
SUE SCHULER: Great, thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thanks, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Today is the 19th of December. Welcome to our regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. I'm Rick Wilhelm from Verisign, the chair. I'm glad that everybody could join us here today for our last meeting of the year.

I have received regrets from Sarah, Roger, and Justin, all of whom, I believe, have conflicts with the transfer scoping team. And also we've got regrets from Russ, who was not able to make it today. I believe that the ePDP has wrapped up recently. I see Mark SV has joined us. I believe, then, therefore, Marc Anderson will probably be joining in a little bit but has not made it yet.

Without further checking on anybody's attendance, let's look at our agenda, here, today. I've sent out the typical pre-meeting note a few hours ago. Hopefully, folks had a chance to read it. We'll do a little bit of agenda-bashing and checking on the inevitable AOB, any other business, topics.

And so, we'll do a quick walk around the room to see if anybody wants to put their hand in the air for AOB topics that we want them to discuss. We'll call out for that, now. You will, of course, have a chance, later, to bring any up. Going once, going twice. Jothan, please come to the mic.

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.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I was just going to give an update on the registrar account and that process. I can do that at the AOB.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Okay. Thank you very much, Jothan. Okay. Any others? Okay. Seeing none, let's go ahead and dive on into a quick check of implementation status. The registry URL count has not moved in quantity. There may have been puts and takes on the number of the actual instances but it's 826 from the change from 1128, so no change there. The registrar numbers have moved up by 30 from 1210 to 1217. So, we're now at 2196 in the registrar IDs files. Jothan, is that the topic that you want to discuss a little bit?

JOTHAN FRAKES: You know what? It is. So why don't we just nail it now?

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Go right ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah. Well, it's a great process. I'm sharing information with the registrars to help encourage them across the horizon. The importance is to have the certificate installed and all the information updated inside the new registrar portal. And then, every Friday, they sweep through and do an update. And so, as we spoke last week, I had everything set and the process went, that following Friday, and I was in the file. It went, really, pretty smoothly, so ICANN's doing the right stuff.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thank you, much. Good stuff. Does anybody else have any questions or comments on URL submissions or anything like that? Very good. Seeing none. I assume that we'll see those numbers move along gradually, as before. Okay, very good.

Our next topic, here, is the old business, looking at the registrar RDAP URL source, recapping our conversation from last week. We had said ... Russ isn't here to join us but I think I saw that Karla is here. I'm not sure how brief Karla is on this but I certainly welcome her into the discussion to the extent that she wishes to join.

I've got some comments here that I pulled from the transcript. One, where Russ indicated they put the request to the NSp team to add URL validation to the NSp. We don't have a date on that. Of course, we had a lengthy discussion about RDAP URL transition. Russ commented that the registry is not responsible for the quality of the registrar's RDAP URL but just providing the correct URL at the time of transition.

We brought up Gavin Brown's presentation from the Regi-Ops Workshop, from the ROW, around switching the URLs in the context of the transition. And then, Russ commented that in the context of the transition ICANN will be generally aware, the MoSAPI tool can be useful to indicate maintenance, and that Compliance is being more concerned with steady-state than transition period, here.

I wanted to just check to see if anybody wanted to bring up any additional topics. Karla notes in the chat, "No additional updates regarding verification by NSp. Therefore, no new information from the NSp team

regarding the date by which they would have that in. Still, presumably, under discussion and consideration by that team.” That’s understandable, having been in the software development line of work myself, previously. Any other comments here, on this topic? I’m opening the floor for discussion. Not seeing any. There we go, Jim Galvin. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, [Russ]. I guess I only have one question for the moment. What are the next steps, here? I feel like there’s a little bit of openness here. I’m wondering, how do you want to approach nailing this down? I guess that’s my question. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Here’s what I’m thinking at present. Right now, where we are is a little bit ... Well, one thing we have is a forthcoming update from ICANN regarding adding validation to the NSp. Adding validation to the NSp would improve the status quo because it would mean that the output of the MoSAPI would, therefore, be validated, meaning that it would have better data and would, therefore, be more in line with whatever data eventually gets into the registrar IDs; .text, .xml files. That would be a step forward. Now, if nothing else changed, that would be a step forward from where we are.

And then, we would just have the situation whereby during transitions the data in the registrar IDs file would be a little bit lagging the data in the MoSAPI for a period of anywhere between one and six days. I’m being

kind of sloppy with that math. It really depends on when the sweep is. That's for registrar transitions, not for registry transitions.

