

DURBAN – Pre-Delegation Testing Update
Monday, July 15, 2013 – 17:45 to 18:45
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Okay. I think we're ready to get started when you guys are, so... Thanks for joining us tonight. If I was on the phone, good evening, good morning, good afternoon wherever you are. I'm Russ Weinstein, I'm the panel coordination manager on the new gTLD ops team, responsible for re-delegation testing.

And this is the pre-delegation testing session, where we hope you'll feel better prepared and better understand the process, and what pre-delegation testing is all about when you leave this session. I think we have a little under an hour now.

So I brought with me a subject matter expert, Francisco Arias from the registry liaison team, and Patrik Hildingsson from dot SE, our pre-delegation testing provider to help walk us through pre-delegation testing, or as we've been calling it for some time now PDT.

So what we're going to talk through today is we'll go through an overview of what PDT is. I'll talk to you a little bit about the process of PDT now that we're approaching production. And give you some status updates regarding how the pilot in beta went, what's going on with the specifications, and then I'll turn it over to Patrik who will help give what we're calling kind of, help the applicants prepare for PDT.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

And he'll go through each of the test levels and kind of give us some helpful hints and what we've been seeing so far and things that we think are pretty preventable to make PDT run smoothly. Then I'll close it out with a couple of slides on communications, when to contact ICANN versus when do you contact the PDT provider.

And then we'll open it up for question and answer. So without further ado, let's get started. Next one. So what is pre-delegation testing? For those of you that were in Beijing, these are pretty similar slide. It's the verification step in the guidebook, I think section 5.2 of the applicant guidebook.

We verify the registry system to ensure that it's ready for production. So we're verifying documentation, self-certifications, and some of the other documents, data escrow agreement and what not. And then we run technical tests on the registry itself, and there is four standard elements and one optional element.

The IDN is the optional element, it's not so much optional as if applicable, I think is a better term. So if you're supporting IDNs at the second level, then you'll go through these IDN tests. Next. Where it fits into the program as a whole, at least the application processing portion of the program, it's after contracting essentially.

So pre-requisite for pre-delegation testing is you've executed a registry agreement and you yourself have a production ready registry system. So as Christa explained, there is various steps to get through the contracting process, once they notify that the contract is eligible for PDT, then we can start.

We can talk about the process. Next one. So there is kind of three main phases to PDT. There is the preparation activities, there is the testing activities, and there is the results reporting. So the preparation activities start when our OPS team is notified that the contract is eligible for PDT.

And then at that time, we'll send out eligibility notifications via our new CRM system, and you'll provide your PDT contact information as well as your earliest available time that you're ready for PDT. We'll use that information as we get it back in concert with priority order to establish a test appointment date for you and we'll send you an email confirming the test appointment date.

And then about a week before your test appointment date... So it's important to recognize, you don't have to sign up right away for PDT. You can respond to us right away and tell us you're not ready for another month, or you can say, "I'm ready now." And we'll just use that information based on when we get your response back and priority order to establish the earliest available appointment for your TLD.

So about a week before your test appointment date, you'll be – you'll receive an email – your PDT contact will receive an email from the PDT provider, and that will give you the credentials to begin entering data to the PDT system. All of that data must be entered into the PDT system by the Friday before your test appointment, so your test appointment is going to begin on a Monday.

The data is due to the PDT system by the Friday before, at 11:59 UTC. And then we move into testing starting that Monday. The testing is expected to occur over two weeks. If there is any issues that are

preventing a pass, the PDT provider will send what we're calling follow up questions to the PDT contact via the messaging tool. And if need be, the test appointment can extend an additional week.

And there is no process, there is nothing that needs to be agreed to between the parties to extend the week, or there is no formal notification about it, it's just that your test won't end... Your date will change in the system so you'll know when your test appointment ends, but it's not like an approval process to get your test appointment extended.

So we're going to identify the issues that are preventing a pass and try to solve those within the test appointment to try and get as many applications through. And then, our goal and our commitment is to provide test results reports back to the applicants within two weeks. And those will come through, back through the CRM system to the primary contact, and you'll receive your overall results as well as a test report to understand the details of the test.

Right now, in the beginning I think we're going to work really hard to try and get to two weeks, but I think we're seeing right now it's taking closer to three, and so we're going to do our best to bring that down so it's a repeatable two weeks. But early on, depending on the capacity, it's going to be two weeks, I mean three weeks, sorry.

So I want to just show you what a results report would look like. This is a portion of it, but I just kind of wanted to highlight that you'll see basically three levels of results. There is the overall, did I pass pre-delegation testing, and that's the top box, application has passed pre-delegation testing.

