
SUE SCHULER: Great. Thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is Rick Wilhelm from Verisign. And welcome to today's call for the RDAP Working Group. We have a pretty good crowd assembled today. We have gotten regrets from Sarah, Jim Galvin, Roger, and Jody. So, thanks everybody for joining. We've got our EPDP crowd here that has joined us. Thanks for joining us over. I had sent out the note with our meeting agenda sent out. Sorry for the type in the first line of it where I got the date wrong of the meeting. Of course, the subject line was correct. And thanks to Sue for correcting that here in our notes. So, I had sent that out. A pretty typical agenda for us. And wanted to do very briefly a section to see if anybody had any agenda bashing they wanted to do. Got any agenda topics that you'd like to bring up? Please go ahead and put your hand in the air. Not seeing any at this time. We will just go ahead and dive right in. Okay.

So, implementation status. We'll do our usual review of the URL files on the registry side. We got an update from the 3/14 version of the file. It actually has one fewer than the January 23rd file. I did not go through the effort to try to find out which exact URL. It's down one. But we are 825. Largely stable now for about two months.

And over on the registrar's side, we've got the 3/17 version of the file. This is up by 20. We're now at 2,297 URLs on the registrar IDs and that's up from 2,277 not too long ago. So that's pretty good progress on there.

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.

Any questions, comments, concerns about this on the URL side? Is everybody able to get their URLs in that submitted them? Hopefully so. Not seeing any hands. Okay. We will move on.

On 3/10, Sarah who's not able to join us, brought up a suggestion for a possible change in the next version of the Response Profile Section 2.11. She brings up this thing about the question about the WHOIS data specification on WHOIS data problem reporting. And the RAA has an URL there for the [inaudible]DotNet in it. And in the RDAP profile, we say in 2.11 that it should be reported to the ICANN.Org [inaudible] number in there.

So, Sarah basically pointing out a possible inconsistency here. Roger sent an email that had a comment there but Owen provided a view that I believe supported the status quo and he said that, basically, going back in time, it's trying to get rid of that old Internet and replacing it with the WHOIS inaccuracy report with the [Wickef]. While I believe that while Owen isn't here to elaborate on this it's my interpretation of his email there that he thinks that it's actually the 2013 RAA that's out of date and that what's in the RDAP profile is actually correct. So, I see Marc has his hand in the air. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. Yeah, I have some vague recollection of this conversation when it first came up. And I agree with Owen. I think that what's in the 2013 RAA was out of date. And I don't see Francisco with us today, but I believe this was something Francisco or maybe Gustavo raised with us that needed to be changed to the URL that's in the profile now. I also

recall that we talked about having some kind of explanation, an explanatory footnote or something to that effect in the profile. Because at some point in the future we may look at the profile and wonder why the inconsistency.

So, I think what's really needed here is just a note explaining why it is what it is currently in the profile, so that six months or a year from now we're not having the same conversation going: "Yeah, didn't we talk about this once before?" So that would be my suggestion there. Karla, I see you on the call. Maybe you can just confirm for posterity's sake that the URL that we currently have in the profile is the desirable one.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Karla, please go ahead.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah, sorry about that. Yeah. I can certainly do that.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. We'll await your comments there. I think it does look like what we have in the document is correct. And presuming that's the case, I think that Marc's suggestion of an explanatory note, some sort of a non-normative footnote or something like that, that just elaborates on this would be a good thing to memorialize this rationale if you will. Very good. Thank you, Marc, for that comment. And thank you, Karla, for taking that action there. Does anybody else have any other questions or comments on this one? Very good. Not seeing any.

We'll move on into old business. And we will have a chance for any other business towards the bottom of the list here. We've got an item we've been dragging around a little bit for Jothan on RDAP source complexity. I don't see Jothan on the call. I haven't seen any items come up on the mailing list. So, if anyone has any comments related to this, this is about a situation where possible complexity in registrar implementations where they have different URLs for different TLDs. Does anybody have any questions or updates or other comments around this one? Right now, we're hanging on the previous solution of 302 redirects that we've been talking about. Anybody have anything there? We don't have Jothan on the call. Seeing none, we will let that one go and bring it back to see if Jothan has anything there.

