

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona  
GNSO - CPH TechOps Meeting Session 1  
Sunday, 21 October 2018 at 09:00 CEST**

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. This is Marc Anderson and welcome to the ICANN63 TechOps Session. We're going to go ahead and get this started and on behalf of, you know, myself and my co-chair, Tobias, I'd like to welcome everybody here and thank you all for coming. We have a slightly smaller group to start off with, and there's a couple faces I don't recognize so we're going to take advantage of the smaller venue and just sort of go around the room, ask everybody to introduce themselves real quick, just say, you know, who you are and who you work with so I'll pick on you down there and we'll just work our way around the room.

Stu Homan: Stu Homan with Mark Monitor.

Sherry Hildebrand: Sherry Hildebrand, Mark Monitor.

Eric Rokobauer: Eric Rokobauer, Endurance Registrar.

Arnold Blinn: Arnold Blinn from GoDaddy.

Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger, GoDaddy.

Jody Kolker: Jody Kolker, GoDaddy.

Gaurav Vedi: Gaurav Vedi, Domain Registries.

Zoe Bonython: Zoe Bonython, Registrar Secretariat.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias Sattler, United Domains.

Marc Anderson: Marc Anderson, VeriSign.

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm, VeriSign.

Dave McBreen: Dave McBreen, Name.com.

Kristof Tuyteleers: Kristof Tuyteleers, DNS Belgium.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

Neil McPherson: Neil McPherson, 1&1 Internet.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1&1 Internet.

Woman: (Unintelligible), 1.com, which is a registrar and a registry.

Mike Palage: Mike Palage, Pharos Global.

Marc Anderson: Great. Thank you, everyone. Appreciate you letting me put you on the spot early this morning and introducing yourselves. As you see up on the screen we have an agenda. This is the agenda we worked out during our regular biweekly calls. Thank you, again for everybody who participated in this and helped us get the agenda today. And again, you know, particular thank you to all the people who volunteered to be session leaders. That's, you know, as we know from past experience, having the session leaders lined up ahead of time is key to having a successful meeting.

We're going to dive right into the agenda. Our first agenda item is Registry Maintenance Notifications. This will be an update from Tobias on where that is, current status of that and so I'll turn it right over to Tobias for an update.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you, Marc. Tobias speaking. So Registry Maintenance Notification back in 2017 we discussed that in the CPH TechOps Group, what we can do regarding registry maintenance notification and we came up with extension for EPP and this extension was drafted in an IETF draft and put out there to the IETF.

Lately we asked the RegEx Working Group at IETF for adoption. Right now as far as I understood is that they are still in the process of changing their charter to actually being able to do, yes, well to actually adopt it as well as some other initiatives that's going on there. Right now we have the version 7 of the EPP Registry Maintenance Notification and Roger Carney and Jody Kolker joined as coauthors to actually drive that through the IETF process, so we still need to see how we actually going to move forward with that right now because yes, well we are still waiting on adoption through the working group. That's actually it so Jody, do you want to add something to that?

Jody Kolker: I'm going to defer to Roger.

Roger Carney: Good morning, everybody. This is Roger Carney. Yes, actually I think IETF and (Banca) will actually get these things on list finally. The charter has been updated, it's going through IESG right now to get approved so we should be able to do it by next month so.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you, Roger. So well the draft is out there. We can put the link in the Adobe chat for information. And I think then I'm practically done with my status update on the Registry Maintenance Notification. Thank you.

Marc Anderson: Great. Thank you for that update. And I guess just a quick couple housekeeping items I guess before we get into this, just a reminder, this

session is recorded and, you know, please remember to state your name for transcription purposes before speaking.

And I guess I have a question I'll ask, you know, I know this was covered at a previous meeting but I think it might be, you know, worth sort of, you know, recapping real quickly why the – what Tobias and Roger mean about the charter changes, why the RegEx group needed a charter update in order to take a look at this so that might be worth – that might be an interesting update for everybody in the group.

Roger Carney: Yes hi, this is Roger. So the RegEx Group of IETF was actually the EPP Extensions Group and dealt only in EPP matters. So I think about two years ago they changed to the RegEx Group which supposedly kind of expanded their role but it was still fairly narrow and only dealt with EPP stuff. So recently the group asked to be changed to basically cover any registration operations matters. No one at IETF does anything with that stuff so it was fitting for the group to take it on, so it includes file formats that get passed between registries and registrars, anything dealing with that communication between registry and registrars should go through that group if it meets, you know, technical standards so.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Appreciate that. Guys, that was – that was fairly interesting and useful to update everybody on. Before we go onto the next agenda item, does anybody have any questions or anything they'd like to bring up around the Registry Maintenance Notification? Vlad.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu I remember a while back there was essentially a call to action by registry operators and some registrars to try to start testing this maintenance notification, did that get any traction or we're just still sitting with a draft right now that we are still reviewing before implement it?

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking for the question. So actually we are just sitting on the draft; there is no reference implementation as far as I know.

