

RICK WILHELM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to today's regularly scheduled call of the RDAP Working Group here with ICANN. Today is 14 January 2021. Thanks, everybody, for joining. This is Rick Wilhelm, Verisign. Thanks, everybody, who's taking time out of their very busy week for this very first meeting of 2021.

We sent around the usual agenda here this morning, a couple of hours ago, and got regrets from Jim Gould that he's not able to attend, but other than that, sort of the usual suspects here. Before we get going, any agenda comments? Do a little agenda bashing, looking for hands. Of course, for those of you that haven't been on a Zoom, your Raise Hand button is now under Reactions, even though raising a hand is not really reaction. Zoom did us a favor of making their interface worse over their most recent release. Any agenda topics? We will, of course, have Any Other Business. All right, seeing none.

Got the URLs there for those of you that are interested. The counts are still relatively accurate. I gave those a quick check. So there was no new business out on the list over the past couple of weeks during the holiday period. So going back to our old business, we had the topic that we had brought up about blank fields and responses, and then in the notes here, I brought up the so-called Galvinian buckets that we had discussed during the last meeting, which is data returned because data exist. No data returned because no data exist—that is, it's not present or not null—and then no data returned because the data is redacted. It's present but not returned. Of course, then we've got the notion of

---

*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.*

---

needing to make some possible tweaks to the profile, capturing something that when the data exists but policy does not permit the data reached including the response and the element is returned with a “null value” and the remarks element includes a comment about the redaction. And then in the profile, we would need to include a section that defines what null means for each data element type, allowing the clients to distinguish between redacted and null for each data element.

Then we saw a brief comment from Marc Blanchet. I don’t see Marc on the call this morning but he had commented very briefly, agreeing that having semantics around null is important. He commented that about 90 minutes ago. So I wanted to see if anyone wanted to add any comments in and around this to our discussion, opening it up to the floor, to see if anyone wants to chime in further. I see three hands. To my eye, Alex is first. Alex, please go ahead.

ALEX DEACON:

Thanks. And happy new year, everyone. I missed the discussion on this the last time so I apologize for that. On the list I asked if Jim could clarify something for me. I found that ICANN support to make as few assumptions as possible, and so in order to really understand—what you call these—Galvinian topics here, it’s important that if Jim does have some time that he’ll respond so I know exactly what we’re talking about. Thanks.

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Alex, thank you. I see Marc is in the queue, but then I'm not sure, Marc, if you wanted to defer to Jim who's also in the queue since Alex's question was kind of deferred to Jim?

MARC ANDERSON: I'm happy to defer, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Okay. Very good. Jim Galvin, please come to the mic, and then I'll also note that Jim just posted something to the list seconds ago. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. Nothing like real-time work here. I apologize, Alex and everyone, because I never replied on the list because of how long in waiting for Alex's question. Very quickly, my answer is actually that I'm responding to all of those, all of the various policies and documents because my proposal is that the Temp Spec, the Phase 1 policy, the Phase 2 policy and what all of that stuff turns into needs to speak to the fact that there's a certain presentation that you're looking for. And I think there's a little bit nuance we probably need to get into when you want to really dig into this and maybe we can talk more about it offline. I don't know if you really want to get into it right here, but I'm suggesting that those policies would speak about the need for and use of a null in actual responses so that the presentation can be what it needs to be. The RDAP profile documents themselves will define what null is and what it actually means for each data element so that the policy can take advantage of that. I hope that helps at the moment

---

but I'm happy to continue the discussion here or if you want to talk about this in more detail separately, I'm happy to do that too. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Jim. Let's go to Marc Anderson while Alex contemplates that. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, everybody. I think this is new news but we did have during one of the last IRT calls from 2020 a discussion on this. I think maybe Roger and/or Sarah raised it. We had a good discussion in the IRT covering all the topics encompassed here, including how to handle redacted data, what to do with blank data, or—sorry, I shouldn't phrase it that way—what to do with fields with no value in them. I thought it was a good discussion. It seemed to go pretty well. It wasn't contentious or controversial to my ears. It did not result in any changes so the profile remains what it has been.

