

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe  
GNSO CPH Tech Ops Meeting Part 1  
Sunday, 10 March 2019 at 09:00 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: Good morning, everybody. And welcome to ICANN 64. This is a meeting of the CPH Tech Ops groups. This is - for those of you new to this, this is an informal group comprised of registry and registrar members that are more focused on the technical interactions between registries and registrars, so the touch point between registries and registrars. This group is formed to really work through some of the technical challenges and issues we face.

We're about two years old at this point and this is, you know, this is I think our fourth or fifth meeting at an ICANN event. So welcome, everybody, thank you for joining us. I see a lot of people are up and ready to go for this early morning session so thank you, everybody.

By way of introduction, my name is Marc Anderson. I'm the Registry co-chair employed by VeriSign. My colleague Tobias Sattler is the Registrar co-chair and we're all - we'll sort of be shepherding you through our agenda today.

We do have an Adobe Connect room and agenda up on the board. I'll just run through that real quickly. We have sort of two parts to our session today. The first half we're going to talk about the transfer process. Something that as a group we focused a lot of our attention on over the last year or so and Tom Keller has sort of taken the mantle there and shepherded this discussion and so he's going to pick that up and lead us through an additional discussion on the transfer process and where we're going to go with that one in the future.

We have a break from 10:15 to 10:30. And in the afternoon - or in the second session we're going to focus on sort of the interplay between the EPDP group, the RDAP Pilot group and the TSG group, so there's a lot of activity going on really overlapping activity that has to do with, you know, Whois, RDS, RDAP and some other fun acronyms there.

But all of these things are going to have implications on us as registries and registrars. The stuff coming out of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations, certainly the completion of the RDAP profile and the newly-published TSG report are all very impactful to us as registries and registrars, and so we're going to focus the second half of our meeting on an update on each of those items and then having basically an open discussion about each of those topics and sort of what it means to us as registries and registrars.

And I think this is, you know, I think what we'll see is this will be a major topic for us in the coming year, so this will be sort of a kickoff to a lot more fun to come where we have RDAP and the like. I think that'll take us through our agenda, before I turn it over to Zoe, do you want to add to that? Good. Okay.

We good to go to Tom?

Zoe Bonython: Yes.

Marc Anderson: Okay. With that, Tom, we're going to turn it over to you to take us through the transfer process. So thank you, Tom.

Tom Keller: Thank you, Marc. Can you bring that up, Zoe? Awesome. Yes, I guess good news is that looking at the document is that we are quite there, I guess, so there has been some contributions to what was written. I think there's a couple of comments that haven't really been discussed so far. But in general it's my belief that we are almost here, so we know how the new transfer process will look like. I think we added even a couple of bells and whistles

and now the really interesting task starts on how we are going to bring that to life.

And this is what I would like to use this session for, not so much as in breakout groups this time but more an open discussion around how we want to go forth on that. I think that's the main problem we're facing currently that we know what we want at least to the greatest degree, and now we have to put it into the policy process. And the question remains how?

I think the good thing is that the EPDP team has delivered and we have something so we know what we have to base our policy on, but it remains completely unclear how kind of pan out with the EPDP and the transition period and it's, for me it's completely unclear how we can actually factor these changes so that we go away from our behavior we have currently with the temp spec. And that would be my question to the people in the room how we want to go forward.

So what I see is there are a couple of elements in the new transfer policy or new transfer process that are novelties. So they're new, we never had them and I think for them we have to be very conscious of the fact that they can only take, well, be included if they go through some kind of a PDP process.

The question there is, what is with the changes we're doing to the current process? And there will be a review of the transfer process during this year, if that's correct, but I don't know when exactly. And there's no timeline to when this will be finished. And this is kind of getting us in the issue of yes, so what we going to do when - what are the expectations? And there I would be very interested to hear from participants in the room how you would like to actually go forth on that so that this effort hasn't been wasted.

I know that the EPDP team is looking at that. I know that they are aware of it and that they want to factor it into their process. But I have no clue how that might work. So maybe if one of you can, yes, or has an opinion on that.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Tom. Marc Anderson. So I'll switch hats for a second here, and as an EPDP team member, I'll provide a little bit of an overview of what was in the Phase 1 report related to this. And so in the Phase 1 policy recommendations from the EPDP group the EPDP recommended two things specific to the transfer policy.

The first thing is they recommended that the language around transfers in the temporary specification be confirmed on a, we'll call an interim basis. And so the, you know, the policy recommendations are basically to keep in place the language in the temporary specification around transfers.

But once again, you know, I think, you know, everybody is aware, you know, the transfer policy language in the temporary specification was largely based on our recommendations, the recommendations of this group, to ICANN staff on how to modify the transfer process in light of GDPR. But, you know, we at the time, and I think everybody involved, sort of recognized that this is just a Band-Aid, not a long term solution.

And so within the EPDP group we had the same conversation. It was like, okay, this is a Band-Aid, it's a Band-Aid that's working. You know, we haven't had major issues come out of it. And so, you know, our recommendations are basically keep that Band-Aid in place.

But I said there's two recommendations from the group. And the second recommendation is - I believe it's addressed to the GNSO Council but it's a recommendation that the GNSO Council take up a review of the transfer process. And I think we put in some flowery language around, you know, as soon as possible or as soon as practical that we, you know, under, you know, the GNSO undertake a review to come up with a more permanent solution to the transfer process.