Then you'll see by test, what we call test levels or DNS, WHOIS, IDN, a pass or fail for the test level. And then every test case will have a pass or fail result, or warning, or non-applicable for those that aren't applicable for that TLD. And any fails will be identified with comments so you understand what did pass, and what the requirement was where you were deficient.

And then I'll transition into more of the status portion. Next one. So overall the message, as Christine mentioned in her session, operationally ready. We're ready for PDT to begin production now that we have signed contracts, we're ready. Eligibility notifications should go out either late this week or early next week, and we're working towards late this week.

We've released production versions of the test specifications and all the test materials so you need input files as well as an updated FAQ, are all available now on the microsite. So those are the versions we intend to use in production. Next.

I'll talk a little bit more about what those changes were to the PDT specs to get them ready for production. Again, as Christine mentioned in her session, we've had a lot of dialogue with the community even before Beijing and certainly since Beijing regarding the test specifications.

And it's been really fruitful dialogue as she mentioned. I think it's been beneficial for ICANN, for dot SE, for the community, to have these dialogues to do the beta testing and really find out where the kinks were. As of a few weeks ago, we've eliminated any... Everybody okay?

[Laughs] That sounds like a more fun session than mine [laughter]. We've eliminated the any cast instance testing and replaced it with what we're calling distributed DNS testing, which tests the public facing DNS service.

[Laughs] And then another major....

UNIDENTIFIED: We're definitely in Africa. Yes.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yes [laughter]. Feel the spirit. So we've changed an approach to a lot of the documents, and Antony hopefully this addresses your question that you had in the contracting session, we're now validating most of the things... The technical tests are being validated against your system and against what's required by the registry agreement and by the AGB section 5.2.

And then the self-certification documents are being validated either to your system or to your registry agreement. So whether it's a specification in the registry agreement, or an Exhibit A. So for example, the WHOIS fields, it's required per specification for – that identifies all the WHOIS required fields for WHOIS.

That's the requirement for re-delegation testing. Searchable WHOIS. Your Exhibit A will identify if required to support searchable WHOIS or not. If you're required, you must comply with all of the requirements and receive the full gamut of pre-delegation tests regarding searchable WHOIS.

But if a registry agreement does not require it, those tests are not applicable and you won't worry about running them. EPP extension, something we were... In covering in the beta period was, we were

trying to match the EPP extensions that were identified in the application to, are they showing up in the greeting of the EPP server? And are you listing them all in your input template?

So we've really simplified this process and just got it down to what's required by a registry agreement, which is the EPP extension to support DNSSEC. That's the EPP extension that's required to show up in your EPP greeting. And the rationale behind this is those EPP extensions that you've identified and are approved to support from your application to your registry agreement, are not required to be supported at time of launch.

What's required is the DNSSEC extension. Additionally in Exhibit A, your IDN tables will be listed. Those are the IDN tables that must be provided to PDT, and all of those tables will be tested. Patrik will go over the details about – in more detail.

And then through dialogue with the community we understood that there was vagueness and a lack of understanding as to what was being tested, and what it took to pass PDT. And so, we took a real concentrated effort over the last few weeks to make sure and improve the test specifications to document what the pass/fail criteria is for each and every test case.

We're you'll find that is in – if you're familiar with the test specifications, the test cases have a .8 section in each of them, and it's the steps that we're taking and we try to identify the pass/fail criteria in that in terms like must, and shall, for what's being tested and what the expected outcome is for each of those steps.

So like I mentioned, and we talked a lot about in Beijing, we had just come off the pilot. So we conducted a PDT pilot in March and it wrapped up at the beginning of April. We ended up with nine participants from nine TLDs from nine different registry service providers.

We got lots of useable data from that. Overall, it told us that the overall system and the process worked but there was definitely areas that needed improvement. And the registry agreement got put out for public comment. So we tried to utilize that time and introduced what we called beta testing.

And that ran from April and it's still ongoing today, I believe the last of the beta appointments started today and should wrap up in the next couple of weeks. So we had 45 appointments overall, either already conducted or somewhere in the process, from 24 different registry service providers.

And again we're just learning a great deal of information. Hopefully we're providing good feedback to the registry service providers and the applicants so that they can be ready for production. Now we're going to transition over to Patrik, who is going to take us through help getting the applicants and registry service providers ready for PDT.

PATRIK HIDINGSSON:

Thank you Russ. So my name is Patrik Hidingsson. I work for dot SE. Some of you know as NIC SE. And I'm the production manager responsible for the entire service towards ICANN. So we wanted to provide a snapshot of the pass/fail rates for the various test levels.

What you can see is some test levels were more problematic than others, but all of them are passable. We will show you the high level data and then talk through each test level. So the figure that most of you have been waiting for, the overall pass rate for all the applicants has been close to 40%.

