
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO: Registration Data Policy IRT Meeting
Wednesday, October 27, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the ICANN72 gTLD Registration Data Policy IRT session. My name is Andrea Glandon, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as I will note in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or 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. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Dennis Chang. Please begin.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to the ICANN72 session for the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation. This is the EPDP Phase consensus policy recommendation. And actually it is now Phase 1 plus Phase 2, Priority 2. And—let me just make that correction now—you will see what we do—Priority 2—consensus policy recommendations. And we will let you know what that is as go here.

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.

My name is Dennis Chang. I'm the Project Director for this implementation project. On today's agenda, I'm going to provide you a very brief project overview, and then we'll get into the project scope and show you the deliverables for this project. And then we'll get right into the IRT working session.

The purpose of this public session is to let the public see how the IRT is working on the policy implementation and give you an opportunity to ask questions. And we will reserve maybe five minutes at the end of the session. So for the duration of the session, please allow us to work with the IRT, and we will point out where you can find more information and also the community wiki page that's always available for all the policy implementation projects where we deposit all our work products.

So let's get on with it. So the quick background. As you know, there was GNSO consensus policy recommendation for EPDP 1. And what we're doing right now is the implementation project for that consensus policy. And if you recall, with that Phase 1 policy recommendation, the Board had accepted and adopted 27 of the 29 recommendations but they did give us a direction to adopt in part a couple of recommendations. And we will talk about that also.

So since then, we've had four recommendations from Phase 2A, Priority 2 items, which happen to be the policy recommendations #19 to 22 that covers these topics like city field reduction and displaying of the privacy proxy registration contact data and updating the purpose of the data processing related to the security, stability, and resiliency and the time period associated with the registration data retention.

So since June of 2021, the project team here has added that scope to the implementation work, and that's what we are working on right now.

Just a quick reminder. The way we have done this is we took a look at the policy implementation in three stages, Stage 1 being the urgent, immediate stage that we had to act very, very quickly in. And what we did is, immediately after the Board adopted the policy for Phase 1, we created an interim registration data policy. So right now, we do have a registration data policy that's in effect, and we call that the interim. And then what we're working on now is more of a permanent policy implementation that we call Phase 2 and 3.

And for now, let's just go to the scope of what that means. So the obvious deliverable from the policy implementation team is the policy language that has to be published for implementation. And along with that, there are reports that we had to produce as part of the recommendation requirements. And there are some new documents like the data processing agreement with the contracted parties and a third-party service provider, like data escrow, that we have to create. And this is rather an extensive and comprehensive project implementation where we have to look at all policies and all procedures within ICANN that have to do with registration data policy.

And, as you can imagine, just about everything that we do has some relation to registration data policy. So we have these waves of reports that we're producing to assess the impact and we're trying to create a list of redline documents of what those impacts are. And all of this—

everything that you're looking at that I'm showing you here—will be published for public comment.

So to date, as I said, we have a lot of reports that we've been delivering, the latest one being the Wave 1.5 report earlier this year. Wave 2 we're still working on. And we call these the redline documents or red docs. But here are a list of consensus policies and procedure that requires updates because of the registration data policy. And—wow—there are other ones. And then I think, to this, we will need to add one more, and that is the transition, the—what do we call it?—thick WHOIS policy to this list, which I haven't done yet. But I think we will have to. And you will see why as we have our IRT discussion.

So all of this is in the IRT wiki space. When the IRT is done with the draft documents and wants to make it available to the public, they are published in this wiki. And this is the wiki that we're talking about right there—this registration data policy IRT wiki.

And this is the agenda page. And this is the typical agenda page that we use for the IRT meetings—a rather typical agenda.

And the way the IRT works is we usually have a long list of agenda items, but it's not always predictable how long each one of these items will take to discuss. So what we do is we get through it as much as we can, and those agenda items that we don't get to we add to our next meeting. So that's how we operate.

So the first item is really a welcome and check-in to the IRT members.