Moving on to meeting planning. Quick item. As most of you probably saw on the email yesterday, ICANN Org officially canceled the GDD Summit and that URL is there. You probably already saw this stuff. So, we won't be having a meeting on GDD Summit. And so that, of course, may be rescheduled. We'll see. But of course, these are complicated times as everybody knows.

And then as far as regular working group meetings, right now as the group here knows, we don't have a lot going on for better or for worst. I'm going to propose that we move us to an every-other-week tempo until we get some work shoved our way either from the EPDP Phase 1 IRT which is expected at some point in the future or EPDP Phase 2 that might be related to the gated access and such. I'm going to propose that we go every other week. And then I'd also like us to see if we can figure out a time that we can do where we are less conflicted with the Transfer Review Scoping Team. I would like to also maintain our current

mechanism of not colliding with the EPDP meeting. So, I don't want to go an hour earlier.

Does anybody know what the situation is around the Transfer Review Scoping Team? Because right now they've landed on using the hour after the EPDP which of course puts them in direct collision with us. Does anybody know off the top of their head when the Transfer Review Scoping Team is going to be winding up? Not seeing any hands. Prior to us starting the recording, Sue and I were chatting offline. Sue is going to go and check into this. And we're going to see if we can figure out when they're going to be winding up. It may be that they're going to be finishing soon and/or that they're going to switch to an every-other-week schedule or something like that. But we're going to try and find a time when we can meet that is unconflicted or nonconflicted—I'm not really sure what the proper term is there—with the Transfer Review Scoping Team.

So, does anyone have any objections to switching to an every-other-week tempo? I think that right now our workload is such that we can do that without any problems. Marc's got no objections. Let me see if there's any yes or noes in the chat here. Mark SV also agrees. Anybody else has any opinions? Catherine agrees. Silence is consent. Okay. Very good. So, we're going to every other week. What we're going to do is ... Sean Baseri agrees also.

Today is the 19th. We're going to aim for our next meeting to be April 2. And Sue's going to work on trying to find out what the situation is around Transfer Scoping Team. She and I will be communicating. We're going to aim to try to keep the same timeslot. And hopefully, by then

Transfer Review Scoping Team will have either wrapped up or gone into a different spot. If we need to, we'll sort of see ... We might even stay in this slot. If we don't have a lot of very aggressive work, we'll probably keep this slot just to avoid bleeding farther out and getting out into everyone's calendars because I think the Transfer Review Scoping Team is going to be winding up soon, and I'd rather not have this meeting dance around everyone's calendars.

At this point, while we don't have a ton of work, I'd rather just sit here on everyone's calendars and deal with our conflict with Transfer Review Scoping Team expecting that they're going to wrap up. That's sort of my thinking. We'll only move the timing of this meeting if it looks like Transfer Review Scoping Team is going to be going for a long time and our meeting cadence needs to pick up and we pick up more work where we really need to pick up those members that have the conflict. If you've got anything that you'd like to chime in on, if that doesn't seem like sound logic or you'd like to add in some thoughts, please feel free to stick your hand in the air. But I'm very cognizant of the fact that this meeting has been planted on everyone's calendars for months and months and months. And you probably all have stuff that's built around this in your day also. So, I don't want to go yanking this meeting to other parts of your calendar if we can avoid it. So, any concerns there? Looking for hands. Not seeing anything. That sounds like an agreement to me. Okay. Very good. Moving on. Let's head over to the microwave. Very good. Okay.

Let's start first with the EPDP IRT. Who wants to take a shot at the EPDP IRT today? Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I know Mark likes to go after me and I don't see Sarah on the call to nominate, so I guess that's me. So, with the IRT our next meeting is next Wednesday. We did meet once during the virtual ICANN 67 meeting schedule and it amounted to basically our regular EPDP meeting—or IRT meeting, I should say. There wasn't anything particularly noteworthy. We're making good progress on what I would call the non-controversial items. I think we're adding some pretty good polish to the draft language that's currently in the OneDoc [inaudible] draft policy language.

What might be a little noteworthy is one of the more contentious items is around the transfer of data, [inaudible] contact data from the registrar to the registry. That has been a source of disagreement really since day one in the IRT. And on that point, the ICANN Board sent a letter to the GNSO Council indicating that there is disagreement there and that the GNSO Council has some work to do to resolve that conflict. I'm sort paraphrasing [inaudible] at a very high level here. But that's the noteworthy thing going on in the IRT. Not a lot at this point that this group should be particularly interested in. So I think there's still in a little bit of a holding pattern pending what we're working the IRT.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thanks, Marc. Anything else on the IRT? Anybody else has any other comments? Seeing no comments in the chat and no hands in the air. Mark SV agrees, good summary. All right.