So we have a Band-Aid in place; it's a nice Band-Aid, it's not, you know, it's not causing a lot of issues, at least not that I'm aware of. You know, I'm seeing some no's around the room so, you know, we didn't break the internet with this transfer process. And so that's good but we, you know, I think, you know, we do recognize that this is not the long term solution that we want and so we, you know, as Tom said, you know, really the long term process needs to be - needs to go through the, you know, the GNSO, it needs to be a policy recommendation.

And so I think that's, you know, that's sort of where - you know, you asked how do we take - how do we go from what we want to making that a reality and I think that's the avenue is through a GNSO review of the existing transfer policy.

Tom Keller: The one thing I'm personally very concerned about is that if you start this process that they will review the complete transfer process and they will start from the stuff that has been put in place 10 years ago over IRTP A, B, C, D, E, whatever number or whatever. And that we will rehash all that discussions we had and will never end up with what want to do. And there will be a lot of people included that don't have to do anything with that but have an opinion and will not listen at that.

And I think we already put too much work into that and we did it from a customer point of view, what would be good for them, it's good for our processes, it's more secure and the question is how can actually make it appealing to the GNSO to actually follow this lead example?

As far as I know that was never done and there is a longer history of failures inside ICANN to actually deal with proposals that should become policy and end up just being something completely else. So the joint wisdom of that group, I think, would be very good, you know, to see how can we structure that. For me, I think we have to be very precise with that document and what

is new and really needs to go through some more elaborate process and what is basically just a change to certain operational behaviors?

Because really whether you do have an auth info code at the beginning or at the end, that's an operational detail and it's not changing the policy whatsoever. So the question is can we use that as a vehicle to have an expedited process, I don't want to call it EPDP, but there is something like a, what is the short track PDP and stuff like that. So we definitely need to explore this possibility, it's more to not be stuck in a five-year process where all the sudden IP lawyers think they can change the transfer process on their behalf. So that would not be good end of that exercise.

But I never done that. I guess none of you ever done that, so yes, (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: While I'm definitely sensitive to concerns about opening it up and potentially stymieing the discussion, I think we also have to look at if we're going to change the process and we're going to change the process in fundamental ways, make sure that we're going as far and getting the requisite changes that we want. And I set the doc to our registrar engineering team and the feedback I sort of got back was that all of the changes were good, they all seemed to make the transfer process better, but then there was some question about if we had the opportunity to make the change whether we were going far enough.

And I know my colleague, (Steven), made some comments in the doc, there were other changes that we wanted to sort of talk through and discuss on email before just drafting language. But potentially looking at like other pain points for users. And I agree, the user-minded perspective is what we need to keep in mind here.

Like transferring DNS information and whether the five-day TTL is really necessary at this point and sort of tradeoff between potentially shortening the

TTL but removing the sort of manual steps around removing the transfer lock, which right now are only necessary because we have this fairly long window. So I have some of these notes. I'm happy to send a list to the group.

I agree, we don't want to like treat a new process like we're going through and reviewing each of the different phases of the IRTP because the IRTP is kind of a mess, but I do think we want to be open minded about thinking about the transfer process from a clean slate perspective.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase with Amazon Registrar. So can we solve this by a charter of - when the transfer policy opens up the charter says hey, there's this gap from the EPDP, this needs to be resolved first, because, you know, if we're relying on a Band-Aid, right, and that's not resolved policy.

So I'm wondering can just the charter - the charter of the transfer policy PDP when it opens can that just say, all right, we're going to fix this open issue first because we're relying on the temp spec and then language in the EPDP that says, you know, we're preserving this temp spec language and then we will continue onto the other topics. That's kind of like the Phase 1 and Phase 2 we have in the EPDP right now so that's my thought of how it could work.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I think we can do that even sooner. But just a suggestion, so Marc, it was flowery language was great urgency, by the way. There's two recommendations by the EPDP team as Marc mentioned. One is to look at the transfer policy. And I say leave that alone. If they want to do a PDP for five years on it, that's fine, go ahead.

The other one is more the temporary short term interim thing and I think that we can try to influence that by implementing this in the IRT review of the EPDP. So Recommendation 24 is what is the temporary solution for transfers? And I think that we can set this in place at that time if that makes sense.

Tom Keller: Thanks. Yes, another idea I had, I came up with is that we say all this what we're doing currently is not really policy. This has nothing to do with policy whatsoever. This is how we treat our customer in certain procedures, that needs to be standardized. And we don't take care of that in ICANN at all. There is basically just tech and no one really cares about tech. And there is policy and everyone is about policy. And as soon as you open up the can of policy fund, everybody is on the table.

And this kind of begs for the question whether we shouldn't have something as operational standards where you say this can be actually discussed and should be changed with a certain process with registrars and registries that are actually having to do this stuff afterwards. And if ICANN wants to add - the community wants to add certain bells and whistles to that on top of this operational standard, they need to go through a PDP process.

That would be a new idea how we could do things like that. But maybe we could do that in light of the review of the EPDP and saying okay, now we're going to change how these technical operational product kind of things need to be done because that would actually even add much greater value to this group and would probably foster more participation if that group would actually have some more piece.

