
RICK WILHELM:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Today is 28th May 2020. I hope everyone's doing well. This is today's regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP working group here with the ICANN team. Thanks to everybody for joining. We have a pretty good turnout. Thanks for all the EPDP-ers who were back to back. I know that's tough duty, so thanks for joining us.

I sent out the agenda last night depending on where you are. Hopefully, you had a chance to read it and walk through it. I've gotten notes from a couple of folks for Any Other Business. We'll have a couple of walk ons toward the end for the Any Other Business, so that's called somewhere between a teaser and foreshadowing depending on what part of the media business you're in. So stay tuned for that. We've gotten regrets from Catherine Merdinger. She's got a conflict, not able to join us.

We've got a little agenda bashing here at the beginning, so like I said, we do have some Any Other Business. Any other comments about the agenda before we dig in? Looking for hands. Seeing none, let's dive on in. Quick review of implementation status, so regular review of the URLs.

On the registry side, we dropped back by one URL in a raw count, down to 823 from the May 26th file that was issued just a couple of days ago. That's back from 824. As you know, we've been hovering around 823-825 for about four months now. It's been very stable.

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.

On the registrar side, we went up by a few, specifically by seven on the 5/21 version of the file up from 2328 up to 2335, so bumped up a few. And so that also has been gradually creeping up there every so often.

Any questions, comments, concerns about implementation status and URLs and whatnot? Very good. Seeing none, we will go on to new business. I added one here. There was an IANA IP address change at IANA.org that we noticed here at Verisign.

One of our folks, Jim Gould has a few more details there. Maybe Jim, if you could come to the mic and talk a little bit about what we observed at Verisign, and then I'm not sure if anybody else noticed this also. Jim, can you come to the mic for a second?

JIM GOULD:

As Rick said, we ran into an issue in downloading the RDAP base URLs based on an IP address change of IANA.org. I'm going to paste in the information in the chat window. But pretty much, based on our egress firewall rule settings, we had it set to the IP address. So when it changed, then we were not able to access IANA.org, thus could not download the RDAP base URLs.

The response from IANA was to set the IP range, which I included in the chat window, to resolve the issue. So if there's any future changes to the IANA.org IP address, it'll not impact our ability to download the RDAP base URLs.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks, Jim. So that was something that caused a couple of weeks—I think it was about two weeks ago or so, something like that. It had happened prior to our last call. We didn't have a chance to bring it up. So it didn't cause any kind of a big problem for us, because it only impacted for a short period of time. The DNS picked up the change without any kind of an issue but our egress firewalls kind of blocked the change in our side. So not sure if that caught anybody else a little bit by surprise. The change wasn't announced.

We didn't have any kind of a big beef with IANA over the issue because it didn't really cause any kind of a big problem. But it was an interesting glitch and something that we hadn't really anticipated. So anyway, anybody have any questions or comments? Or I'm not sure if anybody else noticed that. But if you'd like to make any comments, please feel free to come to the mic.

Thanks for the update, says Sarah. Very good. All right. Next one, RDAP profile iteration. I'd sent out an e-mail last night about one or two minutes before the agenda went out with a Google doc URL for the working versions of the response profile and technical implementation guide along with the issues tracking spreadsheet. So those went out. Interestingly, I had prepared those things around about last year, and so if you had a chance to click on those links, you would have seen that they had last edited date of May of 2019, which made me wax a little nostalgic. So they're set out so folks can look at those things. And if you'd like to start putting issues into the tracking spreadsheet, you can go ahead. So they're there for your perusing and looking at it and whatnot.

So there's the tracking spreadsheet and such. So as mentioned, those are public links. So please be mindful of that, don't post those in any kind of a public place. We don't want those links leaking out and whatnot and having those things trashed. I'd rather not get into a rodeo of doing by e-mail access control on those things. Kind of tedious as the document owner.

Anybody have any questions or comments about those? Should be pretty straight forward. Very good. Seeing none, just a real quick review of RDAP source complexity. There's that one that we've got hanging out from Jothan. He's not sent me any e-mail updates, and I don't see Jothan on the call right now, so I'm just going to keep that one on the proverbial backburner where it's been on very low heat and just kind of sitting there hanging around. We'll keep that around.

Meeting planning, ICANN 68 virtual, we don't have any particular plans to meet during that week. We're just going to let ours go. And we have our standing tempo, just like we did for ICANN 67. I haven't seen anything that would cause us to change that as of now, and our regular working group meetings biweekly until we need to change that based on workload from the EPDP IRT, or phase two.