And for today, I have news for the IRT, our team. Do you remember last time when we met that I told you that Genie went out on maternity leave? Remember that? And we all wished her well. And I can report to you now that she had a baby, a healthy baby boy. So thank you very much for caring. We now have three of our team members having three babies. And when she gets back, we hope that she'll share some baby pictures. I'll let you know when that will be. And we can check in with [inaudible].

That's the announcement. Is there anyone else who makes to make an announcement? Here is your chance. Raise your hand.

Thank you very much. We will relay those well wishes to Genie.

Okay. So now, if you look at the agenda, we went through 1 and 2. And let's get into the Rec 7 discussion. This is good. So you know that it has been one of the dependent items for our work, and we have been waiting for the Board and GNSO to have their discussion and see if we can have a common interpretation of the recommendation because, as you know, we had a split in the IRT in terms of our recommendation understanding. And now that we have, I think, a good understanding, a common understanding, we have been trying to work out how we could best represent that in the policy language. And we believe we have a good approach.

So this is the IRT doc, OneDoc. And for those who are joining us for the first time, we call our policy draft document language a OneDoc, and it's because every one of these sections were, in the past, a separate documentation. And what we did is, at one time, when we thought we

were ready, pulled it all together into one doc. And that’s why we call it OneDoc.

And the other thing to know is, from this line, every word is intended to go into a permanent policy language. But above this line is our working material, including the reminder that some of these recommendations do not result in the policy language.

So let’s look at Section 8, which results from Recommendation 7. What I did is, to facilitate this conversation, I just took another working doc—let me just share this with you—and I copied over the policy language that we want to use without all the suggested changes. And I also plucked out some of the key points from the GNSO guidance letter to the Board. And then I copied and pasted my own e-mail to you when I was tasking the IRT with Task #176. And as you can see, it’s this one.

So what we are wanting to do and what we’re proposing is to make this really, really simple. I know these have been the most difficult recommendations to put into policy, but now, when we look at it, if you sort everything out, we could end with a policy recommendation as simple as this. And what that is is: let’s talk about the registration data elements and what really are the data elements that must be transferred.

And if you look at those data elements, there’s two categories. One, you just have to transfer “must”, period. There’s no [inaudible], no condition. Everybody has to have these data elements. And then you must transfer, period—registrar to registry operator. So simple language. Short list.

The three data elements that is slightly different is that the registrar must transfer but only if they have these data. So it's a fact, a technical fact, that not all these three data elements are available to registrars, so they cannot transfer data elements they don't have.

So we've separated it out. And you can see this language is the same thing in Section 8.1 and 8.2. Now, we'll get to this 8.2.3, which we are proposing to add as a part of the drafting error item. And we'll talk about that later.

So, for now, let's just focus on the concept of the Rec 7 implementation. And what we are in effect doing is retaining only the "must" categories that we can be clear about complying and enforcement.

Does that make sense—what we're trying to do? And why did we not include the other data elements that are not in the category of "must transfer"? And this is my attempt at explaining the reason why we just deleted it from the policy language: because, at the end of the day, if you examine the policy recommendation carefully, we have this statement called appropriate legal basis.

And for all this time, there as a disagreement in the IRT on who decided on that appropriate legal basis. Is it this policy that has already decided? That was one interpretation. Is it a legal basis decided by the registry themselves? That's the second interpretation. The third is, is it going to be ICANN enforcement, Contractual Compliance enforcement, who will ultimately have to decide when they do their audit and compliance enforcement?

And when you look at those three potential interpretations, we are getting clarity that, in fact, it's number two that [still on] the guidance that we have gotten from the GNSO. And of course, we have heard from the EPDP Phase 1 [quality] team that worked on the recommendation themselves. And we heard a lot from them directly within this IRT that that, indeed, was the interpretation.

So we actually question whether or not the EPDP team had a mandate to change the thick. And here you can tell from the GNSO letter that the GNSO Council confirmed that they had the mandate. And then, even though it may not be so clear, which caused us to discuss different interpretation, the GNSO Council here again in their letter to the Board confirms that the change to the thick WHOIS policy is implied, which is what we've heard from some of our IRT members. But of course, it's really good to get that confirmation from the GNSO Council on the consensus policy, which they approved, and directive.