It's however better at each test level. So as for the DNS test level, all of the failures except one is a result of the DNS04 network diversity tests. The test level WHOIS, the items causing failures are with the searchable WHOIS. The biggest issues in EPP are around connectivity. Most of the tests fail to be run because the EPP provider cannot connect or successfully login.

With the data escrow, the applicants have been most successful. While the area of documentation in such a case does have a high success rate, it is taken quite a bit of energy on both sides through follow up questions and resubmitting data to us to get to these passing levels as we have seen.

We want to give you a more detailed view of the IDN tests, so we split them in two. The one called IDN is self-sufficient and does not depend on any other test. The items causing the issues here are invalid code points on the IDN tables and script mixing.

The IDN slash EPP shows statistics for the IDN tests, test cases that depend on EPP. The issues we discovered were with EPP implementation, or the IDN policy. Okay. So as you saw, the DNS tests had roughly a 56% pass rate of the beta tests.

The majority of the issues are occurring in the DNS04 tests, the network diversity tests, which checks for numbers of autonomous system numbers, so called ASNs. The requirement, and it mirrors the IANA requirements, is that your system must be announced from at least two ASNs for each IPv4 and IPv6.

We're doing this check using RIPE routing information service. It is a public utility that you can check, that you can use to check yourself prior to entering PDT. We are finding many applicants are only announcing from one ASN for either IPv4 or IPv6, and have two ASNs for the other.

Overall WHOIS testing has been more successful for the applicants, however it has taken a fairly significant volume of back and forth dialogue with the PDT context to achieve pass course. The primary issues we have encountered are related to three topics.

The first topic we found, non-compliant WHOIS format. The output specified in specification four of the registry agreement is the requirement, not [? 0:19:28]. Second, while testing WHOIS, we have had several issues where access was not granted, but this was a public service that should not be restricted access.

Finally, for beta we were using your application, if the application status report for searchable WHOIS tested for it. In production, we will verify if the register agreement exceeded a specifies support for this service. If so, the service must meet all requirements. Many applicants who claim support for the service in the application were not properly supporting the service for beta testing.

Additionally, in the updated test requirements, we are requiring instructions to the service be available for the users. Without instructions, the service is not a public benefit. The instructions will not be scored, but must be sufficient for us to execute the test cases.

EPP testing. Overall this was the next most failed test level with 70% success rate. We adjusted the criteria for the EPP extension test, as was mentioned earlier. We now only verify that the required EPP extension for DNSSEC is available in your server. Previously we were trying to match each EPP extension mentioned in the application to the server.

We recognized this was not required since approved additional extensions were not required for TLD launch. However, we are still finding most issues related to connectivity. The PDT test node IP addresses are listed in instructions for input data five. This nodes must be granted access to your EPP system.

Related to connectivity, is client certificates. If your system requires a client certificate, it must be provided in the input data, PDT EEP dot XML. You will need to provide a Pkcs12 certificate and include both the public and private part in the data, using base 64 encoding.

After successfully connecting to the EPP server, we do in some cases continue to see issues with EPP implementations who do not comply with the RFC, the DNS, and WHOIS update time as part of the SLA requirements.

The data escrow has a 100% pass rate, however it has taken a fairly significant volume of back and forth dialogue with us. Sorry, with the PDT contacts to achieve these scores. The most follow up questions

we've been issuing have been regarding three items. The first issue is the file names.

It is important that the files in the data escrow deposit are using the correct file naming convention, and that they have been processed according to the requirements. The XML or CSV files must be stored in a TAR file, which is then encrypted into a RYDE file.

The second issue is the valid signature. When it comes to the signature, please make sure that is a detached signature that can be validated using your public key. The third issue is valid XML. The deposit consists of structured data that can be validated against the XML schemas from the latest data escrow drafts RFC.

A tool like XML can be helpful to detect any malformed information before sending it over to us. The documentation testing has had a high success rate. But again, it has taken a fairly significant volume of back and forth dialogue with the PDT contact to achieve pass scores.

We have worked to improve the clarity of the requirements, what is tested and how it is validated in the recent specification updates. Additionally, we have tempted to further clarify the input template for this self-certifications.

The goal is to drive down the follow up questions with better guidance to the applicants. We picked a few test cases where we have seen most of the follow up questions. Dot DNS 01, for this test the applicant needs to provide an estimate of expected capacity on network bandwidth and server during normal operations, as well as available capacity information.

The dot DNS 05 test requires documentation on the DNS probe's location in relation to the test targets. The DNS probe, which is used to measure DNS query latency, should be outside the border router on the physical network hosting the name service.

The dot DNS four test requires a series of statements on actual test response content. The requirement is that responses must be zoned data, NXDOMAIN, or NODATA. Any other response are regarded as invalid.