What about EPDP Phase 2? Who wants to take this one? Let's see. Mark put his hand up and down. Mark SV, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: I still believe its better when Marc A goes first. It seems like I ways miss things or something like that. Maybe I should write notes before the meeting. EPDP Phase 1—

MARC ANDERSON: If you want me to go, and you can clean up anything after, I can do that.

MARK SVANCAREK: Well, but you know I need to develop this skill. So why don't I go first and you can clean up after me? So EPDP Phase 2. We've had a report out for public comment for a while. It's pretty good. I think we're going to get a lot of interesting substantive feedback on it. The feedback phase goes for another four days. On the 23rd is when the feedback is due.

There was a request from some persons within the EPDP team to push that out a little bit just due to the complexity of the working situation right now. And that concept was rejected, although late comments coming in will be accommodated in some fashion.

Today we were working on some sort of priority 2 things that I'm not sure if that how we define them ,but some of the things that were not as well defined in the report. There's something that's called Purpose 2 which is a purpose for ICANN organization. I think Marc can probably

describe what Purpose 2 is. This remains controversial with the NCSG. I think we have compromise language that is mostly acceptable to everybody else. There's a little bit of concern about whether the level of specificity in the thing rises to the lawfulness requirement. But I think we've all made our peace with that. Hopefully, that compromise language can stay in there. This is an important purpose for the Business Constituency and for the IP Constituency. So, it's very helpful if we have something in that Purpose 2 category.

And today we also talked about SLAs. I think I mentioned this in previous meetings. We're trying something new. We're proposing something new. We're proposing something new. Volker Greimann and myself have drafted a concept. And today we ... It's a little bit different. So, we actually had to write a second document that explains with examples of how it works. I encourage everybody to read that example document if you haven't already. That was also a very comprehensive conversation about do we need to do something that's different from standard SLAs? Is this the right approach? How much of it should be policy and how much of it should be implementation? So, it was a pretty good conversation. We spent a lot of time on those two topics today. Take it away Marc A.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Mark. I think that that's a really good summary of where we are. I'll add. Mark said that the public comments end on the 23rd. There will be an addendum, the second set of public comments, an addendum that's expected to go out on the 24th. So, the priority 2 items that Mark

mentioned are going into that addendum which will be going out for public comment immediately following this first public comment period.

The only other thing I'll add to that, thinking from the perspective of this group. The initial report the draft policy language that we have currently is really, really light in terms of how the SSAD system is expected to function from a technical standpoint. So how it will actually be built. What standards, what technology, what interfaces will be used. It's very light on that. It's sort of assumed that RDAP will be leveraged to some degree. But really how it will work and how it will function is not well defined. This is something that's probably of particular note to this working group, what I call "how the SSAD will be operationalized" just isn't defined. And I think that's something that all of us, we're heavily represented by the people that are going to be responsible for implementing this. From our groups, we're going to have to figure out how to integrate with the SSAD system and respond to requestors who are using the SSAD system. So that's something I think that we going to care a lot about and should maybe consider where that intersects with this group and our work. So, I'll just leave it with that for now though.

MARK SVANCAREK:

That's a good comment, Marc. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks, Mark and Marc. And when that starts to get closer to the working group, I think that's where work will pick up here. Both for possible changes to the profile and also possibly using this working group as a source of expert advice guidance if you will to the PDP

Working Group. Because we need to think about the ... As we would say,9 how to provide a mechanism in the face of—to enable the policy. And separating the what from the how. That sort of a thing. So yeah, I think that's all very important. So good stuff. Thank you both very much for that. I would also like to take a moment to just acknowledge as we scroll to see when Mark SV has his hand up in there.

Let's all just give it a shout out to Mark for his amazing diacritics in his name. Mark, of course, is a member of the UASG and does an amazing job of getting all those diacritics into his name. So apparently, Zoom is UA ready. And Mark has flexing on all of us by giving us those letters up there into his name. He's got this Slovak keyboard installed on all his machines. And more importantly, he knows how to use it. So, that's the most important thing. So, Mark, very impressive. So good stuff. Very good. Thank you, Mark and Mark.