So what we're saying is that that interpretation is the one that we're adopting.

So if that's the case, if the registry operator decides on the policy according to a legal basis and they decide what must be transferred for the following items here—Section 3, Section 4, and Section 5—there's no need for us to capture that as a policy language because it would not be able to subject to compliance or enforcement anyway. So leaving that language that we received that transferred from this language—the legal basis exists—in the policy would cause more confusion and the same type of different interpretation discussion in the future.

So what we are proposing to do is just take it out. Any language that does not require clear requirement but could cause a different interpretation later on in terms of enforcement we should not put in. So that's our approach.

And of course, the data processing agreement is also here, but we're more focused on the legal basis, this requirement here. So that's the approach. So taking that language out all together and just deleting those data elements from the policy language and ending with a transfer requirement for these items only is a good, clean, clear approach we're going with.

I'd like to take a pause here and then hear from the IRT members. I know you probably thought about this. And this is different, maybe, than what you had expected. So I understand. And this is the reason why I wanted to have this meeting and explain this all to you first so that you can think about it some more. But I will entertain any questions that you might have at this point about this. What is your reaction? What do you think? I want to hear.

Anybody? Raise your hand. Are you all stunned?

"Need a key to access the document?" Oh, yes, I'm sorry. If you are not an IRT member, you cannot access these IRT documents. And these IRT documents will be posted to the IRT wiki when the IRT is done with them.

I see a hand from Sarah. How are you, dear?

SARAH WYLD: Hi, Dennis. I'm very well. Thank you. It would be nicer if I could be in Seattle, but—

DENNIS CHANG: I know.

SARAH WYLD: So I just wanted to say thank you for this. It's quite a bit of a change, and I really appreciate all of the attention that you and your team have given to this guidance and how to put that into real life.

So my first impression is that, personally, I'm satisfied with this, but as a group, I don't know that we've had a lot of time to review and think about it. So definitely we'll need a bit more time. But I do appreciate that we're trying to figure out how to move forward on this one. Thanks very much.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sarah. When I wrote this e-mail, I gave you a reference for a couple of things: my GNSO letter and also the ... Because he reminded me, this is Sebastien's letter to the GNSO Council on just how much difficulty we are having at the IRT with the interpretation of the recommendation differences. So you have that and you can access that.

And then this letter, by the way, for those of you ... I said that we are maintaining the documents that are published in the IRT wiki, and here they are. And the correspondence that pertains to our documents are

all listed here. There's the Board letters, the GNSO letters. Let's see if we [can see where it is]. This is the latest that we added. But that was my point.

Sebastien has his hand up and I wanted to recognize him. And Sebastien is our liaison to the GNSO, and he has been doing a lot of heavy lifting for us. And I showed you, he did a really deep analysis and expressed just how this physical was and the rationale for why the IRT is split on the interpretation. So you have the floor, Sebastien. Thank you so much, by the way, for all your work.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Dennis. I'll be very brief. So, in line with Sarah and Beth's comment in the chat, I think that everybody needs a bit more time to read through it. I just wanted to say that I've lost track of time a bit here, but I believe it was a Monday on the GNSO call when it was mentioned by Pam Little. And she was very thankful for it. So we'll let the IRT continue their work and all that. But it has been noted by the GNSO, and they wanted to thank the team for having [heard it]. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Sebastien. Okay, very good. Yeah, I didn't expect that [it must have concluded] today. And as you saw, the reason that I'm making these due dates as they are is I am trying to think about what you might need. So if you need more time, by all means please let me know.

And as you know, we do revise our due dates as we need to. And that's just fine. We'll need to get this right. I feel pretty good about having spent a long time thinking about this because, with the time that we are investing together as a team now for doing this policy implementation, we're going to save a lot of time for the people who come after us who are implementing enforcement to make clear policy language. So that's why we are very, very keen on not leaving anything out there that we know is confusing. And we are the ones who have to struggle to make sure that everybody looks at it. And we have of course our extended families back home who are looking at this language and giving us input. And that's all helpful. So please consult your team.

