
SUE SCHULER : Great. Thanks. Okay, Karla.

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. Thank you very much. Hi, everyone. This is Karla from ICANN for the second of [RAR] amendment discussions to include RDAP. As you had seen from e-mails yesterday going back and forth between myself and [Donna], which I think all of you are included, I sent everyone an agenda and the first one was—just to make sure that we get it on the record—is to establish a quorum which we have done.

And then I wanted to jump into the action items from the previous call but before I do, I just want to check and see if there's anyone else, if anyone has anything else to include in the agenda.

I don't see any hands or any comments, so I'm going to start moving forward.

Okay. So the first one is really more of a housekeeping issue. We were ... I thought we were going to try to schedule meetings through the end of January. I don't see anything on my calendar so I don't know if that's something that was sent out separately, but if not, I just wanted to check with this team as far as the week of the 13th and the week of the 27th, and then also to see if we could go ahead and commit to scheduling out through February which would be an additional two meetings.

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.

SUE SCHULER: The calendar invites went out. I'll go back through and send it to you again. I don't know why you didn't get it.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right, thank you. I appreciate that. And any thoughts about going ahead and scheduling out through February while we're at it since this is only going to have ... [inaudible] put it on the calendar. I agree, [Jeff]. Okay, let's go ahead and do that too, see if I can look to you to help me with that.

SUE SCHULER: No problem.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thank you so much. Okay, we had left off last time. We were going through some of those questions that we had sent out in, as the preamble to the summary of amendment changes that we were proposing and I wanted just to check in with this group, and Jeff specifically, to see if you had any comments that you had wanted to add relative to the preamble or if we should just start jumping right on in.

JEFF NEUMAN: Let's ... I have not had a chance to get comments. I've been a little delinquent with Thanksgiving holidays and a little bit of vacation here and there. So that's still on my plate to make sure I get the feedback from everyone else. So I will close that off or try to close it off by next week.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Thank you, Jeff. Anyone else have any thoughts on that for now?

I don't see any hands raised.

Okay. Let's go ahead and move to the next topic, which was the [strawman] proposal for the WHOIS retirement. I sent over a very basic outline of this as I don't think that it wasn't [complicated] by any means. I think based on the last conversation, this might be a little premature in that we will probably get to what this is going to look like as a group as we continue the conversation and the dialogue with the summaries and start diving into the amendment particulars.

So I don't know if anyone has any initial feedback on this. Happy to talk about it now. My recommendation would be to put this on hold at least until we get a little bit deeper into the amendment discussions. Any thoughts on that?

GRAEME BUNTON: I think that timeline was long in general, but you're right that we should mark that for the moment. And then I think we'll do some work on this to maybe put together our own [strawman]. And this is not my idea and I'm probably stealing from Jeff here too, which is we'll take a crack at what we think those tasks are for that retirement and that might drive the timeline itself rather than so we'll start from the components rather than from the end result and see where we get to. But I think that's not an urgent priority.

I will say that I polled membership. We had a good discussion of this on our RrSG membership list and the general consensus not urgent, but sooner rather than later.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Got it. That makes sense. Okay. It sounds like we are in alignment as far as that's concerned. Okay. With that in mind, might I suggest ... Now, I put this one out there. It was a 50/50 shoot here or coin toss in terms of which one we started with, either being the registry agreement or the RAA. So unless anyone has any other thoughts about which direction that we should take, I would say let's start diving into the registry agreement.

I don't see any hands up or different thoughts on that. Gotta start somewhere. Exactly.

So I'm putting a link to the summary here. I think Sue has got it posted. Thank you, Sue. Just in case you wanted to follow along in the document itself.

Okay. So starting off with the very first one, which is the Spec 3 format and content for registry operator monthly reporting. This is down on the bottom of page two. Thanks, Sue.

All right. I don't think that this is a lot of discussion really is required on this one. But this is adding Field 38 for RDAP queries. It incorporates it into the reporting. The one thing that I did add, which was responded to be consistent with the current RAA fields for WHOIS. So if that causes

any kind of angst with anyone, probably a good time to cover that at this point.

No angst. Yes, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN: I don't have angst, but maybe this is not the right time to do this and that's fine—you can just say that – we can deal with it later, that the whole sentence doesn't read well. So responded, received during the period. Maybe we could rephrase that. What is it you're trying to do there?