And that brings s here at 22 minutes past the hour over to the microwave. So let's head over to the microwave, and we will start with the IRT. So we have any updates from the IRT this week? Looking for hands. There's Marc Anderson. Please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. The IRT, I think probably what we're most interested in is timing, and we don't have updates on either of those. I think probably the two things that we care most about is when the draft policy language would go out for public comment. I think the document you sent around is great and we can do some initial work, but I think probably when the draft policy language goes out for public comment, that's probably our cue that it's time to start getting to work. While not set in stone, I think that's a signal that the language is mature enough that we can have pretty good assurances that we're working on a reasonably fixed target and can start doing our work.

That's a roundabout way of saying we're not there yet. We don't have an estimated date for when that'll go to public comment. We also don't have timelines yet for how long it'll take to implement. Those are probably the two things that we most care about.

That said, I do feel like we're making good progress. The IRT seems to have settled into a pretty good cadence, starting—I guess it's been a couple months now, ICANN Org started sending around an agenda ahead of time. You would think that's standard operating procedure, but it was not in the IRT. But at the suggestion of Alex, who's on this call, staff started doing that. And that's really helped things immensely. We're able to come to those meetings much more prepared. We're moving through the agenda, covering a lot of ground.

So I think we do have a pretty good cadence and we'll eventually get there. But we're not there yet, we don't have dates on when we can [anticipate that public comment happening.] Sorry, I feel like I got a little wordy, but that's sort of the message I was going for.

RICK WILHELM: All right. Very good. Thank you, Marc. That's very helpful. We saw some comments from Sarah there in the chat. Very helpful also, thank you very much, Sarah. Anybody have any questions for Marc or any other additions? Good comment there from Roger also. Anybody have any other questions for Marc on the IRT?

Thank you very much for that, Marc. Very helpful. So now let's move on to EPDP phase two. Who'd like to—and Marc's back at it again. Go ahead. Thank you very much.

MARC ANDERSON: I haven't had my fill of crazy yet.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, there you go, more crazy, more better.

MARC ANDERSON: On the EPDP phase two, I've raised this with this group before, and maybe now is a good time to bring it up again. We're hitting crunch time. We're scheduled to wrap up phase two by the end of June. I frankly don't think that's realistic considering the amount of ground we have to cover yet. But as of now, staff and Janis, the chair, is perceiving as if we will.

To be fair, I think that's what they have to do. They have to do everything they can to keep us on schedule and working towards our timeline.

So bearing that in mind, one of my concerns and what I have raised previously is that there's a lot in the phase two recommendations that are left to implementation. And it's not very clear to me how much of the technical operation of the SSAD and in particular the interactions between the different parties, the requestor, the SSAD operator and the disclosing entity, whether it be the registrar or in some cases the registry has allowed for the policy recommendations will interact with each other.

So I think this is a concern. I don't know to what extent RDAP can or will be the solution to these questions, but I think that's the point I want to raise now for everybody in this group, is that the recommendations and where we are right now with the phase two work are not specific at all on how these recommendations are to be implemented. That means it'll be left up to implementation, and there's some risk in that. In some ways, it's better to not immortalize that in policy and leave some flexibility for the implementation. But that cuts both ways.

So I want everybody to be aware of that, and I think if you take one thing out of my update, it's that there's a lot of question marks on how the phase two recommendations will be operationalized. And for us as contracted parties who have to integrate with this system, there's a lot of question marks and unknowns for us at this point.

So that's my update, and I guess what I wanted to raise for this group specifically and flag for everybody here.

RICK WILHELM: Very good, Marc. Thank you very much. I think that's very helpful, and some good context for the group. Any body else on the phase two team care to comment, add in on that good update? Mark and Roger have also commented there related to that. Mark SV, please come to the mic.

MARK SVANCAREK: Actually, I thought Alex is up first.

RICK WILHELM: Did Alex beat you there? Alex, please go ahead. Sorry.

ALEX DEACON: That's okay. I'm not on the EPDP team officially, so I'll let Mark go first. I just wanted to add my two cents.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay. Yeah, the concerns that Marc A. mentioned are right. We're on a forced artificial schedule and we don't know how we're going to deal with the fact that there's a bunch of issues, some of which are charter issues, that haven't been addressed yet.

Another thing is it's not clear what the technical implementation will look like. I sent to the list the other day a privacy by design data flow

diagram, just to show people how such a design would work, and there's just a big cloud at the top that says, "TBD secure mechanism for exchanging disclosed data," because that's where we're at right now.

We know it's not RDAP, we don't know what it is. It's certainly not e-mail. So there's a lot of uncertainty there. And how it's going to interact with this team is unclear, and certainly, as Marc says, the more stuff we leave to IRT, the longer—and more contentious, presumably—the IRT will be. So those are some concerns. I'll hand it over to Alex.

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks. My two cents from the peanut gallery as I'm following the EPDP do their very difficult but important work, I think in terms of how that policy will impact or even rely on RDAP, it's unclear. As Mark said, much has been left to implementation, but from what I could tell, essentially, what is being defined is a glorified ticketing system and it's not clear that RDAP would be appropriate to even implement that.

