

RDAP Work Group

12 September 2019

---

SUE SCHULER: Great, thanks. Okay, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Today is 12th September, 2019. This is our regularly scheduled meeting of the RDAP Working Group. I'm Rick Wilhelm from Verisign. Thanks to everybody that's joining here. This is of course the week that ICANN's hosting an EPDP face-to-face out of Los Angeles. Some of our typical folks are busy out there, so we may have a slightly reduced crew. But I can see here on the chat that we have a pretty good crowd. I think from prior experience, just in looking over the names here, that the Iowa Running Company -- I think that's somebody from GoDaddy. I'm not sure if it's --

RICH MERDINGER: Hey Rick. It's Rich and Jody here.

RICK WILHELM: Rich and Jody, very good. Thanks for joining us. I'm not seeing anybody listed only as a phone number, so that is our set of folks. So we've got a pretty big agenda. Hopefully folks have had a chance to read the note that I sent out this morning, early morning Eastern Time. Want to do a quick bit of agenda bashing. We do have on here the walk-on topic from Justin that he had mailed in late last night, or early this morning. I don't exactly remember which. And we have some other threads that are that are going on here also.

---

*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.*

Anybody have any new topics that they wanted to bring up, or any comments about the sequence in which we'd like to tackle any of these? Certainly open to taking any input on those things. We'll hold here for a minute and look for any hands or comments in the chat. All right. Not seeing any. We will go ahead and be very quick as much as we can.

Just some quick notes here on the implementation status. You can all see the numbers that are posted there, as far as progress as of the 9.4 edition of the registry bootstrap file. There are 817. Sorry, 823. That's up six from couple of days prior. We don't yet have a newer file than 9.6 from IANA, but we'll be getting one of those shortly.

On the registrar side, we've got 1,974 from the September 11th update. That would be yesterday. And that's up 24 from the prior week or so. So, it's still steady progress on that front. Any questions or comments about that one? Very good. Seeing none.

Real quick touch base on our Working Group for ICANN66 in Montreal. It's been generally confirmed that the RDAP Working Group will be meeting in the 10:30 to 12:00 am slot, using CPH TechOps time. I'm not sure of the RDAP Working Group is going to appear -- how that's going to be balanced in the schedule, but that's when we're going to be meeting. Sue, any comments on that front?

SUE SCHULER: No. I just need to still touch base with Zoe. But it will be listed separately in the schedule, so people will be aware.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much for that, Sue. Any questions or comments about ICANN66 Montreal?

SUE SCHULER:

Yes. Just one comment on the public session on Monday. You can see that I put that this has to move. I got an email about two hours ago now, that the welcome ceremony is being moved back into the morning slot. So now, this is in direct competition with that welcome ceremony. So we do have to move it. I've got a couple slots I'm looking at a little later in the day, and I'm thinking it's probably going to fall in around 3:00 or 3:15 -- around that time.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Very good. So still on Monday, but sometime around 15:00 to 15:50 -- something like that -- in the middle afternoon. Thank you very much for tracking that, Sue, and helping to keep all of us informed. Anybody else have any questions or comments about ICANN66 Montreal? Not seeing any.

Let's move on to the topic of the statuses. You can see the response that we got back from Russ and ICANN Support on this one. This is originally a question from Jim Gould. Jim had privately given me regrets that he's not able to make it today. So you can all read the comment here from ICANN. Any comments or questions about this one? Seeing none. We will probably take that one up on the list, I think. To me, while I hear and understand the response here, I'm not certain that the goal of user friendliness is achieved by altering the results that are given back. But that's something that we can separately discuss, I guess. So that's something that we can take up.

We're going to move on from this one. And go over to the notion of the response from ICANN regarding the feedback on, what I would call, quality control on the bootstrap values. Now, one of the things that's

interesting here that I'll note is the first line in the ICANN response there. It says, "Below are the tests IANA completes on the RDAP links prior to posting them to the IANA Registrar RDs registry." I find that a little bit surprising because I didn't know that IANA was testing RDAP links before they went into the IANA Registrar RDs registry. That's a little bit surprising to me. I know that IANA does that to the bootstrap file but it was not my impression that IANA was checking this extra column before ICANN. Anybody have any comments or insight on that topic? Justin, please go ahead.