KARLA HAKANSSON: Have it be consistent with the WHOIS43 queries that's currently in the registry agreement. And I can go back and check, but I'm pretty sure that that was consistent with the way that it was. But I can double-check on that. I don't want to take up time here.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. I don't remember exactly what it says there either. But if that's what it says there, we should clean that up. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Got it. Any other comments? Hands up. Yeah, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: The edit should be “responded replaces the word received” is what the ... to make it consistent.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thank you.

RICK WILHELM: So the red line should be “responded replaces received”. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thank you, Rick. Okay. Thank you. Anything else? It doesn’t look like it. Let’s keep moving. Okay. [Inaudible] four section. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I’m trying to pull up the old version that I have. The parenthetical in there, I’m just trying to double-check right now that that was consistent because I don’t remember a parenthetical but I could be wrong. So just want to put just a placeholder in there. I’m just doing the comparison now, so we’ll ... It might not be an issue, but just wanted to put a flag.

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. I am looking it up myself. J.C., while we are pulling this up, you had your hand raised.

J.C. VIGNES: No need. Thanks. It’s been answered.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay, perfect. Okay. Sorry, I think everybody is opening up there.

So if I'm not mistaken, and actually, I can call this up too because I'm looking at the current WHOIS Port 43 queries and it doesn't have the parenthetical. I think it actually may be in the RDAP SLA document that was put together and that's why we've included it in there.

I'm just looking that up as well, and then if anyone else has that open.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Rick, is that a new hand?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, new hand.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Do you want to jump in there?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Russ, you're correct. The parenthetical is from the February 29 SLA doc. I found the e-mail where Jeff had resent it out the other day, and the parenthetical matches. And in that version, the word "received" appears after the parenthetical or not. And then the responded is bringing it in sync with the WHOIS document. Responded replaces received in order to bring it in sync with WHOIS. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think it may help. You're right. It was in the SLA doc. If we can specify all of the types of queries that there are instead of putting an "e.g.", because that's almost like these are just a sub-list or a partial list. If we can actually list the different types of queries that we mean and if it is just these, then that's great. I'd rather do that than having a parenthetical with an example, just so we're all on the same page.

KARLA HAKANSSON: That's fine. Do you want to list those out now?

JEFF NEUMAN: I would rely on Rick and others that are more familiar with the protocol and that are more familiar with the types of queries.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Beth, you have your hand up. Sorry, Rick. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I think you should go first on this, Rick. You are much more expert.

RICK WILHELM: We can take that as a to-do.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Would a different way to do this—I don't know if those types of queries is defined and limited or if it will continue to change as the world changes. Would it help if we just said total number of all RDAP queries responded during a period and eliminate the parenthetical?

RICK WILHELM: No, I think we'll take a crack at making it be, putting some words around it and put that up for discussion.

ROB HALL: I have a question. Hello?

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah. Hi, Rob. Beth, did you still have your hand up or is that an old one?

ROB HALL: Oh, I'm sorry.

KARLA HAKANSSON: It looks like it's down. Okay, Rob.

ROB HALL: All right. I'll raise my hand next time. Apologies. What is ICANN trying to get at here because "responded" and "received" could be two very different numbers, especially if rate limiting comes into play. So typically, in rate limiting, your first step is to start responding you're

over your rate limit. But if it's truly a denial of service type of doc, you just stop responding. So I'd caution you to think about what query or what data you're really trying to analyze here because those are two very different answers potentially.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Hey, Rob. So we included it to be consistent with the current registry agreement.

ROB HALL: But I heard earlier that one was responded and then the WHOIS was, or the WHOIS was responded and Jeff's group was requested. So which one are we going to use and why?

I don't need an answer now. I'm just putting an Asterix there that those could be two very different query numbers, what you're trying to accomplish.

JEFF NEUMAN: So I believe the intent was responded to because of the rate limiting and queries that may have been received, that may not be properly formed or things like that. So I think the intent was to only include those that were responded to.

ROB HALL: Does that mean actual data given out or is your own [real limit] a response? I think, Jeff, this goes back to your point of we better define

what all the different possibilities are and then decide whether we want them in this or not.