So it may be, again, my opinion that at the end of the day, the SSAD itself wouldn't even leverage, or leverage very little the RDAP protocol. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Alex. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. Yeah, I was going to just add on, I was going to actually ask Alex or the Marks if they thought the same thing. It seems like RDAP will

have a somewhat limited role, possibly, just in the SSAD possibly sending queries to the contracted parties. And beyond that, it seems like there's not much room for RDAP, or anything that's current, actually, to be used. And I just wanted to see if Alex or the Marks thought anything different than that. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Let's see. I see Mark SV. Please go ahead, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks. Yeah, there's multiple ways you could design a system like this, and the way that we've decided to do is a decentralized asynchronous way. so it is possible that the request could come in using RDAP. We would have to extend the profile to allow more stuff in the payload. But that certainly seems feasible to me. But then you'd have to return something like "in process" or something like that. You wouldn't be able to return the data synchronously. And my understanding of RDAP is the session would have to [end there.] You can't just queue it up and come back later. Maybe I'm misinterpreting that.

So it seems like it could possibly be used in the initial request portion, and then just return some sort of error code or something like that, status code. But other than that, as long as we have a decentralized asynchronous system, I think it's going to be pretty limited. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Mark. Yeah, I would tend to agree with that general thinking and theme. Good stuff. Anybody else have any other comments that they care to throw in?

The longer the timelines and the more asynchronous it is, the less that RDAP is going to be a help in general. Very good. All right. Let's move over to IETF REGEXT as we pull some Gs here.

Let me see. I think Jim is here. Jim, do you have a brief update on our REGEXT perhaps?

JM GOULD:

Yes, nothing new, but a quick summary. We do have the two RDAP specifications that are imminently on their way to the IESG. That's the partial response addition to RDAP and the sorting and paging extension to RDAP. There's an editorial exercise that's in progress before our AD actually releases them to the IESG for consideration. But just a reminder to folks that those are now in the publication process and moving forward.

Other than that, I just generally want to remind people, especially here in the RDAP group, work in the IETF progresses because people have an interest and a desire to want to move the work forward. And therefore, you talk about it and we get some review. And I think the question that is in front of me at the moment is there is this reverse search discussion. There's a search document, a reverse search document, there of course is a limited search capability—very limited—that is described in the base RDAP specification, which only talks about an asterisk on the end of a label in a domain name for looking those up.

But ICANN has interest in search, and I just want to use this opportunity to ask folks to take up an interest in this work and be willing to move that forward. If you have an interest in providing searching in RDAP, especially if you're doing searching in WHOIS and you want to make sure that you can have that ability in RDAP at some point in the future, we do need that standard specification. And it's languishing right now in the IETF. It lacks a champion, and that's kind of the issue. And I'm hopeful that folks will want to pick that up and jump in there.

So that's it from me. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks, Jim. On the RA and RAA amendment, we are in the middle of a negotiation with ICANN. The contracted parties are. The Contracted Parties House met with ICANN Org on Tuesday and ICANN gave feedback on the contracted party house language. So that discussion is ongoing. And the next meeting between the two parties is probably not going to be next Tuesday but probably the following Tuesday, the 9th. In-between there, Contracted Parties House is going to be working on their taking in ICANN's responses and working on its responses and such. So that work is ongoing.

So if you've got more detailed questions, you can talk to the folks within either of your stakeholder groups that are closer to it, to get more into that.

And then let's see, ICANN feedback on the NSP, name service portal for improvements on the name services portal. Karla just put in the chat no updates, so we don't have any updates there. So that brings us to Any

Other Business. I had a couple pins on Any Other Business. So I'll let hands come to the fore if folks still have those pins on Any Other Business.

Looks like Mark SV's hand is up on Any Other Business. Please go ahead.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thank you. I was listening to a conversation yesterday in RySG—because we're a remember of that—and it was about RDAP SLAs. Apparently, there's some contract language changes going on—

RICK WILHELM: Hang on just one quick second. Just let me remind you that we're in negotiation with ICANN and ICANN reps are on the call right now. So I just want to use—I'm not sure what the rest of your sentence is going to be, but just hold on to that because this transcript is going to be published also. So even if Karla drops, it doesn't really help.

So just think about what it is you're going to say.

MARK SVANCAREK: Okay. I will think about what it is I'm going to say. Yeah.

RICK WILHELM: You're a pro. Just be mindful of that. Proceed.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Okay, so it's about a use case that wasn't mentioned in the discussion. There were some claims about use cases that I did not think were correct, and I wanted to just mention a couple things. One, that I had actually talked about this in a Tech Day talk back in Montréal—I don't think very many people saw it. I think I sent it over to Jim, so maybe he saw it—that explains some of our use cases for public data. And there was a discussion about why does anyone care if it's X number of seconds versus Y number of seconds, because one-off consumers won't care, they won't even notice the latency, most likely. And the only people who would care are harvesters, I think was the term that was used.