My suspicion is that if we—I won't speculate on why that is but what I will say is we do want changes to the draft policy language, what we're going to have to do is draft redlines to submit. I think what we've done so far is sort of explained our concerns, our thinking, our thoughts to staff. And staff sort of nodded and maybe they understand what they're saying, maybe they don't. Alex, I'm talking about the OneDoc, the draft policy language in the EPDP Phase 1 IRT. So I think we've talked about it and sort of explained our thinking around redacted fields and fields with no values and how that interacts with RDAP and the RDAP profile. But I think if

---

we want changes, we're going to have to propose your redlines or propose new versions. So I think the question for us is, is the language in the OneDoc okay, and if not, what would we like to see differently? Because I think that's really what our next steps are at this point.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Marc. I see Jim in the queue next. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Sorry, old hand.

RICK WILHELM: Old hand. Very good. Thank you very much. Alex, please go ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Thanks. I think the core issue here is that the RDAP profile docs, both of them—this is what I wanted to confirm just offline now that I have the clarification from Jim—but at the risk of jumping the gun on that, I think the core issue is that the RDAP profile docs, both of them that we defined in this group are profiles of the RDAP protocol themselves. But what we're actually discussing is RDAP client behavior, which is not defined. I think what we need is an RDAP client profile, it seems. I think the behavior of a client when it sees the response in the RDAP response message from the server is really what we're talking about, and I don't think that exist

---

at the moment. I'm pretty sure it doesn't exist in the profiles that we defined and published in 2019. I believe it would be helpful to have that. If you actually look at the one major RDAP client out there, the lookup.icann.org, it's a mess. It's a disaster. Some of it is client issues. Some of them are compliance issues from the server. Those are separate things but I believe it would be useful for all of us if some sort of RDAP client profile existed. So that's my initial thought at the moment. Again, I wanted to confirm and really take a closer look at Jim's proposal and the existing profiles that we had defined just to confirm that that was the case. But that's kind of where my head is at the moment. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Alex. Jim, I think that's a new hand, is that correct?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes.

RICK WILHELM: Please go ahead, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Rick. Building on what Scott is saying in the chat room, too, that it would be difficult to specify client behavior, I think that it's that fact that gets us in trouble here and why we got this interesting problem. With WHOIS, it was very easy to say exactly what you were supposed to provide because a registry just

---

dumped a text blob at you and so ICANN felt compelled, and reasonably so, to specify exactly what that was supposed to look like. So clients would absorb that and that was the end of that. In principle, there wasn't much a client could do with that unless you got really fancy and technical about it. With RDAP, we're in a different place and this is really part of the conceptual problem we've got going on here, in my mind.

What we need, I think—and let me see if I can state this in a nice way here—what the policy wants to say is that it has to be worded in a way to suggest that the following information has to be available to a client for display purposes. We need to be careful to translate this into a requirement on registries, that we can't say anything about how it's going to be displayed necessarily. So the policy needs to say something like you either need to use a “redacted for privacy” or similar phrase and then what it means to say is what registries need to provide any RDAP response is they need to state how a client can make that distinction. That's as much as a policy should say, and the policy should probably reference the RDAP profile. Because the RDAP profile document then needs to be fixed to actually show what a registry needs to do—and a registrar—in its response to make that distinction possible. And that's when you get into this null issue. It's really quite nuance. We're treading into a new space here because it's just the technology is different. We're advancing. I understand what ICANN is trying to achieve here. I think that we just need to tweak the words for these to all make sense because I don't want to change the policy. I just want to change how it's represented, and then we on this side need to get the RDAP profile to do the right thing so that it all comes together. I don't know if I'm helping