Because, of course, the registrar IDs file only matters there. It really only matters during transitions and it really only matters for registrars. That means that the registrar IDs file would be behind the MoSAPI or the MoSAPI would front-run the registrar IDs files for between "one and six days." Assuming that ICANN updates weekly and that ICANN would settle under a weekly cadence, that would be the case.

But it would also mean that there would be not a chance that the MoSAPI would be giving back incorrect data because it would be having validated data, always. I believe that that would be the case if the NSp started doing validation. Let me stop there and take comments on that. Jim, I'm not sure. Do you want to comment on that statement? Because Jothan has his hand up, there.

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, please.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, go ahead. Dive in on that and then we'll go to Jothan.

JAMES GALVIN: What I want to do is, maybe, reframe my question a little bit. I appreciate your summary, again. Your summary, again, gets us almost to where all of the details are nailed down. And so my real question here is, is that going to be the summary, this discussion is now over, and a little bit of

ambiguity is left? It's just the state that it is? You opened by saying, "We're expecting a forthcoming statement from ICANN," and then you went through a bit of a description about where we are.

Again, I'm just trying to figure out if we're done and a little bit of ambiguity is just the way it is. Or, are we going to, at some point, nail all of the details down and we're waiting for a final action from ICANN in order to continue the discussion? I don't know if that helps or not. I can get more precise about my detailed question but I'm just trying to keep it high-level for this discussion, today. I don't want to overtake this meeting again as we've done the last few times. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Okay. Very good. Jothan, are you okay with me going to Karla for a quick second? I think she'd put her hand up in response. He's okay. Okay. Karla, please go ahead.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Hey. Thanks, everyone. I think that what we need to do is get a read from our IT team with the requirements to do the validation and when it can be uploaded. As a part of the requirements that we are submitting into the IT team in order to do the validation of the NSp and then uploading to MoSAPI, I don't think that there has been a timeframe yet as far as whether it's going to be one day or six days, once a week or twice a week.

And that's something that we can determine. The challenge that Russ had mentioned on the last call is that we don't even have a timeframe, yet, as far as when IT is going to be able to do this. I think it would be beneficial

to have more details from our team as far as when that can happen. And I hate to say “put a pause” on the conversation, Jim, for now, but I’d like to have clarity from that team as far as when this can happen.

We do know that there’s going to be quite a bit of time and we can nail down those details as far as when the updates will happen. I know it’s probably not going to be great news for you at this time. It’s hard to nail down those details until we’ve got a read from IT as far as when they’ll be able to do this work and if they’re going to be able to map to the specifications that we’re requesting.

RICK WILHELM: Got it. Okay.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Does that help?

RICK WILHELM: Yes. Okay. Thank you very much, Karla. Let me come back and take Jothan’s comment. I want to make sure we get that and then we’ll loop back on this one, a little bit. Jothan, do you want to come to the mic real quick?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, really fast. I went through the trouble of getting a specific hostname and cert in order to have the ability to pivot and move. But I noticed, among the registrars, that the IANA file is very telling with

respect to who outsources to who. It may kick off a trend where people want to set up a custom hostname. I don't know if I'm saying that very well. I'm not very well-caffeinated.

Essentially, my question, with respect to the validation, would be that I specifically went and got a hostname for the purpose of being able to be fluid if I switch providers or move, that the hostname would be the only element, there, that needed to be updated in the registrar portal and in this file. If I do a change, there's no IP address validation as part of this process, is there? Because that might help me inform some of my registrar brethren. Hopefully, I articulated that well.

RICK WILHELM: Sure. Okay. Karla, do you want to go ahead and make a run at that?

KARLA HAKANSSON: No. Sorry. I was actually going to address Jim's other question in the chat. Do you want me to pause and wait?

RICK WILHELM: Let me offer this. I'll offer a non-answer to your question, Jothan. I don't think that people know about what transition looks like because it has not really been done. I say that with a smile on my face. Maybe, that causes Karla to smile, also. But I will not put words in her mouth.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, I can follow up on this offline. Maybe we'll come up with a best practice about this?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. And I think that part of that is that it is kind of a greenfield right now if we do that.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Right.