Marc Anderson: Okay thank you. Seeing no other questions, we'll go ahead and move onto the next agenda item. The next item on the agenda we have a update from the RDAP Pilot Group. I think most people are aware, you know, Rick Wilhelm has taken over as the chair of the RDAP Pilot Discussion Group and so he's joining us this morning to give us an update on where we are with RDAP, the RDAP pilot and I guess the recently wrapped up public comment period. So Rick, over to you.

Rick Wilhelm: Sure. Thanks, Marc. Rick Wilhelm for the record. The – couple things going on in the RDAP pilot area, RDAP overall. One, we have the group – the topic has a couple of different meetings this week. There is a Monday session that's structured as a panel, I believe it's at 10:30 on Monday. Marc's vaguely nodding at me. Jody's definitely nodding at me. And that – he's on the panel so he knows where he's going to be. And so that's structured as a panel and we're going to be talking through for the broader group to help introduce RDAP a little bit more and it's the role that it could play in implementing policy, not – and that's a big thing that we're going to be working on is that RDAP is not there to shape policy but to be an implementation mechanism.

And then we have the regular RDAP working session which is going to be on Wednesday in the afternoon at 1:30 local time, 1330 local time for about 90 minutes. So that's what's going on here. In the RDAP Pilot itself the public comment period for the profile documents closed on 13th October. There were a number of comments posted by sort of the regularly expected ICANN groups. I'll kind of run down those here, At Large Advisory Community, ALAC; Business Constituency, BC; the i2Coalition, the Internet Infrastructure Coalition; Non Commercial Stakeholder Group, NCSG; Registrar Stakeholder Group and Registry Stakeholder Group all posted comments.

Mark Monitor posted a separate comment on their own. My read of it that it – they didn't expressly withdraw from the Registrar Stakeholder Group in there it was just sort of an additional thing, is that fair? Mark Monitor is nodding.

And Gavin Brown from CentralNic posted something – I don't think Gavin's on the chat today but it was posted well before the Registry Stakeholder Group and it did – it was not – just sort of offering some opinions on that. So not attempting to sort of comment about Gavin's comments in relationship to Registry Stakeholder Group.

And there were a couple of others. It's worth reading them on your own, I won't attempt to characterize any of them but they're all, other than to say that they were very thoughtful and considered as we would expect from the usual group of comments. So there's work that's going to be underway to consolidate those as per the usual ICANN process and so that will be forthcoming.

There will be undoubtedly an iteration of the profile docs. This was expected even before the comment period we knew in the Pilot Working Group that an iteration of the profile documents is going to be forthcoming. In the Pilot Working Group which was continuing to go on and meet weekly even during the public comment period, we've been working through, and a number of folks in this room have been part of that, working through the batch of 28 comments that the Pilot group had received from ICANN staff even before the public comment period had opened, so we've been working through those.

At present I believe we're through all but one, I think we've gotten up to 27, not that the last one is all that problematic, it just worked out that we have one to go before the meeting, just odd timing. So after we get through that last 28th one we'll do a coalescing. Those comments I would offer are roughly bucketing into yes, the working group agrees. We kind of agree but we don't exactly agree with the way that the write up is worded and so we're going to sort of take the idea but reconfigure it in a certain way. And no, we actually don't agree at all, as a matter of fact, we disagree. So sort of that's kind of the third bucket.

And so I'll – if you've got thoughts about whether – if that's – I think that's a rough characterization as I'll say. There's probably some that fall in between the cracks on those. And so on those ones where we agree those will be relatively easily reflected in redlines; the ones where we agree but need to reflect in different redlines we'll probably be able to work through those. And the ones where we disagree we'll have to find a way to respectfully reflect that. So that's sort of the ICANN staff comments.

And then we have to go through and address the various comments that came in from the public comment period. And I at least personally have not gone through a systematic assessment of everybody's – of all the groups' comments, maybe someone here in the room is far more – certainly someone here in the room is far more diligent than I and perhaps someone like that has gotten through all of the comments. Time will tell.

Anybody have any questions in or around or comments in or around – yes, Mr. Palage.

Mike Palage: Thank you. Mike Palage for the record. So the bucket of – in which ICANN disagrees, how many fall within that bucket? And could you perhaps summarize?

Rick Wilhelm: Thank you. Good question, Mike. I am not able to precisely summarize. I would say that – I would roughly guess, and I'm going to look around for folks that are in the group, I would say probably about 1/3 are in the – I think that out of the 28 they fall about 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. In the 1/3 we agree and say yes, we'll sort of kind of take the redlines that is; 1/3, we agree but would express it in somewhat different, and 1/3 we kind of disagree. Roger, please.