---

this or extending the conversation but this is where we are and it is a bit nuanced, in my mind, to get all the words right so it will all make sense. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Jim. I think those are good points. Before we go to Marc Anderson, I'll draw attention to what's going on in the chat. The gist of it there, Alex notes that the profiles would not apply to browsers and other comments that the profile really doesn't apply to clients. And Jim I think was making this point also that the profile is binding to servers, not to clients. I think as a group, we've got to be careful here how much we're trying to project on to clients because clients are just clients, and there's really not an ICANN requirement on these clients. As Jim was saying, what we're trying to do on the server side is get the servers to construct and provide the data in a certain way such that it's easy for clients to do the right stroke or reasonable thing because there's really not a requirement on the client because they're not under any sort of jurisdiction from ICANN. Let's go over to Marc here. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I agree what Alex and Jim were saying there. Jim, you're right. It is very nuanced. If I could expand a little on what you and Alex were saying, I think the way the draft policy is currently written, the nuance is really not understood or taken into account and that the draft policy language tries to apply, display obligations and display thinking on to what is simply a transmission protocol. I don't think that the nuance or the



---

difference is understood by those sort of drafting the policy language right now.

I think really this brings us back to—I think our viable next step is to propose redlines. This is what we think it should be and why. Because I don't think the policy language in there really understands the difference between RDAP as a transmission protocol and sort of what obligations around the display of that data would be and where that would fall. Despite some good conversations in the IRT, I don't think we're going to get there without providing redlines. So I do think that's our next step.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thanks very much, Marc. To that end, before we go to Jim Galvin, is that the sort of thing, Marc, that the members of the IRT that are also part of the RDAP Working Group would be looking for assistance/help from the broader RDAP Working Group in providing help and to contribute to those redlines? Or is that something that the intersection, the Venn diagram that you all think that you can handle on your own? Or is that something where you want those broader contributions? Thoughts on that?

MARC ANDERSON:

We have a pretty good representation of people here on this list. They're also members of the IRT. In my head, if those of us here in the RDAP group could agree on what it should say and all of us were to take that back to the IRT and say, "Hey, we all had this conversation and these are our recommendations," if we could agree and provide sort of a unified, consolidated recommendation

---

back to the IRT, then I think that would be viewed positively. If we can't agree here then that's a different problem. Our conversations here make me think we're generally on the same page and we need to figure out how to get what we're saying and thinking in this group on to paper and take that back to the IRT. I think that's sort of what I'm thinking in my head.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thanks, Marc. Let's go ahead and go to Jim and then Roger into kind of further discussion here. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Rick. Let me make two specific concrete suggestions for going forward. I agree with you, Marc, about redlining. I perhaps apologize for this but it would be helpful if you could call out a particular link or text for whatever needs to be looked at. I'm very happy to engage on looking at the words to get there. And then the second thing I would say is my specific concrete suggestion is to never use the word "display". That's the word which has to be rewritten. Anything that says "display" has to be rewritten in some way, probably written in terms of saying that registries and registrars need to publish a response which reflects the following. We need to have some kind of standard phrase that you replace display with, and then everything should fall out just the way you would like. Then of course, we take on an action here, Rick, to get into the RDAP profile and add what we need with respect to null. But I'm happy to engage more offline or on the list here. I'll pay attention, not like what I did to Alex here over the holidays and I will move this along. Thanks.

---

---

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Jim. Good points there. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Just to clarify, I think what Jim was saying, I don't think any of the RDAP documentation mentions display. I think we did that on purpose. I think Jim's mentioning removing display out of the One doc of the IRT registration data policy and not removing it but making it correct, I suppose we should say.

To Alex's point, this group should not create an RDAP client profile because that's not what this group is for. ICANN should create that profile somewhere. Alex I think has a good point. Is that the IRT that should do that? As he mentioned, I think the IRT pushed back and maybe I even pushed back on it, I don't remember, that the IRT would do it or not. I think ICANN needs to do that. I'm not saying ICANN as in staff or whatever. I mean ICANN as a community needs to come up with a way to document what they expect an "ICANN-compliant" client. Just my thoughts. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thanks you very much, Roger. Marc, go ahead, please.

---

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. First, on Jim's point, yes. I'd be happy to provide—maybe what I'll do is I'll get a Google Doc started and I'll highlight what I think are the relevant parts of the current draft policy language and try and maybe just call out why I think it's problematic and try and get the ball rolling. So I'll take that action item, pose that to the list, and hopefully that will start some offline discussion on where it is and where we think it needs to go.

