

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO CPH Tech Ops Meeting Part 2
Sunday, 10 March 2019 at 10:30 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Marc Anderson: All right this is Marc Anderson. Welcome to the second half of Tech Ops. Looking around the room I think not only did people not run away screaming, I think we picked up a few extra people so I'll take that as a good sign. I cut Rick off there at the end of our first half session so I'll give him a chance to wrap up I guess his update on the RDAP profile and anything he wants to add there.

But like I said that's - we'll roll that right into our second-half discussion. I think that's a thread that's going to run throughout the second half. If you talk about, you know, what we as (unintelligible) and registrars are going to have to implement from a technology standpoint in the next year, year and a half we've definitely got a lot of excitement in front of us on that front so Rick anything in you want to add from the first half?

Rick Wilhelm: Thanks Marc. Rick Wilhelm, VeriSign. It - not really that much just that the - we were talking a little bit about the SOAs and reporting requirements. I talked a little bit about what the SOAs are. The RDAP reporting requirements are simply to add one column on the - to give the number of queries that were received in a given month. These are the reporting requirements that are under consideration. They're not formally adopted yet. They're not part of anybody's contracts.

The thing that's been a little bit under discussion over the past while is related to things around the emergency triggers EBRO thresholds and whatnot. As you know Whois is currently on the emergency trigger, an EBRO trigger. And so a fair bit of the discussion has been around the fact that while if Whois is going to remain an emergency trigger then should RDAP be an emergency trigger, don't think so because then that would be my words, double jeopardy with apologies to anyone who's a lawyer in the room where that's a term of art.

So it's been about working around a compromise around that in order to have something to push the requirement for RDAP while not having the contracted parties be exposed on an emergency trigger to both Whois and RDAP simultaneously. And this sort of gets to (Stephanie)'s point about adding obligations to the contract without going all the way to the notion of not having concurrent operations right? So that's sort of what the discussions have been about.

To date there have not been concrete discussions with staff as part of these SLA and reporting things related to shutting down Whois. That's not been part of the discussion. So there is no date that's been discussed around turning down Whois at all. So that doesn't express, you know, an opinion about where - what we think it should be, just a statement of fact about what discussions have been had so far right, so yes.

Man: A quick question, so I will back in the day, when the SLAs first came out there was a huge outcry about where they got the numbers from, how they got their numbers, what they juxtapose them to and how they're going to use them. So are we saying right now that what is currently based or tentative or is it going to become final or is there still some process to work with ICANN staff or ICANN org to review these SLAs to have a final contractual requirement for these?

Rick Wilhelm: So good question. So the numbers when they first came out were a little bit different. The first number that came out was - the big one that changed was around response time. It was previously - the initial one was 2000 milliseconds which was inclusive of cross network performance. There was a fair bit of disagreement around this one for a number of reasons.

Reason one, it's an HTTPS stack which is far heavier weight than a Whois stack. Reason two is the first time RDAP has been deployed anywhere, so no one has any experience with it. Reason three, I can't remember what reason three was but there should always be three reasons just for the - because that's the way it is right? And so therefore...

((Crosstalk))

Rick Wilhelm: ...I'm sorry?

Jim Gavin: Yes there was the performance issue with respect to searching and stuff and because that's - we changed everything to just exact lookups.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes it might have been related to that. So we're - so we moved it to 5000 milliseconds, right? So 5000 milliseconds is, you know, oh I know what was. It - since it was a first deployment one of the things related to these we assumed that operators, contracted parties that were deploying this would not have exceptional network coverage on this. And since it was cross network performance if a contracted party only had network presence close to their place of business initial deployment they wouldn't necessarily have a chance to get their network presence forward deployed for to have network presence everywhere "good coverage," as it was like DNS right now and Whois people have their cloud spread all over the globe right? So in other words so therefore the SLA should be high right now until people got their cloud established further afield. So therefore it's 5000 milliseconds right now which is a fair bit of, you know, five seconds on the Internet is a fair bit of time right? So that's sort of where those things are.

Jim Galvin: So Jim Galvin for the record. I have two questions but I'll kind of do them separately. On this the SLA and reporting numbers so really were two sets of issues. One was everything that you just talked about in all the performance numbers, but the other set of issues was the number of things that they wanted metrics on. There was an increased list of metrics that they wanted to keep.

You know, I mean speaking for myself I wasn't really opposed to all of those metrics so I guess the important question here is what's going to happen with those going forward? You know, there's sort of an obvious thing to do. RDAP is different than Whois. There ought to be a different set of measurements and stuff. I'm wondering, you know, if we can what your expectations are if any in terms of how they're going to get revisited and what's going to happen there?

Rick Wilhelm: Okay so just to let everybody that hasn't been following this terribly closely, the original set of reporting requirements was extensive. There was something like 19 different fields that were there which included all sorts of things like the number of trees on the ICANN campus and stuff like that. That's a joke for the transcript right? So there were a lot of things, all sorts of query counts, all sorts of reasons and stuff like that. And so as we went about discussing these we said look if RDAP is supposed to be replacing Whois then the reporting should be equivalent to that which is present in Whois.

Currently in Whois we report one number, exactly one number of queries. Ergo we just do a - this for that replacement so we're going to replace that. So because it shouldn't be just because we're reporting swapping in this new protocol doesn't mean that the contracted parties should have to take on this additional burden of a whole bunch more queries where there's not clear rationale and benefit reporting, additional reporting when there's not clear and rational benefit for all this additional reporting.

It's our thoughts that we should not be as contracted parties taking on this additional reporting and in our monthly reports until and unless there is clear benefit to be doing so because these reports are a contractual requirement. As any of you know if you've - when you have to restate these reports due to any kind of an error it's a nontrivial effort to go through and get them restated. They are not optional right? They're sort of an official publication. And so I think that adding to that burden of these monthly reports is something that there needs to be a real reason why it would need to be increased. And so that's why when this was coming up we said we should only go like for like and not be adding to the reporting burden for the contracted parties.

(Stephanie): And there is contractual language here to in Spec 4. It says something like unless in the event of a failure to reach agreement on what these spec securities SLA reporting requirements would look like they would - we would implement something comparable to Whois so it was hard to justify that the shift from one metric to 19 metrics was justified if we didn't independently agree with ICANN so fully agree.

Jim Galvin: So that doesn't quite answer my question, lovely summary about where we are and how we got there. I'm more interested in what's going to happen in the future. You know, do we have any sense, I mean these proposed metrics are not going to go away so, you know, do we have any expectation about how they're going to get addressed what we're going to do about it?

Rick Wilhelm: Well so they would have to be brought back via a proposal and that proposal would have to have accompanying rationale. It's a contract mod and there would have to be a reason and a vehicle and a mechanism for that to be brought back. And so, you know, I would - and rationale by which org would have to bring that back to us. So I don't necessarily know why they wouldn't go away but (Stephanie) might have a comment?