Roger Carney: Yes, this is Roger. And I would say that 1/3 that we disagree, it wasn't that ICANN brought a new idea to us and we disagree with it, it was most of those were discussed over the past year and we didn't agree with those things, and the group came to a conclusion that we wouldn't do those things but ICANN

still wanted to record that as something that they brought up so they put it in their document.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, good comment. Thank you, Roger. Mike, does that help? Okay, thank you. Other questions or comments in or around the comment period? Yes, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Rick. Marc Anderson. Appreciate the update. I was wondering if you could say a few words maybe about expected Phase 2 as far as getting into authentication and maybe what the group has planned next step-wise for that?

Rick Wilhelm: Sure. Thank you, Marc, playing the straight man. The – yes, so the pilot is as foreshadowed during the San Juan meeting, we're headed toward a Phase 2 of the pilot whereby we're expecting to do some work in and around authentication, authorization as experimental work related to providing tiered access for some implementing a yet to be defined policy related to differentiated access that could come out of the in process EPDP. And I chose those words extraordinarily – hopefully chose those words carefully enough, how about that?

So that's – and there's other things that need to get done in Phase 2 which will include implementing the redlines that we will – that are forecasted coming out of the comments both that we – that are in place in the public comment period as well as the comments from staff in Group 1 and Group 2 that we were just speaking about.

And there's probably some other stuff in – as part of Phase 2, Marc, that I'm maybe forgetting. But at least – but at least that related to some sort of a authentication and authorization mechanisms. During the meeting on Monday there will be some presentation discussion topics where we give some previews in and around possible authentication mechanisms, there are two



that we have that are being explored presently, one involving certificates and one involving OAuth standards based.

The current thinking is that this is not going to be an or kind of a solution but rather an and solution because they really address two different use cases. The OAuth is a more of an ala carte, you get access to specific things; and certificate-based is more of the buffet style all you can eat kind of thing. Any questions about any of that? Yes, Mike.

Mike Palage: Thanks, Rick. When is Phase 2 anticipated to start? Any specifics on that?

Rick Wilhelm: As soon as possible but no sooner he grinned into the mic. So we'll be trying to get Phase 2 started, we would hope to have something I think going before Kobe, I think. Marc's nodding. Sure. Yes, I mean, we would like to have something going before Kobe, maybe not the all of the implementers would be implementing before Kobe but we would like to have – I think that we would like to have something scoped and Phase 2 pilot defined as we get towards there, I think.

Mike Palage: So will the work for Phase 2 be kind of in the existing RDAP or is there a separate side group, I mean, for people that may be interested in that?

((Crosstalk))

Mike Palage: Just transition rollover?

Rick Wilhelm: Correct, yes, you're – yes.

Mike Palage: Thanks.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, we would not be spinning up a – the phase – the current RDAP team will sort of flow into – and we would hope it would – that any current participants would stay and it would just be that more people would climb onto the bus,

proverbial bus; we don't actually have a bus in our equipment inventory unless there's something I don't know about. Yes, Roger, oh maybe Roger has a bus.

Roger Carney: No bus. Not running you over with a bus. This is Roger. I just want to make it clear though, I mean, the Pilot Group started way, way middle of '16, late '16, something like that; it was a long time ago. And its goal was to test out and improve what RDAP could do. It just so happened that GDPR landed in the middle of that and the group was kind of forced to take on some policy issues that it didn't want to do. And actually Rick did a lot of that driving himself was to come up with something that matched the temp spec, but the group was not trying to do any policy work at all.

And going forward it's not trying to do any policy work; it's trying to do technical work to prove what the solutions could be and we'll leave those decisions of how to actually use those technologies to other people, but we're just there to prove the technologies and which ones are the best ones so.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, yes great point. That's a mechanism, not policy is sort of the t-shirts that we're getting printed up, virtual t-shirts, unless someone wants to print up real t-shirts. That'd be fine with me. The last thing that I'll offer is there's another item related to – which was born out of – which is a good lead-in speaking of the policy, coming out of the temporary spec, the temporary spec was a big impetus for – mentioned RDAP specifically for various reasons and it also brought in the topic of SLAs and reporting requirements. So those are still in the process of wrapping up their negotiation between stakeholders – between contracted parties and ICANN.

At present the issue – I would – my assessment is that the issues that are at stake are largely contractual integration, not the technical SLAs themselves. The technical SLAs themselves are pretty much settled in currently at availability of 98% authentication or sorry, response time of 5000 milliseconds at the 95th percentile and update time of 60 minutes at the 95th percentile, so

they're sort of settled in at those which roughly correspond to looser versions of current Whois specs.

Why are they looser? This is – RDAP has never been implemented in production before at scale by anybody, and it relies on a completely different software stack and has https involved, right, whereas Whois does none of that stuff. So those are in the works and so that's sort of where that's headed but there's still some contractual issues that are in play so that's a – getting sorted out. And I think that's about it unless anybody has any other questions or comments. Okay I think we're bang-on time.

Marc Anderson: Great. This is Marc again. Thank you, Rick, appreciate the update. A lot of people have come in the room since we started and, you know, kudos to you guys for missing the part where everybody got put on the spot to introduce themselves so they have cleverly delayed their arrival time to avoid that. But rather than do that again we're going to go onto the next agenda item which is Neil is going to talk to us about the Registry Reporting Repository. Neil, I hope you're ready to dive right in and get us started?