JUSTIN MACK:

Hi, thanks Rick. It's interesting that they do number four -- that positive test with the demand to expect the successful status code of 200 and not 400. Only because it seems to be difficult to know which domain that registrar has under management, if it's not the same domain as the RDAP URL itself. So I guess I'd be curious on how that works. Possible feature suggestion here for ICANN in the Radar system is, "Hey, you insert your RDAP URL, and here is a test domain that should be successful." I think that'll clear up a lot of problems. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Justin. An interesting suggestion, because I think that your point about how do they know what domain to test, is a very good question there. Jim Galvin, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks Rick. I guess I'm struck a little bit by their point one -- URL should start with HTTP or HTTPS. I thought that it's required to be

HTTPS, isn't it? That's what our profile says. So, don't know why they would allow the other.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Jim. That's also my understanding. I don't have the profile open here on one of my screens in front of me, but yes, HTTPS is not really in doubt -- is certainly my recollection on that front. We did talk about certificates, but that's a different option. Jim, please go ahead, again.

JIM GALVIN:

And then the second thing that I would offer is, I'm not sure I understand what number two means, quite honestly. On the one hand, it'll be added for testing. Well, aren't they testing? Isn't that what three and four are -- is they're testing? So, I don't know what that means. Does that mean if it ends with a slash, they don't do three and four? There's just a little bit of clarity that's missing there.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. Thank you, Jim. It's unclear about why I think to your point -- actually to your both of your points -- it's unclear why these are should's in both of these (using IETF terminology) and not musts. Because the notion that something like the must on HTTPS seems to make sense, and the must on the ending with slash seems to be certainly simple enough to enforce. Anybody else have any comments interrelated to this one? Okay. So I think that the next thing that I'll do here on this one is probably respond back to ICANN regarding the question about, "Is IANA doing the testing or is ICANN doing the testing?"

And then, just to get clarity on that. And then a couple of these other points that Justin -- that you had suggested about how do they know what domain to test, and a suggestion that the registrar could add a domain name that's testable in the Radar tool. And then lastly, Jim's points about HTTPS and the ending with slash. Any other comments related to that one? All right. We'll work on keeping that open.

Just as an FYI, I had to ping ICANN today. ICANN's Support Desk, they were trying to close out the ticket, so I had to explain to them that I was in discussion with the Working Group. So, that's something that's going to be required there.

So let's move on to the next one. This one has to do with the timing of the Registrar RDs .XML file. And I'm guessing here that this is going to be probably our most vigorous topic of discussion. There's a fair bit of content here. We have a post from Michele that he had sent. And then we have a post from Jim Galvin. And then, I believe also lower down here, you can see some comments from Russ. And then a further comment from Justin. Obviously the screen is only so big, so we're not going to be able to have everything on the screen. Let's just go for whoever wants to come to the mike. I see Jim is here first. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks Rick. The post from Russ, the problem here is, he's not answering the fundamental question. I get that they want people to use MoSAPI, registrars kind of have their own issue with wanting to use their own Radar. I guess I'm not sure whether that's MoSAPI on the back end or something else. But the fundamental issue here is, there are two databases; when and how do they synchronize? And he's still

not answering that question. It's great that there's an SLA for each one. What are they doing on the back end to keep them harmonized?

RICK WILHELM: Very good, Jim. Anybody else have any comments that they want to add in? Go ahead, Justin.

JUSTIN MACK: Thanks Rick. Yes. I agree that they're still not answering the question of how are the systems working on the back end. I tried to summarize it in my, maybe verbose, post. I think the ultimate question seems to be to registries -- is there a consistent time frame that we can query this information? We can use MoSAPI and it's updated near-real time, but how often should I, as a registry, pull that information in? And then, as a registrar, how will I know when the registries will get that update? So I think there's some fundamental synchronization issues across to all of the contracting parties here. I welcome other thoughts on this. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Rick. Justin's right. And I think that that's kind of the point and the [inaudible] that I want to get to. So let me take this discussion to what the next step is going to be. I am trying to get to a point where ICANN is clearly documenting what the SLAs are on their side and the relationship between them. We need to know what that is. And ultimately, where this discussion is going to get to -- and Rick, you get to say whether or not this is in scope for this particular group -- but the

issue that I'm really concerned about here is, as registries, and ultimately as registrars, we're subject to certain SLAs, in terms of availability and in terms of providing accurate responses.