RICK WILHELM: Karla, please go ahead.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Rick. Yeah, I can address Jothan's question. I think that we'll need to come back to that one. But as far as Jim's question, that you have around compliance and that timeframe from which there is a change, that is also something that I think that we also need to be putting into the requirements for IT to consider. Regardless of that – Russ mentioned this last week, too – we have these rules that there is this timeframe, when there is a transition of some kind, where Compliance is aware that there is a transition.

If it were to come up that there was this "dead time," if you will, they aren't looking at this 24/7 on a case-by-case basis to say, "Oh, I see that you're down and we're going to call you on it." If a question like that comes up it will more than likely come through the system and say, "Oh,

we see that they've got a transition that is currently in place." It would follow the same rules that we have today whenever there is a transition. We don't expect anything like that to be different if there's a transition with RDAP.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Thanks, Karla. Maybe it is that not a lot of people are fluent in how Compliance handles transitions and SOI monitoring during transitions. I won't speak for the group. But that process that you sketched out, there, it sounds like, from our discussions that we've been having here, that everyone isn't entirely understanding, exactly, how that works. That's my general sense of it. Would anybody else care to comment on that? Galvin, at least. I've got a check-mark out of Jim Galvin on that one, who's at least willing to. Jim, come to the mic, please.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. I'll just comment in general. I accept that we're all going to operate in good faith and I accept that Compliance operates in good faith. And Russ, Karla, and all the rest from the ICANN side. This really is a discussion about the details. Gavin exposed some of the details, in his presentation, and walked through those scenarios.

As a service provider on the registry side, we have certainly been exposed, in other circumstances, to things that happen that shouldn't happen. ICANN alerting, for example, in particular, is the scenario that I'm worried about, when, in fact, they should know not to alert. And yet, stuff happens. I think it's just important in all of this to make sure that

we're aware of all of this up-front, be careful about it, recognize it, and acknowledge it.

It's nice that we're saying it in words, here. I'm looking for some way to codify this. I accept that we all have to step back and think about it. I think that's probably the proper place to leave it right now. We tried, in the last couple of days, to walk through the steps. That's what I was trying to do. And that kind of took over your call, here, Rick. There's a lot to get through, not just this issue, so I am fine with Karla saying we'll take a pause on this. She wants to do some research. That's a good thing. We'll pick this up when we have more information. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. That sounds good. Okay. Any other comments on this topic?

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Hey. I'll just respond to that. You're right. I'll do some homework and come back to you as far as the question at hand, as far as Compliance. I think that the same rules would apply, that we would necessarily need to change anything or update anything for anyone transitioning to RDAP, as I mentioned before, and how we treat these cases today.

If there was an instance where Compliance were to call out to a registry operator during a transition period, it would more than likely be a first inquiry, which is not something that is on the record. And it is something that is saying, "Hey, we're seeing something that's unusual, here. Can you respond to this?" And it could just be as easy as coming back and saying, "Oh, yeah, we're in the middle of a transition with this TLD," and then it's

cleared up. I would imagine that there are going to be instances where that may happen.

The other action that I can see from this conversation is to add more clarity in terms of the overall compliance process as these transitions happen today. I'll take that action item on. Hopefully, we can address it before Cancún so that there is a level of comfort, there. And I can bring that conversation or have someone come in from Compliance to talk about it with this group.

And then, as we also continue the conversation on the RA and RAA amendments, if we feel like we need to codify this in some way, then we can do so.

RICK WILHELM: Very good, Karla.

KARLA HAKANSSON: I hope that helps, Jim.

RICK WILHELM: Yes, got a "thanks," there in the chat, from Jim. I think that's a very good statement, Karla. Thank you for that. Very helpful. Let's move on. If you could scroll a little bit, Sue. Let's move on to the bootstrap RFC. In a certain way, I think that modifying the bootstrap RFC would be an "or" when we think about updating the NSp to have it do validation.

I think updating RFC 7484 to accommodate registrar URLs would be an “or.” This is from my own pen and not intended to represent a view of the working group. Hopefully, I reflected that okay, here. This would be an assumed process. And then, you can see some pros and cons, there.

It was not my intention to have us come to a decision to necessarily decide or not, unless we as a group would feel strongly, here today, that we wanted to propose this. And then, we would put it out on the e-mail list to try and get consensus. But really, here today, I wanted us to perhaps look at this and see if we wanted to improve the list of pros and cons.