I do want to weigh in a little bit. Alex mentioned in chat that the IRT made it clear that an RDAP display profile is out of scope in the IRT. There seems to not be agreement on whether it is or isn't in the scope or whether or not ICANN can do it or should do it. I kind of don't want to weigh in on that. What I do want to say, though, is I think that the EPDP did create obligations on what it expects to be displayed in an RDDS response, whether that be in RDAP or WHOIS. I think very much what is in scope is the expectations around what a RDDS user would expect as far as data received to a domain lookup. So I think that is in scope. And in so much as ICANN is implementing a RDAP client to meet those policy recommendations, I think the display of data is very much in scope. Whether or not that needs to be an RDAP client or not, I'm going to sort size up that question.

Roger is saying EPDP defined what is to be displayed but not how. I think how is an implementation question. I think that is in scope of the IRT. I think there is room there to talk specifically. In my view, I think the lookup.icann.org, that is the right place to meet that requirement. Alex says as sort of repeatedly, voiced frustration with how that user experience is today. I think it would be in scope to make sure that that user experience on

---

lookup.icann.org is meeting the expectations of what's in the EPDP recommendations. I hope that makes sense. I feel like I was talking around in circles a little bit, but hopefully you get where I was going with that.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Thanks, Marc. Yeah, I think that helps. Alex, to your question, at least I did going into this. I think [inaudible] going into this, I think years ago now, thought that people/groups would write their own RDAP client for their own needs. So law enforcement would write their own RDAP client and structure it so that they have the data that they use mostly at the top or whatever, however that looks. Or a lawyer, a client or an IP group would create a client with those important things that they want displayed prominently or however. At least that's how I thought going into this years ago, that multiple clients would be built—and they probably wouldn't look exactly the same or even closely the same. They would be purposely built. But obviously the data would all be the same because RDAP is supplying the same data every time. At least that's my thought. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much, Roger. It's interesting, to think about this notion of clients, creating a client profile, when we create a standard or a profile because people are expected to or required to be held against it, it's unclear to me that if a client

---

profile or client standard is created, what the purpose of that would be because anyone can implement a client and what purpose it would be to have a standard that people aren't required to be held to. Whereas the server side standard that we have in the profile is about to be contractually required one wired into the contract. But the client side ones, it seems to be fundamentally different, given the open nature of the Internet. So it's something to think about out there. I see Alex's hand. Alex, please go ahead.

ALEX DEACON:

Just real quick. I think it's important that we really think about the user here. And it seems like me and Marc are on the same page here that the user isn't the client implementer. It's the person who actually wants to get access to this information. If they go to lookup.icann.org and see one thing, if they go to Marc Blanchet's RDAP client, they see a second thing. If they go to GoDaddy website and see you got a third thing, then I think that's a problem. The way you fix that problem is that you have an RDAP client profile that outlines how these clients should interpret and display the data based on the RDAP response. I think it's important for us to focus on that use case. People will have, to Roger's point, bespoke RDAP clients for their own use. But I'm thinking more so of just kind of the consistency and usability across clients, that normal users who don't know what RDAP is, who don't know what JSON is, or experience. Where that happens or what working group is tasked properly to do that, I'm not too sure. But without that, we're going to end up in a situation where essentially RDDS information may or may not be available to users that need it for ICANN Bylaws, and I think that's the issue.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Alex. I think that, to your point, one of the things that in talking about this notion of data and interpretation and whatnot, one of the key things that kind of got us into this is removing the ambiguity between redaction and data being available and data being redacted. And I think that us maintaining this clarity is going to be something—improving the clarity and the profile by distinguishing between these buckets is going to be something that is an important improvement. I think that one of the things that we should sort of keep in mind that in terms of the data and the clients that it's not a complete free for all. What we're trying to do right now—and I think that we've got a decent start on—is removing the ambiguity between data that doesn't exist and data that's redacted, which is sort of what got us into this thing at the beginning to sort of eliminate that ambiguity. As we kind of think about this, it's important to kind of not think that it's all anarchy among the data but it's looking at that situation. That's probably the key thing that we're looking at here. I see a hand. Alex, please go ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Sorry, old hand.

