

---

SUE SCHULER: Great, thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Today is January 16, 2020 and welcome to today's regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Today, I received regrets from Jodie and Sarah. They've got conflict with the Transfer Scoping Team. I think that's going to be going on for a little bit, but no worries there. They're keeping up on e-mail.

So I sent out the agenda and our topics and whatnot as usual a few hours ago. Hopefully you had a chance to kind of read through that and so we'll do a little bit agenda bashing as usual and give folks a chance to make any suggestions to the agenda. We will, of course, have an "any other business" if you have new topics to bring up toward the end. Letting a moment for any agenda bashing. Seeing none, we will proceed. Very good.

Let's go into implementation status. You can see the URL count there. On the registry side, we were stable at 824. On the registrar side, a movement of six, up from 2235 to 2241. And so a little bit of good progress there. You can see my comment there about a note I received from Dan Wright and you can read that probably faster than I can. I think that Karla has her hand in the air. Karla, please go ahead.

KARLA HAKANSSON: I can address this one actually. I'm familiar with Dan's issue.

---

*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.*

---

We actually, during the 30<sup>th</sup> of October through 19<sup>th</sup> of November, when registrars were submitting their registrar, the RDAP URLs into NSP, the validation was turned off for some reason and so if it was not formatted correctly, it would allow the RDAP URL to go through and I don't have a count as far as how many RDAP URLs were actually submitting during that time period and passed through without receiving an error message. But more than likely, if you have an RDAP URL that you submitted and you think it was on or around those dates and you don't see it on the IANA website, then that could probably be why it's not showing up. And if you want to reach out to me, I'm happy. I've got a full list of them that I can either address or confirm if that's one of your URLs. We also have our account managers reaching out to impacted registrars to let them know the situation.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Karla. And could you just repeat those dates? They kind of flew by real quickly.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Sure.

RICK WILHELM: Yep.

KARLA HAKANSSON: October 30<sup>th</sup> through November 19<sup>th</sup>.

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. October 30<sup>th</sup> through November 19<sup>th</sup>, sort of not quite, well, I guess about a three-week window in there where validation was turned off for a period of time and so if you have a registrar or URL that didn't make it and you might have been caught up by the validation failure that happened later that you didn't see there. We've got it coming from Dan. "Good to know," he says. And so very good.

Okay, so that might be, Karla, an item that you could post to the list if you could. It'll appear in the next week's notes and such and also, I think that would be a good one to get out to the Registrar Stakeholder Group and so that would be, that's a list that I don't have the ability to post to, but maybe somebody from ICANN can post there or somebody else, one of the registrars can post there. But I think this is really good information here.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Sure. And one more thing to add this too is if, for some reason—and I've seen this with a handful of the RDAP URLs that are posted onto IANA—you may be getting an e-mail from an account manager asking you to resubmit it into NSP so that we can have an accurate accounting in NSP of the RDAP URLs as well. But I will definitely do that, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Thank you very much, Karla. That's very helpful, I think. Anybody else have any other comments on this? And we do see Jim Galvin

---

offering his regrets as he jumps over to the Transfer Scoping Team. No others on that.

Okay, let's scroll a little bit, Sue, and we'll go to the RDAP URL source. This is one where we talked about this and we were... Sorry, Jothan has his hand in the air. So Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Hey, and I'm mobile so hopefully you can hear me okay. So Karla, can you paste those dates into the chat? And I'll send that out to the registrar list.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Will do.

RICK WILHELM: October 30<sup>th</sup> through November 19<sup>th</sup>.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Is this just that there is a requirement to have a trailing slash? I don't understand.

KARLA HAKANSSON: You know that's... yeah. That's the most typical error that we've seen is it doesn't have the trailing slash and yeah. There are some others that are mixed into that too but that's the most common one.

---

JOTHAN FRAKES: So some validation things. So I see a lot of times in WHOIS where people will take in the entry forms and they'll do things like strip out the http:// or https:// from WHOIS lookups or they'll take spaces or tabs or other nonvalid characters out when accepting form entry into a system. Is there something that can be done to kind of normalize for this or fix the data without having to reject entries or things like that? Because it seems like if it's one character that's messing this up, it just seems like a lot of people's time versus something that could be programmatically fixed.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah. I hear you, Jothan. We had that conversation and we've got a very strict rule and I think that for most times, you can appreciate that we never want to be in the position of changing the data in any way, that it comes in to us. So it was contemplated but no, we're not going to be changing that and we'd rather that it come in. We were trying to do the right thing by having the validation and the entry point when you put in the RDAP URL. Again, don't know why it was turned off for those particular dates. But by the time that we actually could get something written in order to programmatically change that, you could probably do it much faster to be honest.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Right.

---

KARLA HAKANSSON: And for some reason, I'm not able to type into the chat. I don't know what's going on but thanks for adding that in, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: No problem.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Okay, thanks Rick. Yeah, I'll send that out to the list now.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you. I'm on a mobile so I got to figure out how to put my hand down. So please proceed.