KARLA HAKANSSON: That's fine. And I think what the action is, is that Rick and team are going to be putting that together as far as what the, instead of just having the examples, but what the queries will be and then we can come back to this once that's provided.

ROB HALL: Works for me.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right. All right, moving down to step four, section one. At RDAP 2, the set of required RDDS services incorporate the gTLD RDAP profile of the set of requirements for the technical implementation of RDAP service.

Yes, Rick. No, okay. Old hand. Okay. Thank you, Rick. Old hand.

So moving down, we've got the RDAP response profile and RDAP technical implementation guide. Collectively, the gTLD RDAP profile added in. Just making sure there's no comments or issues. And then the next is to find the RDAP amendment ramp up period is the first 180 days after the effective date of the amendment. And just to remind everyone, the effective date in the SLA document which originally contemplated as the 180 days following the implementation date. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. The one caveat on this one is whether additional functionality will have to be put in place as a result of these amendments. So for example, we're still discussing the whole issue of whether each registrar has to provide their own instance of the RDAP as opposed to relying on the registries. If it turns out that that will be required, then I think we need to revisit this ramp up period because it was when we initially talked about the ramp up period, it was from the date in which all the functional requirements and everything were done and set in place without an understanding of this new potential requirement. So I'm not saying 180 days is not what we would agree to from the amendment date. It's just something I think where we need to just—and this is more for the registrar side—it's something that we need to just put a pin in, as well as from the registry side, if there is a requirement to have some sort of client tool that registries and registrars are responsible for, then we may have to come back and revisit this ramp up period.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. So let's talk about this one because in all actuality, we're looking at a timeframe of the 180 days falling into around June of '21, 2021, so does that mean that the expectation is that that would be a challenge to complete it by then? Or is it that you want to clarify the language?

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm just putting a pin in this one because, again, to the extent that there is, there are additional requirements to actually build stuff and to test

stuff out after. I don't think registrars, anyway, will start building anything until the agreement is solidified. So if there is new functionality, then 180 days from that date of the amendment, I don't know. I can't tell you whether that's going to be enough time or not until we get towards the end of the process and know definitively what's going to be required.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Thanks, Jeff. So is there ... I get the fact that we probably need to get this more finalized, but in the spirit of trying to move forward with this, is there a comeback or a suggestion as far as what the registrars would want to have as a part of this? Or to alter this wording or the timeframe?

JEFF NEUMAN: I see Rick's hand's up so I don't know if he wants to add to this. But from my perspective, I think at the end of the day, when we went into these discussions, I don't think it was understood that registrars would necessarily be having to build their own separate instance or build a kind of client tool that makes things human readable, which I don't know how that's going to come out in the negotiations. But at the end of the day, if those aren't required, then absolutely 180 days is fine. If there's going to be new technical type requirements, then we might have to revisit this.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Rick?

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Karla. I would just offer that right now it's premature to discuss the length of what the RDAP amendment ramp up period is because we haven't yet described or discussed what the RDAP amendment ramp up period would be applying to. And so since we don't know what that is, it's impossible to know whether or not 180 days is exactly the right amount of time, more than enough time, or not enough time. So we need to get to the point of where we've attached something that is dependent on the RDAP amendment ramp up period and then we can talk about whether or not 180 days is the right number. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Rick. Russ?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Jeff and Rick. And yeah, I see your guys' point and I think that's fair for us to circle back to this one and let's figure out what the requirements are and then we'll figure out the implementation and whatever the opposite of implementation is for WHOIS retiring, after we know, to Jeff's point, what the product is we're trying to build and offer for the community.

So I think we put it in here because this is what was defined out in the document from February 2018, the SLA reporting document. I think it's okay for us just to [find] it as an issue here and something we circle back to when we have a better definition of the requirements for both registries and registrars. And Jeff, I think my understanding of it in the

February 2019 document is the same as yours. The ramp up period was meant to cover performance to the SLAs, not functionality. I guess we can put a pin in it and figure out what we're building here first.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Okay. All right. Thank you. I don't see any other hands. Okay. Let's keep moving forward. This should be an interesting one with the update to Section 1.10, searchability.

So our perspective on this is basically that if you've got searchability already included in your RA that this is something that would transfer over into the amendment, and I know that there have been discussions around this already, but let's have it out there for the transcript. Anyone want to start weighing in on this one?

