
SUE SCHULER: Okay, thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much, Sue. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to today's meeting of the RDAP Working Group. Today is January 9th, 2020. Happy New Year, everyone. I trust that by now all of your holiday cheer has worn off and you're back to your normal selves. That's a little joke. We've got the agenda and topics that I had set out, helping to knock some rust off from the holiday period. Hopefully, you had a chance to read that. That went out a few hours ago.

And so, that will serve as our pro forma agenda. We'll take a second to do some agenda bashing, here. You can give that some thought. I wanted to let you know that I do have regrets from Jim Galvin and Sarah Wilde, today. They both have conflicts on something else. Does anybody have any agenda bashing that they'd like to do? We will have time for any other business toward the end of the call so you've got time for that. Okay.

Without further ado, let's go into our usual review of implementation status. The number of registries dropped by two URLs in the Bootstrap file since our last review. I think that there are some registries that terminated during the period. And of course, remember that this is the number of URLs, not the number of TLDs, that's covered. There are a number of URLs that have many, many TLDs attached to them. This is only the number of URLs. That's an important qualifier when you see that number go down.

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.

Secondly, on the registrar side, we are now up to 2235. It moved by almost 40 in the past couple of weeks in the back end of the old year. And so, we're now up to 2235 so continued, steady progress there. Does anybody have any questions or comments about implementation status?

Very good. Seeing none, let's go onto our topic of the registrar RDAP URL source. In here, we've got the general topic of the ... I've recapped our discussion from last time and, basically, right now ... Well, we decided last time that we're going to wait for some feedback from ICANN IT about the timeline at which they might be able to make modifications to the NSp, such that it could add some validation capabilities and what those validation capabilities might look like. But with the goal of making them a little bit closer to what IANA does, such that, therefore, anything that went into the NSp and was therefore being returned by IANA, was at least going to be returned by MoSAPI and would at least be validated somewhat.

I do see Karla is on the call. Karla, thanks for joining. I know that it has been mostly a holiday period at ICANN but I wanted to just check gently to see if there is any update from ICANN IT on the timeframe of updating the NSp.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Hi, Rick. No, no updates at this point in time. We probably won't have an update until the next call, at the earliest. And if I hear anything more in advance of that, I will let you know.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Very good. Thank you. That's kind of understandable because when we last left it was just before the holiday and everybody was just starting

to get going so that's not entirely unexpected. Does anybody have any questions or discussion around this one that they'd like to bring up while we're on the topic? Not seeing any.

Let's move down to the item on the Bootstrap RFC. The topic here is the notion of the possibility of updating/modifying RFC 7484 to allow to accommodate registrar URLs. In the last meeting, we'd put these in some pros and cons. We had a little bit of discussion about them. We didn't do any discussion over the holiday period, even though in the last meeting I talked about sending out a note. It seemed a bit like shouting into the wind to send that only a few days before the holiday period so I just kept it. We're keeping a discussion here.

These are essentially the same pros and cons that you saw the last time on this topic. Sue, if you could scroll just a little bit more there are a few more cons on there. There we go. Thank you very much. I wanted to open this one up for some discussion and see if anybody has any topics on this one that they'd like to bring up.

One thing that did come up here was the next item that I have on the screen which says, "Registrar RDAP source, new complexity." This is an item ... Oh, I'm sorry. I do have Marc Blanchet. Let me go to Marc first before I distract. I was looking at the screen and not seeing Marc's hand up. Marc, please go ahead. Thank you.

MARC BLANCHET:

One, two, one, two. Do you hear me? Can you hear me?

RICK WILHELM: Yes, please. Yes, we can. Go right ahead, Marc. Thank you.

MARC BLANCHET: Okay, thanks. I think there are a few there that may be a question mark in the sense that ... The transition period, obviously. At least on my side, I haven't more than just a generic idea. I haven't looked into more details. But it may be possible that the Bootstrap file with the registrars could actually essentially be converted to the registrar ID that XML file could "automatically," therefore would be almost transparent to people during the transition period. That could be very long. There is probably some mitigation techniques that essentially would make this almost transparent for the time needed, right? Just a [count].

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Essentially, I think what you're saying is that there could be two ... If the updates would flow to both the registrar IDs, .txt file, as well as flow to that file additionally, that then it would both facilitate transition and maybe it could even stay as a long-term field in the registrar IDs file as a way to help avoid transition concerns. Did I parse that correctly?