So the suggestion that we were just talking about in the OneDoc is this suggestion that I am deleting for 176 and we are discussing right now. So with support of the IRT, it would be our pleasure to delete Sections 3, 4, and 5.

So if there are now more questions on Rec 7, we can continue to other topics. And that it is our change for the technology agnostics. And as you know, we already had one discussion, and we got some really good input from our last IRT meeting, so we made some adjustments per your input already. And we want to talk about it again and tell you about what did not change and what did change. And we are going to start with the OneDoc again. And it's now Section 10. So what we're looking at is Section 10.131 and 33 and the addition of Addendum 1. Right? Everybody with me?

So Section 1. We're deleting the note. Section 3.1. We're deleting this detailed instruction on how to do the redacted. Same here in Section 3.3. And the new addition to the addition is Addendum 1. And this red addition—the [note] addition—by Gustavo is the result of our last conversation.

Okay. So let me turn it over to Gustavo at this time. He is our resident RDAP expert, as you know, and is on our [ITT] to make sure that, number one, the policy language there we were publishing is technically accurate and, number two, is easy for our engineers back at home to implement. They're the ones at the end who have to code. So, Gustavo, you have your mic open?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Can you talk to the team about maybe, quickly, the old change you've already explained and then the new change. Do you want to take over the screen-sharing or do you want me to keep [driving]?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: I will prefer to share my screen here.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. There you go.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Can you make me co-host?

So as Dennis was mentioning, the idea with the policy to be technology agnostic as you may be aware. Most of the policies that you can find about, let's say, RDDS output like AWIP and [CLD], have text related to how to do things in WHOIS right. Then, when we were working on RDAP, we came up with the idea of the RDAP profile and these RDAP process maps. Some of those requirements on WHOIS and some requirements are related to RDAP were implemented into RDAP, into the profile.

So the idea now is to have these policies that are, as I said, technology agnostic so that they apply to any RDS service being this RDAP service or WHOIS 43 or web WHOIS or—who knows?—maybe something else in the future, right?

So with that, we decided that is the best approach—to remove the text that you're seeing here—because it was basically trying to define how you must display the fields when you don't have a value. And this was pertaining to how you do it in WHOIS 43 or web WHOIS. So we removed that text.

Also, we have this text saying that you need to replace the value with redacted ... Some of technical folks that are on the call may know this one [inaudible]. That's not the way use it on RDAP. So we're also removing that text and also the same text in [Section 3.3] that says that you need to [inaudible] string.

Unfortunately, here is nothing like a WHOIS profile like we have for RDAP. So we need to say how you need do this in WHOIS 43 and web

WHOIS. So that's the reason why we have this addendum at the end. And this addendum only pertains if you are doing implementation of WHOIS or web WHOIS. So basically the text says that if you're implementing a WHOIS or web WHOIS service, you need to do this. Section 1 is defining what you do in case you don't have data or you don't have the value for the [folder] field. And Section 2 is saying that if you need to redact the value, you need to place this thing [inaudible] redacted.

And we added this note as part of the IRT suggestions just to be sure that someone that is doing this policy understands that this addendum is basically [is a place for] contracted parties that are providing WHOIS or web-based WHOIS directory services. And this note is also important because, as you know, at some point in the future, RDAP may replace WHOIS 42 or web WHOIS. So it's important for someone reading this policy that they understand that this session is basically how to do these things in WHOIS 43 and web WHOIS.

I don't know if that's clear or you have any questions. It's kind of difficult to see the chat, so ... Yeah, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Gustavo. Thanks for the explanation. I think that's very clear and helpful. I do like these updates. I think it makes it easier to understand from an implementation standpoint, especially as it relates to WHOIS implementation. I know we talked about how to make it clear that this addendum would apply only where contracted parties are implementing the WHOIS protocol but always when they're

implementing it. So I think that note accomplishes that. I know you're sort of struggling with how to get that into words. So I like the addition of that note at the end.

I know we talked about this at the last meeting. I'll just mention it again. I don't like referring to the right-side/left-side of the colon. I think you can remove the left-side/right-side language and just refer to the key value pairs—the key and the value. I think that's clear to implement, so you don't really need the left/right language, which could potentially be confusing.