RICK WILHELM: Marc, old hand, new hand? I think that's a new hand.

MARC ANDERSON: Mine is a new hand.

---

RICK WILHELM: Please, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: So what you were just talking there, I think that maybe circle back to something Jim Galvin was saying earlier. He was talking about how under WHOIS, there really wasn't a distinction between the transmission and display of the data. The RDAP is a little more nuanced in that there is a distinction, there's a difference between the two. Rick, you were talking about the difference between when data doesn't exist and when it's redacted. But if we just simplify it a little bit, looking just that when data is redacted, when I look at the policy language, the draft policy language in One doc right now, how I read it is that staff in drafting that language is trying to make the display of data easy to understand by a user—and to Alex's earlier point, the RDAP person, not the RDAP client developer. So they're trying to write language that will make it easy for the person to read that language. But that draft policy doesn't take into account the distinction between the transmission of data and the display of data. So in trying to make the data easy to understand to a RDDS user, unwittingly or maybe unintended consequences there is they're putting an obligation on how the data is transmitted. And I don't think that's what's intended but I think because the nuance of the transmission of data and the display of data isn't maybe well understood, that's what I see is the problem in the current draft that I think we need to fix. I guess that's what I've been advocating for. I apologize if that isn't always been clear what I see as the issue and why I think we need to fix it. But I hope that helps.

---



RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Marc. I think that's helpful. What the server provides, what the server emits, aka the transmission versus what then the client does with that, aka the display. Two different things. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. It's interesting. I think most people—I won't say everybody—on this call seem to agree and understand the issues. I think that the problem Marc has brought up is the pin holder on the One doc I'm not sure sees this distinction yet. And I think that that's something that's important. One thing that I'll throw back to Marc, to try to solve—where Alex is trying to get to—is just trying to define this client requirements, whatever it's going to be called. It's not RDAP requirements; it's going to be registration data display requirements or whatever it is. But I don't know. Maybe, Marc, this is a topic for TechOps to pick up. Obviously, it's not for this group. I'm just trying to throw out ideas to move this along and get it into the right hands. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Roger. I certainly agree that probably the best step forward is, as Marc said, he's going to send out a link to a chunk of the One doc, appropriate sections highlighted, annotated, sort of requesting suggestions or maybe with proposed texts and things like that in order to try and get this clarity established. Because as we've talked about here, getting clarity there is best, and getting more clarity around this issue of null

---

---

versus redacted data is another key and important part as we've talked about as it relates to our buckets.

I think that's good. It probably gets us to a reasonable point to kind of as it said, draw a line under this one for this meeting. Let me see if there's anybody else that has anything that sort of burning that they'd like to bring up. One last call for hands related to this one. I'm looking over, I'm not seeing any.

Let's take a quick trip to the microwave here. We've kind of been talking a little bit about the IRT and such but let's go to the microwave for things related to the IRT relevant to the working group. Looking for hands on that one. There's Marc. Marc, please go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Rick. I guess I lost the game of chicken there and raised my hand first. I don't actually think there's a whole lot in the IRT that's relevant to us. The IRT, like most other groups, had a little bit of a hiatus over the holidays so nothing new there. I think generally, though, the IRT is a little bit slowed down waiting for a couple things. One, there's discussions going on at the GNSO Council to try to address outstanding questions around Recommendation 7 and Recommendation 12. And that is certainly slowing down the work.

The other sort of gating factor on the IRT is around data processing agreements. And that has been an ongoing discussion between ICANN Org and the contracted parties via sort of a

---

separate process. I think both of those have contributed to sort of a no update answer on the IRT.

RICK WILHELM:

Got you. Very good. Anything on Phase 2/2A?