Rich Merdinger: Thanks. Rich Merdinger from Go Daddy. Without getting too pedantic on the acronyms themselves it seems that what we're talking about doing is reiterating on the IRT that is on the - whatever the existing policy is and not actually opening up a PDP. But a PDP being opened up for the broader thing is great, that's fine, let's do it long term but let's really more adjust the implementation so that it fits what the underlying policies that have been changing through various groups.

Greg DiBiase: So I agree that's the best solution but we are - what we're envisioning is contradicting the transfer policy as it stands to a certain extent, the part about the - you have to send a gaining registrar FOA. So, I mean, yes, it would be

ideal to change it through the IRT but I don't know if IRT of the EPDP can actually contradict the standing transfer policy and that's okay.

So maybe we could do the IRT and say we think this should be contradicted and we will confirm this, like this is how it stands and we will confirm this in the transfer policy later, but I guess I'm just bringing that potential issue up.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And actually the EPDP already did that for us because they said we're not going to use the policy, we're going to use what the temp spec has allowed which is not following policy. Now it's not - it's not this, it's what the temp spec says, and there are some issues with the EPDP recommendation. Specifically it says we have to do this when we implement RDAP, which is a problem because when we implement RDAP the data's still not going to be shared. So there's a little iffy part in that recommendation.

But anyway, I think your point is right. I think the EPDP and the GNSO now has accepted the fact that we're not going to follow today's policy, we're going to follow the temp spec policy which we're suggesting that this is the better solution of the temp spec policy. It's still a temporary solution but - and we still may get pushback on that, I know, but I think the IRT can handle those things as it goes through it.

Tom Keller: This is Tom speaking. So what you're saying is that we - you have the feeling we could exchange a Band-Aid with another Band-Aid? That would be acceptable in the process to make it very easy.

Roger Carney: Well, I think that that's what we should be suggesting. Now if the community accepts that or not, I don't know. Right now if the EPDP clears the Board and everything we're stuck with the temp spec. So what it says is we're stuck with the temp spec transfer, so we wouldn't be able to do this, we would have to use what we're doing today. But again, the IRT is going to have some leeway on what today is, so I think that that's where the bend will come from.

Tom Keller: So what would be the right group to discuss that with? So this is where I'm struggling is not the GNSO in itself, it's not the EPDP team, it's not the ICANN Board, in fact I think it's no one who could accept that because it is out of band, it is out of policy. No one knows how to police that. So who would be the right person to talk to? JJ or...

Roger Carney: This is Roger again. I think ICANN is going to initiate an IRT as soon as possible on the EPDP recommendations. So at that time is when that would come into effect where we would suggest that hey, for this recommendation we suggest a better Band-Aid than what the EPDP saw.

Tom Keller: Who would be suggesting that, the EPDP team or would it be us?

Roger Carney: I think it would be us and the IRT that's put together. So ICANN will put an IRT together to implement, and there will probably be several IRTs, to implement the recommendations from the EPDP. And at that time is when I think that we introduce this better Band-Aid, and then I think the IRT has to make that decision and eventually if someone in the IRT doesn't agree with it, it'll go back to the GNSO Council and they'll have to approve it.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I was talking to Becky on the Board about how she thinks that there's a need to update the transfer policy. I'm happy to sort of have an informal offline chat with her about where she thinks it sits in the policy versus implementation world and how we can sort of work around this efficiently. I do think that even though it's easier to try and squeeze it into implementation I tend to agree with Greg that saying that because it references the temp spec we can sort of supersede policy with anything else we want might be a leap.

I also think that to the extent that we're able to, and I would like to understand better the challenges that we had in the other prior IRTs to avoid this going forward, to the extent that we could make it a model for like efficient non painful policy development and figure out a way to do this it would be

fundamentally important at a time where like most of the policy processes are slowing. And I think having a document like this which is a really, really strong starting point would help us toward that.

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm, VeriSign. The one thing I'd offer around this is that it's not yet the language is not yet before the Board, obviously, related to the EPDP, and so we don't know exactly what they are going - we can't look into the future and see exactly what they're going to adopt and how that's going to be written, right? So we're conjecturing a little bit. And similar to, as Marc and Sarah and others noted, we're deeply involved in the EPDP.

The language around how the temporary spec dovetailed and overlapped in the February 29 language actually made its way into that relatively late as people looked to kind of reconcile how the temporary spec compliance and the EPDP compliance were going to get sorted and reconciled. So that future is not yet written is the thing that I would offer. And so I would caution all of us against kind of projecting forward too much because some of what we're taking as fact is not yet fact.

And so it's a little bit up to us to help shape a good outcome for what we want it to be similar to the way that someone, I don't know who it was, and Marc or Sarah might have a better idea, said, look, we're going to say that you can comply with the temporary spec up until February 29 of 2020, and then thereafter you have to comply with the output of the - and I use that as an example. And similarly, analogously, in this thing there's going to be something that gets worked out around this.

The idea of them being contradictory, there need to be - there's going to need to be language that resolves this because once the outcome of the EPDP final report comes out it will be policy also and so therefore cannot be contradictory policy. And so there's going to have to be language that resolves those things. So I would just - so it's kind of up to us to help suggest the language to not have them be in conflict. Thanks.