Yes, Donna. I think you're on mute.

DONNA AUSTIN:

I am on mute. Sorry about that. I think from a registry perspective, one of the concerns with this is that the wording of the amendment would need to reflect that RDAP is quite different to WHOIS searchability functionality and that would have to be captured in any amendment here. So we need to recognize that RDAP is different and reflect that in any amendment. So I don't think it's an apples and apples thing that we're considering here. We need to understand that there's different.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Thanks, Donna. Jeff?

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry. Just that they're different. Thanks. Sorry, Karla.

JEFF NEUMAN: On this one, yeah, I agree. This one, we need to think some more about just because ... I think I brought this up earlier was when a registry committed to doing searchability with WHOIS, it was understood by the registry or the backend provider exactly what it needed to do before it made that commitment. Because, and Jim and Rick can correct me if I'm wrong, because searchability is not necessarily defined in any of the RDAP protocols and we don't necessarily know how all of that's going to work, I don't think it's a fair assumption to just assume that because a registry committed to doing searchability with the WHOIS protocol, that they should automatically be held to have to do the searchability for RDAP because what I think you'll find is after the amendment is signed or even before when registries get wind of this, you're going to have probably hundreds of RSEPs requests to remove searchability. And I think that would look really bad from both an ICANN perspective as well as from our perspective if that happens. So I think we just need to give that some thought.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Jeff. Good point. J.C., you've got your hand up.

J.C. VIGNES: Yeah, sorry. So as a registry RIPE, I want to thank Jeff first because I agree with what you just said. And I wanted to go back if we have time

to the definition of the RDAP profile and the link on the ICANN website that the language refers to. It talks about the version of February 2019 and it talks about something that was there with the community, giving the impression—I don't know if I'm right or wrong—but giving to me, the impression that the profile could change eventually and I'm not sure we should, when dealing with an agreement, base it on something that would be subject to variable. So I wonder if there is no way to solidify the definition, or at least not to be fair to something that could be volatile.

KARLA HAKANSSON: That's a great point, J.C. Do you mind if we come back to that one when we finish the searchability conversation?

J.C. VIGNES: Sure. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thank you. Jim?

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks. I want to just agree with Jeff and I want to cast it in the following way just so we understand what we're talking about here. With WHOIS, there was searchability because you were really only looking up domain names and so it was all about being able to get partial domain names and see what you could get for it. And then various registries made enhancements to their WHOIS server to allow

for look-ups based on other kinds of data. And that really was outside the specification of the WHOIS reference. The interesting thing about RDAP is you've got structured data now. So you've got searchability in two dimensions. One is whether or not you can search on interesting elements of registration data and then there's the question of whether or not you can search on partial information that might exist in each of those elements.

And this is all new functionality. It's new stuff. It has not existed before, and in fact, it's actually not even documented in the standard. It's an active work item in the IETF. So there's not even anything for us to reference and suggest to go do it. And it's important to keep that in mind. So I think we're going to need to figure out a different way to deal with searchability that's not going to naturally carry forward in a one-to-one way from what's in the existing contracts. So thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Thanks, Jim. Rick?

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Karla. I largely would sort of build upon what Jeff and Jim were saying there, and sort of echo that basically, search when it is sufficiently robust to be implemented in RDAP is probably going to be sufficiently different from a search in WHOIS that ICANN would probably argue that a registry operator would require a new and different RSEP in order to implement it. And so, therefore, sort of bolting it on and claiming that it sort of naturally follows it because you did WHOIS searchability that you're required to do RDAP searchability

seems surprising and odd. So I don't think that because someone signed up years and years ago to do WHOIS searchability, that they would be suddenly required to do RDAP searchability necessarily follows because they are not at all going to be the same thing when RDAP searchability is sufficiently documented in order to be implementable. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Rick. J.C., I think you have an old hand, and Jim as well. Russ, did you want to weigh in?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Sure. So thanks for this discussion. I think what I'm hearing—and correct me if I'm wrong or we can take it back—I don't think we're in a position to make decisions quite yet on this, but what I think I'm hearing is on the registry perspective, don't bind the registries. They do an opt-in that they didn't know they were signed up for when they took on [inaudible] back in either the application days or at other points in their life. So don't default into opting in to searchability. Make it a new discrete opt in when the time is right. Is that what I'm hearing? Okay. Thanks, Rick. That's helpful just to at least make sure we're clear on what the point is. I guess then we'll take that back and discuss it internally., but understand the state of the State regarding RFCs and that sort of thing as well.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thank you, Russ. Okay, so we've got that action to go back. I don't see that anyone else has any comments or hands raised. Okay, then I