(Stephanie): And my sense would be that the appropriate place for these to come up is in the bilateral negotiation that can be triggered between the stakeholder groups

and ICANN where there's trade-offs. And there might be sort of asks on our side for gives in certain places. And this might be a place where it's reasonable to ask but should be included as part of a larger negotiation process that's included in the contracts.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, I would offer further that, you know, DNS is a far more important service I think operationally than something RDDS. And our monthly reporting on that is a few - very small number of fields. And, you know, we shouldn't be technically interesting for those of us that our technicians myself included, does not mean there should be a contractual requirement upon the community to be reporting this stuff every month. And it's an ongoing burden because those numbers have to be accurate and at least at our company we invest a great deal of money in making sure those numbers are accurate, that they're double checked. And the amount of effort that goes into producing those reports accurately every month for all the TLDs that we support is completely nontrivial. And so we shouldn't just think of it it's a simple effort and just something we should do in support because it's technically interesting as a research topic.

Jim Galvin: So thanks for that. I have another question too. The actual document that was sent around by ICANN as a summary to where the SLA reporting stuff was, you know, they had proposed a document that was supposed to come out of that subgroup. And there's just - the status of that as I understand it right, the last time that (Jeff) sent a message to the list so there were some additions that ICANN had made to the document and we are going to push back on them on that.

I don't know if (Jeff) has done that or not yet though, you know, and that's supposed to be the document that will define the SLA and reporting requirements because we split that off from this group. But that should happen and it is somehow tied to the RDAP stuff and I guess it's actually a question that I have in my mind. What is the tie here? Do we know? There was this notion that at some point here there'd be a transition period, there'll

be a window during which you won't be held to the SLAs but then the SLAs will become valid. But aren't they on the same timeframe as the deployment of RDAP or are they going to get their own 180 days and make all that work? But yes curious about where all that is. And I don't know if you know. You probably don't know if (Jeff) has submitted the document or not yet.

Rick Wilhelm: So I don't know if (Jeff) has submitted the document yet. What Jim is referring to is that in the SLA and reporting language there is an SLA holiday that's baked into their - a term, that's a term if you will where the - it doesn't mean that you all get to go on holiday because you're involved in SLAs just in case you were - sorry (Sarah) and yes. The - what it means is that the SLAs will not be enforced. I think the current number is 180 days after RDAP goes live. And so that would be 180 after the August date.

So that the one, the SLAs are not enforced for 180 days after RDAP goes live. And that's what's current and that - which is a relative - the concept of an SLA holiday is relatively common in what we have been doing in and around ICANN where a service goes live and it gives it the whoever is providing the service a chance to kind of get up to speed, get their machinery working where the SLA monitoring takes place but enforcement is deferred for this period of the holiday.

And so that, right now the SLA holiday that's in the document is 180 days. And so that means that RDAP goes live August of '19, 2019, this coming August. And then the SLAs would be enforced 180 days after that which would be February of 2020 right?

Jim Galvin: Just to focus in on one detail though what's important is that the holiday starts when the RDAP deployment is enforced. And that was part of my question too. And I just wanted to call that out and make sure that's the way we all see that so we're all in agreement on that particular point. Even though this document has not yet been published and unless you were part of the group

you don't know that the SLAs are but so, you know, we're already in the window here for RDAP, that's all.

Marc Anderson: Yes (Rich), go ahead.

(Rich): Thanks, (Rich) from GoDaddy. The - I wanted - I haven't seen the SLAs and I don't know the language where it's required for Whois to give one number. But I don't want to take it too lightly that a replacement system would mean that all we have to give is the number of queries because for each different type of Whois query that you can perform we give detailed counts. There's only one type of Whois query you can do. With RDAP there's going to be anonymous, there's going to be authenticated -- things along those - there may be some things that are material not that I'm arguing for it, but people could make an argument like this saying that it's material for the stability and security of the Internet to know how many invalid this or that or the other. So I just don't want to take it for granted that a one for one replacement will get us off the hook and we need to be vigilant.

Rick Wilhelm: Right, so right - fair point (Rich). So and I'll come back to Jim your point in a second. So right now there are only unauthenticated queries. And so if and when the world changes which we expect it will with regard to UAM, then we would revisit that and perhaps there would be another set of another reporting element that might get added to that. The original set of 19, (Stephanie) seems to think it was 19 it might be - it was more than ten less than two dozen. Nineteen sticks in my mind also but it had - it was a variety that was a lot. And it was stuff where I was kind of shrugging my shoulders saying I don't even know why, you know, we probably wouldn't even track these kinds of things internally right? It was that much fine-grain.

So your point is fair that it might in the future there might be the need for an additional data point or so similar to like right now in DNS we report more than one number right? We report a couple of different query numbers. And in Whois right now there's at least in some of our stuff we report like a Web

Whois number and a raw 43 number in our legacy contracts as an example. So yes I - that's a very fair point. I still don't see us getting up to 19 right?

And then Jim your - you were saying about I'm sorry, I lost you're the point that you made but there was something I ...

Jim Galvin: So that SLAs the holidays starts on the day that RDAP deployment is required.

Rich Wilhelm: So yes that is - that's something that we're tracking very closely. And my inside counsel that I'm working with that is like posted number one on the document with regard to how we're tracking this. Yes we're very cognizant of that. (Stephanie)?

(Stephanie): Jumping back a little and I haven't been deeply involved in either of the sort of separate strands of conversation but intuitively it seems like the point at which we're expected to abide by the real SLAs might be a reasonable period to link to sunseting Whois. There seems to be a sort of logical relationship between those two things.

Rich Wilhelm: An interesting thing that - for us to take up with staff yes. Jim?

Jim Galvin: Yes just to add to that a bit, trying to recover in my mind all the discussions that we had in the SLA group about the Whois versus RDAP. And you were summarizing some of that in the beginning there Rick but there was this desire to at some point you would be obligated to both. I'm actually trying to remember, I've got to go back and look in the SLA document now. Isn't there a thing where you're allowed to have one or the other go down? If you have both then they both have to be down in order for it to be a breach. As long as you have both and one or the other could be down and it would be okay. And that's the conclusion we came to in what we did here which I don't think is quite the same as what you were talking about (Stephanie). And I just wanted to call that out. There's some discussion to be had there about RDAP SLAs

and Whois sunseting that we probably want to have some more discussion about.

(Stephanie): Is not quite the same but I don't think it's necessarily incompatible either. You could have a set up where optionally you ran both in parallel and then it would be one service goes down or only if both services go down that it's triggered or at the end of the period if you were opting to just do one then you're sort of putting your chance on that one service and if that one service goes down. So I actually they're not the same notion but I think they would actually fit together well.

