head. So that's good. Let's take that as a decision. So there are a few policy items that I have in mind, but I'm not going to talk about that today. I will talk about it probably, I have to think about it actually a little more and then maybe have some discussions and then maybe I will call an IRT session with a specific agenda to talk about those policy items.

Remember that our policy has this Rec 27 recommendation that asks us to look at all policies across all the consensus policy that we have. And let me just show you, this is probably a good time to show you what that looks like. This is our updated consensus policies page. And if you look at this, we have a note that says on 21st of 2024, the ones that have asterisks have been impacted or changed. So you see many policies that have the asterisk sign. And you can find the previous versions all down here. So this took a lot of work to iron this out and try to make it as simple as possible and easy to understand.

But when we look through this, because things happened, right, as we were implementing, we want to, there's some thoughts that we have about maybe we should do this, maybe we should do that, but all those are kind of a nice thing to do, and we did what we had to do first. But I may come back to the IRT to get your advice and input on what, if anything, we will do with some of these policies to make it more clear or maybe even clean it up a little bit. But that's part of our charter so we can do that. Should we do that is another question. And that's what I'll be asking you for advice on.

We talked about registry operator having to do something first and then registrar having to do something next. So I want to talk more about that,

Session

but right now, since ICANN Org is here too, what I want to do is make sure that we use this forum while I'm here and Gustavo is here, and we have our other members here in the back. We want to understand what ICANN Org can do to either facilitate, support or guide in your efforts for implementation. Before I turn it over to Gustavo and talk about some of the things that we have been doing, let me hear from you. Is there anything that you need from ICANN Org? You have something?

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl, NIC.br. Just a comment that the registry first, registrar last idea doesn't apply to thin TLDs. And most of the domains under management today are registered in thin TLDs, not in thick TLDs. So this probably suggests an implementation path of going, at least if I were a registrar, I would be looking first at thick TLDs, .com, .net, and [.job.]

DENNIS CHANG:

Sarah?

SARAH WLYD:

Thanks, this is Sarah. I feel like the answer to this question of what can ICANN do to help will really become more clear over the coming 18 months. Like right now, I'm so deep in the planning, I don't even know what I need help with yet. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent point. And we just published it on the 21st, so maybe it's unreasonable for me to ask you that question so soon. But, yeah, this is

Session

the question that I want you to think about. And come to us. Use the IRT forum to ask the question. And we may answer those questions using a different forum. But you will all know where and when we're talking about that. Okay? Okay. Gustavo, you want to talk a little bit about what we've been doing?

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Sure. So in the case of ICANN Org, we have been analyzing all the different data flows, right, in which registration data flows. We have identified most of them, I think. And we are working on having support for this policy. For example, escrow agents. They need to be able to support the changes coming from this policy. EBERO providers, they also need to probably update their systems based on this policy, right? We have the ICANN lookup tool. That's something that we provide to the public, and we also need to implement a new RDAP profile in there. We have registry system testing, the system that is used to test registries for [MSAs and PBTs.] So we also need to update that system because obviously the system was developed when the new gTLD program was in place and everything was thick.

So we have identified all these different tasks that we need to do and we are working on them. Basically, we have all of those in our project plan. And yeah, if you want to participate at some point or you want to know the details, happy to explain those to you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Anything else? Marc, you want to speak? Go ahead.

Session

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. Maybe a follow-up. I think in the data flow you mentioned escrow, and I think that's good to hear, right, because I think that might be an area where we need some help, because I think if we tried to escrow per the policy today, it would fail validation at the escrow provider, maybe. And I think also that would affect registry and registrar escrow transfers. And so that might be an area. But I think also there are IETFs that existing escrow transfers are done against an IETF standard, I believe. So there may be a need to update that standard, and I think there will probably be a need to work with escrow providers, make sure they can support escrows both before, during, and after the transition period for registries and registrars. So that might be a good area where we need further collaboration.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Yeah, from our analysis, we don't think that we will need to modify the [RSA,] which is good news, obviously. But there is a big question of the tech contact, right? The tech contact, if we want to continue to support that in the industry, at least it requires an EPP extension, for sure, and probably it will require an RDAP extension. So that's also something that the community needs to understand how it's going to be supported and create those extensions for those two protocols. But at least for what we have identified for escrow, we think that an update to the [RSA] won't be needed. But we'll provide more details as we continue doing the analysis.