Neil McPherson: Yes, I'm ready. I've got some slides. Zoe, do you have those? Yes, anyways, this is Neil for the record. Today we've got a 45-minute slot so let's see how far we get but essentially I wanted to give an update on where we currently stand with the various reporting drafts, dive quickly into the kind of the pain points that we're fixing. There was a comment recently on one of the TechOps scrolls to get some more insight there and then a discussion about the current draft that's, yes, I guess needs to be written, the transaction report draft and then have a little talk about the next steps.

Next slide please. Yes, so what was done already is the top bar there, essentially the Registry Report Repository that we've been working on over the last I guess nearly a year. And that draft is all about where the documents are going to be stored hopefully from the registries and how so strictly talking about the repository. I'll go into a little bit more detail in a second.

Then the second one, the light blue one, the report standard, that's talking about – the draft's talking about what every report should have so trying to standardize a couple of things that we're going to be seeing repeatedly. I'll go into some more details in a second again. But for those are currently draft IETF process – prospectus draft. And then below there are the individual reports, so each report the idea would have their own draft and their own best practice document.

So there are two that have already been done by Roger and James, right, so the unavailable names and premium names or I think that as called fee, so domain fee draft. So the domain fee draft is currently dormant, the other one is still ongoing, the unavailable names. And then the one that we'd like to do next would be the transaction report which is the upcoming and then hopefully we'll have some more reports coming on after that. So next slide please.

Rich Merdinger: Hi, Rich Merdinger for the record, what does – could you please describe what “dormant” means in this context as far as the status that it is and how it's dormant? Is it being deprecated, is it...?

Roger Carney: This is Roger. So again, going back to what we were discussing a little bit earlier with the charter changes, the RegEx group actually couldn't take these things on so they were published to IETF Internet drafts but no one could actually bring them on and start working them so they were just sitting there and they're basically stale now, they've been there for over a year and now we can finally start bringing them on after the next IETF, so.

Rich Merdinger: Thanks, Roger.

Neil McPherson: Okay. Next slide please. Right so the repository essentially, you know, formalizes the repository type, gives guidelines for access management and there's also the idea to have a checksum to control the data integrity in all

reports that come through there and there's a link there as well to the current draft. Any questions on that? Okay, next slide please.

So the reporting reports draft, this formalizes the (far) naming standard, it formalizes the standards within the content, things like time stamps, domain name syntax, and here I guess is a question throwing out there to everyone, is there anything missing. I'm not sure people have been looking at that. One of the things that I thought could make sense to put in there would be a currency standard as we're dealing with currency in a lot of different reports to make sure where we put the currency standard in there. The other thing that I thought about was to make sure there's a number format in there as well.

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm. Did I see on the prior slide that it settles on SFTP? So, what if an entity has a security policy that prefers a different mechanism based on security like hypothetically FTPS or something else? Because that seems to get towards security policy.

Neil McPherson: Yes, good question. Any ideas? Toby, do you have any feedback on that?

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking. So, Rick, to your question, so the thing is we discussed that during the CPH TechOps and there was a thing if we are doing it through https, SFTP, FTPS, and so on, and we decided on SFTP, so if there a registry would not be able to comply with SFTP then well, it's probably not going to work then we need to take a look on the draft and see how we're going to solve that but right now it's just SFTP.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller speaking for the record. I got you, Rich. That was a very long discussion we had at that point of time and I think the benefit of a standard is that everyone is using the same thing so at the end I think the registrars don't really care what it is as long as the standard was a wish from the registries to use SFTP if I remember correctly. And we can change that but we can also (unintelligible) in the process of re-changing everything we kind of come up

with. So the question is, you know, how can we come to something that is final and everyone is agreeing and then we can use that.

So I think the registrars are very easy at that point of time where no implementation has happened to do whatever but if we end up in the scenario where every registry is choosing their own methodology and then come up with own formats again because well, we can't do that or we won't do it, then we don't need to run through the exercise of trying to send it.

Rich Merdinger: Hi, Rich Merdinger. I was going to basically comment kind of in two different ways. One, if we're going to be speaking about the level of security, the – what the security is attempting to accomplish and things of that nature, I'd rather be in a policy meeting to discuss those things.

When we're talking about standardized implementation, I'll cut short and say what Tom said as far as if we're going to standardize maybe throw away EG SFTP but – and we can come up with a refined solution because it has taken awhile, maybe something new has come out, maybe get a recommendation from the SSAC or something along those lines if that's important. But looking for individual security officer within individual firms to come up with their flavor of what this is, we might as well not do it.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes, and I'm echoing kind of what Rich is saying that the – at least in our company the people that make those kind of decision about SFTP versus FTPS don't sit on the same floor as the people that talk about file name formats and delimiters and stuff like that. So it does – it gets to security policy because they're the same ones that talk about password length and complexity and just a different – it's a different kettle of fish for us.

Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger. Adjacent topic, and that is is there going to be any – are there any data privacy issues we need to consider regarding the content of these files or is like we're sure any GDPR, no PII, personally identifiable information, things like that in them, those are concerns that in the beginning

when we started talking about this we touched on but I don't remember if we vetted it thoroughly.

Neil McPherson: This is Neil again. We haven't thought about that to be honest, yes. Any other comments on the repository or dive back into this topic? So, yes, so the reporting reports, yes I guess I'm throwing it out there, any comments on anything missing point? Should we put something with regards to currency in there? Should we put something in regards to number format? Are there any other ideas or if anyone's also read the draft, or comment that we've got things that are missing in there that could be in this for standardizing all reports? Cool. Tom.

Tom Keller: Yes, Tom Keller for the record. There's just one more general question and I don't know whether you're going to address it later on but the question is what are we going to do – a lot of the stuff, once it's done, a lot of stuff that's listed at the IETF currently, most of the people are not very familiar with where to find anything there including myself.

So the question is whether we should set up some kind of a TechOps website for best standards and then link to all of the repositories because currently we – this group knows about it, but if we want the registries and registrars to adopt it I think we need to go through some more promotional pain actually kind of make them at least aware of it and then it's maybe up for the registrars to put some weight behind that. But that's one of the things I would like to bring up as a topic; we should discuss maybe not today but at a later stage on how we can promote the standards and best practice become aware. Thank you.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking again. Thanks, Tom, for the input. So I think we just started a domain name for that purpose a couple – a while ago but we haven't used it. So, yes, we can take a look on that. Thanks.

Neil McPherson: Okay, it's Neil again. Next slide please. So I guess – also just for the record, a little bit also what Tom was saying this is just keeping – those are the two drafts that also been ongoing from Roger and Jim, just put those in there so people can follow them. Next slide please.

So like I say, I said on the agenda on one of the last TechOps calls there was a question with regards to these pain points and what – what we're trying to fix here. Yes, I'm not going to spend too much time on this but yes, currently every registry has their own repository file name, convention report, format and report content. Formats are not the same, content's not the same even though everyone's reporting on the standard events. This causes pain and effort for registrars.

And yes, and best – in a perfect world we'd have completely standardized formats and complexly standardized contents and we can take all of those reports and work on them very easily. Any other comments for feedback on that? I think that's pretty clear.

Yes, next slide please. So the next slide that we want to jump – sorry, the next report that we want to jump into is the transaction reports. Yes, I think what will generally be billable transactions, that would make that differentiation straight up. The format and the content of the report needs to be standardized. We've already been looking at is taking standards that are already written into the reporting reports draft and available names and domain fee or premium name draft from Roger and Jim. We need to formalize event types, that's something that we don't have currently out there in registry land is that a lot of registries call what should be standardized events, call them different things.

What we also definitely need to do is formalize the multiyear standard so that in my view at least the event and the period should be separately noted. This shouldn't be event types with the period baked into the event type for



example there shouldn't be an event type that's called three-year create, four-year create, 10-year create, but it's a create of period X.

Next slide please. So for sure these are, I mean, hopefully get some discussion going. So a simple version here, I put down that the transaction report must always list the domain name, time stamp, the event period, transaction cost, currency and description and description is also coming with regard to premium tier, coming from the domain fee draft. Could be the register ID, it could also there have a notification if a price is standard price or a promo price rather than a registry just changing the actual fee that there is for a promotion or a discount domain, that it should be some kind of marker to show that it's standard or promo.

I've got a question because this was maybe some registries or other registrars can help on this one, but I don't really understand why you need to put the registrar ID for every single domain name. Is there use cases where one report has multiple registrar IDs on there? Jody?

Jody Kolker: This is Jody for the record. I don't know of any registry that would print out a family of registrars within one report but it would be an option to be able to do that.

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm. Wouldn't the registrar want the registry to do that such that the registrar could therefore easily concatenate the reports without doing intermediate manipulation?

Rich Merdinger: This is Rich Merdinger...

((Crosstalk))

Rich Merdinger: Yes, I agree. The idea that you could have a folder full of individual reports concatenating them together for processing just it seems like it is plausibly useful and completely harmless to do so as long as the registrar ID is

normalized and is not becoming a confusing factor in the end because we, you know, etcetera.

Neil McPherson: Great. This is Neil. Great, I'll put that down on my list as a must. With regards to the standard or promo events topic, how do registrars feel about that? Is this something we'd want to have in there, the market or standard or a promo? No heavy feelings? Tom?

Tom Keller: Tom speaking. This is an interesting one but I would say yes, that's something we need but I'm looking at how registries are implementing currently. That might be a tough one. So maybe we can not use it in the initial report and maybe come up with something more definite. This is just a marker, I don't know how useful that will be and whether registries will be able to fill it in at all and we do something with it. So for the sake of getting that thing out there I would rather not do it currently and maybe, you know, yes, leave that for more discussion in the future.