Rich Wilhelm: Yes, you're both right as it's frequently said (unintelligible). So did you - so Jim you're hitting on language that's in the current document that refers to the avoidance of so-called double jeopardy, again my term whereby if there - this is to avoid the emergency trigger for - that would be triggered only by RDAP going down or only by Whois going down. And then (Stephanie) you're going, rolling forward to a possible future scenario in which you would be able to say look we're going to go, a particular contracted party is going to go into sunset mode on Whois. And if we're going to go in sunset mode on Whois then that means we're going to put all of our, we're going to put our emergency threshold trigger onto RDAP and we're going to put that weight on RDAPs shoulders and dot, dot, ,dot, that sort of a thing. But they're, but your both correct yes. Not surprisingly yes.

(Clark): Was, (Clark) here just to drag us back into the land of ICANN reporting for a sec, searchable Whois is a thing a lot of us run variations of authenticated and on authenticated access as well and also allows you to do fairly complex searches on a number of fields. That's deduced to a single row on how many searchable inquiries there is. So you could argue that there is something similar to RDAP right now in terms of its capability which people run and ICANN seems to be okay with the data that we've given them right now, just bring it up there.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, good conversation there and thank you Rick for seeing that one through. Yes I think, you know, there's, you know, the discussions around SLAs reporting requirements, you know, sort of not to be lost in the shuffle right? It's, you know, those are obligations that we have to keep on our radar and there are certainly contractual implications around those so thank you everyone for a good conversation there.

Moving on to that, you know, so I think Rick you can draw line on this one and we're going to switch up the order a bit. So I'm going to ask Jody to go next and give us an update on the TSG group. I tried to get (Roger) to do it instead but (Roger) dutifully set that to Jody but we're going to get Jody to give us an update there.

And then what we're going to do is leave the remainder of our time for the discussion on EPDP and particularly, you know, talk about, you know, what, you know, what we as a Tech Ops group what the implications or modifications on us and what we're going to want to focus on in the next year or so. So that's where we are agenda-wise. With that lead-in I'll turn it over to our own Jody Kolker who is wearing, you know, I think you're the only person wearing both hats as Tech Ops and TSG right? Gavin oh okay, so we can put Gavin on the task of making sure Jody is on the up and up here.

Man: And you know he's wearing a white shirt so those with tomatoes might want to go this way instead of that way.

Jody Kolker: So I'm glad Gavin is here because he can keep me honest and probably answer a lot more questions than I can. But, you know, I'm going to start with some assumptions. We all know what GDPR is right? We all know how we had to change Whois. I don't have to go into all of this. Now there is going to be a session tomorrow from a think it's 1:30 to 3 o'clock that will go over this in much more detail than what I'm going to.

Basically the reason that this group came around is because ICANN saw that entities needed access to the private data or the nonpublic gTLD registration data -- however we want to phrase it. And this group was brought together to try to figure out a way to reduce the liability on contracted parties and still allow entities to be able to get this access.

No I'll stay out of the editorial. Anyways so we explored some technical solutions for authenticating, authorizing and providing this access the - with legitimate access or interest and it was all built on RDAP. Now the solution that we came up with or basically I should say first of all we're a group of engineers. A few of us maybe had some policy experience but I don't think any of us had legal experience. So I will say this. If you take a group of engineers I think that you can create anything you want given enough time and money but it doesn't make it legal right? It doesn't make it legal and follow policy. It just means that it was able to be done.

So basically to start with an assumption that ICANN would provide a proxy and all access to that registration data. The query itself from RDAP would go to ICANN and then ICANN would forward that on based on credentials, authentication, authorization. What we came up with was who's going to provide the authorization and the accreditation for this? Asking ICANN to do authorization for thousands of usernames and passwords did not seem like it was tenable to ICANN.

So what we basically came down to is an o-auth and an open ID solution were basically a request will come in for RDAP to ICANN. ICANN will then authorize and accredit or not authorize but give authorization authenticate that request and then send that to the registrars or the - who's ever closest to the data, either the registrars or registries and then send that back to the requester. That's basically it in a nutshell. And I know there's lots of questions especially from Jim I'm sure of how this is going to work.

There are several questions that I have in my mind is this was supposed to reduce the liability of the contracted parties but with every person that receives this data, the liability only increases. It doesn't reduce. So I'm not sure how this is going to stop that or limit the liability of contracted parties.

So I believe that with the implementation of this it will have to go through an implementation review team I'm sure something, to be able to be implemented. And I think it's going to have to have a very hard look by both the legal and policy departments of registrars and registries to determine if registries and registrars are comfortable with implementing something like this. As I said we were a group of engineers tasked with something to fix. We fixed it and the best way that we could see but it doesn't mean that it reduces the liability of the contracted parties.

(Sarah)?

(Sarah Wilde): Hi, this is (Sarah Wilde). I have a question not related to liability just to keep things fun. You had mentioned the ICANN would go to whoever is closest to the data, either the registrar or registry. How would it decide which to ask?

Jody Kolker: Yes we didn't cover that. And I knew that was going to come up, but no we did not cover that of who would be asked. I mean obviously for com, I think it would come to the registrars but for any other Thick gTLD I'm not sure if it's going to be going to the registries or the registrars. I think that's up for debate. Registrars actually own the data they just transferred to the registries but I think that that's a legal and policy issue too.

(Sarah Wild): Indirectly that's a question about liability.

Man 1: (Unintelligible) question, so cool, ICANN take the load in authenticating and then we do the rest. But a question here is does the registry operator always in the back end registry for that matter, probably most of the registrar but what's their ability to deny access to someone?

Jody Kolker: I'm glad you brought that up. So one of the - what we can be passed from the registries and registrars is we can be passed a user ID to determine - now that's a, you know, it's a random user ID though. I mean you get a user ID and it should be the same one for every request that entity makes. And what I'm hoping is that we will be able to allow so many in just like we do with Whois requests now but, you know, not knowing who that person is the liability of the registrars and registries not knowing who that is, is very large.

Man: We never have even discuss that.

Jody Kolker: No we did not discuss that at all. I mean I think Gavin can fill us in on this too is that, you know, we have a series of error message we can send back, you know, for instance too many queries or, you know, one could also be not authorized, you know, not authorized by your system itself. Maybe you want to be able to have some kind of contract with that person too.

Man 1: Yes sorry, that's a - that's good that you got started up in that way but and I guess that's where the challenge is is that knowing who the person is, the entity or the organization and be able to throw that back if there's some sort of gigantic database of holds who those users are as well then there's a whole privacy thing on who can get access to that database and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

So whilst it's kind of cool to have this centralized model great, but their ability to control the data and if it - and if anyone ever comes up and goes why did you give person A that information especially when you've got inter, you know, policing rules and things like that, you know, that's a little scary for everybody.

Gavin Brown: This is Gavin Brown for the record. So a couple of points. The first one is obviously the group had to work from a set of assumption one of which was that there would be a legal and policy framework in place that would satisfy

the concerns of the contracted parties in terms of their liabilities. And we also designed a system that was flexible enough to allow a certain degree of transparency on who is making a request and why.

