
DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, everybody. I think the purpose of this call is to go through the documents and see where we have agreement to move forward and then share those with Karla and Russ. Karla and Russ are not on this call. It's just our respective members.

And then I see, Sue, that you've also put mechanisms for updating the RDAP profile. So I think we can have a brief chat about that as we go through the documents.

Okay, so Jeff is saying that he has been through the registrar doc and partially through the registry doc. So, Sue, can you bring up the registrar document, please? And, Jeff, I might ask you to walk through the changes. When I looked 90 minutes ago, you were the only one that had seemed to have provided comment on this, so I'm assuming nobody else has had time to review and make comments.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, although I don't see the changes on this document. Is this the right one?

SUE SCHULER: I opened it about an hour ago, so I just did a refresh. So maybe that will help.

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.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sue, I think there are two versions. So I think the one that Jeff has edited is not the one where Karla has made changes. So they're the documents you created last week.

SUE SCHULER: Okay, I thought this was what I had picked up, but maybe not. Can you just drop the link in the chat real quick, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, just give me one sec.

SUE SCHULER: Oh, Jim just did it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, cool. Okay.

SUE SCHULER: There you go. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, yeah, so I mostly ignored the top three paragraphs or that preamble part simply because it's just preamble so I just kind of ignored that for now. So I started really with the technology transition. I think we talked about if we were going to set some goals for this document, Number 2 was not really a concern of ours. Which is what's the best way to support the new service from both a tech savvy and a non-tech savvy user. I don't think, as we discussed, that should be a criteria for our amendment, so I just crossed that out. I don't know if there are any

questions on that or anyone disagrees. I'll just look and see if anyone has any questions.

Okay, and then for the management of the RDAP profile, certainly this relates to how the profile could change. I think there is no way around the to comply with consensus policy or temporary policy specifications because that's in our contract. But Part B is one that we still need to discuss. This one says if endorsed by the Registry Stakeholder Group and registrars, but at the end of the day it's really about whether there should be an extra-contractual or outside the contract way of amending the profiles. From the last call, it didn't sound like we were convinced that there should be another process. But that's a discussion item that I think we should reserve to discuss further.

And I see Jim. Donna, should I just let Jim in?

DONNA AUSTIN: We'll work it out, Jeff, but, yeah, if you see a hand pop up, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, thanks, Donna. So, Jim, please?

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Jeff and Donna. I don't know if you want to get into the discussion here. I know it's listed separately on our agenda, so we can put it off for later. What I wanted to call out here for you, Jeff, is in the registry version of this I spoke to this issue of updating the RDAP profile and was providing a different way to frame this issue about talking about a public response profile and not worrying about anything else. If we just want to hold that discussion until we get to that agenda item,

that's fine. But that will give you something to go look for in between here when we are transitioning documents. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Jim, thanks. That's a good point. A lot of this language is similar to what's in the registry part. So, Donna, I don't know how you want to tackle that, or we just go through with the edits I put in and then we'll go to the registry one and then both Jim and I can talk or whoever else made edits in that one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, what I thought I noticed is that there were more changes made to the RA one than the RAA one in the stuff where we have commonality. So maybe we can just pick this up in the RA conversation. So we'll just put a pin in this for now, and then we'll come back to it when we get to the RA.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, that's a good point, Donna. Maybe I'll just start then where I edited down at the RAA Section 3 since that's the uniquely registrar part. So on that section, thanks for scrolling down, there are three bullet points. The first and the third are sort of related to each other, so I'll do the second one first and then I'll go back, so backwards.

So the second bullet point is registrars provide web-based RDDS for all sponsor gTLD registrations sponsored by the registrar. It's interesting that they worded it like this because if you look below, they talk about RDDS as encompassing both the existing WHOIS as well as the new RDAP service, as both being elements of RDDS.

Therefore, interestingly enough, it's basically saying you have to have a web-based RDAP service for all registrations sponsored by the registrar but you also have to maintain your web-based WHOIS service for every registration sponsored by that registrar. Which if you look at all three of these together, what it says is that even though the current contract for registrars doesn't require you, at least for the existing WHOIS service, it doesn't require you to have a web-based WHOIS for your own instance of the current WHOIS service for Thick registries.