Then, one of the things that we could do is we could consider pursuing this – if we like this, here – more aggressively. And/or we could say, “Well, what we’re going to do is we’re going to hold on this approach of updating 7484 to accommodate registrar URLs until we get back the estimate from the ICANN IT team regarding the updating of the NSp to add validation.”

And if we find from the ICANN IT team that that’s going to take a longer-than-expected time – and I don’t know what “expected” is here but whatever that is – or, ICANN says, “Wow, that’s going to be a lot of money for our budget,” or whatever, if it determines that that ends up less than desirable then one of the things that might add some emphasis, that might be a pro that gets put down in the column, here, about updating the RFC, and then we might further take ... And say, “Look, we’re going to set aside the idea of updating the NSp and instead update 7484 and have the home for the registrar URLs be the bootstrap RFC.”

No doubt, there could be some improvement on these pros and cons because these just flowed off of my pen. I wanted to put these out there. We could have a little bit of discussion now around the pros and the cons if people wanted to do them. Or, someone could grab them and cut and paste them into an e-mail and we could have some e-mail discussion on it. We could take it either way. If anybody would like to update them and have some discussion on it now, please raise your hand and come to the mic. Jim Galvin, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. I guess the one thing which is not captured in the pros and cons, which raises the larger question for me because it seemed to have come up even in the previous discussion, is, are we worried about serving ourselves or are we worried about serving the general user community? And this really is my issue, in general, with where the base URLs are; understanding the SLAs and when changes are visible and when they're not.

In these pros and cons, there really is a difference between whether something is in the NSp or not and whether that data is available via MoSAPI or if it's only available via IANA and the relationship between them. I think, with the pros and cons, there's a different pro and a different con depending on whether you're trying to serve the Internet community at large or if we're just trying to serve ourselves and our operation. I don't know if that's important or not in all of this but I did want to call it out. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Let me try and echo that a little bit. In other words, you're saying that one of the pros is that it would make the registrar URLs available to everybody in one spot? Is that captured in the first pro? Because the registrar URLs are currently available to anybody. That file is available to everybody already. It's not a private file. But the one-spottedness of it, if that's even a word – that'll flummox the transcript – does that capture it? Do you want to comment on that? Does the one-spot get to it for you?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. Let's see. There are three kinds of communities to be served here, right? One is the Internet user at large who might want to go and find a base URL for a registrar. There are clients, like Marc Blanchet's clients, that want to regularly grab the registrar ID files to know where things are. So, that client base. And then, of course, there are registries that need to know about the registrar base URLs because we have to put them in our responses when we get a query on our side.

And the pros and cons of whether you ... It says here that they're going to update it into IANA. If that's going to be the primary source, that's fine. But if registries are supposed to get this stuff out of MoSAPI or if registrars are going to update via NSp or update the IANA, then the time that it takes for updates to take effect varies and it affects each of those user communities differently. Does that help?

RICK WILHELM: Right. Okay. Is that one captured in the second pro, "should provide more deterministic SLAs because the update flows straight from registrars to IANA"?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. That's part of it.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Yeah. I'm just trying to hone what you're saying and see if we can find a new one. If there's a new one that we can add, that's great. What you're saying all makes sense. I'm just trying to augment either a pro or a con. We can find a new phrase to add to it, or something like that, right?

JAMES GALVIN: Well, the con would be ... I guess we could argue that it was probably there, also, in the fifth bullet on the con side, about the MoSAPI. Okay. Well, thank you for that. I'll take my comment back. I'm willing to concede that my concern here can be captured in the bullets that are here. Thank you for that. I appreciate the clarity.

RICK WILHELM: And I would also encourage everybody to drink a cup of coffee with these and chew on them because they only had one cup of coffee as they came off of my pen and I did not, while certainly Scott and Jim are here in my building with me, sit down with Scott and Jim and go over these before I hit send. I've not even gotten their feedback on these, yet. They will definitely benefit from a lot of expert reviews on this. I would definitely encourage all of that from everybody, there. Yeah.

And Sue's firing up a coffee, there, in the list. I would encourage everybody to fire up some coffee and give these some thought. They can certainly be improved on both the pro and the con.

Let's all take a look at those. What I might do is ... Actually, I will do this. I will take a separate thread and put it out on the e-mail. I will also offer that this is the kind of thing that I can see Quok having a pull at this when he wakes up and has a coffee, too. This would be something good for him to give a thought to.