Neil McPherson: Jody.

Jody Kolker: I'd just agree with Tom on that. I would agree with Tom on that is that I think we need to make this report as simple as possible to start with and then let's talk about it. I'd rather not try to boil the ocean with this yet.

Neil McPherson: Rick.

Rick Wilhelm: I mean, a tactical thing, I'm not sure why currency is – that's an interesting one because if there's one thing that's ambient about the registry it's currency, right? No he says.

Neil McPherson: Answer is no. So there are some registries where you can choose the currency. It would be one, okay...

((Crosstalk))

Rick Wilhelm: Well then I would...

Neil McPherson: ...for reconciliation that you have it in there. I'm not sure about it.

Rick Wilhelm: Okay then I would say it should be a "may" right? I mean, over all the whole – and for me this whole initiative of – the notion of having the report format be fixed is – I would rather if we went to a – where we were defining a – we were defining a data definition language instead of defining the report that the – which would allow more long-term flexibility because I think that from the standpoint of the registrars parsing the report, the – if they received with the report the report definition that allows – that allows the ability to be a midpoint between being flexible between the reports and allowing the ease of parsing, right, because I don't think it's as important that all registries have the exact same format but it is understandable that registrars should want the ability to parse.

So the notion of having a report have an accompanying data definition language, lower case, right, such that it provides the – a meta description of what's there is a way to accomplish the goal without jamming every registry a one size fits all forever and for always into a standard definition that's then brittle over time across all registries because it's not a one size fits all business otherwise there'd be only need for one kind of registry.

Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger. We've been there with one kind of registry in the past; we don't need to do that again. But doctor evil over here. No, I was going to say I understand where you're coming from where as a provider of the information or the data, let's call it data, it's not just information, one doesn't want to be constrained to take an internal format or construct and force it into something that is – as you use your term – jammed together so that it's all normalized for the receiver.

The flip side of that is if all we're doing is a data definition language we might as well say let's use XML, let's go. I mean, let's – there's got to be a happy medium where if we can look across the concept of there are core things that are common, dates, times, things of that nature that are going to be named and treated, etcetera, the same so we don't end up saying we get the reports down and say, "Is the system configured properly for Registry A as far as we're coming down into the times that are being delivered? And B and C?" It's the effort of that normalization to a degree that we're trying to achieve here.

Now that said, I'm envisioning a table in my head, not this, that has got a set of mandatory normalized columns with the extensibility of additional things on the outside. Exceptions may need to be made but let's see if we can do transformations of some form so that when the consumers are seeing normalized data and the senders are sending out data that is at worst transformed a bit from their internal formats because there's thousands of registrars and there's bunches of registries now and it's only going to continue to grow. And I think that's the problem we're trying to solve. And I apologize if I didn't mean I was going for humor in my first comment, nothing political.

Rick Wilhelm: No, Rick Wilhelm for the record. No, I mean, and there's thousands of TLDs, right? And SubPro is underway so, I mean, this notion that we're going to have this many to many situation and we're going to solve this many to many situation by defining one report format to solve them all I think is fool's gold, not that anyone in here is a fool, right, but I think it's something that is – we're kind of tilting at windmills.

So I think that we need to think about extensibility and flexibility because as those of us who spend time at IETF know, getting IETF standards changed is not easy, right, even something very simple.

Tom Keller: Tom speaking. I would like to respond to that. So what we talked about is a file with a couple of fields, period. So we can extend that, we can change that, we can change that around, it's a best practice. It's not written nor set in stone; we can change it whenever we want to. Currently the registrars are going through the exercise of normalizing up to 400 domain names and it's feasible but it's a fucking pain. And I think registries, whatever format they have, can certainly put out a file without actually breaking any bones that looks like that.

So this is the kind of discussion I don't get, you know, as soon as we talk about – just thinking about, you know, putting all GoDaddy's bills in an XML file will be pretty big and absolutely useless. I mean, just a couple of data fields we need to actually verify transactions you send to us. And speaking as the customer, I don't know why we should make that any more complicated and such a simpler report. You're already putting it out in front of us, and I don't see that there's any difference if there are 20 or 20 million registries, and 20 or 20 million registrars, it's always the same data we need and we already getting it.

And much of the registries are already using a format that is somehow like that. So this is I think a customer request saying please, registries, do something to make our life a bit easier.

Neil McPherson: Okay, so can you then like we said, maybe the registrar ID we put there as a must and the standard or promo event we could kind of table that for further discussions or that could be the next version or that's optional. And can you jump to the next slide please, Zoe? So if we're thinking about defining events, so my question there, do we need everything? Do we really need to define all the various types of sunrise events, EAP or land rush variations? How different are these?

My feeling is that especially there's quite a bit of effort just to define to make sure we have create, renewal, auto renewal, transfer when, etcetera, so the

real standard events that (unintelligible) to make sure those are standardized. We start also trying to send out all the various, let's call it, pre-GA events and also pre-GA, there's also a lot of different kind of business models that – isn't really I guess a standard out there.

