

RICK WILHELM:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Rick Wilhelm from Verisign. This is October 10th, 2019, and this is today's edition of the RDAP Working Groups call/regularly scheduled meeting.

I'd welcome to everybody today. I've gotten regrets from Jim Galvin and Scott Hollenbeck. It looks like we've got a pretty good crew here. I think that the EPDP call might have ran a little bit long, based on what the attendance is showing here. So we'll let some EPDP folks draft in as they get a chance to reload their coffees and switch over their conferences calls and such, but we will take the time to go ahead and getting going.

We sent out the meeting topics here this morning, a few hours ago at about 7:30 Eastern Time. Hopefully you all had a chance to look at that. Sue, of course, has them, as usual, plunked into the screen share. We'll do our usual bit of agenda bashing. If anybody has any walk-ons or other topics that they'd like to bring up for consideration, please raise your hand and bring those up.

Not seeing any. First order of business: a big shout out and a big thanks to Roger for chairing last week's call. Certainly much appreciated. Thank you very much, Roger. Claps all around. Word on the street is that you did a great job according to the sub-Reddits that I frequent.

Let's dive right in. On our implementation status, you can see the numbers there reported. Sarah is now furiously Googling Reddit to see if there are RDAP sub-Reddits. There probably are. I will admit that was a bit of a joke, Sarah. But I shudder to think if there are RDAP sub-Reddits.

We can see a modest movement in registries over last week and really a decent movement in the RDAP – in the registrar IDs – from 9/23. That

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.

was a number that was posted as of 10/3. So we're up to 2,033 in the registrar IDs. There are still about 400 registrars that are active that still don't have RDAP URLs posted in the registrarids.xml files. We'll see if that moves again next week.

Any questions or comments in or around that?

Going once, going twice ... Okay. Moving on to ICANN 66, we've got our schedule there. Still our slots are Sunday at 10:30 to 12:00 – [RFC (ph)] Tech Ops – and Monday, 15:50 to 16:45. We've got our volunteers there: [Qwok], Jim Galvin, Roger, and myself. And we are of course looking for another registrar volunteer. I had of course badgered the always-entertaining Justin Mack, but he's not able to make it. So, if we have any other registrars that are particular folk that we're looing for that are interested in stepping up, please feel free. We would of course love to have Sarah if she's free. Of course, she may not be able to attend. We'll save any possible jokes about why Sarah may not want to travel to Montreal for later. But if there are any registrars that would be interested in participating, we certainly would love to have you.

Right now, we are not working on slides, but this is something that we would like to talk about and spend a little time on. If anybody has some thoughts, we'd like to get some notes down around these two various topics around what we know, what we've learned, and what we've done and then, secondly, what we haven't done and what we don't know yet. If anybody has any things they'd like to contribute verbally here, we'd certainly welcome you to offer those comments. They will of course appear in the chat room. From there, of course we can capture them into some bullet points that could appear in the slides to help advance the discussion.

Anybody have any thoughts about topics that we may care to cover under either of these two buckets: what we know, what we've learned, what we've done, and then, secondly, what we haven't done and don't know yet? So it's a little bit of open mic as we get things started and a way for you to help shape what we are talking about in this panel session, a way for you to put words in the mouth of the panelists, one might say. Anyone got anything they'd like to offer?

Seeing nothing at the moment, I'll throw something out – oh, there's Roger. Go ahead, Roger, and then I'll chip in.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. I think Sue put in a suggestion in chat, and I think that may work. I'm not sure what slides we would actually have – maybe numbers and progress like that for the first session. But probably more of an agenda will work out well for that, at least for that second session or part of that session. I think we need to talk about the accreditation or access models and those possibilities and what's happening there. That's probably the big ones for me right now. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good, Roger. Those are some good ones. Yeah, I think just some points would be some good things to talk about. One of the things that I was thinking about would be that we could bring up some of the points that Marc Blanchett has discovered that's captured in his Internet draft: some sort of working experience with things that you see out in the field. So, some working experiences from there, some information from his paper.

Then I thought that we might also talk about – this is what I think you were getting to, Roger – how authentication and authorization might work. We could talk a little bit about that. I think that's in the area of what we could say some commentary about.