But we - one of the things we did clearly hear from people like (Benedict) and Steve Crocker who are the group was that there are certain potential users of this system for example law enforcement, security researchers for whom there would be an operational risk if too much information about the request they were making was disclosed. And this is entirely legitimate and law enforcement looking at terrorists for example don't necessarily want, you know, anyone in the world knowing that they're investigating a terrorist group. So it's not an unreasonable thing to say that there may be - there needs to be some sort of pseudonymity to those requests.

Obviously our group kind of discussed a lot of the kind of nontechnical policy things as a general kind of - knowing in detail and certainly not in the decision-making way, but we do flag up a number of the policy considerations in our draft report. And we're encouraging ICANN org and also ICANN community to address those issues.

Man 1: Another question, maybe you said that already but then I didn't catch it. So if ICANN is doing the authentication that's all fine but who is doing the credentialing to authenticate anyone? And what will be, you know, part of a credentialing, and who's keeping that data, and is that passed on and all this interesting little questions?

Jody Kolker: Thanks Rick, asking (Thomas), I did not say that but I meant to. The credentialing body would be such as the law enforcement agency itself would credential whoever they would like to have access to it. And that's - there would also be other groups that would be credentialed by ICANN. And then those groups would be allowed to credential their users. And yes there's lots of questions over that and concerns about who's going to be allowed to see this data and what specifically are these entities looking for and who will they

be credentialing? You know, I have a cousin who's suddenly a lawyer now. Yes he graduated and he's a lawyer. So can he just go to the IPC community and say, I'm an intellectual property lawyer. I'd like to see the private Whois for 3 million domains. And because I'm a lawyer I should be able to see that. So I mean those are just huge concerns of mine of how they can, you know - I also come from a very small town and, you know, there's 2000 people there and, you know, a newly ordained cop could get access to 180 million records because he's part of law enforcement.

Man 1: One more question. So is that work done from your perspective? I totally I understand the technical concept, I totally understand that the problems that come along with that. But is that - it's basically...

Jody Kolker: You make it sound like we didn't do anything.

Man 1: Sorry, no that's not what I meant.

Jody Kolker: Come tomorrow that's basically it is that we have - the paper I believe is ready to go and I'll let Gavin answer that.

Gavin Brown: Thanks Jody. So what we - what was published a couple of days ago was our draft report. And we're here now at this meeting, meeting with a lot of different organizations in groups within ICANN or sorry ICANN community to discuss it and give feedback. And there will be - I don't know if there's going to be a public comment period. I think that we're basically soliciting feedback from the community on this model.

One thing I want to stress though is that what we've designed is not something that is, that once it's finalized ICANN org's going to go off and build. We're - the objective for our study group is to produce a model, an operating model that Goran and the ICANN organization could take to the European Data Protection Board and say, "Hey have a look at this. We think this can work from a technical and operational point of view. Does this if we

implemented it reduce the liability on the contracted parties for disclosing non-public registration data?"

If the European Data Protection Board says no then that's it, it stops. That whole process stops. And if the policy development process says no this is not acceptable, this is not compliant then it stops there as well. So what we're doing is it's more like I kind of is a straw man. We're coming up with a potential model that may subject to legal and policy approval end up being implemented in some form or another three to five years down the line. But it is not something that is going to be up and running in, you know, 18 months or something. This is the start of a potentially quite a long process and we're producing just the first draft of the first version of the kind of, you know, the seed that may eventually grow into something actually implemented in real - in the real world.

Jim Galvin:

So I wanted to take a moment and kind of walk through a little bit of a use case in terms of how I understood the document which was distributed a couple days ago and have actually looked at most of it. So but there's a - I want to frame this in sort of a slightly - an interesting way -- oh and this is Jim Galvin for the record. It is a technical framework for how one - how a provider of data could decide ultimately, has the decision on whether or not to disclose the data. And it's simply a framework for credential management more than anything else. So the provider of the data still gets to decide ultimately whether or not they're going to honor that credential. They are the last decision for themselves.

And so there are a lot of policy and legal questions that come to bear on where different parts of the system fit right? So a user wants data they go to an ICANN service is the way this thing is framed and there's some kind of identity validation that happens. And it might happen at ICANN, it might happen by a third party service provider but there is some kind of legal and policy framework that goes around all of that happening. And there's some credential that's created as part of that. And that credential is then passed on

to the service provider or the source of the data and said here this is a valid credential. There's some other magic that'll happen on the source on the provider side about whether or not they believe the credential and then they decide whether they're going to return the data or not and pass it on.

And there are a lot of choices that are still yet to be decided in there. I mean I ask questions like is the credential persistent or a one-off? And, you know, the answer is well that just depends whatever you want, you know, and so you do different things. You know, the issues of how you deal with law enforcement who might want to have some amount of anonymity or pseudonymity with respect to their credentials is all part of this whole process. And yes the legal framework is all about who carries what data where and when and how you get access to that. So I guess, have I characterized, have I said anything which does not align with what you - so I got all of that out and I'm good to go?

Gavin Brown: Yes, I think everything you said is completely compatible with the report. I mean we didn't make any assumptions on - well we did - we kind of we designed a model that could accommodate almost every conceivable outcome of a policy development process. So let's say that the policy development process allows for high-volume automated access to nonpublic registration data, system allows for that. We would take no position on whether that's acceptable or desirable. But it also if each individual request has to be manually reviewed by a lawyer then the system allows for that as well. And so the, you know, the one, this model does accommodate and that is flexible to cover all the possible operational actual usages.

Man: So I think maybe Marc did this on purpose and put it in this order for a reason or changed the order. I think it was a great exercise to go through like everybody - several people have mentioned. It has no weight or validity to it. It's a technical solution that somebody can use later on. And I guess to me the obvious place where this goes next is the EDP Disclosure Team whatever that's called. And I was just wondering to get view points from those

members if they see this as useful and are they planning to use it moving forward?

Jim Galvin: Can I just amend your question a little bit, not just the EPDP team but I suspect this TSG report should also have influence into the RDAP pilot as we begin to work through the issues of, you know, experimentation and testing and I say I just got Rick raised his hand, all right. Now we've got a discussion.

Jody Kolker: I would agree with that amendment. Thanks.

Rick Wilhelm: So I - so I think that we in the RDAP pilot group need to hold - well as while I would like as an engineer to charge in on this, the RDAP pilot working group needs to first work on absorbing the output of the EPDP phase one which has just concluded the final report after it gets going after the Implementation Review Team because this stuff here on my screen is the technical study group report is going to be influencing EPDP phase two.

And so I think that the RDAP pilot working group needs to quote stay in its lane and to focus on the EPDP output for phase one and wait until the EPDP phase two makes some decisions because if they - to me the most interesting piece of the technical report put by the - in the draft technical access model is in on Page 10 where it says each of the following actor models are supported by the proposed solution in Section H, policy requirements will determine which actor model is best suited right?