MARC BLANCHET: Yeah. Essentially, it's the same data. The Bootstrap file, if we go that route, could be the authoritative and normative version. And then the registrar ID XML file could be generated based on the Bootstrap content. In that way, people won't have to rush into modifying their systems. The registries don't have to modify their systems in a rush to use the

Bootstrap. The two, together, could be there for quite a long time. That's obviously an injuring comment. It may cross over political or organizational issues but I'm an engineer.

RICK WILHELM:

Right, right. No, I understand. Yeah. This would be a transition facilitation mechanism to avoid the one ... There's an item that we have in there about existing code, "the last con," which is existing code that consumers or registrar URLs would need to change. It would reduce that con because it would allow the registrar IDs file to keep getting updated for a period of time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

And also the first con too, right?

RICK WILHELM:

Right. Okay. That's very good. Other comments on this one? No others at this time, it looks like. Okay. I guess a lot of, as we discussed last time, our decision on possibly updating 7484 is going to hinge on what we hear from ICANN IT about the timeline to update the NSp. Obviously, if ICANN says that the NSp can be updated "relatively soon," and we're not sure what that means or even what that threshold would look like, then it might provide less motivation to update the 7484. But it is something to think about. Hopefully, we can have some discussion on the e-mail list about this.

Okay, very good. Let's move on to the next one, which is a topic that Jothan brought up last time. I don't see Jothan on the call this week but

we didn't get a lot of time to discuss it. The item that Jothan brought up was that the current structure that we have for registrar URLs does not readily support the notion of registrars providing support for different TLDs from different RDAP URLs.

It provides a spot where each registrar's RDAP data is provided out of a single URL. And in a way, this is somewhat less flexible than the registry mechanism, which allows for a particular registry, which shows it by TLD. I wanted to bring that up and have some discussion about it. I see Marc Blanchet's hand is up. Marc, please come to the mic.

MARC BLANCHET:

I think it was not on that. It's actually a good and interesting comment, especially given the discussion we just had with the possible Bootstrap file for registrar IDs. Was this comment related to that we're thinking about it? Or may one or many registrars have that issue right now?

RICK WILHELM:

We don't know how widespread it is. Jothan brought it up so there's at least one. And he described a particular example where he knows someone or is involved with someone that is running into this where they're supporting different TLDs out of different infrastructure that makes it more difficult to have one source. So the question is, is there a workaround that we can describe or are there other mechanisms that we can use to have that be anchored at the single place? Maybe using redirection or something like that.

And then, how can registrars route the request as they need be? It might be that the answer here is doing it with clever use of 301 redirects. Marc, your hand is back up. I think that's a new hand. Is that a new hand? New hand. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC BLANCHET:

Yeah. Well, honestly, one way is actually have a Bootstrap file, right? If we design it right with this in mind then we can support it. Anything else would ... Obviously, I guess, the way to do it right now is a redirection based on URLs and stuff. But if there's a real need for this – that was the purpose of my first question – then the Bootstrap file registry/registrar ID Bootstrap file could solve that issue easily.

RICK WILHELM:

Yeah, that's a good point, Marc. I'll just recap that. If this turns into, as we examine it, if it is a real problem that needs solving, this is something that the registrar IDs file being the mechanism to convey the URLs would have a hard time supporting and it would really put more need or requirement on respinning 7484 to handle this level of complexity. That's a very good point.

Are there mechanisms that we can think of – and this is to the group, not to Marc himself – where there's one URL per registrar? I know there are mechanisms, whether they be 301s or something else, where the registrar manages this complexity and we don't let that server-side complexity of the complicated implementation that certain registrars may have, require a more complicated solution across all of the Bootstrap

file. Does anybody have any thoughts about that, about what a registrar could do at the server-side on this one?

No one's got their hand up. Let's see who we've got today. Yeah, we have neither Justin nor Jody, who would be two good folks. Maybe that's an open question, as far as what can be done on the server-side to handle this complexity. There are probably some tricks involving proxies, 301s, or something like that, but I'm not that up to my [Gizzard Internet present] to be able to come up with that on the fly. Okay.

I might throw that one out on the mailing list explicitly to see if we can get some discussion on it. Maybe we see some of the folks, whether they be folks like Jody, Justin, or Quok. Someone like that might have some contributions to make. Okay. Very good. And maybe others can help flesh out the problem. Okay. Any others on this here, on RDAP source complexity? Thank you, Marc Blanchet, for those comments. Much appreciated.