Okay. Very good. Anything else on this one, here, right now, with the bootstrap RFC? I'll also note that I don't think I saw Marc Blanchet on the call, today. He's not able to make it. Very good. Okay. Anything else on this one? Not seeing any.

A real quick pull at the GDD Summit planning. Let's see, one last thing. "One thing as a potential challenge ..." Jothan, do you want to elaborate on that? I'm not quite parsing that.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, sure.

RICK WILHELM: Jothan, please go ahead. Sure. Go ahead, please.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Right. This is something I'm facing, now. Prior to RDAP, you'd have a situation where there would be ... I'll point out with .com because it's

thin. Verisign would refer, in the WHOIS, to a WHOIS server that the registrar would have identified. And that could be different per TLD, in some cases, for some of the registrars. For the RDAP implementation, that consolidates it all under one hostname.

There are some of the registrars who, for one TLD, might have a service provider that they use. And in the case of another TLD, they might have a different established relationship for how they would sell or manage a front-end. It's proving to be a little challenging for some of the registrars to do that.

I'll tell you my story. My story is that I work with one registrar service provider, HEXONET. They charge me per TLD to set up all of the stuff I need. I've established relationships with other registries in order to be able to sell those names. But I might want to make a relationship for that back-end to be operated for that registry with a different service provider and have a different WHOIS.

The RDAP, I'm finding, doesn't allow me to do that so I have to work with one provider – period, end of story – or set up a server that normalizes this. Why I'm saying this is that there are many of the last-mile registrars who have legacy set-ups like that where they have those existing relationships and have to migrate them or consolidate them under one RDAP server.

I think that makes it easier for the people who need the data to go to one place. But it's going to prove a bit challenging for some of the people who are trying to get their registrars to be compliant. That was the other topic I wanted to see on this. Did that make sense?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, I think it did. Yes. So you've got a situation where, for example, for a particular registrar ID you want to have, let's hypothetically say, your .com RDAP provided at one URL and your .org RDAP provided at another URL. Hypothetically.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, that is essentially true. But I think it could be grouped by where the registries live. [For example] for Verisign. It could just be .com/.net.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Let's say that for your registrar you want the RDAP for all of the Afilias back-ended TLDs to be landed here, at this spot, and the Verisign TLDs to be landed here, at this spot, and all of the Neustar back-ended TLDs to be at this spot, hypothetically.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Hypothetically, yes.

RICK WILHELM: And all of the CentralNic ones here.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Exactly, yeah. And it's a little bit even more detailed because within those providers there is distinction we talk to.

RICK WILHELM: Sure. Yeah.

JOTHAN FRAKES: That seems to be the correlation.

RICK WILHELM: You could almost say it's arbitrary.

JOTHAN FRAKES: [Name-store] for CCTV. Others ... Right. Exactly. The fact that the RDAP doesn't have that flexibility creates a challenge for some of these last-mile registrars, many of which have it architecturally set up like that.

RICK WILHELM: Okay.

JOTHAN FRAKES: This conversation may come up as we're trying to back-fill more of the files. But the registrars are finding that they have to stand up some kind of server and solve more than might be apparent in order to consolidate that. One view is, "Hey ..." Anyway, that was [I wanted to update on the registrar pieces for].

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very interesting. We'll need to chew on that. Jothan, would you be able to write up an e-mail?

JOTHAN FRAKES: [One thing] needs to be true as I'm helping my registrar brethren across the finish line.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Got you. Would you be able to write up a note on that, Jothan, and send it to the list so we can get more than just the folks that are within earshot thinking about that? Very good. "Yes, will write this up to the list." Okay. Thank you. That's one of the most interesting problems I've seen in a while. Good stuff. Okay. Good. Very good.

Let's move on, here, to GDD Summit planning. Thank you for that, Jothan. We were planning and RDAP Working Group meeting [that targets] the tech track. Does anybody else have any comments on that? Marc Anderson is here as part of our GDD Summit planning team. He has his hand in the air. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. Can you hear me okay?

RICK WILHELM: Yes, we can. Please, go.

MARC ANDERSON: All right, great. I'll just add that we had a GDD Summit planning session yesterday, very ably led by Karla, who's on this call. Thank you, Karla. And we do have, on the list of topics, an item, there, for RDAP. There have

been a couple of RDAP-related topics proposed. We're still in early-planning mode, here. But I think it's safe to say that as part of the technical track, we'll have a time there for something RDAP related. I'm looking forward to that and seeing everybody at GDD Summit for 2020.