suggest we continue to move forward and we'll put a pin in this one as well. Okay, I do want to go back to J.C.'s point about the profile and that on the ICANN website, it is listed as the February, it's dated as February 2019.

So let's talk about the RDAP profile and the updates, or at least the wording, suggested wording that could go around this to make sure that we've got a clear understanding as far as what could potentially be updated if it can be updated because I think that there are still things that need to be considered relative to the temp spec.

So we do have it dated. It could be something that, as we continue this conversation, that the February 2019 date is changed or updated. But at this point, we could either put a pin in it and we could investigate to come back on this one or do folks feel strongly about whether or not it should be a dated profile? J.C.?

J.C. VIGNES:

Just to clarify, at the moment, my comment is I'm not even talking about substance here, but I don't think we should refer, we should send anyone to a link that could be abated and changed in the wording of an agreement and yes, I do think we should solidify the profile before, I mean at the time of negotiation, but before that, from a pure forum standpoint, sending people to a link that can be changed, modified by anyone and by ICANN technically is not the way to go.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Got it. Thank you. Russ?

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks. Thanks, J.C. So I think we understand the concern, right? You can't sign up to a blank check so to speak. But I think what we want to accomplish is plan for the likely evolution of the RDAP profile, the forthcoming evolution of the RDAP profile through consensus policy.

And I think if you look at the way the agreement works today, in our mind it's a bit clunky that you have a defined set of requirements and if you're only looking at the registry agreement and you don't have knowledge of the consensus policies, you don't know how that's augmented and each of those consensus policies, most of them having to do with RDDS, often tweak the expectations of registry or registrar related to their RDDS. And it would be, I think, beneficial for both, for all parties, including the community to have more clear requirements of what's currently obligated.

And I think we've agreed on that in the concept of why we want an RDAP profile. And so by moving it to a link, I think you can maintain, "Here's the authoritative requirements for given periods of time." So I think that if guys can come along with me on this, I think if we focus more on what are the controls we put in place in the agreement to define how that profile gets updated could be more beneficial than trying to download the profile into Spec 4 of the agreement or some new spec. So I'd be interested in exploring that with you all.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

J.C.?

J.C. VIGNES: Sorry, I don't want to hold the night. But we are bound by consensus policies in the registry agreement. We know what they are. So there is no need for flexibility here or there because it's already baked in.

On the other hand, we're talking about a new service that has technical ramifications and that could be spec-ed out and could evolve, according to consensus policies.

So I think you're already getting the flexibility you say you need and I would agree you need it. But we need to have something concrete to negotiate on. I understand that we need to be flexible, but there is a difference in being able to evolve with the community which is what consensus policies give us, and having just a link and say, "This is the profile of the day."

KARLA HAKANSSON: Anyone else have thoughts on this one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is ... Rick's got his hand raised so I'll go behind Rick. Sorry.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Go ahead, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. And maybe I'm kind of missing it. What is the issue here? Karla, is ICANN saying that it does not want the profile incorporated as an exhibit but rather incorporated as a link? Is that what we're hearing?

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah, so that is the way we had originally positioned it, but I think this is where we need to talk about it. Jeff, do you want to weigh in?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I mean potentially, we could try in the agreement to address both parts to say, "Okay, we'll post it at the link but in the agreement itself, we'll say that the content on the link cannot be changed in any material way without going, "I know we're going to develop some sort of change process," so essentially, we'll say that ICANN may not alter the content on that link in any material way without going through whatever that change process is that we agreed to.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Jeff. Rick?

RICK WILHELM: I'm sorry. Was that for me, Karla?