RICK WILHELM: No problem at all. No problem at all. Okay, very good. Good discussion there and any other questions or comments related to this one? Dan provided some basic rules there, start with `https://` and end with a slash, and obviously, be syntactically sensible in-between.

And so there's code that's now working and was previously working. It was just... It took a three-week vacation in there. So all better now. Okay, so flipping over to our next item, the registrar RDAP URL source, this is the next one we had been working with Karla and Karla was going

---

to be talking with ICANN IT about possible updates to the NSP on this front. Karla, any update there?

KARLA HAKANSSON: No. That's a requirement submitted and waiting on IT to come back to us as far as when they're going to be able to do this. I wish I had more news for you.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Thank you very much. And then related to that, did you have any discussions with compliance regarding operational transitions?

KARLA HAKANSSON: No, not yet but on my list.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Okay, thank you very much. Any others on this one? We're just kind of pending there on the registrar RDAP URL source. Of course, this [does] trying to get the... Speaking of validation rules in the NSP, trying to get those beefed up a little bit more to be real consistent with the ones that IANA is doing. That's just to help everyone recollect. Very good.

Moving on to the next one, the topic of the bootstrap RFCs. Sue is scrolling for us. Due to the page break, it's a little bit hard for this one to get all the way on the page. But last week, we discussed some pros and

---

cons a little bit, possibly modifying RFC 7484, A.K.A. the Bootstrap RFC and that might possibly allow it to have registrar URLs included in there and so there was a little bit of e-mail discussion afterwards. We had some good contributions from [Quoc] who had a cup of coffee and got rolling on e-mail. Mark B. chimed in. And from what I could tell based on some comments from [Quoc] who very graciously invested some time and did a candidate implementation about what the file might look like. And Mark commented about the likelihood of people actually using this, using one file to get the registrars.

And the general consensus that I got out of that discussion and direction was that it didn't seem to be very motivating to update the RFC at this time. And so you can do some reading in there through those topics and hopefully you had a chance to look at that prior to coming on the call. But as of right now, my leaning is that we would really sort of let this one sit and see if we get new information coming up on the topic that might cause us to want to update the RFC. I'm not seeing a lot of motivation that presents a really compelling case to update the RFC given the complexity of both updating RFC and then the resultant complexity that would cause in the file.

So I wanted to kind of get that out there for a little bit more discussion and see if anybody has any further comments on this one. Anybody wanted to come to the mic and talk about this. No one does.

Okay, does anybody object to tabling it for now? Let's try and do it that way. Not seeing anyone come to mic on objecting to that. So I think we'll just... We will call that a consensus and so we'll just, we'll put the



---

update of 7484 to the side, of that RFC to the side for right now. And we'll work on some other stuff.

Let's go over to our next item. This is a little bit related. Jothan had brought up the item that the current mechanism for registrar URLs does not appear to cleanly handle the condition where the registrar has different RDAP URLs for different TLDs. We talked about this a little bit in the meeting last week and then while we were on e-mail, let's see, Justin came up and offered the suggestion that he thought that it was possible. And I think I typed 302 redirects. I'm not sure. I think I mean 301 redirects. Sorry for the typo there.

So, but using redirects, http redirects to accomplish this goal. So that, from what I could see on the e-mail thread, that seemed to be a pretty reasonable solution. Now Jothan was going to go and do a little bit of research. I don't know, Jothan, if you had a chance to get any feedback from anybody on that one or if anybody has any comments that they'd like to make on this possible solution to this situation.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Sure. Right. So the... I did submit sort of a bit of a summary post-meeting last week that I think in the context of everybody having to consolidate the information for the purposes of their data escrow, that it's really just the straggling challenges of addressing maybe some of the aspects of how they're going to present WHOIS, if they had been leaning on the registry as a thick registry to basically present that information.

---

And so, I have submitted to the registrar list kind of a call for people to present some cases where it might be valuable or worthwhile to come up with a solution per registry. I have not, as yet, had feedback that there is. I have had one bit of feedback that it wasn't. So I might step back from this unless there is further input. I've tried to do outreach to non-member registrars. The Registrar Stakeholder Group doesn't represent every single registrar and it's some of the registrars who are accredited but are not participating in the group. That's a little bit more intensive, but I do have some outreach to individual registrars that are non-members and I'm also not getting feedback that they need this.

So I appreciate that the group took some time to discuss this and I think the list will capture that it was discussed. But I don't want to continue to hold things back for this specific need absent any strong reasons to continue with it.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Very good. Thank you very much, Jothan. I think that's good feedback, and as always, the group appreciates your efforts in doing outreach to other members that aren't present on the call.

So this one can, of course, come up in the future but I think that for now, we're going to look at the redirect solution here as the possible workaround to this one. And so we will go ahead and hold with that.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Well, Rick, I was just going to say the exercise took a little time but I think it was worthwhile in the interests of being as inclusive as possible.