Indirectly, what they're saying with these three requirements now is you have to run your own instance of both the legacy, this existing WHOIS service, plus your own instance of the RDAP service for all registrations including those with Thick registries. So that's kind of indirectly what they're saying here. I'm not sure that they meant it that way, but of course these three points are still under discussion. And, of course, as Jim says, we have to talk about the web-based WHOIS.

At the end of the day, what this is saying is that registrars are required to provide their own instance of RDAP at least for all registrations they sponsor. They are required to have a web-based version of RDAP. And indirectly, they're required to, at least until the full transition date, also have their own web-based RDDS service or existing WHOIS service. Which is not something I think we agree to.

Can everyone still hear me?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, we can hear you, Jeff. Well, certainly, I can.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Good. Okay, so then the next part is the WHOIS accuracy specification. What ICANN wanted was to change all the references from WHOIS to the term registration data. There are six references in this specification to the term "WHOIS" including the title. But there's no definition anywhere in the agreement of what is "Registration Data." There are some lower case references to registration data and there is some talk around what it could be, but there's no definition of "Registration Data." So if we're going to put that in, then we need a concrete definition.

It's hard to come up with a definition though because of all the policy work that's going on now with the EPDP and the IRT for Phase 1. So my recommendation for this one would actually be to not make those changes and let them flow once the EPDP is done. But I guess in theory that should be done—well, I don't know if we'll be able to define Registration Data from the IRT in Phase 1. I'm not an expert in that PDP.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Jeff, just on that point, I know Beth is on the call and is pretty close to the IRT on Phase 1. So, Beth, do you have [any views] on this? Because [the thing to me is that] we're doing a lot of work here that could end up being overtaken. Given this is a [inaudible] lead time that [inaudible] we could [inaudible] or overlapping or running into one another. So, Beth, do you have any views on that? Sorry to put you on the spot.

BETH BACON:

No, no worries. I really apologize. I'm getting every fourth word, so what I got from your request was do I have feelings on the WHOIS accuracy section with regards to how it might intersect with the IRT and the forthcoming consensus policy. Is that correct?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, kind of, but I think in my mind it's bigger than that. The IRT is doing a lot of work and there may be implications for what we're doing or vice versa. I just wonder from a timing perspective, what challenges are we're going to run into given that there are two or three separate pieces of work that are going on at the moment.

BETH BACON:

Okay, yeah, no problem. I think it's important to cover, and I actually was just having this conversation because I saw the WHOIS 2 RDS review report came out and it's 200 pages and I was like, "What is this on?" I was like, "We have so many WHOIS things going on and RDS."

So right now for IRT the plan is to have a consensus policy out for comment on March 1. Again, that's the plan, the target. So following that, it's the 30-40 days of comment and then the standard turnaround time of going back and reviewing and responding to comments. So that can take quite some time.

Whatever we put out there, there's certainly no secret as to what is going to be contained in the consensus policy because it's just making a policy out of all of our recommendations from the final report. But I do think it would be good for us to go through this, and I'm going to let you know very clearly I have not gone through these documents to see where they would intersect with different items from the EPDP Phase 1. And remember, we have Phase 2 coming as well, and that will for sure impact these things that we're talking about.

So I do think that would be a really worthwhile exercise for us to do just to see even if it's just flagging so that we know that there might be an

intersection and we can future proof it to the language to the extent we can. I think that would be really helpful to all of us so we don't have to do this again. But, yeah, I'm not going to pretend that I have gone through this all and mapped each one to the consensus policy at this point. But I do think that would be a valuable exercise.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Beth. So, Jeff, not really answering your question, but I think for all of us to be mindful that what we're doing here, we will need kind of a sanity check, I suppose. Beth, as you say, just making sure that there is no overlap or duplication or intersection in some way that's going to compromise what we're doing here. And then if there is and we identify that there are some potential problems, then we're going to have to have a conversation about how we manage that. So it's probably important that we do that sanity check in the short term rather than the longer term. So I don't know if that helps, Jeff, but go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks, Donna. It does help in the sense of it we're going to have to create a definition of registry data, then it needs to be consistent with what's going on in those groups. So I do think that helps, and I'm not the expert in that area. And as Catherine in the chat just mentioned that it's pretty much the same situation in the registry agreement to the extent that there's not even a definition there that we can draw on.