And then lastly, I guess I'll ask a question. I don't know how I feel about it, I'll just maybe give it to you as food for thought. You mentioned the RDAP profile, and I'm wondering if there should be some mention of that here, like—I don't know—an Addendum 2 or an additional note, just referencing the profile and noting the expectation that RDAP implementations would be done in accordance or in line with that profile. I haven't thought that out, so I'm just maybe giving it to you as food for thought. And you can see if that makes sense or not.

Otherwise, good explanation. Thank you.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

Thanks. Yeah, we will take the suggestions and discuss internally. Thanks.

Any other questions? Comments?

Dennis, back to you.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's go to our next document: RedDoc. So this is the main policy language that we've been looking at together. Now Gustavo is going to pull up on of the red docs (redline documents) which means that there was a document and, because of the policy implementation effort here, we are updating that. It's one of those long lists of red docs that I showed you before. These are the ones that we're currently working on.

Do you need the link? It's on our agenda. [I'm going to send it] to our agendas here.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: So which one do you want me to continue with, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: The next one. The next one on the agenda is the additional WHOIS information policy. #5 on our agenda.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay. So I will follow the agenda.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: You can change the order if you want.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Okay. So this is the AWIP policy, which now is called the IRIP policy. Well, this is a suggestion, right?

DENNIS CHANG: Mm-hmm.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: And what we were trying to do here is to follow the same process that we're following with the OneDoc, which basically means trying to make this policy technology agnostic and having a section that defines how to do this in WHOIS 43 and web WHOIS. And again, these changes are coming from a person that was tasked a platform to support a new TLD program like 12 years ago. And it was really difficult to go through all these policies and to understand what was needed to be implemented.

So what we're trying to do is hopefully make things easier for implementers. And if someone wants to—I don't know—in the new round become a new registry of RSP, they have an easy task at least in reading how these policies shall be interpreted and what needs to be implemented.

With that in mind, we are trying to use the same terminology that we have been using from the IETF regarding the “must,” “shall,” and “should,” and so on and so forth. And as the policy mentions, we have two sections. The first section is requirements that we believe apply to

all RDDS services. And Section 2 is just what applies to WHOIS 43 and web WHOIS. And, again, we are taking that legacy text and we're trying to come up with these two sections. I know it looks like a lot of changes, but we're trying to show what is the redline between what we have right now in the AWIP policy and meeting what we believe are the changes that are needed.

As you will see, we are changing the terminology from WHOIS to RDDS so it's clear that this applies to any RDDS service, including RDAP and not only WHOIS.

In the field section, for example, as you see, most of the requirements are related to how you need to do this in WHOIS and in which place of the output you need to put it and how it should be presented to the user and so on and so forth. But, for example, in Section 1.3, we believe that this requirement is for all RDDS services, and it basically says that you need to show this text for the end users so that they know where to find information about what the EPP status code means, and, in the case of RDAP what the RDAP status code mean, and what client transfer procedure means, and so on and so forth.

So believe this is a significant requirement and we are drafting the text as a significant requirement, basically saying that, in the RDDS output, you need to show this text as we have here.

And the other thing that we believe is a general requirement is that registries must use the IANA ID when referring to the IDs for the registers. So we believe that's also a general requirement.

Now, if you go to Section 2, those are the requirements that are defining how to do these things, WHOIS 43 or web WHOIS. And it says, for example, that the status [refers back to] the respective EPP status code. In the case of RDAP, we have [NRC] that defines a mapping between the EPP status code and the RDAP status code.

We have Section 2.2. It's saying that a link must be shown to the EPP status code. In the case of RDAP, we have the array with all the status codes.

And 2.3 is saying that research [inaudible] the links and messages describing when providing the WHOIS data. Also we believe that this is something that pertains to the way the WHOIS works and not the way the RDAP is defined by on the proper language and that the registry and the registrar must provide the RDAP response with all the elements that are defined there.