We have gathered some generic tips on how to avoid driving follow up questions. The first is fulfill the requirements as strictly as possible, where you cannot fulfill, please tell us why. If a requirement asks for 10 data points, do not stop at nine.

If a requirement asks for data up to and including 10% query loss, do not stop at 9% unless you pass the max limits data. If a requirement asks for charts and tables, do not leave any of them out please. Responses should be standalone.

While information very likely is present in the application or in the appendix, that document may not be available to us reviewing the self-certification documents. Instead, please repeat the relevant information in the self-certification document to make it as self-contained as possible.

Not all load tests require actual testing. A number of points are left to the applicant to decide how to answer. Tests are one way, but extrapolating from existing data from comparable domains may do just as well. This is a self-certification. As long as you are confident that you

can reasonably live up to the data in your report, and the data points are not hopelessly bad, it's fine.

Do not [provide] more than you need. If the instructions are unclear, let us know rather than try to cover all possibilities. If the self-certification document becomes larger than 50 pages, something maybe wrong. We've been passing self-certifications with as little as 10 pages.

Be sure to read the reference specifications. All IDN tables and policies will be evaluated on their basis. The policy statement is central to this. It must describe the registry specific IDN policies in adequate detail to enable the tables to be understood and evaluated.

A recitation of general IDN concepts is not a substitute for this. As I said earlier, the IDN EPP testing goes hand in hand with the EPP testing. If we were unable to connect along to the EPP server, then the EPP related IDN tests, IDN valid 07 through 08 failed. Roughly 50% of the applicants passed the IDN/EPP based tests.

Half of the failures were due to the IDN policy not being implemented in the EPP server. Half of the failure were due to the EPP backend systems did not have IDN support available. This condition has however changed, and now is passed with warning, which isn't reflected in the current success rate.

We've compiled a checklist for you to focus on. Pick a PDT contact who is available for the entire PDT. This person will be the PDT provider's single point of contact regarding any follow up questions we might have. The contact should be someone knowledgeable in infrastructure and registry services.

Second, review the PDT resources on the ICANN microsite. They have been updated since the beta. Third, make use of the self-test tools prior to the PDT. Check the FAQ available at the ICANN microsite. Number four, along with the self-test tools, the excellent RIP routing information service is a great way to avoid failing the network diversity tests.

Make sure to format your WHOIS response according to specification four. And also make sure you also grant access to the PDT nodes to your EPP server. Finalize your DNSSEC practice statement per RFC 6841. And last, don't forget about the data escrow agreement, it needs to be executed.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the beta participants. Your input has been very valuable to us, helping us form a better service. Thank you. Over to you Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

All right. Thanks Patrik. And before we leave that topic, there was a question, I believe it was in Christine's session regarding the DPS document. So we do... If you've provided a version in the application that's no longer current, we do want you to provide an updated version.

This version that is tested at PDT should be the version you intend to go to launch with, and it should be fully compliant to the RFC. So on to communication. Unfortunately some of you have felt like this was the mode of communication during some of the beta testing.

We've been working hard to try and improve that and hopefully I'll continue to show where we're improving. Next. Yeah we were going to take them right at the end. I have about two more slides I think. Sorry about that.

Should have specified in the beginning. So we've deployed... Since Beijing, I guess, we've deployed – around Beijing time we deployed the updated customer service module – customer service portal. And launched just last week, we deployed an updated module within that tool to administrate PDT.

So we strongly encourage and to the point of almost requiring, all communications regarding PDT between the applicant and ICANN to go through that customer service portal. Use the cases, if you have questions regarding appointment scheduling or changes, process related questions, requirements clarification, before you enter PDT.

And even while you're undergoing PDT, if there is something that's not getting resolving between you and the PDT provider, use the customer service portal to escalate an issue, and we can do it. Please and try to work it through with the provider while you're in PDT, but we understand it's time sensitive and if something is not resolved or there is a further question, go ahead and ask it through the customer service portal and we'll get you an answer.

And then after the process is complete, you'll receive your test report. And if you have test report questions, please ask them at ICANN and not to the PDT provider. The relationship is with ICANN as much as possible, and the PDT provider needs to be focused on answering questions with the applicants that they are currently engaged with on PDT.

Next slide. And then while you're engaged in PDT, please use the PDT provider dot SE to engage questions related to requirements clarification. They're going to ask you follow up questions. There is a

messaging tool within the PDT system. We've definitely heard the feedback on that, we had it ourselves when we saw the volume of questions occurring at PDT.

So we have improved the messaging tool, that update is rolling out at the end of the month, and I'll take you through that at the moment. But try and use that tool as much as possible for questions. There is also an email address in the FAQ if things aren't being clear through the messaging tool, or if in some cases, if you feel like questions aren't hitting your email box from the messaging tool, then you can use that email address that will reach a group box at dot SE.