RICK WILHELM:

Very, very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Thank you, Karla. Does anybody have anything else on the GDD Summit? Seeing nothing. Very good. Okay.

We had one dangling around; the best practices for reaching out to ccTLD operators to learn about RDAP servers. We didn't get to that for a couple of weeks. Does anybody have anything related to this? I can't remember exactly how this one came up but it had been hanging on the agenda for a while.

My best practices there are generally similar to Marc Blanchet's best practices for reaching out, which is to reach out to people that you know. And if you don't know someone, reach out to people that you do know and say, "Hey, do you know someone over at such-and-such?" I'm not sure if that was a topic of anybody that's on the call. Does anybody want to bring that one up to discuss or have anything else that they'd like to add on the topic? Jim Galvin, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

I don't remember if we mentioned the TLD Ops group on the ccNSO side that often has meetings and discussions? Jacques Latour is one of the leaders of that group. That might be an opportunity, setting something

up with them to create some material, because that's what they do. They create materials for ccTLDs as a technical group. Anyway, it's just a suggestion of someone to reach out to to talk to about what could be done here. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks, Jim. I don't recall if we did that or not but that's a good suggestion. That's obviously a good place. I think that was done in the context of people with clients that we having difficulty with back-end situations. Very good. Good suggestion. Okay. Very good. Let's head over to the microwave. We've got about 15 minutes left. Let's check in on any new updates on the IRT. Let's see. Who do we have from the IRT today? Who wants to put their hand in the air from the IRT? Not seeing anybody. Marc Anderson, not so quick today. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I was scrolling down the list to see if there was somebody else that could be put on the spot but it doesn't look so promising. From the IRT perspective, we did meet this week and a considerable amount of time was spent on the implementation timeline, which I know was a topic that has been banging around, at least with Contracted Parties, quite a bit.

A couple of people from the Contracted Parties House, notably Sarah and, I believe, you, Rick, were involved with the effort to look at the Phase 1 implementation requirements and call out all of those that would require work by contracted parties and take a stab at t-shirt sizing how long that would take. That document was shared with both registry and registrar

stakeholder groups recently, soliciting feedback, and then also shared with the full IRT.

This is intended to result, ultimately, in what the implementation timeframe will be for the Phase 1 recommendations, which is likely to include changes to RDAP responses, so it's certainly applicable to this work. I think that's probably the most notable thing I'd like to share from this week. I also see that Mark SV has his hand up so I'll stop there and pass the baton to him.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Mark SV, please go ahead.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:

Baton passed! Something that came up towards the end of that meeting about implementation timelines was an awareness that we need to understand the dependencies between the various work items. There is a fairly large, granular list of work items with t-shirt sizes. It wasn't always clear where the t-shirt sizes came from but when we discussed it we noticed that there was a lot of interplay between the various items. And that was one of the reasons that things received bigger t-shirt sizes in some cases.

Like, "Well, I have to work with resellers and that's going to create this following dependency," or, "I have to do this other thing and that depends on the previous thing." We didn't really develop the idea so much during the last IRT meeting but I think we were starting to accept that it would be valuable for us to do a subsequent exercise building from

that t-shirt sizing document, where we could understand all of the interactions and dependencies between those items so that if we did want to prioritize something – there has been some discussion of prioritizing one of the recommendations – we could understand what would need to happen in order to prioritize a thing, for instance, or which things are inherently going to have to be last because they have interdependencies on other things. I think that if we pursue that line of investigation there will be some benefit to that. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much. Very helpful. Does anybody have any questions on this? Okay. Very good. Seeing none, it'll be ePDP Phase 2. Marc Anderson, is that you also, today?

MARC ANDERSON:

I can, maybe. Mark, do you want to go first on this one?

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:

I never want to go first because somebody always does it better. It's better to have me come in and fill in some blanks, as opposed to me just leaving a bunch of blanks and doing a terrible job. That's how I feel about that.

MARC ANDERSON:

All right. It's worth a try. In the update last week, I let everybody know that the timeline for Phase 2 has shifted out. Our new target for getting to initial public comment is early February so the ePDP Phase 2 Working

Group is meeting in L.A. at the end of January with the goal of finishing up the initial report to go to public comment in February.