So that's what we're trying to do here. Obviously, if you believe that something should be in Section 1 or something is not correct, feel free to provide your feedback. So that's basically what we're trying to do. And hopefully this makes life easier to implement.

Any questions? Comments? I'm going to try to show as much as possible of the text.

DENNIS CHANG:

I see Beth has her hand up. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Hi, Dennis. Hi, Gustavo. Thank you very much for this. How are you?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Good. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Fine. How are you?

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Yeah.

BETH BACON: [inaudible]. So I did send an e-mail to the mailing list and it's not specifically on perhaps this, Gustavo, but the additional changes to the policies in general. And I think that, as we noted in the e-mail, we don't disagree that this is a good idea, but it's helpful for implementation that it makes it easier.

But when we look at adding the RFC definitions, again, if we didn't agree with them, it's not something that was agreed to be done or recommended by the EPP.

So my question—and I think this is one that we wanted to further discuss—is, are we allowed to do this? If there is some sort of normalizing or normative exercise to make policies easier to read and to use consistent definitions, that's almost a PDP or an effort in itself. And it's not something that has been within the scope of the EPDP.

Again, I don't think is bad ideas. I think it'd be helpful, but I'm very focused on the fact that we should be true to the implementations and that we should be implementing the intent and the word of what we've done. That's kind of what keeps us sane in the PDP process, and we have to follow those rules or, frankly, there's no predictability. And I think that's something that's really valuable within our multi-stakeholder process: that predictability.

So I just wanted to throw that out there as another item for discussion. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you, Beth. Yeah, we hear you. We've been asking the same question to ourselves: should we or should we not do this? And we, as you see, came to the conclusion in all the work we do that our job really is to make it clear. And if we're not changing the requirement ... Here we're not making a new policy or changing the policy, but we are trying to implement the intent of the registration data policy that has an impact on this. But we're look at the CLND next, like the advisories and things like that too.

It's all our collective opinion that, yes, it's more work for us but we should do it. And are we allowed to do this? We're coming to the conclusion that, yes, we are allowed to do this. And we, I think, in a way, are encouraged to do this. That's why we're looking at every single procedure and policy to see if we can remove any kind of inconsistency. We're correcting errors are we go, as you saw, and then also reshuffling the paragraphs if we need to to make it clear how to apply this

additional WHOIS information policy. It is an additional policy. And when people look at this ... And they will always have the old version. You know our approach, how we're going to do that.

So when I saw your e-mail, Beth, as usual, you don't disagree. So I had translated that as you agree. You want to speak again? Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Yes, I do. So, no, what I said was that I don't disagree that these are helpful, but I do disagree that we should be doing them now. And that's the question.

DENNIS CHANG: [inaudible] question.

BETH BACON: So here's my other thing. So, again, I appreciate that you guys have put thought into this. If there's some sort of rationale with support other than, "We think you can do it," I think that would be very valuable to do it. But also, I think—the group can add pins to my voodoo dolls that I'm sure you guys have in the ICANN office somewhere; just [me] sitting in a hallway; just stick a pin in there once a week; I get it ... But if we've already done the work but maybe we don't think that it's really a part of this IRT, can we save the work and this be just an ICANN effort? Is this something that ICANN do—saying, "These are really confusing. We're not changing the content but we're going to lay out the content differently to make it clearer"—and do that as an ICANN effort as

opposed to ... Because it's not changing the [content] of [inaudible]. And that way, people will be able to see exactly that these are the changes from the IRT. But then also, later on, once you can see the changes from the IRT, instead of having it be lost in this morass of rearranging, you could do that at a later date. So keep the work, apply it after we make the IRT changes.

And, yes, I understand. Pins in the voodoo doll. I get it. Go for it. I deserve it.

GUSTAVO IBARRA:

So I think it is important to mention that, when we discussed this internally, we're just trying to be consistent. So we have a policy that is technology agnostic. That's the OneDoc. I think it's a really good idea what we're doing now with the policies.

And we read the recommendation as saying we need to be consistent with all the policies and be willing to modify or change or it or whatever terminology you want to use.