---

RICK WILHELM: Absolutely.

JOTHAN FRAKES: That we have a good solution. So I appreciate the group indulging that exercise.

RICK WILHELM: Sounds good. Sounds good. Okay, very good. Anybody else have any other comments on this one?

Okay, very good. Let's move on. Just a quick review of our meeting planning. ICANN 67, regular working group meeting, no public outreach session, GDD Summit planning. We're going to have our RDAP Working Group meeting as part of the tech track. Then we're booked weekly through Cancun. Anyone have any questions or concerns about our meeting planning? Sue, any items that we need to cover? I think it's... I don't think we have anything pressing for ICANN meetings.

SUE SCHULER: No.

RICK WILHELM: Is that fair? Okay.

SUE SCHULER: No, we're good.

---

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Sue.

Okay. Let's go over to some of our, any walk-ons? We will, of course, have a shot at any other business. Looking for hands. Not seeing any.

Okay, let's do some... We are rolling here today. It's as though Roger's in charge. Let's go over to EPDP IRT and get some brief updates. Let's see. Who's on the call from the IRT that wants to speak up? Looking for a hand. Let's see. Let me look around here. Marc Anderson, are you able to provide a few comments on the IRT from the week's progress?

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

RICK WILHELM: I can. Thank you very much.

MARC ANDERSON: All right. I'll give it a go. I'm not really sure what to add for an update though. We did meet this week in the IRT, yesterday in fact, and over the course of the 90-minute call, I'm not sure that a whole lot changed. Dennis and staff continue to work towards a March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline to get the draft policy out for public comment.

We had a lot of discussion about how long it should take to implement the policy and based on the work Sarah did, polling contracted parties and sort of creating a long poll in the tent, her recommendation was for

---

18 months. And there was a lot of discussion about that, and in particular, I think Dennis was looking for justification for why 18 months instead of, in his view, the standard six-month window. But I don't know that we really came to resolution on that. So I think that's still an ongoing discussion that needs to be resolved.

Aside from that, I'm not recalling anything else sort of noteworthy that's worth passing along to this group. I think I saw Alex on the call or if there's anybody else on the call that remembers something that I'm forgetting, please feel free to jump in. But that's all I'm thinking of off the top of my head.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. You got what we will count as a plus-one from Mark S.V. and a concurrence from Alex. So any quick updates on EPDP Phase 2? I'm not sure which of the Phase 2 members would like to speak. Mark Sv. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK:

We really have two main tracks going on in the EPDP right now. One of them is we have a draft report that we're working to conclude and so we're going through that page by page, line by line, word which is the standard process that you would do. But also, there was a side submission from some people in the contracted party house putting forward an idea for what's being called a hybrid model. And without explaining what the centralized model is or the hybrid model is, it's just a... It's a different model that requires less legal certainty and less technical certainty in order to implement. And so we've also had some

---

side meetings as small groups to discuss that as well. And so that's starting to inform our work on the final report And that's what's been happening this week.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Thank you very much, Mark. Anybody have any questions for Mark? Marc Anderson, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: I think Mark Sv got that pretty good. I'll just add that timelines, the post-timelines remain the same. We still have a plan to meet in L.A. at the end of January with, I think, 8 February is the target to publish a draft report for public comment. So I think I updated. So I guess I just wanted to add no change in timeline. We're still trying to meet the same timelines.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Okay. Mark Sv, I think that's old hand. Is that correct? Yes, it was an old hand.

IETF Regex, let's see. Galvin abandoned us. So let me see. I think, and I don't see Scott. Oh, I do see Scott there. Scott, please go ahead.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Thank you, Rick. Other than some routine Internet draft updates, there's really been nothing happening on the Regex front so I don't have anything more to say than that. Thank you.

---

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. Thank you very much and on the RA/RAA Amendment update, this week, the contracted party has met internally within itself to discuss some various topics including terminology, definitions, mechanisms for updating the RDAP profile and then a request from ICANN to possibly extend the duration of our calls to a little bit longer because there is a stated goal from ICANN to get the things in place, the draft language agreed by ICANN. So that was that call. There's still a fair bit more to do there within the contracted party house. So right now, the plan is for the contracted party house to meet again internally. But generally, nothing of import right now for this group.

Jim Galvin and I have a little work item related to definition of what the profile is. We're going to work on that. But that's the extent of it, sort of slow but steady progress on that front.

Anybody else have any questions related to that one? Seeing none. Okay, that takes us to the end of our topics. Let's go to everyone's favorite acronym, AOB, any other business. Not seeing any. Okay, well in that case, we are, as predicted, we are kind of rocketing along here for our progress this week. Things are pretty quiet, largely because we're still, of course, awaiting work from the Implementation Review Team. So we are going to... I'm going to give everyone back 30 minutes of their day to go do something else. Sue, you can wrap us up.

SUE SCHULER: All right, early lunch. Thanks, Michelle. We can end the recording.

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**