What's going to happen here is, since even now, registries are required to provide that pointer information to the registrars in how to get more information. What's going to happen here? Are we going to be held accountable -- let me phrase it differently. I want to ultimately know what the relationship is between these SLAs and the SLAs that we are accountable to. There is a disconnect here. And we're going to get to that question next, once we understand what they have.

And so, I find Russ's comment -- that the IANA system is not subject to the ICANN SLAs -- that's also an issue, and that's going to be a problem. And we have to figure out what the downstream effect of that is on our individual SLAs. And we've got to get all of this sorted out. That's where I'm going with this. Maybe we need to have a different discussion in a different forum. I don't know, Rick, what you think about this and where we want to go with it. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Jim. I don't see any other hands, so I'll just comment here. My main concern here is about the confusion about which data source is authoritative, because I think that ICANN is unnecessarily establishing that kind of confusion by the way that the MoSAPI is being updated, in terms of its direct reflection of what is in Radar, as opposed to the MoSAPI directly reflecting what is in the IANA database. Let me put that there on the side for just a second, Jim, because you were talking about SLAs. Could you elaborate?

Because, by posing the question, I don't want to necessarily imply that I'm disagreeing. But I don't necessarily see the direct connection. So maybe you could elaborate on it between SLAs at IANA and ICANN, regarding these URLs, and subsequent SLAs that are forecasted to be present in both the RA and RAA amendments. Because the SLAs that are there, they talk about availability and response time. And so, I'm not quite seeing how that is impacted by an SLA issue on these bootstrap URLs. Could you perhaps elaborate on that a little bit?

JIM GALVIN:

Sure. Thanks, Rick. There are two things that are on my mind that I want to walk through carefully, once I feel like I've got all of the right information on the table. So, in terms of availability, there is this question that -- when something appears, you need to know when something is going to be present, so that you know what your obligations are in getting an entry out there soon enough so that when you are obligated to be available with the service, the entry is there to represent that. Otherwise, you run into this issue of even if you stand something up initially, if the database hasn't been updated, your service might be valid but nobody can find it and they can't see it. And I'm wondering about the timing of those steps and how all of that fits together. So that's kind of one issue.

The other one is about transfers. What happens when a TLD transfers? When is the database supposed to be updated and at what point is the new operator obligated to the service versus the old operator? And at what point in time is ICANN going to be checking for that availability consideration? So it's really about timing. It's possible that there's really no issue here and that the rest of the procedures that go with initial availability and transfer availability will account for all of this, but

without proper information about, as you said -- I like your question, Rick -- where you said the real question here is, which one of these databases is authoritative?

That's a critical and important question. And if they're going to pick one over the other, that's worth noting. But if they're not going to pick one over the other, we need to understand the relationship between the two, and then we have to understand the relationship with what's here versus the availability obligations that we have. What is the timing of those things? So that's my question. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you very much, Jim. Good elaboration. Anybody else have any comments here? I want to make sure that we get a lot of voices to the mic. One thing that I would offer to that, Jim, is that I think as it relates to the question of transfer of TLDs, I don't really think that the ICANN to Radar IANA link is valid or impactful on the question of availability for TLDs. Am I correct in that? Because the only thing that this is affecting is the registrar URL. Would you agree with that?

JIM GALVIN:

Yes, I do.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. So from that standpoint -- the question related to availability and transfers of TLDs -- that's probably more on the "pure IANA side", that when a registry transfer is taking place, to make sure that that timing is understood. And then as far as the other part, I think it probably does matter on the the ICANN Radar IANA linkage. That probably matters

most for registrars when there's a determination as to whether or not a registrar is going to be up or not.