So basically, we're just trying to do what we're doing with the OneDoc: use the IETF language so there is [inaudible] requirements and have a section defining how you do this in WHOIS. Unfortunately, when these policies were developed, WHOIS was the only thing and there was no other, let's say, RDDS service that was required. So that's basically what we're trying to do: just trying to be consistent with what we're doing with the OneDoc.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. And even though you haven't seen it, RDAP is a big part of our policy implementation. And it's probably a good time for Roger or for Marc to tell us what we're doing because one thing I was sort of waiting for—the RDAP profile update; there's two documents that pertain to the RDAP profile—was Rec 7. And now that I've shown you how we plan to implement Rec 7 in terms of policy language, I wanted to ask Marc or Roger what they thought. Number one, do you think that our policy language has enough clarity for you to do the red docs or the two profile documents? And if you do, how long might that take? Because I think having a look at those in concert with all these other things would help too. So a question to Marc and Roger.

But I see Beth's hand. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Sorry. That was an old hand.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. Marc? Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey there. I'm scratching my head. I don't know how to answer the "how long" part. So—

DENNIS CHANG: You got to talk about it with your team, I think. Right?

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. I think that would have to be asked to the RDAP Working Group itself. I think anything I told you would be sort of an irresponsible guess on my part.

But as far as your other question about the detail, yes, I think there's sufficient detail to be able to do a redline of the RDAP profile documents.

DENNIS CHANG: Good.

MARC ANDERSON: I think that is not an issue. I think the question would be for you: do you think the OneDoc is stable enough that now is a good time for the RDAP Working Group to sort of go about making their redlines? I hesitate to speak for the entire RDAP Working Group, but I think they've been more waiting for the OneDoc to be stable enough to be able to make their changes. So maybe I'll fire that back to you.

DENNIS CHANG: The reason that I'm bringing it up is because I do believe we have enough in the policy language, and the language is stable enough. Rec 7 was a big change here. We could have gone one or the other, but it looks like we have clarity there. And then Rec 12 is close following. And I saw the letter from the Board to the GNSO, and it looks like the Board at least has a good understanding and [is] looking for confirmation. So I expect that to be resolved soon.

But regardless of those changes—I think they may be small in terms of the RDAP profile—in answering your question, yeah, I do believe we have a stable policy language that I would recommend the working group to go ahead and initiate the red doc on because I know we’ve talked about this many, many, many years ago already. I remember talking to Rich and being in that working group and talking about this. We were making these wild predictions of when things would happen.

Marc, do you want to speak again?

MARC ANDERSON: Absolutely. Thank you, Dennis, for that. With that, I’d be happy to take that back to the RDAP Working Group—

DENNIS CHANG: Please do.

MARC ANDERSON: —and let them that the IRT feels that the OneDoc is in a stable enough position that they could use that language or should use that language, I’ll say, to produce redlines of the RDAP profile.

I’ll say just a reminder that that working group is inclusive of ICANN staff. And, Gustavo, I don’t think you’re a regular attendee, but I think it’d be extremely beneficial if you were present and involved when we have those discussions. Obviously, other ICANN staff are welcome. And I know some regularly participate. But I’ll just maybe throw there out there, Gustavo. It’d be great to have you part of those discussions.

GUSTAVO IBARRA: Sure. Yeah, I will.

DENNIS CHANG: Cordially invited, Gustavo. Marc was so nice.

ANDREA GLANDON: Dennis, this is Andrea. We are at the top of the hour.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, my gosh. I didn't give five minutes to the public. Sorry. We got carried away. Let me go back to ... Let's stop here, Gustavo, and just, right now, give the public a chance to ask any questions. I'm really sorry I did not do the five-minute announcement.

So for the IRT members, obviously, we will pick up at our next meeting. And I encourage you to look over the drafting error, #10. That really was a find by Gustavo, too. And we think that we should handle it that way. So we would appreciate your feedback there, too.

I don't see any hands. No questions.

So let me then say thank you, all. We usually have 90-minute calls, but this has been a one-hour call due to ICANN72 demands on everyone. So we'll see you later. Bye now. Thank you so much for all attending.

Are we done? We're done.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]