The providers are working towards responding to all inquiries within one day or better, one business day or better. There are certain issues that need to get escalated to ICANN. Mostly because of time zone differences, those may take a couple of days to resolve.

But they'll get back to you and let you know when that occurs to help set your expectations. Additionally, although they're located in Sweden, we have worked with them to extend their business hours so they can be responding to issues from 05:00 to 19:00 UTC. So nearly 14 hour service window that should accommodate nearly all of our locations around the globe with some compromise from the applicant side as well.

So last, I wanted to show off a quick screen shot of the new messaging tool. So what you'll see... The features you'll see in the new tool that you don't see today, for those of you who are the PDT contacts and have experienced it, is you can kind of see first of all subjects in the

messages, as opposed to just a giant stream of messages with to and from.

So subjects, and the subjects enable threading by subject which has been much needed. And so we'll be ready to deploy that. And additionally, it allows for proper message formatting. I guess the way I understand it, the line breaks and things were getting a little broken in the current version of the messaging tool so we've resolved that issue in this new deployment.

Like I said, that will be deployed July 30th, you'll be able to find that. And that was all I had from presentation material, so you guys can begin forming questions. I want to echo Patrik in saying that I really appreciate all of those that have participated in the beta program, in the pilot program, as well as all of those who have participated in the dialogue over the course of the last several months.

I think it's been really beneficial and hope you found that as well. And then I also just want to thank the team at ICANN for supporting me and the PDT team. And the dot SE team has done I think a really good job getting ready for PDT, building a system and building service around that system in a pretty short amount of time.

Okay. So I guess there is some remote questions as well. So maybe we'll start with a remote question and then bounce over to the queue.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Question. When we do the beta test, is there one tested item, say the second level variance related DNSSEC EPP extension, which is not compatible with the PDT system. In order to meet the requirement of PDT, we change the DNSSEC to condition that is compatible to the PDT

system, say with a compatible greeting. Do we need to make application on this in order to pass the PDT?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Hi, this is Francisco. So I was chatting with the person is that making the question in the Adobe Connect, and I'm still not sure what exactly is the question. We're talking about again, being compliant with [? 0:38:44] 5910, the answer is yes, you have to be.

KEITH:

The mic is a little louder than it was before. So my name is Keith [? 0:38:59] I'm with VeriSign. I have two questions or really two requests. The first I can speak to the second I'm going to have to read because it's from our engineers. So the first question is, when can we expect a red line version of the documentation that was posted on the 12th?

Typically coming into ICANN meetings there is a requirement for any documentation to be posted 15 days before the meeting begins so everybody has a chance to evaluate, and review, and come prepared. Obviously we understand that this is – there is an urgency to what we're doing here, and certainly appreciate all of your efforts on this.

But a redline would be very, very helpful to our engineering teams to be able to sort of try to get up to speed before the week is out. So if there are any further questions or comments or recommendations that we can bring them to you before we all leave Durban. So please, as soon as possible, a redline would be very much appreciated.

The other topic has to do with EPP extensions, and I don't think you need to go back to the slide, but the question has to do with EPP extensions. So I'm just going to read what I was sent by our engineers. It says, "The key item is that we should have the capability of hosting

multiple TLDs with a variety of supported and required extensions on the same system.

The EPP greeting by RFC is an aggregate of all possible services of a server, whereas a specific TLD may only support a subset of the services. Requiring the EPP greeting to exact the TLD specific EPP objects and extensions specified in the application, means that there would need to be an excess point per TLD, which would remove support for common platforms like what we've built.

This validation is not valid in the PDT tests and must be removed.”
Okay.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So yes [laughs]... The only check that we're doing now on EPP extensions is for the DNSSEC EPP extensions, which is required for everyone.

KEITH: All right. Very responsive, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: In the same meeting, you also asked, yes. You also asked about when we can publish the updated documentation. Can we get that out tomorrow? It's the redline. We've published the updated document, we just need the comparison.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Right. So we'll work to get that published as soon as we can. I think hopefully by the end of this week that should be doable.

KEITH: The sooner the better.

UNIDENTIFIED: So we have the old document, we have the new document, we can do a compare. If we publish PDFs, they can't do that very readily.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Correct. Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED: We will expedite that.

KEITH: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah there is a remote question. It's from [? 0:41:51]. Question, "PDT specifications online suggest that dot SE be issuing an EPP self-test tool for the technical registry operations. Two questions, it's been a couple of months now, when will it be issued? And the second one is, what will be the tool exactly do? Sorry, what will the tool exactly do?"

PATRIK HIDINGSSON: I'll try to answer that question. The EPP self-test tool will – is integrated in our infrastructure today, which made it hard to break out. We are working on it, and we are working very hard to get it released, but I don't have any dates yet.