Another thing I think that we could talk about here – this is maybe in the first ... That would be one for the futures. The topic about Marc Blanchett's would be under what we have learned. Another one that I think we could talk about under what we have learned is I think we could point to the success of lookup.icann.org because I think that that's something that, one, we could help drive some publicity around. It really is a positive outcome because one of the things that I do from time to time is to help people understand why they can and can't find WHOIS information at different endpoints. The fact that they can just, right now with RDAP, go to lookup.icann.org and find everything via the bootstrap is something very positive. So I think that we could do some publicity for lookup.icann.org in there.

Roger did some things about under what we haven't done: a profile update for EPDP Phase 1. Then he also captures in the chat there what I said about authorization. Yeah, the profile update will be coming for EPDP Phase 1. We certainly do expect that.

Other folks have some other things along these lines. Does this get your motor humming and get you thinking about some other stuff? Or maybe I said all the easy stuff.

Maybe what we'll do is start capturing some of this. Maybe we can work on putting it into a Google Doc and having people contribute to it and have that as a way.

Let's see. Sarah, if the SSAD coming out of EDPD – Sarah, can you elaborate on that? Do you want to come to the mic and maybe elaborate on that also?

SARAH WYLD:

Sure. Thank you. In the Phase 2 EPDP, we're working on a system for standardizes disclosure. There has been discussion that that system will use RDAP as the authentication and transmission method of the non-public registration data. If we're talking about what we haven't yet done, part of it is indeed the Phase 1 profile update, but part of it would also be using RDAP for that system.

Sorry. I can help at the public session. I'm not sure I can be at the Sunday working group. I'm looking at scheduling still. But on the Monday session, if it would help – I don't have anything to contribute to the first section (what we've learned and done). I have nothing else to do add to that. But if it's useful to talk about what we haven't yet done, I can try to help with that.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. That'd be great. For the Sunday session, consider yourself penciled in. That would be fantastic. Sorry if I misunderstood. I took from your chat that you weren't coming to Montreal at all, but I gather that that is not the case, that you are going to Montreal. So that's good to hear.

SARAH WYLD:

Sorry. If I could just clarify, yes, I will be in Montreal. The Sunday session I'm not certain I will be joining because I have another thing that might

happen on Sunday, although that other thing might be Tech Ops. But the Monday public session? I will be there.

RICK WILHELM:

Fantastic. So we will consider you penciled in. That sounds great. Thank you very much Sarah. All right. So that sounds good. And we'll put you in on that second part, the what we haven't done and what we don't yet know. I think that your participation in EPDP Phase 2 and the EPDP in general makes you a great person to have on there. I think you'd be able to contribute a lot in that area. So that'd be good, especially doing some commentary and doing some Q&A on there. And any time that someone gets to steal Roger's suggestions, that's always entertaining, too. Very good. So I think that's good.

What I'll probably do this week is try and get a Google Doc started that we can all chip in some topics on on this, and then we can work on sorting that stuff out. In short, everybody is contributing some things there and having it be, I guess you'd say, crowdsourced. That's probably the right way to do it. That way, everybody gets to have a voice in some of the things we're doing.

Also, in that way, I'm looking to avoid burdening folks with building slides because that's certainly not one of my favorite things to do. I'm sure that's got grins all around as we go forward here.

Any further on that topic? Anybody have anything else they'd care to add?

All right. Very good. Seeing nothing. Let me do a quick blast through these two very long old business ones. I don't really have anything to add here. Quality control on the registrar bootstrap values. This is still

with ICANN. They haven't given us any new information. So we can go ahead and push on past that one. Additionally, regarding the update of the timing of the registrarids.xml file on the same data on the MoSAPI, no update on that from ICANN either. The more general notion of whether or not the MoSAPI is reflecting registrarids.txt or if it is reflecting what is in the RADAR system is also still open and is still with ICANN.

So there's both of those things, which of course we've been pushing on with ICANN. This group's consensus position, of course, is that the MoSAPI should reflect what is in the registrarids.txt file. That is still pending with ICANN and we are awaiting a response on that topic.

Anybody have any questions or comments on that? That hasn't moved since we last spoke.