As far as if ICANN is going to be monitoring these SLAs, which you URL are they going to be looking at, and making sure that ICAN is checking the correct URLs. That if a registrar's undergoing a transition or migration -- a technical transition for a registrar -- that ICANN is actually checking the correct URL that is in place. Is that a fair way to add a little bit more color around your comment there on the linkage between availability and the URLs?

JIM GALVIN:

Yes, absolutely. And honestly, I don't think that any of this is a hard problem and a hard discussion, but I just feel like the context here is not being brought out and we're not getting complete information. As you say, operationally, as long as we know what we're dealing with, there are steps that we can take to make sure that the right thing happens at the right time, and that we have to do this. But I just feel like ICANN is not being responsive in a way that lets us know what our obligations are and how those things fit together. That's all.

RICK WILHELM :

Thank you, Jim. Anybody else have any comments here? I think that we're making some progress on flushing this thing out. As far as in terms of a shared understanding on this. Any other comments on the topic? Let me work on trying to get consensus here about this notion. I think that the comments from Jim, and Justin and others that made comments on the thread, were helpful to elaborate this, as far as the issue. I think that it will be good for us to get to and ask a request, if you will. And as I think about this, right now the biggest issue that I see

is that that MoSAPI has a direct linkage to Radar without regard for what is actually been provisioned into IANA.

And I think that the request to them would be to have MoSAPI reflect IANA, as opposed to having MoSAPI affect what is in Radar, and introduce some decoupling there. Also, if a registrar put incorrect data into Radar, we wouldn't want that to immediately flow into the MoSAPI and get into the ecosystem and such. So I'm thinking of something that functions a little bit more as is typical of a modern TLD registries, where for example, a WHOIS server it is not directly linked to the database of record, but instead has its own persistence mechanism underneath it that is then populated after appropriate business rules are checked in and around the SRS -- populated very quickly, but decoupled nonetheless.

And so, I think that that would be the ask or the request, if you will, that I would like to see us put towards ICANN regarding the linkage between MoSAPI and the Radar database. Anybody have any questions or thoughts, agreement, disagreement? Do you think this is asking too much? Does it not go far enough? Is it a good first step? Any questions or comments around that? I see Jim Galvin has his hand up. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

I guess, in for a penny, in for a pound. I'll just say that I was trying to track that very carefully while you were saying it. And at least for right now, all of that sounded right to me. But as is typical in situations like this, I'd probably like to see it written down once so I can work through it more carefully, and look at it on paper before committing to it. I don't think you were trying to make that an absolute statement, but I'm just

offering that yes, good stuff, let's just make sure we still have yet one more chance to comment on it before we make it the final ask. I don't want for it to be interpreted as final until we've really had a chance to think about it and look at it carefully. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Jim. And certainly, understood there. I've typed it while you were talking. I typed a few words into chat to try and really boil it down here, regarding this thing. And I could even clarify that further -- decouple MoSAPI from Radar regarding the RDAP URL's. And that is, have MoSAPI reflect what is in IANA and that which is past testing. At that point, Jim, MoSAPI would be able to be authoritative because there would not be a gap or an inconsistency between what is in IANA. Because MoSAPI would essentially be a "caching proxy" for the data in the Registrar RDs .XML file. And so therefore, it would be, not front running what is in IANA, but it would be reflective, and so therefore, it would have authoritative data. Justin, please go ahead.

JUSTIN MACK:

Thanks Rick. Assuming you have that, that MoSAPI is authoritative in the sense that if you query it, it's reflecting exactly what's in the IANA Registrar RDs list. I guess my follow up question on that would be, based on the current messages earlier, that it's sometimes updated twice a week and eventually it would be back to once a week at varying times, is there a consistent timeframe that we could all be aware of, as registries and registrars? Would that help this discussion as well? Thanks.

RICK WILHELM :

Thank you, Justin. Let's wait for any comments back on that. I can throw in a few words. I don't see any. I think one of the things that this kind of thing would do is allow there to be a tempo/cadence/regular schedule about when Radar updates are quality-checked and then pushed up to IANA, and then that would therefore give this expectation and allow people to fix their plans around when these updates take place.