However, I can get back to the person asking the question once I get to speak with my team. And the tool will be a substitute, or should I say, it will do exactly what we are doing in the automated EPP tests.

So when the user runs this tool, they should be getting the same results as when they're doing PDT.

UNIDENTIFIED: Jeff.

JEFF NEWMAN: Thanks. Jeff Newman. Thank you Russ for the new communications tool, I think that's going to be very helpful. It was very difficult to... I think we had a total of 150 messages back and forth, with no subject line and it was impossible to weed through.

One of the.... And the redline is going to be vital because there is hundreds of pages of materials and maybe this will be answered in the redline, but you said the pass/fail criteria have been provided. So I'll guess we'll see that in the redline, we couldn't see it when we first went through the document.

My question is, on things that we have passed, but it's been kind of a very frustrating experience going through it because it seems like there are certain things that are either not in the guidebook, not in the contract, and not in RFC, that there have been interpretations that have been made by ICANN staff, or by the PDT provider, I'm not sure who made those decisions.

And it was very frustrating because from our perspective, those are the key documents to follow, the contract, the guidebook, the RFC. And when you come in and say, even though we fixed all of these things, when you come in and say something like, "Your WHOIS output display..."

I'm not an engineer. But it's not in conformance with XML spec that came out with the W3C. That's ridiculous, I've got to say. That's incredibly frustrating. And the frustration what I'm expressing here, is nothing to what our engineers back home. Because they keep saying, it's not in the contract, it's not in the guidebook, it's not in the RFC, but you come back and say, "You can't pass because of this W3C XML spec," or something.

I'm not even sure I'm referring to it right. So my point is, and then there is another item. So you have up there on one of your slides, that two AS numbers are required for IPv4 and IPv6. We're still going back and forth

on this. That's not in a RFC, that's not in the guidebook, and it's not in the contract.

What it says, and I'm quoting it here, "The name servers must be in at least two topologically separate networks. And I understand there is a debate going on, or there has been a multiple – a multi-year debate as to what that actually means.

But what's frustrating is, when we get tested by the PDT provider, we fail that because of your interpretation which isn't necessarily the only interpretation, or necessarily something we would argue is the right interpretation.

And so my question is, when there is a matter of interpretation, you fail them. And I don't think that's right. So hopefully, the path fail lays exactly what is required and when we read that we'll come back and say, "Please point to the RFC, the guidebook, or the contract where it is."

If it's not in either of those, we're going to ask you to revise the pass/fail criteria. Thanks.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thanks. So on the example that you gave about compliance with the RFC standards, and you're correct that's not our requirement. And I must be surprised then as it being required, so we will check into that.

And I forgot what was the second question [laughs]. Yes of course. So that is actually not a requirement from the guidebook that is coming from IANA, it's a technical requirement from IANA and we're only doing what exactly as IANA does.

You will work to... If you pass on PDT, you will fail when you get to IANA.

JEFF NEWMAN: So where did that... Where did IANA come up with that requirement?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I believe there was a full consultation that recommend [? 0:47:42] was developed, I don't know when...

JEFF NEWMAN: What I'm saying is the requirement is there must be, the name service must be in at least two topologically separate networks. Right? But our interpretation of what that means is different than your interpretation that we didn't pass initially.

Right? We fixed it, it's done because it's less of a hassle to comply than it is go back and forth and fight you on it, but the point of the whole thing is that there is matters of interpretation that weren't reflected in any of those key documents that applicants have signed on to agree to.

That's the point. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED: Online comment?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes please. The next one is from Christopher [? 0:48:34]. If the primary contact for the application is not the PDT point of contact, how can the PDT contact use the CSC system? Are there separate logins for the PDT contact?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Good questions. So they can still submit cases to the CSC portal via the email address, it's on the microsite, I believe it's new gTLD at ICANN dot org. It might be new gTLDs – okay. I got it right the first time.

It's on the microsite on the applicant's page. So they can either use – send an email which will generate a case, and we can respond via email through our CSC tool, or they can work with their primary contact to generate a case within the portal. Good question.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Okay. [? 0:49:35] PDT contact [? 0:49:38], and in fact it was not that difficult and with the messaging tool that you're doing now will be much easier, thanks a lot. Because that was the real problem, playing the contact role.

Now on the question we have, sorry for being a real [dance on that 0:49:52], but I want a further clarification on something that you answered to Keith. When you say now and before, before means PDT and now means in the future real test for the EPP extensions?

That is, from now on, not just talking about PDT, [? 0:50:10], but the real PDT will only change the DNSSEC EPP extensions is what you were saying? Because now and before can be – now can be the PDT test and before can be the first test you had in March. I'm a little bit lost here.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Okay. So I think we clarified that requirement internally and resolved that internally about a week ago or so. And have been working with dot SE to that definition since that point. So I guess, up until about a week or so ago it was before, and since then it's been now or in the future.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Sorry about that, but [CROSSTALK 0:50:49]...