And then there's five actor models which run the gamut. And that's where the technical study group has sort of set out the range of possibilities. And then the EPDP phase two will sort of set policy that will sort of select, down select within when something. And then subsequently the RDAP pilot working group will come back. Now the EPDP phase two may come to the RDAP pilot working group with a question or two but I think that right now the RDAP pilot working group needs to focus on the output of phase one so...

Marc Anderson: So I agree with your timing question and I don't have any issues with that. But what I do want to be careful about is that I don't want to serialize the EPDP and the RDAP pilot working group. I'd like to think that as the RDAP working group which is not what this is -- I understand that - you know, it's a technical body too. You know, we should have some influence into what the EPDP is doing or the next phase two is doing so we have the opportunity to do some work to consider some of these things and, you know, that bit of discussion, thanks.

(Roger): This is (Roger). Yes and until you brought that up I agree that the order is correct. We need to address recommendation - the first set of recommendations first. But again the RDAP pilot group was moving on to this discussion next. This was their next discussion. And one of the reasons was so that we could influence policy, you know, in the correct ways. We didn't want policy to come up with things - this framework is again, a good piece of work but the problem is its way to open.

And if you give this to a set of policy people they're going to make everything in the world happen because it allows that. And that's not really what you want to happen. You want to allow that structure but - and I think that as Jim mentioned I think we need to do, the pilot working group needs to do that work alongside of the EPDP work. So thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks (Roger), Jody everybody who participated there. I think especially (Rich). Okay yes go for it.

(Rich): Okay, thanks (Rich) again. You know where I work. Anyway one of the things that I don't quite get it is if through the workflow that I've seen data for a - registrant data for a particular domain name for a fixed scenario will it be housed at the registrar and at the registry, yet each of those two entities gets to decide independently theoretically on whether or not they will accept the accreditation or the authentication that has been performed.

And if there are differing levels of scrutiny that each of the organizations provides will this solution that's been brought forth allow for venue shopping for trying to get access to data where the "owner" or the - I'm going to stay away from controller and processor and stuff but how do you prohibit venue shopping for the data?

(Roger): So I'll jump in on that one. You know, there's a lot of ways we could answer that. And I'll just say like the EPDP is aware that we have not addressed that particular item. And I, you know, that's, you know, I can't guarantee what the output of phase two will be but, you know, that is something we're aware that is an outstanding question and we hope to definitively answer that in phase - as part of our phase two recommendations. I have my own opinion on how that should be answered but I'll keep that out of the discussion today. Did you want to jump in?

Jim Galvin: Yes so Jim Galvin for the record. I guess I wanted to complicate the question a little just, put a couple additional questions on the table just so it's all visible to everyone. What I think about in that particular scenario is I cast it into there are a few questions which have not been, you know, reasonably answered yet. And I think the answers to these questions will help influence where the query goes to to get the data right?

So the way to avoid the forum shopping is the fact that one of the ways in which this thing is laid out the TSG report is laid out is that ICANN tells them where to go find the data, okay? So in theory, you know, all of the sort of sorts itself out but that assumes there are well-defined rules on that end to make that work. But there are things that complicate that decision which ICANN may not have access to and wants to do that referral.

So for example there might be differences about publication depending on whether it's a legal or natural person. And it depends on whether that information is in the registry or the registrar because we also have to answer the question whether that information is passed up or not and what that really

means. There's also the question of consent-based publication, you know, are registries going to honor that or just registrars going to honor that question? And that hasn't been decided from a policy point of view and also in the legal framework role that goes.

I mean if you're going to have it then, you know, who's going to be responsible for it and if you have to pass that data up. So forum shopping is, you know, sort of a nice vague term to describe this but for me there are some real issues in here that have not yet been discussed at all that have to be exposed and opened. And I just wanted to put that on the table more than anything. It's just a comment. Thanks.

(Rich): Thank you and good points. And just sort of in general, you know, I mean (Sarah)'s one of the alternates. I'm one of the representatives on the EPDP. So to the extent that we have issues like this that should be brought up, you know, please let's take advantage of that fact here and raise them on the group. I'll quibble a little bit on the consent-based one. I think we're pretty clear in our phase one report or at least we intended to be that, you know, there's no, you know, there's no transfer of consent from registrar to registry. In, you know, in our recommendations we're very concerned about the legality of being able to transfer consent. So I mean not to disagree with your point, you know, valid points but I'll just I think, you know, I think we tried to make the case that, you know, consent, you know, consent to publish is just at the registrar level, not at the registry level.

Jim Galvin: So thank you for that. You know, I do get that. It was more about the larger picture of it factors into this whole thing about forum shopping and how does ICANN make the decision on about where to send you for the data? It's not going to have that fact. So, you know, that factors into how the whole system works is my point more than anything.

- (Rich): Yes fair enough and I, yes I agree. And I think, you know, like I said we're aware that we haven't answered that one and intend to as part of our phase to work. But...
- Man: ICANN's not going to have what fact?
- (Rich): They're not going to know about the consent question, has the registrant consented to publication ICANN won't have that data if it's only held at the registrar not passed up in any way. So how are they going to do the referral to the registrar versus the referral to the registry?
- Jim Galvin: Yes I, yes I, yes I get the point yes. I think we yes we intend to address that in phase two, I'll just say. I know how I think it should be addressed but we'll see how the rest of the EPDP shakes out. But, you know, and I think that's a great segue is, you know, (Roger) pointed out, you know, this, you know, there's a lot of overlap between these discussions and the work that's going on in the EPDP both...
- (Zoe): Sorry I just wanted to point out, I'll put this in chat. So there is of course the main cross community session with the TSG group tomorrow but it's on exactly the same time as the registrar meeting with compliance. So because of that the registrars have requested that we have our own updates. (Saram) is coming to the registrar meeting on Tuesday and we're having our own private Q&A and update. So just if you're conflicted about those two things don't worry there is going to be opportunity to speak directly to them at that time. Thanks.
- Marc Anderson: Great, thank you (Zoe). I lost my train of thought. Oh, okay. A lot of, you know, a lot of overlap between, you know, what's going on with the RDAP pilot and I think, you know, Rick made an excellent point that what's in the RDAP pilot recommendations are recommendations for how to implement the temporary spec.

And there I'll segue, you know, quickly into the EPDP phase one recommendations which, you know, in part recommend that the language of the temporary specification be kept in place for what we call the bridging mechanism, as a bridging mechanism giving contracted parties a chance to implement the phase one recommendations until February 29, 2020. Yes 2020 is the leap year. So you can ask me later how we came up with that date.

But, you know, what the RDAP pilot report or recommendations do is provide instructions for how to implement RDAP for the temporary specification. And so we'll also have two go through the exercise through that group of defining how to implement RDAP per the phase one EPDP recommendations. And as, you know, as we've discussed that's, you know, assuming the board approves it and then proceeds. Yes, go ahead.

(Roger): Sorry just wanted - this is (Roger) just wanted to ask then from in RDAP pilot standpoint are we trying to plan to get our work done by August 27 so that our six-month window for the new profile would be available August 27 so that people could implement it before the February 29 deadline of the EPDP?