I think that the unpredictability of the updates for IANA is one of the things that's a challenge at present, and it's only exacerbated by the fact that MoSAPI is reflecting in a not QA'd real-time view of Radar, so they are even further and consistent. I think that the suggestion that you have there about getting on a schedule, is something that would be a further improvement. Anybody have any comments about that -- that notion of getting on a schedule? I think that that was a new plus one from Jim. There's Jody with his hand up. Jim, please go ahead. Sorry. Jodi, please go ahead.

JODY KOLKER:

I'm all for getting on a better regular schedule. It seems crazy to me that that IANA only updates once per week, when we believe that's RDAP. The RDAP list is gonna change constantly, probably for the next six weeks at least, I would say, while registrars are getting on board. I'm not sure why it's not once a day. So, I'm all for having it be more often.

RICH MERDINGER:

I'd like to understand better how changing a URL that doesn't get replicated properly will be impacting the SLA? And could it provide a mechanism for circumventing the SLA by just simply changing it immediately after the scheduled time, if it's only once a week? We can

basically limit the number of lookups we get by people that are leveraging one database or the other, by engineering our updates to coincide to immediately follow the prescribed update. Once a week is irresponsible, in my view.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you Rich and Jody. And that is an interesting thing where this gap could actually be undermining the effectiveness of the SLAs. And I think that this sort of gets to your amplifying a point I think that Jim was starting to make earlier, in honing it a fair bit about one of the unfortunate side effects there. I see in the chat you've got a plus one from from Gavin, also. Thanks Jody and Rich for both of those comments. Anybody else have any other comments on this one?

I typed in there -- and hopefully folks are on the chat -- about the request that I'd like to get some consensus around, asking ICANN to decouple MoSAPI from Radar and have MoSAPI reflect what is an IANA. And then we also have Justin's add in that others have plus one, about getting on a regular schedule. I'd like to see if I can get consensus around putting that as a request to ICANN for a way that they would change the interaction between Radar and the MoSAPI. Jim has his hand up. Please go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Rick. A friendly amendment to your question is, yes, we should go forward with that and do that. We're simply asking them to consider this and have them do the investigation on whether or not this can work and we can do this? That way we can progress this along very quickly. It gives us a chance to think a little more about all of these details where it's surfacing some interesting interactions here. And we do want to be

careful about this. And I guess I'm just falling back on my comment about not wanting to be too absolute just yet. But definitely trying to explore the right kind of option here that's gonna be good for everybody. We do need them to engage in these discussions with us in a more complete and timely way. It kind of stepped out of this group, and I think we're motivating the fact that they got to get back at the table. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good, Jim. Thank you. I think that's a good amendment there, as opposed to a request for action -- a request to consider and investigate. Those are two words that stuck there, Jim, from your comments that you made. So, how about that -- consider and investigate are options to allow the decoupling of the MoSAPI from Radar and have the MoSAPI reflect what is in IANA. And also consider and investigate options related to getting on a schedule. Do we get some consensus around that? Does that, Jim and others, sort of fit the bill there?

I got a checkmark from Jim and Justin in the chat room. Also Jody, I see. And Roger, also. Sarah has her window open but I don't think she's able to come to the mic. She's EPPing, I'm pretty sure. So I'll go ahead and make that request to ICANN. That's okay, Sarah. We were just seeing if you had opinions around this consensus topic that we're talking about -- that ICANN consider and investigate options to decouple the MoSAPI from Radar, and therefore have MoSAPI reflect what is in IANA. And then also, to get on a schedule regarding the IANA updates for the registrar RDs file. We've got something close to support there from Sarah. So we'll keep going on that one. Any other topics on this one? Thanks everybody for your comments there.