All right. We are moving today. We are moving, moving, moving. Meeting planning. This will be pretty quick. Dan writes, "I don't have enough understanding of the problem to say, but it sounds like they could handle it internally." Yeah. And I think that maybe, Dan, what we need to do there is come up with some best practices. Or, "Oh, here's the trick that you need to do to handle it." I think that would be a way to do it.

Okay. Meeting planning. What you see on the screen here, ICANN67, just to recap: regular working group meeting will adapt the agenda to the face-to-face style like we normally do. We don't have any public outreach session planned. GDD Summit. We're planning to have an RDAP Working

Group meeting as part of the tech track. That's coming up in May. Our regular working group meetings are booked through Cancún.

And back to ICANN67, I believe that we are slated in on Sunday morning at 10:30 local time for Cancún. Sue, is that correct?

SUE SCHULER: That is correct, yes.

RICK WILHELM: All right.

SUE SCHULER: In the middle of the TechOps day.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. And we have 90 minutes, is that right? 10:30 to 12:30?

SUE SCHULER: Correct.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. And hopefully, we'll have some more stuff to talk about in there. That will be good. Does anybody have any items related to meeting planning that they'd like to bring up? All right. Not seeing any. I will note there that we're planning on not having a meeting the last

Thursday before Cancún for our regular working group. That's something you can make a note on your calendar for. Okay.

Let's do a quick check for any other new business. Does about have anything before we head over to the microwave? All right. Not seeing any.

ePDP IRT. Who wants to take a whack at that one this week? There's Marc Anderson. Marc, please come to the mic and join us.

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

RICK WILHELM: Yes, I can. Thank you very much.

MARC ANDERSON: All right. Great. I'm just looking at the list, here. It might just be me from the IRT so I guess my number's up. On the IRT, we haven't met since the last RDAP meeting. I don't have a whole lot new to say. We do have our first meeting of the New Year. It's next Wednesday. And then, this is something I reported at the last meeting, Dennis is targeting March 1st as the date to have the draft Phase 1 policy language out for public comment. So that's the date Dennis is circling. He's really pushing hard for us to meet that date.

I'll just add one other thing before I draw a line in there. I talked about this a little bit. I think I gave an update on this on our last call but this also

came up on the TechOps meeting. It's the timeline for how long to implement the Phase 1 ePDP recommendations. That's an ongoing effort to look at all of the tasks that are on the critical path and how long each of those tasks will take so that staff can develop a reasonable timeline for implementing the Phase 1 recommendations.

So that's something Sarah Wilde, who I don't see on the call today, has been spearheading. They've put out a call for contracted parties to provide input on that. That is something that Dennis is asking to have completed by the Wednesday call so that staff can firm up the timeline for that draft policy recommendation language. Obviously, how long it's going to take to implement is pretty important to us so I wanted to flag that one for everybody.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. A very good summary. Does anybody have any questions for Marc on that one? All right. I'm not seeing any. Let's move over to ePDP Phase 2. Mark Švančárek. Very good. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:

I lost your audio, Rick. Can you hear me?

RICK WILHELM:

Yes, we can hear you.

MARK ŠVANČÁREK:

Okay, good. Now I don't remember the exact dates so Marc A will have to remind us of the exact dates. But before the holidays, staff put out the first draft of the Phase 2 final report and the comments from the various constituencies and advisory groups was due on Monday. Most teams submitted pretty substantial feedback on it so most of the document is looking pretty good and pretty stable. There are a couple of areas of disagreement. We had a pretty good meeting today where we worked through some of them. We're working towards a face-to-face meeting in the last week of January in L.A., where I think we can resolve another bunch of them.

There was another topic. The ICANN Organization had sent a request for clarification, I guess you'd call it, to the European Data Protection Board, that was based on certain implementation suggestions. And they received a non-answer, not from the Data Protection Board but from the Belgian DPA. We do have, within the plenary, a level of disagreement on how we should act based on the response that we received from the Belgian DPA. That was the subject of some discussion today, too. I think that's the most noteworthy stuff that's coming from there, except for the actual dates when we expect to have the final report out for public comment, which Marc A could probably remind me. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thank you very much, Mark. Marc Anderson, do you have the details on that public comment document?