The next set of comments. Oh, sorry. Then there's also for the next specification called the RDDS WHOIS specification, they want to remove the parenthetical WHOIS from the title. Okay, I don't think that's a big deal if we work everything else out. I'm not sure that does anything other than removing the term WHOIS. But what doesn't make sense is

just two lines below that it talks about RDDS being the collective of WHOIS services and registration data access protocol. So they want to change a bunch of references away from WHOIS to registration data, but then they want to keep in the term WHOIS services here.

It's confusing and it's inconsistent, and I'm not sure why they want to do that. So I think that's just something I'm trying to figure out their motivation for wanting to do that. Although I do note that in the service level matrix there are some that are for the WHOIS services and some for the RDAP services. But I don't understand how that interacts with the accuracy program where they wanted all the references to change. Donna, sorry, your hand is up. Donna, you're still on mute.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yes, I am. Sorry. I'm just wondering whether—I'm not sure why ICANN has continued to use this, but perhaps what they're trying to get at is the fact that WHOIS services did have a meaning prior to RDAP. So what they're trying to do is capture that that is the case. Perhaps what we could suggest is the collective of what was formerly referred to as WHOIS services. Maybe that would overcome it. I don't know for sure why they've wanted to keep that in there, but it could be just to acknowledge that it did exist prior to RDAP.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I mean, that was one of my thoughts as well. But then in the bullet point in the WHOIS accuracy program specification, they wanted all references changed from WHOIS to that new term registration data. It just seemed to me inconsistent, so I'm probably missing something but I'm not sure what it is.

DONNA AUSTIN: Rick's hand is up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Rick?

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Jeff. It might have to do with the fact that we're going to be talking about the concept of WHOIS sunset because that would actually refer to the Port 43 service that's being sunset. And other elements or concepts that are going to remain are things where the word WHOIS is still included presuming that something like what is the capability formerly known as WHOIS accuracy that they might want to pivot over to calling that RDDS accuracy as an example. But overall, it might have to do with the concept of WHOIS sunset and just seeing that term WHOIS fade away out of the nomenclature and lexicon. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks, Rick. That is possible. Especially if they wanted to define the term registration data as the former WHOIS data, then that would make sense. But it could be, yeah. We'll just ask them that question.

So then again there's another kind of reference here about updating things via the endorsement of the stakeholder groups. That Jim will talk about in the registry agreement, so I'll skip that for now.

Then the next comment I had was there's a section that says add Sections 2.2.10 through 2.2.18. My assumption is that means that what they want to add there were the relevant parts of Section 1 through from the February 6 document. And in both this version and the in the

registry version I attached the wording of that document to the end of both of those documents. So if you wanted to look at what was agreed to, you can go back and see it. So that's just kind of a placeholder.

Then interestingly enough, the legacy WHOIS service, what they're saying was RDDS, the SLA is not 2,000 or 2 seconds. It's actually less than or equal to 4,000 milliseconds or less than or equal to 4 seconds. So I corrected that. I didn't want them to increase or decrease the amount of time in the SLA because that's not what's currently in the agreement.

For both the registry and the registrar versions I crossed out the 2,000 milliseconds because they list that as the goal performance SLR. That was never discussed or certainly not agreed to in that February 6 document. That was a new add that we should push back strongly on.

Now I put this paragraph in. I added it, but I need to revise it. I just didn't get around to it because there actually is no equivalent in the registrar version of this emergency threshold. But I was thinking of it more in terms of just a breach of contract. The way I'm going to revise the section, because it was in the February 6 document for registries as an emergency threshold, I was going to actually reword this to such a way that basically says that until the transition if the legacy WHOIS services are considered available, then that shouldn't be a breach of contract. So just I'll revise this language to be similar to the concept of the registries and the emergency transition. Sorry I didn't get a chance to finish that paragraph, but that's essentially what I'm going to try to do in that one.