Marc Anderson: I think, you know, I'll just jump in and say, you know, we'll have to work that out right? The, you know, there'll have to be, you know, some implementation phase. And we actually have Dennis standing in the back of the room who's the GDD staffer who's assigned to the implementation of the EPDP phase one recommendations right? And so, you know, so he's the man on point there who will be working on the policy for, you know, for implementing the EPDP phase one recommendations. And, you know, I think that will, you know, will sort of dovetail nicely into the work for the RDAP pilot working group.

The - but I think getting to what you were asking the recommendations from the EPDP are such that until -- let's see, if I get this right - February 29th you can implement either the language in the temporary specification or what's in

the new EPDP recommendations. So you can do either but by February 29, 2020 you have to have the EPDP recommendations completed. So there is an opportunity for overlap.

(Roger): Yes and I guess my point is, is to come into compliance with what you have to do by February 29 the RDAP profile has to change and it will have to be time between when that change is end February 29 for people to implement it. So that - my question is, is we - the RDAP Profile Team will have to create that profile quick enough so that it's done with how much ever lead time, if it six months is probably not needed but whatever it is, that has to be done forward, you know, to get that 29th date.

Marc Anderson: Yes absolutely. The sooner we have that in place the sooner we can implement it. And, you know, I think we'd all prefer, you know, more lead time to less lead time. You know, and I'll also say, you know, one of the decisions we made in the, you know, in the early phases of the RDAP pilot working group was to split the profile out into two documents. You know, we knew we would be in this scenario where, you know, the policy, you know, underpinning this would change.

And so, you know, we made the decision to separate out the document for exactly this purpose. So we're going to test our theory and see, you know, how easy it is to swap that out. And Rick's nodding but he looks like he desperately wants to jump in the queue so go ahead.

Rick Wilhelm: Jumped over the queue. So thank you Rick Wilhelm. So we've already tested it once right because we've already leapt from the original profile that was done to the current profile which supports the temporary spec right, so we did an original implementation of the profile documents which never really saw the light of day and then modified it. So we trial run - we trial ran that mechanism previously.

And so this time to implement the output of the EPDP temporary, implement the output of the EPDP final report will be the second time that that's done. So we've got a fair bit of confidence that that will work. So that - so with regard to the document split.

Marc Anderson: Yes fair point. I think you were looking for a cookbook. The first version was done against the cookbook. Yes and they yes, and we did once the, once a temporary specification was available we, you know, we updated it for the temporary specification so yes a fair point. We've done this once before.

Hopefully we're able to adjust it fairly rapidly and get it new version of the profile out that works for the EPDP recommendations. And we have as much lead time as possible to implement that. I think obviously all of us want as much lead time ahead of February 29, 2020 as we can get.

All right just a couple of other things. You know, we had some excellent, you know, excellent discussion on the TSG report. And I think, you know, one of the things that - that's sort of been an undercurrent or a theme for a lot of the discussions around GDPR compliance is sort of a chicken and the egg discussion about what is possible from a technology perspective versus where the policy is and what policy needs to be in place.

And so one of the things that I, you know, and, you know, for my 2 cents one of the things that the TSG report does nicely is it sort of outlines what the policy guidance what policy guidance is needed in order to implement a technical solution. So hopefully that will be helpful to the phase two work. But I want to sort of touch on real quick that the - what's - what the EPDP phase two work is chartered to do is very specifically answer the question of what policy recommendations are needed in order to accomplish a unified access model or disclosure as we prefer to call it.

But, you know, it's important that, you know, in the EPDP group we're just developing, you know, the policy and that the technical solution's completely

separate initiative from that. And so, you know, I think Jim references this that, you know, we would like, you know, with the RDAP pilot group we would like the ability to sort of influence or provide input into, you know, what's practical or what's possible from an implementation standpoint. And I think that's, you know, one of the things, you know, in my read that the TSG report does nicely is sort of try and say, you know, try not to influence policy so much as, you know, predetermine an output or an outcome but more sort of guide what are the policy questions that need to be answered in order to develop a solution.

So, you know, I think that's, you know, one of the discussions that's been going on throughout this whole process and something that I wanted to sort of highlight for everybody, applaud or anybody wants to react to that or jump in?

(Rich): It's (Rich), GoDaddy. The concern I have was already iterated by Jody I just want to reiterate it and that is that by describing the universe it implies the universe is on the table. And I know it's up to the policy folks to decide the subset of the universe that will be implemented. But it just gives me pause to think that this is going to be some sort, the TSG report's going to be some guiding menu of possibilities that can be implemented as opposed to what should be implemented, et cetera. And I get that the distinction to it. It just gives me pause and it makes me gives me concern.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. (Sarah) do you want to state into that? Okay realize I've been doing a lot of talking but I'll go ahead and continue. I guess I would say, you know, I don't think that the EPDP group is going to look at that as a buffet and try and take everything off the buffet. You know, I, you know, I appreciate your concern but I don't think that's a likely scenario from that group. That's, you know, not how phase one played out and I don't think there is a, you know, I don't think that's a realistically how phase two will play out but fair concern. Any other thoughts on that?

All right so I want to shift back to the phase one report and highlight something I think, you know, Gavin you were maybe the first person to bring this up. He's nodding so I think he knows where I'm going with this one. But, you know, in the phase one report sort of fundamentally make some changes to our ecosystem as we're used to dealing with it in that the admin contact has been dropped and the technical contact has been sort of changed from how we've traditionally thought of the technical contact.

And, you know, I'll maybe, you know, I'll tee this up a little bit more but maybe see if Gavin if you want to jump in and a second. But, you know, I'll not assume that everybody knows this so, you know, in, how we, you know, how registries and registers implement contacts there is not an admin contact or a technical contact. There is a contact object that is assigned the role of admin technical registrant billing if your system supports billing for example.

And so changing, you know, changing the context to be - to have different values or different properties whether you're in a registrant contact or a technical contact is a not insignificant change to how our systems have operated traditionally. And so I think this is one of the more interesting things that came out of phase one from a maybe a technical implementation standpoint. And because this is, you know, front and center in this group's charter as far as looking at technical challenges between registries and registrars, touchpoints between registries and registrars I thought this would be a good topic to bring up here. And as I said, you know, Gavin brought - has brought this one up so I'll throw it over to him to see if he would like to tee this up for discussion.

Gavin Brown: Yes, thank you Marc, Gavin Brown for the record. So as a registry we implement the RFCs for EPP and they define a set of first-class contact or first-class objects in our system. So there is a domain name. If you implement the host object model there are hosts and you implement contact objects if you're a thick registry.

And these contact objects are first-class objects and they are created independently of the domain names that they may be linked to. And when they're created we don't know at the point of creation what they're going to get used for. And in fact as it turns out my research suggests that a lot of the contact objects are created and they're never used and which and then this comes into conflict with the recommendations of the EDP, EPDP report because of the way that as Marc has said the data model for domain names is changing.