Session

- SARAH WLYD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Just a question about the process, because I think what I heard earlier from Dennis is that the ongoing meetings moving forward for this group will focus more on policy questions, but what we're talking about now is a technical implementation question, which I would very much like to continue to understand the status for. So will that also be part of our ongoing meetings?
- DENNIS CHANG: Actually, no, that's what I meant. I would not be sharing that detail with the IRT, but I am going to direct you all to participate in places like Tech Ops and follow that track as part of their conversation to implement this policy. Now, if that doesn't work, then we'll have to think about something else. But Beth, go ahead.
- BETH BACON: Thanks. So I think that Volker's right, registries and registrars need to pull ourselves together and do that, and registries are likely to go first because we're the ones that are charged with any change if that happens. But I do think the IRT has a role because not every registry and registrar are members of the stakeholder groups. They aren't all members of Tech Ops. So I think some overall coordination and updating would be helpful from the IRT because we only have six months and if we don't want the August 25th to be just the worst day we've had in years, then I think we need to just—more coordination is better than less. So I think maybe some high level coordination here would be really nice again for those folks that aren't steeped in this and three months from now go, “Wait, there's a new policy?”

Session

SARAH WLYD: Thank you. I do agree with Beth here, and I think within the IRT, we've brought together this great group of representatives. I think it is the right place to maybe not do all the work, but to have updates about what work has happened.

DENNIS CHANG: Good point, Beth. Okay, so I stand corrected in my thinking, and that's a good suggestion. So I will go ahead and keep that in mind as we, I mean, I'm going to trust Gustavo to be in the Tech Ops having detailed discussions. And we're always coordinating. We're working together. So based on what he sees and does, we will bring it back to the IRT and then let you know. And please, you do the same for me. If you have revelation discussion points that IRT should know, use the email. You ask for a meeting, right? Let's come together and share. That's an agreement, everybody? Very good.

So just for your information, we did, ICANN Org, did send a courtesy email to all the data escrow service providers that this policy has been published, and not giving them any details, but just letting them know that there's a new policy, and then we're going to be working with them. So they're all notified.

We've also notified the URS and UDRP service providers. So they're going to be having some sort of an update on their procedures, and expectation needs to change, so that has also happened. So we are going to continue to go ahead and do those type of announcements and

Session

notifications. And I will make sure that this IRT is aware of those things going out.

Okay. So have you all met our newcomer here? Hello? I want you to introduce yourself because you're new, and this is the IRT and who you are and what you will be doing to support the policy implementation. Go ahead.

JIANKANG YAO: Jiankang Yao from CNNIC. CNNIC is for .cn registry, also for some [inaudible] network, Chinese version registry.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for coming, and we look forward to your participation, too. Now, anybody else have anything to say? Otherwise, I don't mind closing the meeting short, because I think there's another meeting that is happening that some of us are anxious to get to. Roger, come on up here.

ROGER CARNEY: Nothing for me, but it looks like Hadia has something. She's got her hand up in chat. Oh, sorry, maybe it's the wrong one. Sorry. I have nothing to say, though. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm opening up the session for the community Q&A if there's any questions. Otherwise I'm going to think that we have done such a

wonderful job on creating a clear and concise policy language that needs no explanation.

If you look at the policy document, there is actually requirements, but also policy implementation notes at the bottom. Implementation notes. And we also provided the implementation resources, and we're going to be continuing to do that. In the future, I think we're going to be maybe creating the FAQ. As we go, if we receive frequent questions, just let us know we're going to add them to our FAQ. So that's in the plan.

I don't see any raised hands in the room. Is there any raised hands in the chat? No? Okay. Thank you very much. I will conclude this session. Everyone, next time—I have to think about when it is, but if you do feel the need for the IRT, let me know, okay? So we can come together again. But if not, maybe I'll see you in the next ICANN, ICANN 80.

Oh, there's one more thing. CP Summit, right? In May, those contracted parties, we are having a summit in Paris. You have the days. You like Paris. So we have a session in the summit. I think an hour will be reserved where we are going to dedicate this cross-functional discussion. So invite your implementation team to that. You know, bring them to Paris so they can all enjoy our res data policy together. Okay? Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]