Then below this they have their timeline. But then, did I put some more in this one? Yeah, I just added this is the February 6 language. Now that

comparable provision if we do want to go to the registry agreement just since we're talking about it, if you could scroll down up above the title line, it's really interesting what ICANN did without telling any of us. The provision as it was on February 6 is what I copied in here, the emergency thresholds.

ICANN interestingly enough changed it to basically say that only during the ramp-up period would this count or would this come into effect. In other words, what ICANN did on their own—which is not what we agreed upon at all—ICANN added in and said, “Okay, well, we won't consider emergency transition if you have one of the two services up during the ramp-up period. But if it's after the ramp-up period but we still haven't transitioned to only RDAP, then we are going to say it violates the emergency threshold.”

And that's not what we agreed to. So I thought that was pretty sneaky that they didn't even point it out that there's a real change to the meaning with what they put in. So I thought that was kind of, well, in bad words it was bullshit basically what they did. It's not a great contractual tactic.

All right, Donna, hands raised.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, thanks, Jeff. Just back to that goal SLA. I may have missed the call where there was a conversation about that, but what's the difference between—Sue, can we just scroll back up to that? Do we have it? Yeah, just there. Thanks, Sue. So what they're saying here is that they'll start with less than or equal to the 5,000, but ultimately what the goal is is to get to 2,000. Is that what they're saying?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, and interestingly enough, they have some language in the RA in this document saying that we need to come up with a process of getting towards that goal and making that goal the enforceable SLA, but that was never agreed to. In fact, it was just the opposite. We told them that if the SLAs were going to change, it had to be by mutual agreement and that this 5,000 milliseconds needed to be the SLA, and nothing about this goal was even remotely agreed to.

DONNA AUSTIN: Do we know why they've introduced this?

JEFF NEUMAN: I think it's mostly because of perception and it's where they started from initially. It's because the existing SLA if you go to the WHOIS services query RTT, that's at 2,000 milliseconds and they want it to look like to the community that by going from RDDS to RDAP there's no change in service levels and everything is just the same as it was before. But we've said to them on many occasions that that's not true. There are more things we have to do here. It's untested, and we can't just automatically without ever really operating it in the full form agree to this higher SLA.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks. So question for the group as a whole—and I see Jim has said confirming what Jeff has said is that ICANN always wanted the 2,000—so this seems to me something that is not negotiable. So it's the 5,000 because that's what was previously agreed with the other group, so we're not moving on this.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Donna, and I did make that statement at the very end of the call, the last one we had with them. It may have gotten lost because it was the very end, but I agree with that. I see Rick has his hand up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, yep. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much. In addition to the points that Jeff made and the point that Jim made in chat, I'd offer that there's really no reason in today's environment for this goal to be any lower because the only folks that it would benefit would really be those that are interested in very high performance, which would be the kind of people that would be mining an RDDS service.

So it's extraordinarily unclear why it would be in anyone's interest to be pushing people, either registry operators or registrars, to be making technical investments to improve the responsiveness because for all normal users that are operating under reasonable thresholds of usage 5,000 milliseconds is perfectly acceptable as an SLA because most operators are going to exceed that under normal operation. So it's only the people that are going to be basically mining the RDDS that would really be interested in a much higher SLA. For casual, normal users they really don't need it. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Rick. I think that context is helpful.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Then one of the last points, if you look below this chart—the real small wording below the chart—this is the same as in the registrar document. They said contractual compliance enforcement for WHOIS Port 43 and web-based WHOIS will be in place until RDAP performance matches WHOIS performance.

There are a whole bunch of problems with that sentence. Matches WHOIS performance is a subjective test that just doesn't make any sense. So while this could at the end of the day be a little bit longer, in contracts you like to have certainly and so you would essentially put in that contractual compliance enforcement will be enforced until the complete transition. We can't have some sort of subjective measurement of matching performance.