MARC ANDERSON:

I'll just not even play the game of chicken and jump right in there. A couple things I'll say. On Phase 2 itself, I've generally given the update that I don't think there's a whole lot relevant in Phase 2 to this group. And I don't think that's changed. But I'll just say real quick, Phase 2 Priority 2 items are out for public comment, Phase 2 Priority 1 items are not yet. I think that's because the ICANN Board intends for those to leverage their new Operational Design Phase concept, and so they're waiting for that to be finalized. Again, in general, I don't think there's a lot there that's relevant to this group.

You mentioned Phase 2A, that has recently kicked off. That deals with differentiating between legal versus natural and pseudonymized e-mail contact address. That may or may not have some impacts to us. That's just kicking off, so maybe in the very preliminary stages. It's possible that recommendations coming out of Phase 2 will involve changes to the display of data, which certainly would impact us. Or recognizing the nuance of display versus transmission involves the transmission of different or changed data sets. It's really too early to tell at this point. So maybe we'll just give that a wait and see sort of update there.

---

RICK WILHELM:

Sounds very good. Thank you very much, Marc. Okay. Let me take a quick break from the microwave and go back up to meeting planning. Sue gently reminded me that I blasted right past that in my rush to get to the microwave.

A couple things. I think that based on kind of where we are now with things that are both going on with this topic here that we've been talking about, as well as other stuff going on in the IRT and such, that we'll kind of stick to our biweekly schedule. One of the things that I noticed, when we go more than two weeks without meeting, my brain tends to experience the half-life decay and I kind of forget what's going on. It's not just the too much sugar that happens during the holidays, I think. So I'm going to propose that we kind of stick to our biweekly cadence. I see a plus one from Roger there. Any objections on that? Looking for hands. Got a plus one from Jim. Very good. Plus one from Jody. All right, that'll do that. So, Sue, you can kind of put us down for biweekly, that puts us on the 28<sup>th</sup> and then 11<sup>th</sup> and the 25<sup>th</sup>, etc.

Okay. Then as far as ICANN70, meeting planning is—as far as I can tell, ICANN hasn't really officially even admitted that it's going to be online. I'll save the editorial there. But I'm going to assume that it is going to be online, given everything that's going on outside the wide, wide world. "I'm barely even traveling to the grocery store these days," is what Sarah and I are both thinking in the back of our heads. Consequently, based on sort of where we are now and assuming that we're sort of in the same mode for ICANN69, I'm thinking that we as the RDAP Working Group will not take a slot during ICANN70 and we will just sort of stick to our own regular normal schedule because everybody here is busy

---

enough with other stuff, and so that we would just not do any sort of a meeting slot during that ICANN week because everybody's busy. Anyone have any objections to that at this point? "Plus one to the skip," says Roger. Marc Anderson—is that a new hand, Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, it's a new hand. I agree with the skip. Plus one to skip. I'll just say the only reason why I think we would consider having a meeting as part of the regular ICANN meeting is if we wanted to open it up to the public for any kind of outreach or communication. But I don't think we have any need for that at this time. So I just want to plant that in people's heads because at some point, that answer may be different. But for now, I agree, skip.

RICK WILHELM: I've been sort of thinking about that notion also. But right now, we don't have anything that I think is cooking. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Thanks, Marc, for bringing that up. That's a good point. I agree, Rick, I don't think that we have anything that needs to go out. Hopefully, by summer, we will. Hopefully, we get the profile, blanks, nulls, redacted, everything updated to why we want to see it and we can take that out to those that are interested. But at this point, I don't think so. Thanks.

- 
- RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you very much. Thanks for that comment. Sue, are we good from a scheduling standpoint? Any logistical things or did we answer your questions then?
- SUE SCHULER: Well, my only comment is that your normal biweekly schedule will put you having a meeting right in the middle of ICANN week.
- RICK WILHELM: That actually works perfect because then we'll just skip that one and we'll bracket around it.
- SUE SCHULER: Perfect.
- RICK WILHELM: Then that actually works out fine. So, no problem. Very good. "Feature not bugs," says Jonathan. Very good. Good stuff. Let's see, we've got nine minutes left. IETF REGEXT. Jim, can I coerce you to the mic for a quick REGEXT update?
- JIM GALVIN: Absolutely. Thanks, Rick. I'm going to paste a bunch of stuff here into the chat room when I had it ready to go. Well, let me paste it into the chat room. Probably because it's too much stuff, I got to do it a bit at a time. All right. I'll speak and then tell you.
-

---

A couple quick things for people, publication is imminent on an RDAP partial response document and query parameters for sorting and paging. These are not obligatory documents. They do represent a way to do those kinds of things if your RDAP server wants to support that.