KARLA HAKANSON: Yeah, you had your hand raised?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, that's a new hand. So if we're trying to be clear, it seems to me that the easiest way to be clear is to just incorporate it as an exhibit into the RA or variously into the RAA just like the specifications for WHOIS were previously incorporated into the specifications for the RA previously. The problem with incorporating it as a link is that ICANN is solely in control of what gets published at the ICANN website and the counterparty, the contracted parties, don't have any ability to influence that at all and not able to impact that. So if we want to be clear about it, let's just incorporate it as an element of the contract and then the change control process will be very well-defined and that's very simple. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Rob, you've got your hand up.

ROB HALL: I think I'm in sort of agreement reluctantly. I do wish we had a way to change things. Someone referenced the WHOIS one and I know we would have loved to change just the order of the fields on WHOIS and we couldn't because it was in the contract. So I'm just thinking out loud and wishing that there was a way to, as we implement things like this,

and we want to make minor changes, we don't have to come back through this arduous policy. I'm sure we would be happy to host it on our site rather than ICANN, which might take some of the fear away. But I'm betting ICANN would then have the same argument. So I think there's probably no way around it unless we put a paragraph in about external links not being changed and without both parties' agreement.

But I know this is out of the scope, but I really wish there was a way to change little technical things that really have hurt us in the last contract such as the order of the WHOIS fields where the registrar's e-mail address was first and we got tons of e-mail from people thinking we own the domain.

I don't think that was intended so I want to make sure in the RDAP, there's a way to fix it quickly if we need to.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Rob. Yeah, Russ, do you want to chime in?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah. So Rob, thanks for that point, and for everyone, for the discussion. I think the concern we're looking at is the profile is currently a 19-page document. The [technical] [inaudible] guide is a 10-page document currently, and we know we're on the front end of this changing, probably multiple times over the next several years based on consensus policy. And reproducing these all over the place attached to different consensus policies seems like a good way to not have clarity that you guys say you want whereas I think the idea we were coming out with,

and we fully agree there needs to be controls. There needs to be controls in the agreement about how, what the conditions are to update the profile and if they're really insistent, that it's got to go through the amendment process if it's not a consensus policy change. We can talk about that, but I think Rob makes a good point that we're on the starting end of this new technology and amending these contracts is hard. So if there's a fairly minor thing, it might be easier to do something through a letter, exchange of letters or something through the stakeholder groups or some [inaudible].

And that was the idea behind the link, I think. So I'll leave it at that. I think we know, as you guys have all stated, that consensus policy is definitely going to evolve these requirements for RDAP in the profile. And we're just trying to look ahead a little bit to that so that we don't produce 20-30 pages of content that instantly becomes obsolete shortly after we agree to this contract.

ROB HALL:

Just to [make] a respond quickly, I do think we also agree in the document, in our contracts, to reference specs such as the RFCs. So if we could find a way to make this not so much contractual language in the attachment, but more of an RFC or a technical spec, it might be more palatable. And again, I'm just thinking out loud off the top. But I think the danger is putting contract language in this as opposed to just a technical spec.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Jeff, you're up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So Russ, I understand as a former contracts manager that these agreements are really difficult to keep track of, especially when there are amendments, and essentially, to know all of the requirements, you not only have to read the original spec. But then you've got to read all fo the amendments which, in a very clunky way, changed words around and it's difficult to follow. So I think we understand what you're trying to achieve and I think we're all in agreement that we need to develop some sort of change order process that's separate from this kind of full amendment process.

So I think we should take it back and see if we can discuss that internally and figure out if there was another way to do it, whether it's the way that Rob is kind of talking about, similar to an RFC, we'd link to those because we know that the change process there is robust and not as easy. And so if we can have that kind of trust in a change order process, then it might be the way to go.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Rob, is that a new hand? Yeah. Okay, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Karla. And excuse me. I'm not a lawyer but I'm just wondering if there's any parallels we can draw from the experience we've just gone through with amending the PTRP. So where we've agreed, we went through a process to agree to immaterial changes, which ICANN is allowed to make as specified in the registry agreement.