Tom Keller: One of the problem with the fact that we still have to follow the temp spec is that most registrars today don't follow it because in the temp spec today they're still the gaining (for), if we can find the email in Whois or something like that we actually still have to do it. And Compliance told us that this is really a requirement and they are going to follow it. I don't know any cases yet but they said they were going to be strict on that if they got any complaints on it.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And I would agree that that language is a little soft. But I think that that's on purpose because ICANN Compliance is not legal and if we go after a name, now we're legally responsible for that data. So we have no, from a business standpoint, reason to try to get that email address because then we have a legal responsibility with that data and it's someone else's. So the temp spec says to go get it if - if you can. And what Legal says is don't go get it. So it is - we can't go get it so even if it exists out there we can't go get it. So that's how that language is soft if that makes sense.

And now I've forgot what I was going to say to Stephanie - or to Rick. I think that's - and to Stephanie actually because so is now actually a good time to bring this new document up with the Board before they get EPDP in front of them? Can they make any changes? And I don't know from a - you know, can ICANN Board say, yes we like Recommendation 24 with this asterisk.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc again. I'll jump in there. I don't think that's an avenue that's open to us frankly. I mean, it's a, you know, it's a good idea. I'll say there is, you know, the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations are out for public comment before the Board votes on them, so, you know, there is an opportunity to comment there. But, you know, the Board isn't going to change the recommendations from the GNSO Council.

You know, the GNSO Council, you know, really took the view that they're, you know, the recommendations coming out of the EPDP are the

recommendations, are the policy recommendations, the job of the GNSO Council was to confirm that the process was followed. They did and sent it onto the Board.

You know, I don't think there's much opportunity for changes during the implementation phase. You know, if there's issues, if language is unclear, if there's, you know, things that need to be interpreted, you know, that's where an IRT can come into play. But as far as changing the recommendations I don't see that as an option.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. So Marc, do you think as a group should we post a public comment on Recommendation 24 saying hey, there's a better Band-Aid? And not just to Marc but everybody I guess.

Marc Anderson: I'm happy to jump in first. You know, I don't think that's going to make a difference. I think the, you know, I think the, you know, the GNSO process of reviewing the existing policy I think that's the lever we need to pull. You know, so I think, you know, commenting, you know, commenting during, you know, the Board comment period before they vote, you know, I, you know, I think we're the only ones that would care about that comment. I don't think that would make a difference.

You know, Greg, I know you've had your hand up for a second but I'll just say, you know, Greg, right?

Greg DiBiase: Yes.

Marc Anderson: Yes, okay. Greg had - Greg made the point, you know, I think the, you know, the way the review of the existing policy is chartered I think that's, you know, that's the avenue to go down as far as, you know, what the charter covers is the scope, what is and is not in scope, right? And I think that, you know, focusing on, you know, chartering the review you know, as narrowly and

specifically as we would like to see it focused, I think that's the avenue that makes the most sense for us as far as pursuing these changes.

Greg DiBiase: Yes, so that part that we've been going back and forth with on compliance is you have to send the gaining registrar FOA if it's available, right? That's up for interpretation and that's what the IRT does, right, is define interpretation. So I'm somewhat optimistic that we could say in the IRT, the gaining registrar FOA is not available if the losing registrar hasn't gotten permission from the registrant who've used that email, right, which is what we told ICANN.

So maybe we can - that is something we can resolve in the IRT and then I understand Jody's point that because the EPDP says that we will maintain this language from the temp spec, that takes the gaining registrar FOA issue off the table, if the IRT determines that, you know, it's not available how we think it's not available. Then at least that gaining registrar problem is taken care of and then we can begin with I guess the rest of our recommendations in actual transfer policy. Does that make sense?

Tom Keller: Yes, we have a speaker list. So Owen and Steph.

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen. I put my comment in the chat but I was going to say there's the question is compliance going after this? Yes, I can confirm they came after (NameT) for it.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I have a point to add onto Marc and then a response to Greg. I totally agree with everything you said, Marc. I think there's a pretty low chance that the Board would jump on this and say just because it's better therefore go forth. Beyond that, I don't think we would want them to. I think that precedent that some other group might bring something that they conceive as better and sort of get the ear on the Board is really, really dangerous and something that we don't want to be creating a precedent for.

In response to Greg, I think that's like an interesting specific point for the IRT. I'm like a little bit worried that if we made that argument - that it could also be that as an argument that it would be reasonable to require registrars to collect that consent, that that requirement would additionally come up in the IRT. But I tend to agree that it's potentially within the scope. There might just be other contingencies that we'd have to worry about.

Tom Keller: So to summarize the discussion, so we see two options. So we can either find the way how to change the Band-Aid, or we can wait for a review and then scope the review accordingly to our wishes if we achieve that. I kind of see that this is the more proper solution, this is how it should be done, but then I've been part of the IRTP and it was a nightmare. And that's nice, nicely put.

So and I foresee something that will be very similar and will not really come to light any time soon. And we have good reasons why I want to have this thing implemented. So I would not be against actually trying to change the Band-Aid. We apply the Band-Aid by basically saying we can't do that anymore and that would be our solution, with acceptance by ICANN staff. And I think now we are at a time where we can say, okay, this was just a very bad solution and we thought about it very carefully and we had this group and this is what we would suggest. So why don't we go ahead with it?