But also if you look, the SLAs are different because under the existing WHOIS service it's 2,000 milliseconds but for the new RDAP service it's 5,000. And this also is another indirect way for them to say, "Oh, no, no. You have to get to 2,000, otherwise your performance is not matching and therefore we're always going to require you to have Port 43 and web-based WHOIS until you get it down and allow us to measure it under 2,000 milliseconds." And, as you're saying, it's not apples to apples. So that whole thing just doesn't make sense.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So, Jeff, on this one, is this related to the WHOIS sunseting?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Well, I would make it related to the WHOIS sunseting so you can have an objective date. This is very subjective the way they've worded it, and it doesn't have anything to do with the transition. It just says until you

get your RDAP performance level to match your WHOIS performance—which is so vague—we’re going to contractually enforce the SLAs for legacy WHOIS. Even though it may end up being a longer period, I’d rather just keep it objective and have an objective test instead of this subjective one.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Right. So I agree that I think it’s a date that this should be driven by. I guess the question that I have is whether there would be some overlap in contractual compliance enforcing for the WHOIS and also for the RDAP. And that’s part of the discussion that we still have to have is whether the WHOIS sunseting is a cliff edge or whether it’s stretched out a bit. Sorry, Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Donna. In the interest of trying to move it forward, one of the ways that this might be advanced in a direction that’s more positive, we might say it comes into effect not when the performance meets WHOIS SLAs but when the RDAP performance meets the RDAP SLAs. In other words, there might be a period of time when RDAP is running but not meeting SLAs, but then when it comes into being within nominal ranges then that’s when it would make sense to be effectively having the transition. I think the issue might not be getting RDAP to run in accordance with some SLAs, but rather it’s the wrong comparison point that ICANN is trying to make. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, so that’s one possibility. The downside of doing something like that, Rick, is that you basically now have—so let’s say they said

something like until you can show you've done three months of RDAP service meeting these SLAs and then we'll convert over and not do the original, the problem with that is that it would be different for every single registry and registrar. So there's not one common window when they would cut over to only enforce the new RDAP.

So we would just need to think about, is that something we like or don't like? I would think we'd want one uniform date certain that says that when we make the cut over or at this date certain that's when for everybody we're going to stop.

DONNA AUSTIN: Rick, is that a new hand?

RICK WILHELM: New hand.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Sure, thank you. That's a good point, Jeff. So maybe what there is sort of a transition window over a period of many months. I don't know six, seven, eight, nine months whereby a registry could transition if they met their performance thresholds, but everybody would have to be transitioned by a certain date. Something like that. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: What's the relevance of the language underneath? SLA monitoring for RDAP begins on the amendment effective date and contractual compliance will begin 180 days following the amendment date. So that's where they're talking about RDAP, right? So it looks to me like there are 180 days' grace before contractual compliance will start looking closely at RDAP. But what's preceding that, it doesn't really make any sense to me because of the language underneath. Sorry.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think what they're saying as we've discussed it was that they would monitor whether you're meeting the SLAs and presumably send you information, but it won't be an escalation or a breach of contract or anything like that. So they'll monitor it starting on day one and they'll tell you for this month your performance was whatever it was. But if you're in violation of the SLA, it's not going to be a contractual compliance issue until the ramp-up period is over. So I think you said it right. It's a grace period, but they're going to measure you during the grace period. They just can't do anything about it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Jim, I see your hand is up.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, thanks, Donna. I have a question. I heard something in this discussion going back and forth that just confused me a bit. Were we saying—I don't remember agreeing to this and I just wanted to be clear that we weren't trying to say this—that the sunset of WHOIS when we're talking about this transition from WHOIS to RDAP we are saying that we want there to be everybody doing it the same way. What I

mean by that is there's going to be an overlap in running both and then there will come a point in time when you can be done with WHOIS, whatever we decide the sunset date is. But it's not that you can stop running WHOIS when you are satisfied with your RDAP in some way or your performance is in agreement with ICANN in some way. Did I just mishear? Where are we going here? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I think what Rick was saying is that we can create some sort of objective test which basically has that end date certain where they'll stop measuring the WHOIS and Port 43. But I think what Rick introduced was the concept of saying something like there will be this transition period where we can apply some objective tests like during this nine-month if in the first three months you met the objective tests, then for you we're not going to do compliance on the legacy WHOIS service for the remaining six months of the transition period. But for others, if you're not able during the transition period of whatever time that is to have the SLAs up and running for a continuous period of time, then we are going to measure it against the legacy system up until this last date certain where we're going to only measure RDAP from there on out.