So, IETF REGEXT. We don't have Galvin here. Let's see. Scott Hollenbeck has his hand in the air. Scott, please go ahead.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK:

Thanks, Rick. So, the IETF decided to cancel the in-person meeting that's supposed to be starting next week. But as much as ICANN did, they are proceeding with a virtual meeting. And much as ICANN did the agenda has been trimmed down quite a bit. The REGEXT meeting will not be taking place next week. But there are some conversations happening about scheduling a virtual meeting. No details yet about when that will be happening.

In terms of RDAP-related goings-on, though, within REGEXT there are a couple of last calls in progress for some extended features that are focused on managing large data sets. Large data sets returned in response to a search query, for example. But because search isn't something that we're all implementing, I don't know they're of general interest to this group of people. But if you do care about doing things like sorting and paging and managing large data sets, it's worth taking a peek at what's happening there.

The one thing that is relevant to this particular working group, though, the two internet-drafts that I'm working on that are the [bis] revisions to RFCs 7482 and 7483. Revisions, in this case, means clarifications. No protocol changes. No functional changes. It's simply updating the documents to reflect and capture the corrections that we've all identified and documented since we've been doing our implementation work.

When we have these virtual meetings, I will be running the changes that I've made to date by people for comment and head nodding. And assuming that there are no issues or whatnot, it's reasonable to expect that within a couple of months we'll probably wrap up those documents and get them into the IESG's hands for review and hopefully moving them onto the RFC editor for publication. That's everything I have, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thank you very much, Scott. Are there any questions for Scott there? Scott, I'll give you one. Do we have any

thoughts about when an interim meeting might be happening for REGEXT?

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Not REGEXT specifically. But there are other groups in a similar situation, who found that their regularly scheduled meeting that would have taken place during the face-to-face got bumped. And they're requesting those interims now. So, assuming that Jim Galvin and his co-chair get their request in, they could be happening within a matter of a few weeks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. That sounds good. All right. Very good. Thank you very much. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Along those lines, there was at ICANN 67 there was a plan to have a joint CPH TechOps/REGEXT meeting. And that was one of the things that got bumped from the agenda. And it was the intent that we would schedule that post-ICANN 67. We have not settled on a date for that yet. So that's something we are still planning on doing but it's a work in progress.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. Thanks for that, Marc. As one of the co-chairs of TechOps, that's good info. Very good. And by the way in the case, everyone didn't notice Jothan joined. And he said that there are no new

registrar scenarios that have been provided or discovered. Just update that bullet point. Thank you, Jothan, for throwing that into the chat. Thanks for being aware that we had discussed that earlier. Appreciate that. Moving on in a microwave.

Just a brief on the RA and RA amendment. Discussions continue among the group. Right now, the Contracted Parties House is working on some term sheet style language to get things simplified and better understood. And what we're doing is working on getting that put together in order that it can be presented to the stakeholder groups. That work is in process at present. We're working on that right now. We plan on getting that out to the stakeholder's group shortly. I don't have an exact date on that. But do stay tuned for communications coming from the respective stakeholder groups. But no great turns or twists on what we're doing on the front right there. Does anybody have any questions on that one there? Not seeing any. Very good. Let's move on.

Karla's with us today. Karla, any updates from ICANN IT on progress on the NSp? Nope, Karla says. Okay. I'm sure that ICANN IT is pretty busy these days on other stuff. Very good.

And I assume no updates either from Compliance and such. Also, nope. Okay. Very good. Let's move onto any other business.

Does anybody have any walk-on topics that they would care to bring up? Not seeing any. But as I scroll I will not that Ed not to be outdone by Mark SV has put his, I assume that's a Chinese name in there Ed, it's typed his Chinese name into the chat. Ed, go ahead. Come to the mic. You can flex on us all.

ED: That's the Chinese for Edward.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Okay. So, I'm just going to stick. I can barely pronounce Rick. And have a hard time typing that if I haven't had a latte in the morning. So very good. All right. Excellent. Well done. But I know that Mark as a member of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, Mark is very proud of you exercising your UA chops. Okay. So, very good. Very quickly we're going to looking at our next meeting will not be next week but it will be on Thursday, April 2nd. So, stay tuned for an invite from Sue on that one. and we will go ahead and wrap this up. Sue, you can go ahead and take us on out.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Rick. Okay, Andrea would you please end the recording.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]