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

....totally a fair question. And we want to make sure to get it resolved before we published the specs that we intend to use for production.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Okay. The second question is, whether we will get – because we find through customer support some requests for clarification, so maybe absolute because regarding the question of mapping the EPP extensions.

The other one was about the famous DNS04 because we also have a different interpretation, and we think the minimum means minimum and the maximum anyway. As if solving that problem is simpler than keeping it pinged ponged.

Now the question that I have is a question that's procedural. So the thing about the concrete examples of the procedure, because we got this question online and Francisco answered the material question which is not the point here.

The point is that many of us have got requests from the PDT evaluators doing the beta, to change our applications. For purely formal things like, in this document that is in the application, this attachment, there is a missing date so please put the date and send the corrected one. Or, we think that your answer in question whatever is wrong so please provide us the correct answer.

When probably it was a question of interpretation. Now, they may be correct in both cases, perhaps – or in the three cases that's here, yes you must do that, the questions, may I... Can we... Are we allowed to just provide a different attachment and a different response on the one that we provided to ICANN?

Should we stop and go through a request and change the request procedure? While we are past constructing, so the question is for the [? 0:52:28], we took the simplest answer is that you have the new one.

But I don't think that applicants... Now, sorry. Now contracted parties are allowed to do that, at least without going back to ICANN and saying what we do here? So how do we handle this? My solution would be, if that's a missing date, whether we forget that, if this went through evaluation [? 0:52:48] we didn't remark that, developers didn't mark that, and it's just a date in a 20 pages long document, right?

It's not dated. Well is that critical? The question is, if that's material, if that's important like you are not complying with a RFC how we handle that?

UNIDENTIFIED:

Thank you [? 0:53:04] So in the interest of time, we're running out, you are correct. Once you are a contracted party and you're in production, pre-delegation testing, you would not need to submit a change request to change your application. I will let the team talk offline about, unless you have a response on some of the detailed changes.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

So that was an issue we were encountering during beta and that's part of why we re-thought the approach of what we're validating against and try to make it more align with what's in the registry agreement.

So when you will be looking at specific documents in the application and trying to have you change those specifically in the application in that – and you're in conflict, we're trying to validate against the requirements identified in the registry agreement in most of those cases that require document submittals.

UNIDENTIFIED: So we've got three in the queue and two online. Let's take the three folks in the room, we'll try to go through these quickly as questions, and then we'll go to the online questions. Thank you.

JORDAN: Thanks. Jordan again. So I think Francisco has already clarified this online, but let me just be helpful for people in the room to know. It sounds like there is the XML spec for providing registry data is not correct in the latest data dump, so people shouldn't rely on that probably [laughs].

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So yeah, we're coming to the remote questions but as you mentioned, yes, the DNS input template, it has an error. It's requiring the [? 0:54:42]... instance data, which is not the case. Shouldn't be there. Okay, we'll fix it.

JORDAN: Okay. And second, I want to come back to this ASN question again. So I understand that this is an IANA requirement, but it doesn't actually seem to be consistently enforced by IANA, there is a number of existing both g and ccTLDs that don't have name servers and two ASNs, presumably because at some point it was decided that's okay.

Or they, to Jeff's point, maybe topologically separate doesn't mean two ASNs, it means something else. So I don't who the right person to engage, it seems like somehow we need to have a discussion about whether that requirement is real, whether it's the right one and maybe you guys can help talk about how we can properly engage on this question, because I think it's a significant one.

UNIDENTIFIED: So definitely worth more conversation but Kim Davies is here, I think he could shed some light on this.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks. Kim Davies. I think most of the behavior that you're seeing is a result of the fact that these tests are only applied at the time name service is changed. So there's a lot of name service sets that haven't actually changed, this test hasn't been applied.

We've been using this test now since 2007. But surprisingly, perhaps, there is a lot of name service sets that pre-date that period of time. I think on the broader question of the applicability, I definitely know that there is different opinions about the correct way to implement this test.

It's certainly something I think will be dialogue moving forward. The way that it has been interpreted by IANA for the last six years is what the PDT testing provider has implemented. The goal there is we wanted to make sure the tests were flagged at this stage, rather than getting surprises further down the track.

But definitely we take your...

JORDAN:

So I guess my question is, what's the proper forum to... Do I just talk to you Kim? Or is there some other forum where we should be discussing this?

KIM DAVIES:

It's a good question. The procedures that we have in place right now are IANA procedures. IANA procedures have a different sort of ratification process from a lot of the remainder of what ICANN does. They are the result of a public consultation that was conducted.