I think it's more complicated that way. I think it would be easier for ICANN and for the registries to just say this is the last date of sunsetting the WHOIS legacy services, and we're going to measure you on WHOIS legacy services up and until that very last day. At which point we're only going to measure you on RDAP going forward. Does that address, Jim?

JIM GALVIN:

So I see Rick's hand up. Maybe we should let Rick speak again and make sure we've got clarity on what each of us is saying. I agree with you, Jeff, but I want to let Rick come back and say what he needs to say.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Jim and Jeff. I'll take that as an invitation. Yeah, that is largely what I was talking about was a transition window for RDAP servers to come into effect and then have people phase out their WHOIS servers.

One of the reasons that I'm considering something like this is that it would, I think, provide the best way to encourage adoption across the community. The thing I'm talking about is somewhat more complicated than having just a hard cut over date whereby this is the end of RDAP and it's communitywide.

By having this be a phased retirement of RDAP, it's going to do more to encourage adoption rather than having a flag day for that where all of them go out of existence on one day. If RDDS service providers have a phased transition from WHOIS Port 43 to RDAP, it's going to be a more gradual thing that happens and it will be allowing the providers of the data to encourage the consumers of the data to make that sort of a thing happen.

If we as the RDDS service providers have everything built up to some sort of a flag day, I think what's going to happen is it's going to provide more and more motivation for people to say the community isn't ready. You need to put it off. And it becomes more and more of a thing like the DNS key rollover where a lot more pressure gets put on that date than might really need to be required. Whereas, if registries and registrars

are migrating over a window and are all doing their own communication programs, it puts less pressure on any particular flag day. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

I'm conscious that there are probably four people doing the talking on this call and there are more than that on the call. So I'm just wondering how other folks feel about the discussion that's going on at the moment. It seems that Rick might be convincing some of us that what he's saying is the way to go, but we do really need to hear from others as well. Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN KING:

Sure. I certainly appreciate what Rick is saying there. From my perspective in dealing with software development and people that need to plan which sprint to roll out, development changes into having a drop date or a transition date can be helpful. And I think Rick is entirely correct that as soon as you give a date, and especially when you get closer to it, you'll hear people screaming that it's too soon and that they're not ready. So perhaps strategically it makes sense to try to agree on a more ambitious date knowing that there's some transition period or some fallback date that we might be able to agree on. I hope that's helpful.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, thanks, Brian. Jeff has put in chat that we should do a flowchart of pros and cons. I think we do need to try to capture what's being discussed here so that we can look at the pros and cons. So, Rick, I'm wondering if you wouldn't mind just putting your thoughts on what we've just discussed, just wrap up where you've come from and maybe

that's our starting point for how we want to move forward on this. And maybe that's come up in the RA amendment, but I'm not 100% sure. So Rick says he's going to drop a note to the list, so thanks for that, Rick. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so I know that Jim wanted to talk about the—he did a proposal on the ways in which things could be amended. So should we jump back up to that? Because I know we sort of started at the end of the registry document.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I think it would be helpful if we did that. So, Sue, can you bring up the RA amendment document. Jim, that's where you've put in your comments? Or is it on this one?

JIM GALVIN: No, it's on this one.

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, okay.

JIM GALVIN: If she scrolls down a bit to the next page, management right there. It's right there in that management of the RDAP profile. I think that's the point that Jeff raised. Let me get a little bit about my thinking here with this and see what folks think about it. I've been reflecting on this business of updating the RDAP profile, and I'm wondering where ICANN is coming from. Part of this is born out of our old WHOIS legacy. So we

have in WHOIS this absolute specification of exactly what output is supposed to be like, and it's in our contracts.

And in the spirit of recognizing that this is new technology and things do work a little bit differently here, we're no longer specifying precisely what the output looks like, what the syntax looks like. Under RDAP versus WHOIS, this really is about what data should be offered up, and then the actual presentation of it is the responsibility of the client on the receiving side. And that's kind of the model going forward here.