We'd still have to do the Whois review, sorry, the transfer review and the IRTP and whatever, but why don't we bring that into life before it is policy? What we have currently is not policy either. And yes, I agree, it is a precedent but it's a very operational one and has nothing to do with this normally regulated in a policy process, or shouldn't be regulated in a policy process. And that's one of the major issues that we as a community tend because that's the way the contracts are written, tend to put everything into policy which is factually not.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I mean, shouldn't be as an argument to make, but I think it's sort of tenuous and we have four different iterations of an inter registrar transfer policy that did go through the transfer process.

Tom Keller: Jody.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. And that's, I think, Greg is one who said it was, you know, we need to focus this very specifically on intra registrar transfers, not changing registrant transfers. I mean, if you start putting that in there we will spend a decade trying to figure it out. This has got to be very defined as being transfers between registrars.

Tom Keller: Rick.

Greg DiBiase: Furthermore, we shouldn't even use that word, that T word when speaking about that concept.

Tom Keller: What T word? No. Okay, anyone else? Any ideas? Jody?

Jody Kolker: I completely agree with Rick. I mean, if we could stop calling it "transfers" I mean, let's think of something and I don't care how you put it together but as soon as you say "transfer" everybody thinks registrant transfer too. This isn't about registrant transfer.

Greg DiBiase: Change of registrant works well for me.

Tom Keller: Change of registrant.

Greg DiBiase: No, if you're - the other one, so there's inter registrar transfer, the operation which shall not be named, the Voldemort operation, right, would be change of registrant.

Tom Keller: Rick.

Rick Wilhelm: I just have a quick question for the room before we move on from this topic, most of us have not been sending gaining registrar FOAs for a lot of different reasons, has anyone encountered any problem from that? Great.

Tom Keller: Okay, so we basically still have no solution for that. I think there is - there's still homework to be done in a way how we kind of, how to say, segment this process into what is really new and needs to go through some policy process and which is just a change to something existing and there I think we would need to go through the process or saying, okay, where does it differ to a policy that is in existence but isn't working currently, and B, and what is different to the temp spec.

That we have a clearer picture of how we should scope whatever kind of requests so that would be my suggestion that we start with getting some clarity around that. And I'm actually happy to do that to have a first draft on it and you can jump in. But without discussing the venue how we're going to bring it forth, so that we say okay, this is what's on the table, this is new, this is not new, this is a change and that change would have to be made there. That's it.

And then we can sit down again and figure out what we want to do with that. And this is what I would use the next GDD meeting for that we figure that out. And maybe at that point of time we need to bring in some more policy people that have maybe a better judgment on that than at least myself because I'm not so much into these processes. But since this is a reiteration what I said before, because it is a more technical operational matter, I really would much rather like to actually keep it there and exchange the Band-Aid if we find a way of doing that.

So would you agree to that channel procedure that we kind of structured a bit more until the next time, go through it so we know what to want to change exactly and where we need to change it and then think about how we're

going to change that or have that discussion again but with a bit more information. Not clear? Jody.

Jody Kolker: I'm just trying to understand what you're asking for. You've got the document and in there it outlines a bunch of different ways to update the transfer process, right? Are we still discussing this document or are we discussing how - okay.

Tom Keller: Yes, so the idea is this document is including changes and completely new things. And I think we have to set the new things aside and focus on what is just the change to the current process because for the new things there might be a different process than for just the changes. And we might have to make clear in the structure of the document what is new so there is no policy we need to change, it's policy that needs to be made or whatever needs to be made, and there are changes to something that is existing and that is either the transfer policy or the temp spec.

And one we have that clarity around what is just the change and what is new I think we can have that discussion again but at least we would make some progress because if we take that document and just endorse it and send it somewhere there will be all these readers saying oh, that's new, you know, no, no, that is new, you have to go through a full-fledged process. But if you can say no, no, this is new, we understand, this is different to that, then we can have maybe a more fruitful discussion around how can we find a good fast way to implement that change. Sarah.

Sarah Wyld: Yes, hi. This is Sarah Wyld. I was just in the chat with Tobias, I'm happy to make a cheat sheet after this Kobe meeting that shows the current or previous transfer process, this process, what are the changes and what are the new elements. I can put that together if that's helpful.

Tom Keller: Absolutely, thank you.

Greg DiBiase: You're a hero.

Sarah Wyld: And I still owe some substantive proposals to the document. I think some of these are more significant changes than what we see in this version so sort of depending on the timeline and the forum we might not want to go forward with them and I think that's fine, but I just want to get it all on the table so I'll send an email sometime today that puts this forward also.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And taking Rick's note into thought here, yes, the EPDP recommendations have not been approved by the Board. My guess is most likely it's going to be so we're not going to worry too much about that issue. But there are some things in the recommendation that will allow us to get some of this stuff in there.

In Recommendation 24c it says best practices of auth codes. So the IRT can implement whatever we're suggesting as a best practice of auth codes from this document within the EPDP realm. And we don't have to wait until the transfer policy gets developed six years from now, so.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That would be a great thing for the cheat sheet if I can volunteer Sarah.

Tom Keller: Yes, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson. Yes, I appreciate that you're not giving up on the IRT approach, but yes, that's fair. Like where there are, you know, opportunities for the IRT to clarify and, you know, where the language isn't definitive, you know, sure, that's absolutely in play. Right, so I think that's a fair point.