Moving on, this is a comment from Jim Gould that he brought up on the call last week. Gould does not happen to be here to carry this one forward. They wanted to offer some comments here related to this. There were some comments after I sent my note out. I believe that Mark Blanche responded at 7:40 a.m. Eastern Time (convert to your own time zone). Mark has the comment that really the referer, it does not seem like the best idea for this. And he thinks that the user agent is probably the best approach. This of course is late-breaking information after the note went out this morning. Does anybody have any comments related to this one that they'd like to bring up here? All right. Not seeing any. We will just move on and let this one go ahead. We'll see if Gould wants to take that up on email whenever he gets a chance.

So now, our item of new business here. We have a post from Justin, this morning Eastern time, that you can see here up on the screen. We've got Justin's text there. Justin, maybe you could come to the mic and offer a few additional comments.

JUSTIN MACK:

Thanks, Rick. Yes. I just wanted to throw a quick note in here. We try not to name any names, but in this case I have kudos that, I guess I'm also not naming, but multiple people of this group have been very helpful to me and each other, at least, in the sense of we're implementing our RDAP servers and RDAP clients. It's new, port 43 was simple. You connected to the socket and you sent your string of ASCII characters, and you read the response back over the wire. There wasn't much more to it than that. Whereas RDAP's HTTPS -- and so, we're all familiar with the web, but in the profile and in the RFCs for it, there's header values that should be passed, that need to be correct, both --

except headers from the client and the server on the various values. There's the course headers that's news.

So, there's metadata along with the regular data. It's just a little different than than we had before. And there's other information I've seen on various server outputs. Some registrars are redacting their own registrar contact information, because it shows up as an entity, just like registrant or technical contact. And so they kind of blanket apply all the entities the same, even though this is the registrar contact with their abuse information. And then the ones that are redacted, sometimes they don't provide a URL for contact, if they've not used an anonymized email address.

And then even with the MoSAPI and the IANA registry we were just talking about, even if the registrar has a URL listed, some of the servers still won't consume that and give that hint to pass the referral. So there's just a lot of issues surrounding this early release from both registries and registrars. And then I thought people in the group have been helpful and so I'm guessing I'm not the only one who's probably had problems with my own implementations from servers and clients. So overall message to the community is that hey, if you need some help come come out this group. And I think we are willing to engage to help everyone out.

I don't think we're in a competition with each other to make the most compliant RDAP server. I think it's in our best interest for all of us to have compliant RDAP servers with the RFCs and with the profile that we've released. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Justin. Good comments there. Anybody else have any suggestions around the lines of the things that Justin was talking about doing, or any comments related to that? I've got Jim Galvin in the queue. Jim, please go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: I agree with Justin. And I just want to add that I think that we have tried, and maybe there's more to be done. We can think a little bit about whether we might approach this a little differently, but certainly at ICANN meetings, when we've had our open presentations and those things, we do try to advertise and remind people that this is the place to be. If you're looking for help, you want some advice, you want to see how things are going, get one of your technical people to join this particular group and this list. Maybe there's more we can do there, I'm not sure. Maybe the individual stakeholder groups could say more, in their own individual forums. Maybe that's a specific suggestion that we can use in some way to go with others. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Jim. Good comments there. Anybody else have any points here? I think that the meetings that we do -- I'll just chime in on a couple of things in general agreement with what Jim and Justin are saying here -- I think that our ICANN meetings can go a long way to helping these things. This is why we're doing our our public sessions. Where we're not in Working Group closed sessions, but our public sessions that are talking about promoting RDAP overall. I think there is some linkage there between RDAP adoption and WHOIS sunset that the folks who are interested in WHOIS sunset would be interested in leveraging there to help promote RDAP adoption.

I think that it's important for all of us to keep talking within our own circles and promoting this group as a place where people can come to get some guidance on how to do this within the registry and registrar stakeholder groups, respectively. I think those will be good things. And then also, obviously, there's other things. We've seen a few articles on CircleID and things like that, which is also important for community education. Good comments. Justin, any other things you would like to chime in on here on this one? Justin, please go ahead.

JUSTIN MACK:

Yes. Thanks Rick. I think internally -- because I think this group's really good about being public and making it aware that we're here to help. It was just more of an overall comment that if anyone else needs another reminder, or if someone's struggling with something, at least refer them to this group and we can help out. And that some of these things aren't easy the first time around. It's a little bit of a learning process as we go through.