MARC ANDERSON: I'll say the target for having the initial report out for public comment is, I think, February 8th. I'm scrambling real quick to see if I can find the exact target date for having the final policy recommendations ready to go to the GNSO Council, which is sort of the end-date for us. Let's see. It looks like that is the 30th of June 2020. Those are the dates we're currently targeting.

RICK WILHELM: That sounds right. Very good. Okay. Thank you. Any questions on ePDP Phase 2? Thank you very much for that update, Marc. Not seeing any. Let's go onto IETF regex. We don't have Jim Galvin here. I know that he normally gives us our regex update. But we do have Scott Hollenbeck with his hand in the air. Scott, please go ahead.

SCOTT HOLLENBECK: Thanks, Rick. It has been very, very quiet. I mean, virtually nothing happened over the holidays. Now that we're back, there's not a lot of activity. But we had talked about the idea of re-spinning the RDAP RFCs from proposed standard status to full standard status with a goal of addressing any needed errata from a clarification or correction perspective. To that end, I've started work on the documents for which I was the original author.

I have tried to reach out to Andy Newton, who worked formally with [ARIN], who was the primary author on RFC 7483, the response document. But he's not at [ARIN] anymore. I'm trying to understand just how involved he wants to be in the continued work on these documents. But in any case, some time before the Vancouver meeting in March I do

expect that we will see, where necessary, Internet drafts published to address these necessary clarifications. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. Thank you very much. That's good progress. And Vancouver is the IETF 106, I think it is. It's the week after the week after Cancún as you look in your calendar. Still in March but a little bit later, I think. I'm pretty sure about that. Very good. Okay.

And on the RA/RAA amendment, I can provide an update here and then others can chime in. Actually, we don't have Galvin on the call but he would be the one. Discussions continue. Some key topics. There hasn't been any movement or progress on the WHOIS sunset. But as it relates to the RDAP side of things, one of the key discussions is how we're going to handle changes to the RDAP profile as time goes on, both in the near-term and over the long-term, and the specific mechanisms of those.

As you know, something like the RDAP profile would end up being something that could either be incorporated as a normative reference into the contract or incorporated as exhibit. There are different implications for how those things get modified going forward. And so, that's one of the key items of discussion.

Those are the main topics underway. There's not a firm draft that's anywhere near ready for stakeholder group review but those are the basics on it. Does anybody have any questions about that? Not seeing any. Okay. Let's see here. Does anybody have any other walk-ons? I did see Jothan arrive. Jothan, I'm not sure if you were here when we were discussing the item that you raised last week about registrars having

more than one source for RDAP URLs for different TLDs. Were you here during that? Did you catch some of that discussion?

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Oh, hi, Rick. Happy New Year. No, I missed that part and I'm still writing that up. I'm trying to capture a few different real-world situations to make sure that that's something that merits further discussion. If you think it through, in the context of where people have to gather the information they'd need for the data escrow and different things like that, it's really on the registrar to accumulate all of that. But on a per-registry basis, there have historically been some scenarios. I'm trying to get some other registrars to share that information with me and what they would like to see. I had taken it as an action item, to write that up. I still owe that to the group.

RICK WILHELM:

No problem at all. Yeah. In the discussion here, no one had any quick solutions to this but one of the things we talked about was discussing, on the mailing list, possible server-side ways of handling this without adding more complexity to the Bootstrap mechanism. But I think that would be a great thing to take up on the list. And we'll look for your note as a way to kick off that discussion.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Okay. And thank you for entertaining that discussion. I think it is just some of the last-mile registrars who had been doing something like that and are looking for a way to consolidate. But ultimately, I am still searching

for some more cases where this is going to be something that we need to solve for. Thank you for entertaining that discussion. I'm sorry I missed it. I had a call that ran long.

RICK WILHELM: No problem. You'll be able to see it in the transcript. You'll see everybody's comments and so on.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you, Rick. And Happy New Year to everyone.

RICK WILHELM: Happy New Year. Very good. Okay. I think that kind of brings us to a close, unless there is any other business that somebody would like to bring up? I think that we are doing a good job of running ahead of time and hopefully being efficient with everyone's use of their day here.

SUE SCHULER: I think we set a record.

RICK WILHELM: One last call. It's as though I'm doing my Roger imitation here, basically.

SUE SCHULER: I guess.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Going once. Going twice. Thank you, everyone, for your time. Sue, you can take us out.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks. Michelle, we can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]