On the cheat sheet, I think, you know, regardless of our approach, right, understanding the deltas between what's in place now and where we would

like to be is really useful, right? So I think that makes a lot of sense for next steps and thank you, Sarah, for throwing your hat in the ring there.

I still think Greg's point about, you know, having a chart, you know, having, you know, there's going to have to be GNSO work on this I think at the end of the day. And, you know, having a charter, you know, that focuses what that work is, is like, you know, in my opinion, the path forward for us that makes the most sense.

And so there again I think having that cheat sheet where we understand the deltas between where we are and where we want to be would help us influence that charter in a way that can help us focus the group. And the GNSO Council is, you know, has, you know, has a recommendation in front of them that they undertake this policy work to review the transfer process.

You know, my guess is, you know, I have not spoken to any GNSO Council members on this but my guess is they, you know, they're probably not sure yet where, you know, what to do with that recommendation. You know, it might not even be something they've had a chance to think about or discuss, there's a lot going on right now. And so my, you know, my guess is, if somebody were to put something in front of them as a starting point they would probably welcome that.

And so there I think is the opportunity for us to have first mover advantage maybe in suggesting okay, this is, you know, hey, GNSO Council, you have this recommendation, here's, you know, here's a first draft or here's some ideas on how you might meet that recommendation.

Tom Keller: So do you think it would be helpful to come up with like a draft charter which says okay, this stuff needs to be fixed first, and then we can do whatever else?

Roger Carney: This is Roger. Yes, and I think Greg actually volunteered to do that so.

Tom Keller: Okay. Thanks, Greg, very much appreciated.

Greg DiBiase: I would totally do this but I think there's a stage before that, we see what we can get in IRT, what interpretations we can get in the IRT nailed down, then the left - whatever's left is we frame in the charter saying all right, there's some leftover ambiguity from the EPDP, this needs to be addressed in Phase 1, and then we can go onto whatever other parts of the transfer policy after that is nailed down. And yes, at that time in the future I volunteer to help with that effort.

Stephanie Duchesneau: First cheat sheet then IRT, then charter.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And I think this is when we can introduce Rick's and Jody's Voldemort thing and get that resolved at the time, so.

Tom Keller: Rick, you want to say...

Rick Wilhelm: Is there - Marc, is there anything around this in Phase 2 of the EPDP or is Phase 2 specifically reserved for access, access, access?

Marc Anderson: Disclosure. But yes, there's not anything specific, you know, in the charter of Phase 2 on this. You know, things have ways of creeping up but there's no planned discussions on this for Phase 2.

Tom Keller: Okay, so I think we - sorry?

Sarah Wyld: Sorry, I just want to add one thing. This is Sarah. Recommendation 27 in the EPDP report does say policies should be updated now that other things have changed that affect them, and that includes the transfer policy.

Tom Keller: Though it doesn't say how, right?

Sarah Wyld: No, it just says, "As part of the implementation of these policy recommendations updates are made to the following existing policies and others that may have been omitted to ensure consistency with these recommendations for example, some refer to administrative or technical contact which is no longer required."

Tom Keller: Okay. Anyone else, comment? Rich.

Rich Merdinger: Hi, this is Rich with Go Daddy. It seems that Phase 2 of the EPDP and its discussion of disclosure is a material element to what we say we can or cannot do relative to FOA support and things along those lines. I'm just not sure how we effectively - we have the interim Band-Aid period, yes, we need to deal with, but we're talking about getting into PDPs to talk about how we're going to - how the transfer policy needs to be modified for the future, but the future is still being developed and it's not imminent. Am I just missing something here? And if so, I'll let Jody hit me and I'll be quiet, but.

Tom Keller: So my understanding is that there will not be an admin C and the owner will not be available just to a random registrant. But that's just my understanding.

Sarah Wyld: Thank you. This is Sara. Yes, so I agree, I have this concern about the "if" in there. If you can find the email, then you send the FOA. I think we should focus on changing that in whatever policy we eventually come up with such that there is no "if" there is no gaining FOA.

Rich Merdinger: Yes, I agree with that. The policy needs to be consistent regardless of whether the registrant has opted in to have their information published; it just needs to be a one size fits all policy.

Tom Keller: Okay, anyone - Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Tom. Just a - I'll just time check real quick, we've got 20 minute for the first break so we're good on time. I don't know if this is, you know, this is a

good time to bring this up but I guess it was a couple months ago now ICANN sent out a survey to contracted parties on the transfer policy. So it was, you know, it was sort of a, you know, what's typically a first step in a review of existing policies. And so I got it, one of them, you know, one of the survey requests came to me, I did not respond to it though. But I'm wondering if other people got that and if they responded to that what anybody's experiences on that were?

You know, that would, you know, in a, you know, in sort of a, you know, a normal world if you will, that would be the initial steps in a standard review of an existing policy. We're not necessarily in a normal world because of all the impacts from GDPR and the recommendations in the temp spec, and the EPDP recommendations. So I think that sort of turns this on its side. But I am curious if other people got the survey if they responded to it, what their thoughts on the survey were.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. Yes, we received the survey and filled it out. And I thought we actually filled one out from the Registrar Stakeholder Group also, didn't we, Sarah?