We're going to continue to have a registrant which is going to have all of the attributes that registrants currently have. The open contact is going away. That is neither here nor there as far as EPP is concerned but the technical contact is changing.

So that rather than having the same set of contact information as a registrant's own name, organization, street address, phone, fax, email it's just going to have a name and then potentially an email address and potentially a phone number. A problem we have is that as a registry where a contract say we must comply with RFC 5733 and there is an XML schema in RFC 5733 that requires us to require registrars to provide at least a city and a country code for every contact object they create.

But something's got to give. Either we're no longer required to implement RFC 5733 or we change RFC 5733 or we come up with some other solution. And I outlined a set of possible approaches to the gTLD tech mailing list in sort of going from the kind of most correct and proper way of doing it down to the most tacky and inconvenient but quickest way of doing it.

So the first option would obviously be to update the XML schema in RFC 5733. So to update a standards track RFC is not a quick process but it can be done. My next thought was to define a new object or a new extension that would allow us to specify the technical contact information for a domain name. Now I've done research in the past and I've published a link to that

research which gives the line to the idea that contact information should be a first class object because that's simply not how their contact ought to be used, not how contact objects are used not by registrars.

So rather than having a many to one relationship between domains and contacts where you have, you know, one contact object which is used across many to many domain names it, because of the limitations of the PDP because you can't see what other domain names that contact object is linked to there's high risk for a registrar in arbitrarily updating the domain. So what happens is the registrars create a new contact object every time, well every time they have a new customer, every time their customer, you know, contact information changes.

And so there are kind of - the architectural style that the EPP RCs currently follow isn't really applicable I don't think anymore. And I 0 so my thought was rather than defining a new contact object or what's been called shallow contact or a light contact let's just treat them as what they really are witches attributes of a domain name. So let's just create an EPDP extension on domain names and just put their contact information, the technical contact information into an extension of the domain name rather than going through the pain of having to define a new object type or updating an existing object type. I have not had universal approval or agreement with that. And unfortunately (Patrick Macek) isn't here so we can have a friendly face to face discussion. But so this is the issue that I raised on the mailing list and but definitely appreciate more attention from this group on how we can solve that problem.

Marc Anderson: Thank you Gavin. That was, you know, a great description of that. I think there's some people looking to jump into the queue on that one. Food for thought though, I'll also just mention that it's possible to transfer contacts which, you know,...

Gavin Brown: So...

Marc Anderson: I don't know if you want to tackle that today but I'll just throw that out there...

Gavin Brown: ...yes but so again so I - at the (Reggie) Ops meeting in where was it, the Amsterdam I think it was, I published - I've linked to it so I've done some research on this. We have - we - our registry system supports contact transfers. We've done 200,000 registrant or domain name transfers. We've never done one contact transfer. In fact the - some of the other stats that I can give you we received so 20,000 to 30,000 new contacts created each day. About 50,000 contact updates each day, 24 contact deletes each day which is why we do it ourselves. We stopped - we purged these domain names, these contact objects ourselves because you can't registrars just it's too hard for them to work out whether it safe to delete the contact object or not, so they don't.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Lots of people looking to get in the queue so apologies if I'm going out of order but I'll start here and work my way around.

(Roger): Yes this is (Roger). And I actually I just wanted to add something so give people food for thought as it goes around. It - the RFCs that Gavin keeps referring to is used by more than just gTLDs. So the issue about changing it is one of the big issues that come up about changing it the ccTLDs are using appears so if we change that you're affecting something that this policy doesn't even we have any control over. So it's one of those things just food for thought. You know, I don't like that argument but it is something that's been brought up.

Gavin Brown: Yes and that's why I kind of feel like chain RFC 5733 will have the exact opposite affect that sum of the proponents of it have because as I said in the place to the mailing list that there is an implicit data collection policy written into RFC 5733 that says - that allows a registry server EPP server operator to rely on the XML schema to ensure that city and country code elements are

submitted when contact objects are created. So that enforces that policy that they may have.

Now if we change the XML schema from underneath them, you know, one intention engineer and we'll say oh there's a new version of RFC 573 or 33 or copy out the XML schema and deploy it in production. And then they're running for a potentially considerable period of time when they realize actually every contact object has been created since that happened and it's no longer in compliance with their data collection policy which is why I think if we kind of come up with a solution it has to be something that's separate from the existing data model in addition to and make that - make it clear in the specification for that that this is intended for use by, you know, gTLD registries and ICANN accredited registrars. Otherwise we yes we could end up pulling the rug out from under ccTLD registries.

Marc Anderson: (Clark)?

(Clark): (Clark) from Neustar. Taking one big leap backwards contact objects are completely irrelevant until their use for domain names. So the view of talking about contact objects in isolation is I find the wrong way to approach it. I think it's - you find a domain name in a thick registry and then you find what contact is linked to that domain name which with whatever relationship and then that's your information that you're looking for. Starting with context and things like a supporting with RDAP supporting entity searches I think is, it's silly personally because you're starting at the wrong point but that's on the side.

Then I, the comment I just wanted to make was yes the contact chat is good but it has to be always in context with to the domain first. Start with the domain, then find the contact is the point I want to make. Thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thanks (Clark). A quick time check, we've got about 13 minutes left in this session so just keep that in mind on your comments. Rick I think you're next.

Rick Wilhelm: In other words Rick, please be quick, so subtle. A couple things contract - contact transfers they - we see them from time to time when you're doing portfolio work. That's probably the only circumstance where they kind of come up when there's a portfolio acquisition which may or may not have come across your - it's still very rare right, because most of the time portfolio work they don't - they still don't want the contacts but it does come up from time to time.

(Clark): Yes so I wasn't including bulk transfers that we have, we handle out of band. But, you know, if we - like I say that stat was from a couple of years ago and I'm sure it's no different now. I think, you know, may even have disabled contact transfers and no one's complaining.

Rick Wilhelm: Outside of bulk it's entity. On the, you know, 57 - there is related to 5733 that, you know, that was built in a pre-privacy world. And so what might be relevant and this is really a discussion Scott Hollenbeck is going to be giving here tonight and he'll be here the rest of the balance of the week and so conversations with him should probably ensue. And I think there probably some of it might also just having to do with injecting more optionality into the thing as opposed to, you know, may rather than musts in and around the schema.

And because I think that the points about maintaining interoperability in around ccTLDs are very important especially for the registrars as we've been, we in the community have been doing things to make the cc, more the ccTLDs get on the standard space approach of the gTLD bandwagon. We shouldn't be doing things to be moving them or to dissuade them from that. That would be wrongheaded of all of us. So that's just my quick comment.

Marc Anderson: Thanks Rick, appreciate that. (Tobias)?