Seeing none, we will go on to – this is really not new business because you all chatted about it next week. When this note went out the transcript hadn't yet been published. Since that time, the transcript did go out – thanks, Sue, for helping to prod the transcript folks and getting that published – and I was able to read the discussion that happened last week about abuse. We didn't seem to come to any established consensus regarding this. So, to my mind, the lack of established consensus for change means that we wouldn't have any agreed-upon change to this.

Does anybody have any comments? Is that a correct assessment? Because, from my reading of the transcript that I got through on it, it sounds like everyone said, "It sounds kind of interesting, but there's already an extension that's available. It has partial adoption, and we

don't really need to do anything with RDAP regarding this." How did that capture it?

I don't know. Maybe, Roger, you want to comment about this one since you had the [cahn] for the meeting last week? Sorry to put you on the spot.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. No, I think you captured it right. I don't think that there was any definitive conclusion. It was just a good discussion on it.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Very good. So we'll hold that one, that idea, in the wings then. Thank you, Roger. We won't do anything at present. If it comes up again, we'll see if we want to do anything. But as of right now, we'll just hold it on our issues list and see if we want to do anything about it in the future.

Does anybody have any – if you've got any objections to that, please raise your hand. But for right now, we'll just hold it in the wings.

Okay. Very good. Seeing none. Before we go to the microwave, there has been a bit of discussion on the list about the topic of – which I'll throw in as an Any Other Business item, but we'll put off going to the microwave for just a little bit – whether or not an RDAP web interface would be required. This has been something that's been discussed a bit on the list. I've been pretty vocal about it. Jim Galvin has been pretty vocal about it. I wanted to see if there was interest in discussing that here a little bit. If people wanted to ask questions about the topic, or if anybody wanted to bring an opinion about it, this is a good group here to discuss it. So I want to just throw it out and see if anybody wanted to

bring it up and have a discussion about it while we are all on the phone and see if you wanted to – Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. I think some of the things that we saw on the list is probably what we need to get to. It's hard to say "web interface" because obviously RDAP is a web interface. But I think that it comes down to ICANN's definition of, is it a webpage that is needed versus just a web interface? I think both of our contracts actually say "web interface." Obviously, that's going to be up to some discretion, but I think, maybe if we get off the discussion of web interface (because we are providing that) and maybe talk about, is there a need for the web page or not ... Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much, Roger. Very good. Anybody else have any comments related on that one?

Not seeing any right now. I think, Roger, that that's a good comment. I think the one thing that I will offer just briefly – something for the group to consider – is that one of the things that I noticed since RDAP came on board is that one of the things that probably doesn't get enough credit in this whole discussion about RDAP and WHOIS is the utility and benefit of the RDAP bootstrap file and the way that the RDAP bootstrap mechanisms serves as an anchor and a unifying mechanism that helps general purpose users know exactly where to go. It gives them one place to go, one well-known place to go, for their queries. Because the thing that's very interesting is that we all take it for granted that people will either just go know to go the registries and know where those are, or they will hit a search engine to go.

For example, just the other day, I was answering a query from someone who was using a terminal-based client – it happened to be on Mac OS – which happens to have wired in it the IANA WHOIS Port 43 client. It had a limited set of servers that it goes to. For example, it doesn't go and find out which is the registrar's servers. These only hit the registry's servers. For example, under an RDAP situation, that thing would be able to go and hit the bootstrap file and be able to follow those links, just like lookup.icann.org does. It wouldn't have to go and only be hardwired into certain WHOIS servers.

In you look at the [MAN] page, which probably most folks on this call are comfortable doing, it gives a very complicated explanation about which WHOIS servers it knows how to reach and that sort of thing. Right now, the general public is trained to reach out to the registry and go to its web-based WHOIS, which doesn't seem to be the best experience for the user. I think that having the ability for users to just know and leverage the benefit of the RDAP bootstrap file via their client is really a much better experience than training users to go visit the registry or registrar's web interface individually.

So, since we're switching people to go from WHOIS to RDAP, now would be really the time to switch them going from WHOIS in a decentralized distributed fashion to RDAP with one endpoint, which is the bootstrap file, that helps, via their client, to go take them to all of their results.