Sarah Wyld: I don't remember. I know I did the survey but I'm not sure if it was for me or for Tucows or for the Registrar group.

Jody Kolker: So basically several were submitted, I mean, there was one from the Registrar Stakeholder Group as a whole and I know that Go Daddy submitted one also with its own answers in there.

Marc Anderson: Okay so I guess, you know, like I said, I'm not sure how that fits into the temporary spec and the EPDP recommendations, but, you know, it might be worth some outreach to, you know, I guess it was GDD kicked off that survey. I'm getting some nods there. So that might be worth some outreach to find out what the status of that and maybe what the, you know, are there follow ups planned from that. You know, it's, you know, we don't want to have

maybe overlapping or conflicting efforts going on so I'm not sure who the right contact person with GDD would be but that might be worth a follow up.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And I'll just add on that Go Daddy's response and the Registrar response was very consistent with what we've talked about in this group continuously so to your point of how did it go, I mean, it was fairly easy because I mean, we've sat here for months talking about this and it just followed along with what we've been talking about so.

Tom Keller: Okay, being conscious of time I think we have to draw that to an end. It's my personal opinion that since no one in this room and probably in ICANN knows how to deal with that issue it's even more important to have a plan. We can suggest and then people can get their minds around whether they like the suggestions or we need to change them. Not the technical suggestion but in terms of process and how we go forth.

And we can figure that out in this group how we want to do that. I think to agree to disagree is not enough but we have to agree on a path forward. And what we have now is we have the cheat sheet first and then we can look at the IRT, and then we shape the charter, if all - or come up with a charter for potential review.

And we can put that forth and we can tell the people that this is what we want to do, do you think it's going to work and we can talk to our councilors about that and we can talk to ICANN staff about that. But we need to get that in writing so they can actually tell the people what our way of thinking is and how we would approach the solution because I think currently it's - no one really knows what to do because there are certain things that are proceeding certain things.

There is a certain sense of urgency to exchange that (done) date, we have a better solution but we don't know how to put it into play. But we need to have something which we can consistently communicate and I think that is the next

thing we need to put on the table and then see how we end up with it or where we end up with it. Is that kind of - would you agree with that? Is that the feeling in the room that at least my sense that that would be very helpful.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. Good summary.

Tom Keller: Cool. Thank you. So that brings the session to the end. And I hand it over back to Marc and Tobias. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: Yes, so and thanks again for stepping up and championing this. Tom's really taken point on this one for, you know, well over a year now and so thank you for shepherding this along and making sure it, you know, it stays on all our radars.

That does put us ahead of our agenda by about 15 minutes, so I'll sort of open it up to the floor, we can have new topics or we can take a long break. And so no pressure on anybody, but, you know, if anybody wants to bring up any other business or any other topics that are not on the agenda, it looks like Zoe wants to jump in.

All right, we also have a - we also have an idea on the table to start our second half now and wrap up our session early. So I'll leave it up to you, does anybody - a longer break, does anybody have anything they want to raise any other business or would you rather we kick off our second half now and wrap up our entire session early?

Tobias Sattler: Let's move forward.

Rick Wilhelm: We may not even wrap up early depending on how the discussions go but let's try to.

Marc Anderson: Fair point. All right. Zoe, can you pull our agenda back up? All right so I think the - I think rolling into our second half agenda early and seeing how that

goes is carrying the day here. So I think - Zoe's pulling this up but I think I might be putting Rick on the spot first here to talk a little bit about the RDAP Pilot work and profile that has recently been published and sent out. So Rick, can I turn it over to you for an update on that?

Rick Wilhelm: No problem. No bull pen time needed. So the RDAP profile - if you're an ICANN person, ICANN technical person unless you've been under a rock for the past couple of weeks you know that the RDAP profile was published out of the RDAP Pilot Working Group a couple of weeks ago and then ICANN Org published the contractual notice on the 26th or 27th of February and then so that came with it a 180-day implementation time window.

The - pretty much everybody's contract there was 135-day window that's in the contract. The Registrar Stakeholder Group initiated a request which was then jointly submitted with the Registry Stakeholder Group to have that extended to 180 days. Org obliged and so now the deadline for having RDAP up and running in production is 180 days from the February date which turned out to be like August 27th I think. Is that right? August 27 so that's, you know, of 2019 so at the end of August basically.

So that's for the version of the RDAP profile that implements the temporary spec, it's kind of an important thing to kind of keep all this stuff straight because we've got the EPDP that is coming around and stuff like that, so this is to implement the temporary spec for public access, so general just everybody unfettered access for general purpose queries and whatnot.

So that's out there going - the only thing that the RDAP Pilot Working Group the one deliverable that's remaining is the RDAP Pilot summary report which is - which we're probably going to get published within a week or two of Kobe. That's just the simple matter of us wrapping up some last minute documentation and kind of declaring it done.

After that the RDAP Pilot Working Group is going to begin work on - once we're officially asked I think we - I think the - technically the RDAP Pilot Working Group needs to be officially asked by somebody to begin work on implementing the changing the RDAP profile to implement the outcome of the EPDP final report.

That - the exact timing of that I'm not exactly sure because that would presumably be roughly in echelon formation with an implementation review team for the EPDP final report. So we don't exactly have that timing squared away but it certainly wouldn't be too far in advance of that.