- (Tobias): (Tobias) speaking. And so just to get a better understanding of that so we should or we would need to update the RFC or if we are not going to update the RFC then be going for domain extension?
- Man 2: My feeling is that the least disruptive approach would be to define the domain extension. But I don't think there's any kind of consensus that that's the right way to go and I feel like we need to kind of discuss this further because yes, and I totally take on board the ccTLD, you know, interoperability thing, you know, as completely critical. We run ccTLDs and gTLDs on the same platform and we want something that can work equally well for both of them. And we also want ccTLDs to be able to use the same stack.
- (Tobias): Thank you. So but however then if we would create another extension it would probably take us long as just updating the RFC anyway?
- Man 2: I'm not sure that's true because RFC 5733 is a standards track RFC. So the level of due diligence that is applied to updating it is much higher than that of publishing an informational RFC defining an extension. There doesn't even need to be in RFC. You know, the whole of the trademark clearinghouse runs on Internet drafts so we can proceed and define an extension. It doesn't have to hit RFC status before actually running it.
- (Tobias): Thank you. But however I still see a lot of registries just claiming they're only implementing standard track and stuff like that. They're not going to implement informational ones so we are stuck a little bit here in my opinion.
- Man 2: We can't force registries to implement things. Now am I, I wouldn't accept being forced to implement something but I would implement something if it solved a problem for me and this for me is a problem.
- Marc Anderson: Before I go to (Roger) I'll just say, you know, I'm glad (Dennis) is here to hear some of this because of these are challenges that will come up during the

IRT phase. But (Roger) and if is it anybody - if I've - if there's anybody else that wants to jump in I've missed you so...

(Roger): This is (Roger). I just want to kind of add on thanks Rick for I don't know putting Scott on the spot here. I think that yes...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Roger): 5733 I think done, you know, with great intentions and everything but that was done incorrectly. The problem is, is now as Gavin pointed out is people have depended on their policies because of how it was written. So they depend on 5733 because it does require a city and country code. It should not have. I mean there is no technical reason that it should have required it. It implemented some kind of policy that was in somebody's head but it wasn't a technical reason to do it so but that's not the issue anymore because people are relying on it is the biggest problem now. So thanks.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, you know, and just to be clear I don't think more or my applying nor am I stating that 5733 was done incorrectly right? It was done correct at the time. I mean many of us were all rounded in that timeframe, you know, myself included when it was - when that was done, was at a different company at the time. but it was done correct at the time and it was done in an environment that a lot of us did foresee what we see now in 2019 different era and, you know, that - there's things that reflect the period of the time. And now in retrospect, you know, is just a different world, right? It's been almost 20 years and so consequently we need to look and see how we can make that thing adapt accordingly right? So it's just a different world.

Gavin Brown: Yes, I was just going to say 5733 is the latest version of the document that goes back to 3733. The XML schema didn't change during any of those versions so the basic RFC, you know, the XML schema in that RFC is yes as Rick says is 20 years old.

Marc Anderson: And I just add for those that don't pay attention or play in this field that much as Gavin just said, you don't update in RFC so a 5733 isn't going to get updated. They'll be a new RFC created that takes over whatever is needed. So and probably the biggest argument from a registrar standpoint is to not update, not to do an update means that now we have to support 5733 and this new one whereas we could just use the updated one. So it's one of the things that we're forced, we're going to be forcing everybody to implement two instead of possibly one.

Gavin Brown: I - my feeling is that because the XML schema is changing that the namespace version will change. And then you'll have to, you know, support context Version 1.0, context Version 1.1 because there will be two - you'll have registries that only support one and registries that only support the other which is just as bad as defining a new contact object.

Marc Anderson: Except you won't because a lot of registrars only deal with com or only deal with certain registries. And those registrars won't have to make a change at all except to move to namespace two. And they'll only have the support one whereas if you do it this way you would have to support two or three.

Gavin Brown: I'm just trying to - so to pause that. I - what I'm thinking is if you're a registrar and you're talking EPP to ccTLDs and gTLDs from the same client system so some of those ccTLDs will stick with 5733 forever and some of the gTLDs will mix and there'll be an overlap period because of deployment. And so I think you'll yes, maybe you're going to have to deal with that pain anyway. Yes, this may be true.

(Roger): So Gavin we deal with that pain all day every day. I mean this is like adding a toothpick to a camel. I mean this is...

Gavin Brown: Okay well I don't like putting toothpicks on camels.

(Roger): I mean it's just another difference between ccTLDs and gTLDs. I mean I don't think it's going to be that big of a deal to registrars to have to implement a new schema.

Gavin Brown: And as well as a DNS camel we now have an EPP camel.

Man: Yes, I should as (Roger) said, this is good assumption for us but I'm not sure how small registrars would feel about that. So point taken.

Marc Anderson: So we're under our five minute mark here so I'm going to, you know, sort of try to start drawing a bow around this one. You know, hopefully this is - this has been useful for everybody. You know, in some of our last Tech Ops meetings, you know, leading up to Kobe here we started talking about, you know, these three, you know, the EPDP recommendations, the RDAP pilot report and the work coming out of TSG and realizing there's a lot of overlap, a lot of interplay here and there's a lot of work for us.

You know, so coming out of that, you know, we've got, you know, we've got the RDAP pilot profile which we're now on the hook to implement with less than 180 days to go. We're going to have to, you know, revise that, come up with a new version of that profile that works for the EPDP phase one recommendations. We've got other things coming out of the EPDP phase one recommendations that we're going to have to figure out how to implement and then at some point down the road we were looking at, you know, phase two EPDP recommendations and, you know, something that looks like, you know, something that the TSG report produced as far as supporting a unified access model for disclosure of nonpublic registration data.

So, you know, I, you know, these topics were starting to boil up to the top for us. And I think, you know, I think we realize that this is going to take our attention and in particular, you know, this is - there is a lot of touch points here between registries and registrars we're going to want to collaborate on.

I want to roll back a little bit, you know, I think, you know, (Rich) and Jim both brought up, you know, points of consideration maybe for the phase two report and, you know, encourage everybody, you know, here too, you know, take advantage of the fact that, you know, we do have cross pollination here if there are issues that you would want brought up items you want to see you brought up please raise them in tech ops. You know, I'm happy to carry those items over and, you know, make sure those issues get raised. We also, you know, rolling back to our first half we heard from (Tom). We focused on what's next for transfer of process. You know, we've spent a lot of time over the last year defining how we'd like to see the transfer process. And the focus of our meeting today was okay how do we get from where we are today to how - to where we want to be.

So we have sort of a three-step process lined out I guess where we're going to look at what the deltas are between the two. We're going to see what can be accomplished in the IRT phase. And for everything else we're going to look at going through a GNSO process that's hopefully as specifically tailored or chartered to avoid scope creep and maybe opening up cans of worms that we don't want to open up hopefully that's a fair summary.

So that really brings us to the end of our time. You know, thank you everybody for your participation. We had a great discussion, great attendance today. And, you know, I'll see you guys on the Tech Ops mailing list. Thank you.

END