With that in mind, I'm thinking about the fact that what the RDAP profile really should focus on—and it actually pretty much does here, and so this is more about reframing the messaging here so that we all see it this way if we agree and this works—but the obligation should be on what is the minimum dataset that's considered public that will always be displayed? And anything outside of that would be an exception. So it's the data that will always be present in a response.

Because I made the observation that any additional data that might be in a response based on a query is probably coming out of some other policy requirement or contractual agreement. That's the model that occurs to me. So it's not something that ICANN has to manage as all contracted parties. That's a one-off thing. There might be some advice that comes out of the EPDP with respect to the SSAD. Certain types of queries will get you certain types of data. But my point there is that's a different policy, a different set of rules. And whatever consensus policy they are, we'll adopt those as we need to. They don't necessarily have to be called out here.

So I think that in the spirit of just public information, that's kind of a one-off deal and the probability that's going to change is pretty small.

And I don't see any problem with just leaving that as a contractual thing if we reframe all of this in that way. I hope that makes sense. I'm sorry to be a little longwinded if it felt that way, but that's my thinking and I'm interested in whether that aligns with what people are thinking and how that might fit with where we're going. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. Beth, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

BETH BACON: Yeah, thanks. Thank you, Jim. Thanks, guys, for the comments. This is just a question on one small portion of what you said, Jim. You mentioned do we identify the minimum public dataset for a response and also said some of the other policies like the EPDP and SSAD are separate policies. However, I just want to flag for everybody back to the original time I weighed in the EPDP, the Phase 1 consensus policy, does identify the aggregate minimum dataset. And that's related to data that is collected and transferred or processed by certain parties. I do think that will impact what that minimum public set is because that's also in the recommendations. So I don't think we should ignore those because otherwise we're just going to have to change what we've done. But I do think that we should just flag this as one area where it certainly overlaps with existing policy. And it may give us an answer or not at all.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Beth. And I apologize for jumping in. I want to clarify one thing that I was using. I probably overloaded using the words minimum dataset, so let me try to reflect this functionally. I don't want to get in the way of the already existing definition of minimal dataset as you just

described it, Beth. That's what's documented there. What I wanted to speak to is the data that a response would always have in it because it is considered publicly available data. And we need to find some way to characterize that and give it a name. That's where I was going with this RDAP response profile is, what is the public data that will always be there? So I hope that helpful. Thanks.

BETH BACON:

Jim, that's super helpful, and I just wanted to quickly respond. That is also covered a bit in the EPDP report, so maybe it could help us as we do that, move forward with this. But that data that is considered public or not personally identifiable is noted simply, just like it is in the temp spec. So perhaps that leads us to what that minimum output would be with regards to the RDDS. Thanks. Sorry, Jeff, for jumping in again.

JEFF NEUMAN:

No, that's fine. If I can just restate what I think Jim is saying in this way is that I think what you're saying is that there really doesn't need to be a second method of changing the profile outside the normal contractual ways which includes what Beth is saying, the consensus policy or temporary policies. That would be the way to change the profiles. You don't need any other way, especially if we change ICANN's mindset to think about this issue a little bit differently as the parts that we really care about that would be mandatory are not going to change in ways other than through a consensus policy, a temporary policy, or the normal contractual amendment process. And that was one of the reasons. I see Jim's hand go up, so maybe I didn't understand. Sorry.

JIM GALVIN:

No, you're exactly right, Jeff. I agree with you 100%. I was going to dig into the details and mention one little specific detail that's in this, a distinction between registry and registrar. And that is there is actually a difference in what goes in the response with respect to the email address between a registry and a registrar, and that's the only real difference in these two response profiles. I just didn't want to lose track of that detail as we get into this. But otherwise, I agree with you 100%. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Oh, okay, good. I think that difference is why ICANN is insisting on registrars operating their own instance of RDAP even for Thick registries because there is a difference in the response. So as the registrars are still discussing that issue I think, and Graeme can probably attest to this, I think the registrars are starting to come around to understand that this is going to be a requirement. Now whether they can have it up and running as fast as ICANN wants it, that's a whole other story. But I think we're getting closer to the registrars understanding why that needs to be the case.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Jeff, thanks. I think that's probably a topic that we're going to have to keep hitting on in the membership calls, but I still think there are a few people who are not there but they're not paying enough attention. So we're going to have to keep hammering that one home a bit, and I'm going to have to lean on you for that help too. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: I seem to recall that on the meeting we had last week I think Jim and Rick were going to have a go at providing a definition of the RDAP profile, or is that something else?