Separately, also in and around RDAP, there's the Technical Study Group. We're going to talk about that in a little bit so I'm not going to talk about that now, but that's more concerned with going forward in and around unified access models.

I think that within this group in CPH Tech Ops over the coming six months we'll be mostly concerned with implementing the RDAP profile that was just published, right, so in other words implementing the RDAP profile that implements the temporary spec, which of course is about to be overrun by the output of the EPDP final report.

However, I would offer that it's - it's an important thing to be able to get everybody's RDAP up and running in production and the work that will be done there will be highly complementary to the - to getting your RDAP running, right, because for various folks where it stuff running in the pilot but of course it's one thing to have it running in a pilot where you can have it running on a server that's sitting under your desk, quote unquote, but when you have to have it running in production it's a very different kettle of fish.

And then that will be of course important to get it in preparation for implementing the temporary spec. Also, while we've been talking - various folks have been talking informally about the timing of Whois versus RDAP,

there's not a lot of people that like running Whois. If you don't, the best thing that you can do is show your commitment to RDAP and get it up and running and that's a great way to sort of show your support for it and that.

So I don't know, probably enough monologue-ing. Questions? Thoughts?  
Roger, please.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. That's a nice point that you bring up about the Whois and the possible sunset. As no one really wants to pull that into any group, I don't know if that's the RDAP Pilot Group should try to get that pulled in, and discuss that in that group and move it forward there. But you mentioned that maybe the next thing on the group's work is the changes the EPDP is bringing on.

Last year we were talking about the next step would be, I don't know, you guys are calling it disclosure or whatever, but we've been calling it authentication and authorization would be our next step with the pilot, though in light of the changes coming it does seem to make sense to move that back around. So that does make sense.

But the one question I had to you was the SLAs are still kind of up in the air and didn't know if you wanted to speak to that.

Roger Carney: Sure, I can talk to that. Did you want to go first, Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sure, quickly. So our position has been, and we haven't really pushed this aggressively with ICANN, but that the existing language on the registry side in the registry contract actually does include as it stands, a sun-setting provision such that once RDAP is implemented you're not required to continue to operate Whois.

If you look at the language at the start of Specification 4 it says, "Until ICANN requires a different protocol, registry operator will operate a Whois service,"

which to me is pretty clear. And I have taken it up with our lawyers. I'm not sure that this is like the ditch we want to die in, but I think that there's pretty strong - if ICANN is sort of having unreasonable requirements in terms of overlap I think there's a really strong position that we're actually not required to operate them in parallel at all and anything that we're doing is voluntary.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. And actually that's in our contract as well. We can drop 43 services as soon as RDAP is installed. But from a community aspect we probably wouldn't do that so I think that that's a good point in that we can use that but I think we should probably as a community agree hey, we're going to run them for 90 days or whatever, post, you know, RDAP...

Stephanie Duchesneau: I agree. I think we should use it as a lever to get a reasonable period of parallel operations, not no period of parallel operations but to the extent the ask there is unreasonable I think we have a strong leg to stand on.

Man: Good points. I've not done a close read of Spec 4 as far as that particular language, it is an interesting thing, in informal conversations I've not gotten any indication from staff that they would support that point of view.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sure, but that doesn't really matter if that's what our contract says.

Man: Right.

Tom Keller: This is kind of bringing back to the discussion about transfers. So if you talk about the overlap, are there any other operational needs that actually need the Whois currently? I'm not too sure about that actually. I don't think there are, but we have to be careful about that that there must be some transitional period if you would need Whois for something.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I'm not sure that there's a contracted party operational dependency going forward. But ICANN does because they're - what is it

called, the ARS, whatever it is that monitors the accuracy of registration data, it's tuned to Port 43 so.

Man 1: (Unintelligible) here. Is also the URS process that heavy levies - you're required to do a Whois snapshot of the current registrant as part of - that's what a complainant needs to do in order to submit a URS complaint. So the language is pretty clear, go to Whois, grab a snapshot, submit your complaint.

Roger Carney: But it doesn't say where you get the Whois...

Man 1: That's right, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man 1: Yes, yes, that's right.

Roger Carney: And actually the EPDP states Whois is RDAP so in one of the recommendations so.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, I think the issues about lack of access to Whois have been well documented around things related to GDPR so I think there's a wealth of literature on that topic. So Roger, you had asked about the SLAs and reporting, they're closing in I think. The SLAs and reporting requirements themselves haven't really changed in months, Roger, so there's still - the numbers are still what they've been.

And for those of you that don't, they're like 5000 milliseconds on the response, 98% uptime, that's - the 5000 includes cross network latency measured by probes. And then there's an SLA on accuracy of updates, I think it's 60 minutes for 98th percentile, yes, go ahead Marc.

Marc Anderson: Sorry, Rick, I'm actually cutting you off here. We're coming up on our hard stop here. So but I promise after the break we'll pick this back up and I think the, you know, we'll find - this is a thread that's going to run throughout our second half conversation, discussion on RDAP really has a lot of overlap and interplay with the conversation we're going to have about the EPDP recommendations, how that impacts us as well as we have an update on the TSG study group, but we are up against a hard stop there, so sorry to cut you off and we'll pick this back up in 15 minutes so hopefully I'll see everybody back here in 15 minutes. Thank you, all.

END