So I'll put my talk here just so everybody knows what I'm talking about. You can peruse it at your convenience. There are valid uses of the WHOIS data, which presumably will be moving over to RDAP, which are service to service. For example, examining the attributes of an online transaction. And of the public data, creation date is an important one to look at.

Now, if you can imagine all of the payment card transactions that go on, something that takes multiple seconds is already kind of a nonstarter. So multiple multiple seconds is even worse. So there actually are use cases where differences in SLA on the number of seconds level would be important, and the way to get around that would be to cache the stuff for a period of time, but then you would fall into that category, so pejoratively known as harvesters.

So I think these things should be considered while creating practical SLA numbers. That's all I'm saying. So the link is in the chat. I've said

everything I needed to say. Feel free to ask me questions about it if you want. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM:

Got you. Okay. Thank, Mark. Very good. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Sure. Thanks. I'll just add a comment here too. I like where Mark is headed with this, and I guess I'll just add a related comment about some of all of this effort. There is often these discussions about the user of RDAP and what really is it going to be used for, who uses it. And I do struggle with kind of the issue that Mark is talking about here. Who is really going to notice these SLAs and what values should they really have? And it's important to think about the fact that the SLAs serve particular communities for particular purposes.

It's always been my personal view that bulk access to data should be an entirely different class of usage and I always fear—I think one of the points that Mark is getting at here that we've got these interesting SLAs, and we feel like we're driving those SLAs in order to serve a particular user community, a user scenario. And I've always questioned whether that's an appropriate user scenario. What is the real purpose of RDAP? And those SLAs, they serve a particular scenario. Let's focus on that and identify that and make that real. Other scenarios that had different kinds of parameters, let's deal with them separately. Bulk access in particular, I don't really have a problem with bulk access, but let's provide a mechanism and a means for dealing with that in a way that meets the needs of everyone.

The fact that this notion that RDAP should meet everyone's needs all at one time has always struck me as—I don't know where the origin of that requirement came from. Actually, I guess I do. It's legacy, right? That's kind of the environment we came from. But I feel like we have an opportunity here to think about this differently and do something different. So maybe Rick, to make this concrete for this group, as we look at version two of our profile, and we think about this kind of usage issue, and maybe we can have some thoughts about that and considerations that we might document as we're looking at version two of our technical profile that comes out of this group, especially as we get into authenticated profiles, I think that's a worthy consideration here. Are the SLAs more applicable to a per user kind of thing? And maybe we can have some guidance about that as we go forward. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks, Jim. Very helpful point. Good stuff. Anybody else have any comments on this one? Okay, seeing none, very good. Anybody else—there's Justin, probably an AOB. A new AOB, or a follow on to this one? Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTIN MACK:

Hi. Thanks, Rick. It's a new Any Other Business, just a super trivial comment if everyone else is done. I was kind of curious if the RDAP group may have been thinking about this. Maybe the IETF crowd potentially has heard about this too, but I've heard that in this era of

social distancing, many applications that are using TCP are being rewritten to use UDP precisely to eliminate handshakes. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: That's a good one. I wish you were on video so I could see you grinning, presumably behind your beard. I trust you still have the beard rolling.

JUSTIN MACK: Yeah, it's even longer now.

RICK WILHELM: It's even longer now. Yeah, I trust it's in fine form.

JUSTIN MACK: It's been a long month of April so far. Thanks for indulging me.

RICK WILHELM: That's a good one, golf clap. Very nice. I don't know, but that would have been a good April Fools RFC to publish. I'm not sure, maybe Scott would tell us right now, "Oh no, someone did try and publish an Internet draft around, in the age of social distancing, the TCP is being redone to avoid handshakes."

That might be the highlight of my day right there, Justin. Maybe April Fools got distanced from April and so it should be celebrated on June 1st to give some distance from April. Thank you, Justin.

Let's see. Any other Any Other Business on today? Not seeing any other hands, let's take a quick look at the diary here. By my math, we should be sitting here on June 11th. My calendar is up to date, and so I see us out there, June 11th. That sound good to you, Sue?

SUE SCHULER: Yeah, that's what I have.

RICK WILHELM: All right, so hopefully everybody's calendar is up to date. If you don't see it marked on your calendar for the same time, same station, June 11th, please let Sue know. And so with that, I think we will wrap it up for today. Thanks all for your time and attendance and participation and engagement and all that whatnot. Everybody stay safe, take care, and enjoy your time with someone that you care about. Sue, take us on out of here.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Rick. Julie, we can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]