Let's talk about what might come down the track, but I think for the moment, I think it has to be assumed these texts are going to be in place for the foreseeable future, until they might be remedied or altered by some kind of consultation further down the track.

JORDAN: Okay. Thanks.

ALEX: Alex [? 0:57:31]... I have two questions that are connected. The first question is, can we assume that the documents that you have released on July 12th are the final ones? I suppose if there are errors in XML that is not the case.

And my second question is, there is a problem with one of the EPP tests, with registries that require approval of domain names. I've been talking to someone else from the EPP service product team. The problem is that there is one test that requires the EPP provider to create a domain and immediately update that domain.

Which obviously fails if the registry policy requires approval of the domain before it can be updated. Is there any update on that case to be expected in the documents?

I was told by your colleague actually, that the test will be split into two tests. The one create test and one update test, so that's – that would be separate domains, but I think it somehow fell of the table it seems.

UNIDENTIFIED: Let us get back to you on that. It seems like there was some recollection, but we need to go back and chase what that answer was.

ALEX: Okay. Thank you. Documents, final ones?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: In terms of the finalized, I think we have a couple of things that we want to update this week unfortunately, so we're going to work to get those updated as quickly as possible. I don't think it changes any of the tests, but I think it further clarifies some things.

So I don't think anyone couldn't perceive what the documents that are currently published...

ALEX: Okay. No substantial changes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Jeff.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: There is some more remote ones...

UNIDENTIFIED: Let's take Jeff, and then...

JEFF: Mine will be short. Jeff [0:59:19], Untied TLD. So, the question I had is regarding the actual website and the uploading of information. We had issues with certain types of information and files that we were not able to upload. So you guys were...

I mean, the communication was great with you guys. We were able to send them to you in email, you confirmed them and that those were there. For example, on our escrow data, it's not clear the documents if you were able to upload either binary or test – text. And we weren't able to upload the binary so we sent you the text via email and that was fine.

Is that going to be clarified in the new specs? And also, will people be able to send, if there are issues be able to send the documentation via email, because it wasn't really clear I think even in the new documentation there so. We want to make sure that avenue is open because, of course, nobody wants to fail because the documentation can't be uploaded correctly.

And sorry, one last thing, will there be other changes to the interface? Like for example, there were certain pieces that unless you had all three

new files uploaded, it couldn't be submitted. So if we had to make a change to one part of say the EPP, or it was the escrow, we couldn't submit it unless all three were done.

So is that something you guys are looking to fix, or a suggestion I would hopefully fix something like that in the next round. Thank you.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

On those issues are new to me, so I don't think I'm prepared to fully answer them all. So I mean, we'll certainly look into the upload, I hadn't heard any planned changes to the interface coming, but if it's needed, we'll definitely work on getting it fixed as soon as possible.

And then, with regards to the data escrow spec, I think the intention is to be able to reopen the interface to allow you to resubmit, even if you might email something and we check it and say, "Yeah, this is what we're looking for."

I think we would like to re-open that interface to allow for a resubmittal. We'll have to check on the file type like you mentioned, again, that's new to me. I haven't – that one hasn't surfaced to my attention yet.

JEFF:

I'm just... Yeah. We're just looking for the clarification, so when we do the actual testing it really doesn't become an issue.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Right. I think the goal is that we get a complete set of documents that, this is the set of documents that past for PDT, so it's all together and packaged and archived. But like I said, we'll look into fixing that.

JEFF:

Perfect. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. The last two questions in the queue, one is from Cal. “Although the extension of EPP conversion is better documented in the information and document, thanks by the way, will there be XSLT or similar mapping for all supplied XML or EPP to actual EPP commands?” Should I read it again?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes please.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. “Although the extension of EPP conversion is better documented in the information and document, will there be XSLT or similar mapping for all supplied XML or EPP to the actual EPP commands?”

FRANCISCO ARIAS: We are not planning to release any other XML schemas for the ones that are already included in the templates.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you. And the last question from PDT dash CX, “My question is, will the PDT provider check the DNSSEC extension stated in the application to see if it is exactly matches the tested system, since we have made some changes to our DNSSEC extension in order to be compatible with the RFC 5910? Do we need to also change our application response?”

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So the only EPP extension that is check is the DNSSEC, or RFC 5910, so we – the EPP server, it’s expected to be compatible with that.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Sorry. Yes the other clarification of that would be, if you don’t intend to support that spec, you need to make that clear during the contracting period, and make sure to work through that with our – the Exhibit A process, because we’ll test what’s in Exhibit A if it’s different than what’s required in a base agreement.

Okay. It looks like we're all done. Thank you very much, thanks for staying late. Good questions. We have a few to get back to you guys on, but appreciate the feedback. Thanks. [Applause]

[BLANK AUDIO 1:04:28 – 1:04:38]

End of Audio