My thinking would be we let registries do what they want with sunrise, LEXS and land rush variations. Any comments on that or is there a strong feeling that these need to be standardized as well now? Roger. Jody.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. I think there needs to be some kind of standardization on there but I think it needs to be very flexible as far as, you know, this could be as simple as just saying "phase" you know, adding another column that says "phase" for sunrise, land rush because you're doing a domain create, you're doing generally you don't do renewals in a sunrise phase but, you know, if somebody wanted to you could do that if there was a different fee for it. But I think there needs to be something there as far as a standardization for those. Like I said, it could just be another column. Thanks.

Neil McPherson: Rick.

Rick Wilhelm: So there – I think that we're kind of getting into what the business may or may not want to do and I think we're still going to see create – we as an industry are still going to see creativity in this area that at least I can't predict. So I would caution us against getting too rigid here with a, you know, and creativity on both registrar and registry sides.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody again. Yes, I think that we had something in there at the very end that's a description, at least there would be something that we could use to be able to identify that fee, if there was something new.

Neil McPherson: Okay, then by the define events, the second bullet point there is are there any other event types that we need to put in there, I guess that could also be something on the description that there may be validation fees that some

registries charge, I believe some registries also charge for updates. Anything else that we've kind of forgotten or missing? We could always have some kind of description being "other" for example so that you know to have a deeper look at it, it's not something that's standard.

Premium pricing, I think that's pretty clear, they would take all of the work that the guys have already done in the domain fees draft and just use that. Back to currency, there I also wonder whether the currency could kind of be set by default in some kind of header in the document to say hey, all of these domains are going to be charged at USD or euro or whatever, whether we really need to have a currency column next to the price?

Kristof Tuyteleers: This is Kristof. It needs to be currency per domain because we have registries that have different currencies like Channel Isle Registries that have USD and euro and it depends on the TLD. And also if we – I'm pretty sure some registrars will use this with their resellers and a lot of registrars use different currency per TLD as well so that would be very usual.

Rick Wilhelm: That's fine but I don't think it's fair to burden all registries with the practices of some.

Kristof Tuyteleers: An option could be that you have a header for the document that says if this is for the whole report or if it's like a per domain. So and then you only have the column if the header says "per domain."

Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger again. Check me if I'm wrong but we're talking about here is something that is an industry preferred practice and if registries that have inabilities to, and I'm not suggesting that in this case, but inabilities or desires not to etcetera, etcetera, keep doing business the way you're doing it, but let's not let the idea that it has to be completely mutable get in the way of those that do want to come to a standardized format. So just remember, doing none of it is definitely one of the options.

Neil McPherson: So the next point there is the pricing and promos I guess we already had that discussion previously, had to do with promo pricing. Let's maybe table that and think about it in a new version. Auto renewal, I've called it "net" there or not, and that would be something that I'd love to have as if a registry clearly defines what kind of auto renewal model they're working on or charging, do they charge straight away and then allow the domain to be deleted with the refund or do they wait the 45 days before they put their auto renewal in there on the invoice? Like I say, I'd like to have that in there somewhere. Any comments or questions on that?

Jody Kolker: Just a comment, maybe a question, isn't that part of the type of the charge? You know, it's a renewal, it's an auto renewal or it's an explicit renew isn't that in the report already?

Neil McPherson: Yes, Neil again, auto renewal for sure is in there but I guess it's there saying is this auto renewal done at the date of renewal or is it done 45 days after or billed after?

Jody Kolker: Yes, that seems it's more of a policy than being in this report.

Neil McPherson: It is a policy, agreed, but it's also a different – for us it's a, yes, slightly different transaction. Maybe it's just me, maybe it's just 1&1 that looks at those differently.

Jody Kolker: Let's talk later.

Neil McPherson: The next point there, the registrar column, we already discussed that I guess as well so we don't need to go into more detail there; there's something that is needed but with a standardized way of notating the registrar. And then the big question at the end here is extensionable, how do we make this report extensionable? Do we say these are the musts, and put the first whatever it was kind of the eight or nine columns that we were talking about, this is what a report needs, and then after that the registries can kind of do what they



want or do we review every whatever year or two to look at extensions? I don't have any experience in this kind of stuff within the IETF what's kind of the normal practice for...

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. So I was hoping we'd get to this question actually. You know, right now the premium and the unavailable names are basically best practices, drafts, what do we call that in IETF, informational, it's an informational draft. I mean, and those are – anybody can put out an informational draft and anyone can comment on it. And it doesn't need to go through the whole getting to be a standard, going through IESG, I mean, as you guys well maybe not everybody knows this, but it takes a long time to get those drafts through IESG.