So that might be something to consider, which is really taking a step back away from the difference between a web client and a web page and all this stuff and getting more to the fact that the bootstrap RFC is really one of the great features of RDAP that I think isn't getting a lot of credit for RDAP right now. So something to think about.

I don't know. Anybody want to react on that or comment on that or disagree with it, which would be great too, to maybe have a discussion on it? Or plus-one it of course, if you agree.

All right. Jim Gould says plus-one. Sean Baseri says plus-one. Everybody else must be asleep, which I can certainly understand. It's 12:27, so [inaudible]. Sarah needs a cup of coffee. Coming off the EPDP, that tends to be exhausting. I can understand that. Very good. Marc Anderson was up late last night watching the [nats], and he came off the EPDP. Very good. So that item is something to consider as your contemplating this point.

With that out of the way, let's move on to the microwave. Speaking of the EPDP, who wants to grab the EPDP straw today? Hmm. My bet is going to be Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

I'm laughing because [inaudible]. I honestly don't know what kind of update to give this group. We had two meetings this week. So we met twice since I last gave this update. We're ultra-focused on building blocks. Janis, our Chair, is concerned that we're falling behind schedule. He's making efforts to increase our pace and get us to having a new draft that we can review in Montreal.

That said, beyond noting that we're focused on building blocks and that we're talking about things like accreditation, I don't have a whole lot more than just that general high-level update to share. Unless Sarah and Marc want to jump in, I'll leave it at that, that we're pressing forward and we're working through building blocks and trying to get to a new draft for us to deliberate on in Montreal.

RICK WILHELM: All right. Very good. It looks like you got a plus-one from Sarah and Marc. Very good. Anything regarding Phase 2?

MARC ANDERSON: By Phase 2, do you Phase 1 implementation?

RICK WILHELM: No. Sorry. So EPDP – sorry. That was Phase 2.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah.

RICK WILHELM: So EPDP IRT. Anything related to EPDP – Sarah has her hand up. Sarah, do you want to go ahead?

SARAH WYLD: My hand is up to say that there is no interesting IRT update. There was no meeting this week. The work continues, but I don't think it really touches on this team right now.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Sarah. All right. Sounds very good. Roger is plus-one-ing that.

Okay. IETF regex. We don't have Galvin here, and we don't have Scott here. I think we had some updates for a couple of papers that came out. We are still working on getting regex interim meeting scheduled, which

would be coincident with a CPH Tech Ops meeting during ICANN 66 Montreal, probably during the afternoon on Sunday. That's not been finalized, but we expect that it will be finalized over the next week or so. So that is the quick IETF regex update.

And on – Roger, that sounds good; okay, very good – the RA/RAA amendment, there was a small group meeting this week. It was not with ICANN. I believe there's going to be some communication between Graeme, as the Registrar Stakeholder Group leader, and Donna, as the Registry Stakeholder Leader, and ICANN staff, Russ and Carla, regarding next steps as it relates to the amendment. But noting reportable from an external standpoint. So that's where we are on the amendment. No real movement. A little bit of activity, but no real movement. In that sense, it rhymes with EPDP IRT, you might say. It was a very quick trip this week through the microwave, the microwave actually living up to its microwave-ian reputation.

Let's quickly go to AOB (Any Other Business). Anybody have any other business that we'd like to cover?

All right. Not seeing any. Don't see any right now. Seeing none, we will do a quick schedule check. We are looking at the 17th of November, same time, same station.

Does that sound right, Sue?

SUE SCHULER:

Yes, except let's make it October.

RICK WILHELM:

Ooh. So, October, November ... Yeah, the 17th of November would actually be after Montreal. Thank you very much. It's funny how time flies, as the song goes. So, yeah, the 17th of October. That means you still have Halloween candy sitting around that's fresh as opposed to stale.

We are starting to get some of the pre-Montreal calls going on. Sarah's got on that's got a conflict. There may be other folks that have a conflict. So we'll do our best, and [see] how that goes.

Anybody else have any last items before we wrap up? Thank you, Sarah for the warning.

All right. Going once, going twice ... You all get 27 minutes of your day back. Sue, you can take us out.

SUE SCHULER:

Thanks, Rick. Okay, Julie, we can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]