So I think what we're talking about here are these small changes and maybe it's the, something similar to what we have for the PTRP that it's immaterial that we can agree with ICANN. But anything that's material or substantive would have to go through a more funnel process. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Donna. Rick, you've got your hand raised.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. Very briefly. One thing that even if we make the document be incorporated by reference, it would still need to be presumably dated or versioned or something like that so it would still, to incorporate a new version, would still need to be, it seems like it would still need to cause a change to at least a few words in the contract or the agreement. So it sort of just pushes the problem around a little bit. So that's something to think about, that even if we would post the document on a site and say, "Well, we're going to shift from the February 2019 version to the March of 2020 version, it would probably still cause a change of a few words in the agreement because we probably wouldn't want to have it be open-ended as to which version of the document, of the agreement it was referencing. So that's just a thought. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Rick. Rob, you've got your hand up again.

ROB HALL:

I do. Sorry. And I don't [inaudible]. Jeff said he got it taken away and asked t come back with a proposal is good, but I wonder aloud if there isn't a way that in the future, we could have ICANN propose a new contractual language in this amendment or in this specification or webpage or whatever we decide on. And once 90% of registries implement it, it becomes contractual.

Like I'm wondering if there isn't a way to say, "Look, if this is really minor, we're all in violent agreement. Why isn't there a quicker way than going through this process?" And unfortunately, I think Rick, that means the versioning idea would be off because I think we would like a way, certainly with this new RDAP spec, to be able to change technical issues very quickly if need be. And I think we should probably propose how to do that.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Thanks, Rob. Back to you, Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks. So thinking about how we kind of initially triggered the RDAP requirements or what we used was there was a work order that Rick and company led to help develop the profile and then we, I think may have provided a report to the two stakeholder groups who then polled their members. And then we got kind of a letter of endorsement of that version.

I wonder if a letter of endorsement from the stakeholder groups might be suitable for these non-consensus policy based changes.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks, Russ. All right. I am not seeing any additional hands. Here's what I would suggest. Given that we are four minutes from the close of this session, could I ask that the discussion group collectively between registries and registrars, think about this and come back to the next conversation with a consensus as far as how you'd like to see it? We'll also take it back on our side to consider this and think about what a possible solution could be to address the versioning. I don't think that we're going to solve it here, obviously. Rob, is that an old hand or a new hand? Sorry, thanks. Okay.

I do want to address, Maxim had a couple of comments in the chat that I want to make sure that we also take some time to address, the first one being, "Does ICANN expect registries and registrars to continue development of new WHOIS features until the very end? Could it be moved to spec four?" I'm sorry. I'm not really following, so maybe if you could speak to that, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOPA: The idea was if the WHOIS is outdated, and new features such as something with IDNs, something else, are going to be developed for RDAP, does ICANN expect us to do actually software development for the old, old data services. For the same features. Because it's double work and since the protocol is dying, it shouldn't be done because it's a waste of our time effectively. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Okay, thanks Maxim. No, I don't think that there's any expectation of that. We can discuss internally and confront that but there's no expectation as far as I'm concerned or as far as I know. And then you had another question about for WHOIS, we have Spec 4, why not for RDAP?

I think that's what we are trying to include as a part of all of this. So if I'm not following your question, or if I'm not addressing it, let me know. Okay.

We are—I'm going to set the—okay, it was discussed by J.C. Got it. Thanks. Okay, we are at the top of the hour. I do want to just quickly kind of set expectations as far as the conversation for next time, which will be, I don't have the date, but she's going to send it to me where we will come back and look at moving over to the action items list. So clearing out the, let's see, Spec 3, registry to define the variety of RDAP query subject to the reporter requirement rather than use examples. Revisit the ramp up period and following the definition of the requirements and then we'll come back to the searchability question and it looks like we've got the Registry Stakeholder Group coming back to that one, and we'll also take the action item to discuss searchability further, to consider it more in terms of how that would actually play out.

And then Spec 4, version control for the profile, RDAP profile. The discussion group, the collective discussion group, if you could please come back and give us your proposals on that and then we'll also think about it some more on our side, think about how we could actually

come to a collective agreement as far as how that profile versioning is managed.

Great discussion. I think this has been really helpful. I'm glad that we're digging in to all of the details of this. It looks like we're making progress though, for sure. Any other parting comments or questions before we close out the session?

I'm not seeing anything. So thanks, everyone. So we won't have a call until next year, I wish everyone happy holidays and I look forward to our next conversation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, all.

SUE SCHULER: Julie, we can end the recording. Bye, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]