So something like this, I mean, I'm just curious what everyone else thinks, it seems like I think we'd be better working among our group, which our group is the group that's in the IETF, but we can decide what we would like this to be and it could be a best practice that doesn't need to go all the way up to IESG, go through all the formalized – at least formalize it within ourselves and say be able to point to somewhere. I know that that having that draft out there in IETF helps us, you know, when we talk to a registry we say we'd really like to see a format of this. And then we can send them to a link that shows a standard and hope for the best. Yes, standard.

So, I mean, I guess what I was wondering is do we want this to be a like – like the premium fee documents where this is a best practice, this is what we've decided among our groups of how we'd like to see it and then, you know, when registries ask, "How would you like that formatted?" Here you go, this is what we've worked on.

Neil McPherson: Tobias.

- Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking. Jody, currently all the drafts we have put out is just a best current practice so it's not the (unintelligible) is not standard track, so we should be fine.
- Roger Carney: Yes, this is Roger. I'd also add that we need to have a place to point people to, an Internet draft can live for quite a while at the IETF. Almost every registry implemented six years ago the fee document that is still being worked on at IETF. And it is in production at every registry today but it's still an Internet draft; it's not a standard at IETF. So when something gets published there as an Internet draft, at least the group can say, hey, it's there, take a look at it and work from there. And three years from now this may get finalized, you know, so thanks.
- Rich Merdinger: Rich Merdinger. And I'd like to put Rick Wilhelm on the spot in a good way of saying, how would you suggest we implement this type of extensibility? Because I appreciate where you're coming from, and I'm hoping we have very few people that are just leaving it at the gate and not doing it, so I want some sort of a hybrid potentially of data fields that are – I alluded to this before – but I don't want to reiterate that, so how would you like to see that, you know, if you're willing to share?
- Rick Wilhelm: Thanks, Rich. Rick Wilhelm. So we'd be more in favor of something that where the instead of defining the format you define a language which defines the format, going meta, if you will. And then also probably trying to stick closer to something maybe along the lines of what the – maybe along the lines of what the escrow format definition is, right, might be a way because that's something that folks have already implemented.
- And so by going with something that where you define the format, to define the format definition that leaves the ability to have flexibility among the implementers on both sides of the connection and allows for more variability over time for those folks also because, you know, it recognizes that both on the registry side and the registrar side that there's going to be variability in

implementation and then also recognizes that longitudinally over time things are going to vary for both implementers and in that which we are attempting to implement as far as the communication. Right?

And so by defining the report definition format it allows for greater flexibility in that regard. So that, you know, an attempt to kind of sum it up, that's where I would propose we go.

Marc Anderson: Excuse me, I'm going to jump in real quick just a sort of a time check, we have five minutes before our break and that's a hard stop, we have to break in five minutes so...

Neil McPherson: That's fine, I've only got one more slide that will only take 2.5 minutes to go through.

Rich Merdinger: The thing I was going to respond to – I get where you're coming from and I feel like we could roll back the clock a lot of years and we would be talking about something called the Extensible Provisioning Protocol and how it's going to solve all of our problems. And it's a wonderful solution but the extensible part of it has led to a great deal of difficulty and variation of implementation which is what it was intended to do. And so having some level – having the data definition language concept and the – a formal way that extensibility is done I think is a great – it's essential that we have that. But – and maybe we end up with – bless you – some defined fields, something along those lines, I'm thinking hybrid-y. Go ahead, Roger.

Roger Carney: Yes, this is Roger. And I was going to say the same thing, I mean, yes, from a technology standpoint, you know, extensibility is great and everything like that except for when you actually want to get something done, the variability sucks. So and I agree with Rich saying that yes, okay, let's at least get something standard defined, and that's what I say, I say let's define it, put it as an Internet draft and put it out there, and then if we choose to update it later, let's worry about it then, so.

Neil McPherson: Then next slide please Zoe. Exactly, so the next steps would be that myself probably Tobias as well would put this again down on paper and put that draft out there. Definitely very open to other volunteers as coauthors if anyone's got some time and motivation to get involved. Can also speak to us offline, send us an anonymous message.

But yes, so we're going to try and put this out over the next I think maybe four to six weeks and then definitely welcome any comments, it's always a lot easier I think for anyone to be added kind of dive into these topics once it's in paper rather than just throwing ideas around in a room, but, yes, the idea is to have this on paper within four to six weeks and then get some comments. So I guess that's it. Maybe even less than 2.5 minutes. Any other questions or comments before we – Roger.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I just want to add because Neil posted to the list last week or whenever it was a question on the two documents, the unavailable names, and I just wanted to say that the next steps for these documents will be to incorporate the reporting spec because those were done before that and it somewhat needs to change for that so we'll update those documents probably shortly after IETF next month so that it'll conform to the new standard, so.

Marc Anderson: All right, not seeing any other comments. Neil, thank you very much, appreciate you, you know, all your work and contributions on this and shepherding this once again. We are coming up on our first break so rather than squeezing anything else in we'll go ahead and break now. This is a 15-minute break so we'll be coming back at 10:30 just, yes, so okay, so with that I think we can pause and hopefully we had a good first session and most people come back afterwards so thank you.

END