The other thing I did not share is that, if you play that timeline out, that would get to delivering a final report to the GNSO Council on the 20th of June of this year. That's the current timeline mapped out that staff is projecting for the working group.

The other thing I'll just add is that coming off today's call we were told that staff is working on a new draft of the initial report. At the end of November, they provided a first draft of the initial report. While it contained considerable progress, the group did not feel that it was ready to go out for public comment. They told us today that they'll be giving us a new draft, based on our deliberation since then, as homework over the holiday break, here.

They tried to describe it as a present. It didn't really sound like a present to me but we'll get Mark SV's take on that one, as well. We'll be using this new draft for our deliberations heading up through to our L.A. face-to-face, again with an eye towards getting this out for public comment in early February. Over to you, Mark.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:

Yeah. It was sort of a "thank you, sir, may I have another?" kind of present. I think a lot of us have some concerns about the timeline because there are some really fundamental things that haven't been determined. For instance, what's the relationship between the various controllers? Is there going to be a joint controller agreement or are these

entities going to be co-controllers? And all of that depends on who's actually doing the authorization decision.

ICANN had sent a very equivocal memo to the European Data Protection Board that says, "What about this? What about this? What about this?" And the Belgium DPA, who it was not addressed to, came back and said a bunch of non-answers; "It looks like you're a joint-controller." Until that sort of stuff gets worked out there are going to be a lot of ambiguities in the report. And I think that even after public comments those ambiguities are going to result in something that's not implementable. That is my primary concern, right now. How do we get to something that is implementable by a team different than the team that created the recommendations? Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much. Okay. Any questions on that? Seeing none, a really quick stop on IETF regext. Jim, would you be able to give us a quick update? I'm not sure that there is much going on, there.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. Nothing deliberate to report on at the moment. I guess the only thing I'll add, since we were talking about the GDD Summit, is that we are still talking about joint meetings with the TechOps group. Hopefully, we'll have a slot of time there, during the summit, for that to continue. Even at the GDD Summit, we certainly offered that up.

We have some pending actions in order to move things along, including opening a discussion of the RDAP RFC, which I think is most relevant,

here. That hasn't happened yet but that's the pending action. That will be of interest, here, once we get that started. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you. On the RA and RAA amendment ... Oh, sorry. Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Rick. Jim, on the regex meeting, there is a suggested topic for an interim regex meeting on the GDD Summit topics list. I'm glad you brought it up, here, because I hadn't had a chance to talk to you specifically about that to confirm that that is something you do want to do at the GDD Summit, this year. What I took away from your update is that you would like to do that and you see value in that. And so, I should take that back to the GDD Summit planning and say that, yes, we do want to have this topic. Do I have all of that correct?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, please. As part of the TechOps agenda list, if there's a slot. Yes.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. Great. Will do. Thanks for confirming.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Marc and Jim. On the RDAP RAA amendment, the Contracted Parties House Group is meeting weekly and on every other week it's meeting with ICANN staff to have negotiating

sessions and, on the opposite weeks, are meeting internally. Key topics are the WHOIS sunset and the means by which the RDAP profile is going to be incorporated.

Additionally, we're going to be discussing exact language for incorporating the SLAs in the reporting requirements. Those discussions are going to be re-spinning up after the New Year. We've had our last set of discussions for this year. That's all that's going on, there, right now. Nothing definitive papered, as of yet, so not much to update on that on.

Let's see. I'm just checking our schedule, here, as we get close to wrapping up. There are no more meetings this decade. Our first meeting in the New Year will be on the 9th of January. Remember, we are booked through 2/27. As you can see, there's a reminder for the Cancún meeting. We will not be having a public panel/outreach session. I assume that nothing has come up in everyone's mind to change that for our next Cancún session.

With that, let's do a quick "any other business" check. I think that we can wrap a little bit early. Woah, look at that! How fancy, Sue? Very impressive.

SUE SCHULER: I thought I'd just add a little touch at the end.

RICK WILHELM: Wow. Very impressive. Does anybody have anything else for today before we wrap up and give back a whole three minutes early? I've got a ho-ho-

ho from Mark Švančárek, and a “Thanks, everyone. Happy Holidays.”
Seeing nothing, Sue, you can take us on out.

SUE SCHULER:

Okay. Thank you. Michelle, you can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]