JEFF NEUMAN: I think it was the RDAP service in general, not the profile but just what is RDAP.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right, because I think maybe it might be helpful to understand if there's any distinction between the RDAP profile and any other reference to RDAP as well. I mean, I think the only way to change it is— and just for context for some of our registrar colleagues that are on this call, we have a couple of other things going on with discussions with ICANN at the moment which seem to be coming up with different and novel ways that you can change the registry agreement without going through a formal process.

We had a brief discussion about this on the registry call last week that this maybe fits into that category. So this is bundled up in a higher-level conversation that we need to have with ICANN that if this is a change to the registry agreement, then the only way to do that is through consensus policy or through this RA amendment process. We have no way of doing—we don't have a way to endorse anything through the registry or registrar group.

I think probably [where they've] come up with that is, Jeff, when you develop the SLAs with that small working group then the registries and registrars did endorse that work or support that work. And maybe that's

true of the profile as well, so that's probably where that's coming from. Sorry, that was a bit longwinded.

We're at the top of the hour, so I think we need to call this. But a question of whether we feel that we can go ahead and have a next call with ICANN staff next Tuesday at this time and whether we want to extend that to 90 minutes. I don't think [inaudible] doesn't happen until the Wednesday. I think that's right. So if folks are okay with meeting with ICANN staff next Tuesday at this time, then we'll extend it, give it that extra 30 minutes at the end or the beginning just to make it 90 minutes. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, so I'll let others weigh in. I think we'll be ready, but I would like to—I know time's up—talk about what we want to give ICANN in advance. I don't necessarily want it to be this version with all the comments in it, but we should give them our redline or something so that they have a couple days to think about it.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, I think that's a good point, Jeff. If we want to take control of the agenda a little bit, I think it would be helpful if we shared something with them and identified the points that we want to talk about. The only way we can really do that is to do it online, or we can set up another call for Thursday if folks want to go over things. But does that work for folks? J.C., I'm reluctant to extend this out an extra week because some may see—optics might be that we're trying to slow this down. I know we're not, but if we can get this done next week. Graeme?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Donna. I agree. I would not extend it out a week. I think we need to show we're pushing here a little bit. And so if we can, I think we absolutely need to talk them through specific pieces and identify what they are ahead of time. We don't have time at this moment, so maybe we do need 20 minutes or a half an hour next week before that next call.

What we should also do is preplan what we want to talk about for our next working call because I think if we can make our homework more specific, then we are going to get I think better input on this call too and better results. So we should probably plan what we're going to talk about with ICANN and what we're going to talk about next with us so we can constrain both those conversations. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Graeme. So it seems like there's a recommendation for us to have a call before the call with ICANN next Tuesday. So looking at timing, Friday or Monday. I'm reluctant to do calls on Friday because we may miss people from the APAC region. But I don't think we have any people from APAC on this call, so we could shoot for Friday if that works for people. Okay, we'll take this offline. Graeme, is that a new hand?

GRAEME BUNTON:

No.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Catherine says it sounds [inaudible]. Yeah, so I think the same time. No, Jeff says no. All right, I'll take this offline with Sue. I think we'll do a Doodle poll, but we'll need some—yeah, that's true, Jeff. Yeah, Fridays for Europeans isn't great. Let me work with Sue to get a Doodle

poll out with the aim that we'll either do this on Friday or Monday. Maybe Friday early AM for the west coast. And Jeff I see [inaudible]. Okay, guys, thank you. We're three minutes over. Jeff, thanks for doing the heavy lifting and giving us something to talk about on this call. We will get a Doodle poll out tout suite and we will move on. Thanks, guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]