Things that will be imminent for response. In our previous meeting, I had reported that the RDAP query format in RDAP response format documents would be advancing. It would be submitted for publication, some updated documents. It turns out that we had some process nuance that we kind of missed, but we got all that sorted out. These two documents, 7482bis and 7483bis, they are updates to RDAP, the query and response documents, but they are also upgrading in state. They will become full Internet standards. They have already been submitted for publication so they're now going through that process. They've just recently been submitted, we had a little bit of business we had to take care of in the working group because of the advancements in state. But all that's taken care of. So folks should just take note of that and just track that. It'll now be in the ISG and RC editor process until it gets published.

We still have a couple of existing RDAP related items that are in the REGEXT Working Group. One of them, of course, is the RDAP using OpenID Connect. I like to mention here again, that we still have some existing work in searching capabilities. There's a document called Reverse Search Capabilities, I really disliked that title. It hasn't become even an ICANN urgent yet. We're focused at the moment on unauthenticated, exact match lookup queries. But clearly, the issue of dealing with search is going to

---

become important for registries and registrars in ICANN beyond just the RDAP protocol. Because some of us, we do provide that service as part of what we do today for TLDs and domain names and being able to standardize that as opposed to the ad hoc various kinds of solutions that we have all implemented in support of doing this in the last round of gTLDs should make this work important. It's just kind of sitting out there, waiting for someone to want to pay attention.

There are three new possible work items that are going to come in front of the IETF group. Two of them, you will soon see a call for adoption in the working group. One of them is an update to 7484. So finding the authoritative registration data service. There is an update from Marc Blanchet, and we'll be calling for adoption of that group to advance that document along.

There's also, as we've said before, a desire to deprecate the use to add JS contact instead of jCard in RDAP JSON responses. So we're going to pick up that work item. There'll be a call for adoption on that work, and then we'll take that off and move that along.

There's also another pending potential work item, which has been mentioned, but there hasn't been a call to actually bring this forward in the working group with RDAP. And there's a document that expresses RDAP redirect with content. It's actually pretty applicable in our industry in the way that we do things. The idea being that you could query a registry or data, it will tell you what the registry has but it should provide you with a redirect as part of the response to say, "Gee, go to the registrar to potentially get



---

more information.” And this is sort of a specification and suggestion for how to do that.

So I suspect this work will become a little more interesting perhaps as we go along and maybe as ICANN gets a little more into how it’s going to do its lookup.icann.org service or what’s going to go on there. But that’s something for us to think about, too. So there’s a lot of RDAP related work going on in REGEXT as we kick into our new year. I will put titles and links to all the documents in the chat room now. Thanks. Back to you.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you very much, Jim, for that very comprehensive update. There’s a lot of stuff going on. There’s an IETF meeting coming up way in March so that’ll be coming up around ICANN70. Very good.

On the RDAP RA/RAA amendment, there’s not a lot been going on that’s been largely on hiatus over the holidays. ICANN and the Contracted Parties House will be getting back together starting in about a week. So that group will be getting back together so we have more to talk about then. Maybe some progress on the SLAs and some of the other items but not a lot going on there.

I think I saw Karla here. Karla, any update on the NSP topics? NSP work currently scheduled for February. That is very exciting. One of the biggest updates—easily the biggest update of the year, Karla. Excellent. Well, that’s very good to hear. Thank you very much for that, Karla.

---

One quick call for AOB. Anybody have anything else that came up in their thinking? I'm seeing no hands. All right. Very good. Very vigorous discussion. Thanks to everybody for their participation. We will see you all in two weeks. Everybody, stay safe. Sue, you can take us out of here.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Rick. Andrea, please stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**