And I think further down the road when when ICANN Compliance starts looking at RDAP server implementations, both registries and registrars, they're gonna have their hands full with tweaking some of these -- at least, evaluating some of the nuances in these responses. We'll see if, maybe in next version of our profile documentation, if there's other things, we can add. And I'm not even clear on exactly what those might be, but again, more external feedback from potentially people outside this group that have used those documents to implement, would be helpful. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Justin. Great comments there. All right. Moving right along. We've got about 10 minutes left, which should be enough time for us to plow through five items in the microwave. So let's go ahead first with the EPP IRT, if there are any updates that we can get there. Let's see, who do we have from the IRT? We have Sarah. Anybody else on the IRT? Sarah's trying to nominate Roger and Jody. Anybody have any updates on the IRT that we can make? No material updates, says Sarah. Jody came and went very quickly. Jody, any comments?

JODY KOLKER: No, I don't think there's any material updates either. I was going to let Roger talk though. That's why I put my hand down. He did the same thing.

RICK WILHELM: Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: I would say, nothing major. We didn't have a meeting this week, and we will have one next week. But again, I think the big things are we're finalizing the last recommendations, and hopefully within the next two to four weeks ICANN will have a single document of all of the responses to the recommendation. So obviously, the February 29th date is not going to get hit. And that's one of the topics we're going to speak about next week. It's probably going to be much later in the year, maybe even summer, by the time that hits. I think that's about it though. Thanks Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you very much, Roger. Let's go on to the EPP Phase 2. Any updates on that one? Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. They just finished having the face-to-face meeting this week. So everybody's travelling home right now. My notes -- really not a lot that had to do with RDAP at this time, but also everything that they're doing has to do with RDAP, because it's all about disclosure of data through -- or maybe using RDAP as a technical method to do so. More specifically, there was lots of discussion about the system legality, but I think no conclusions drawn.

There were some legal questions that we got input on from Byrd & Byrd. The answers came back, and not everybody is super satisfied with those answers. Kind of a general question of do we need an overall system, an SSAD, as we're calling it? We are getting one. That has been decided. And then my own personal favorite question, who makes the decision about disclosing data, remains open and to be discussed, but will probably be affected by the form of the joint controller agreement that is being created right now. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: Very good, Sarah. That is quite the update. Thank you very much. I'm sure it was an interesting meeting out in LA. Anybody have any questions or comment regarding this? Not seeing any. We saw in the chat that Jim Galvin has no material -- IETF update. One thing I will offer is that there's discussions going on within CPH TechOps and a lot of overlap here between the groups, about the possibility of doing a joint meeting at ICANN66 Montreal between IETF RegEx and TechOps. That's the only thing that I'll add in there on IETF RegEx.

On the RAA amendment, I'll only give a brief update here and then Jim, you can chime in also. No real movement this week on the overall progress. There was some discussion about things like SLAs and when the negotiation -- sorry, not so much discussion about SLAs, more just a little bit of discussion about WHOIS sunset and probably more about the process and timing around the negotiations, rather than the actual negotiations themselves. There are some discussions about exactly how they'll be structured and what timing. We don't need to go into all the details here.

But regardless, we're not getting into any anything related to -- yet -- around the process of changing the RDAP profile and how that process will be accomplished. Jim, anything you'd care to add on that topic? That looks like a thumbs up, or a plus one or whatever you call that little symbol there with the clapping hands. Applause, he says. That's a new one. Jim must really not want to talk about it.

Right now we'll get down to the overall any other business. Does anybody have any walk-on topics that have come up in the last while that they'd like to bring up for discussion by the group? We've covered a lot of ground today, but glad to do that. All right. Not seeing any. Let's look at the diary. We are currently scheduled for the same time, same place next week on the 19th of September. That would be noon Eastern 5:00 p.m. in London. So Sue, I assume that schedule is still holding?

SUE SCHULER:

Yes it is.

RICK WILHELM : Very good. All right. One last chance for walk-ons? Not seeing anything, Sue, I think we can wrap it up.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**