COPENHAGEN – ICANN GDD: RDAP
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:15 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: …everyone. Thank you for joining us in today's session on registration data access protocol, or RDAP. This session is basically a continuation of a panel discussion we had in Hyderabad, at ICANN 57. And the objective of it is for us to be able to work out an implementation plan going forward.

RDAP is a contractual requirement in all new gTLD contracts and some so-called legacy gTLD contracts. The protocol that was designed for implementation of RDAP through the work of ICANN on the staff side, with the community, was put on hold based on an objection by the registry stakeholder group in the later part of last year.

Since then, we've gone back to the drawing board. We've had many conversations. We had the panel in Hyderabad, of course, and many discussions on the side. From the ICANN org side, we've come up with a new proposal, and the objective of this panel today, this discussion today, is for us to present to you, the new proposal.

I'm delighted to be join by a panel of technical experts. Jordyn Buchanan who will be representing the registry stakeholder

group. Joe Walden from VeriSign. Roger [inaudible] from Go Daddy. Jim Galvin from Afilias. Andrew Newton, who I believe is joining us remotely, is it done? Thank you. Okay. Andrew Sullivan from IAB. John Levine from IETF, although you'll be speaking on your own behalf, but you sort of represent… And Andrew Sullivan as well. And then from ICANN org side, I'm joined by our chief technology officer, David Conrad and Francisco Arias who is the director of our technical services from the GD side of ICANN.

So, without any further ado, Francisco is going to present to you our new approach, our new proposal, and then the intent is to get into an interactive discussion to see if that's an approach that's acceptable, or it needs to be modified, hopefully getting us moving forward. Francisco.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. Hello everyone. Just before I start… What's going on here? Would you mind passing to the next slide? Just a small announcement here, from our colleagues of the RDS review team, just so everyone knows that the call for volunteers have been sent. I think some of the people attending this session may be interested in participating in the RDS review.

So, you have the information there. There is the announcement. You can still apply. So, if you're interested, please go to this link.

By the way, the slides are publishing the session page, so you can see what we have there.

Okay. Let's start with the presentation now. So, short history of why we are here. So, this started, at least on the ICANN side, this started in 2011. The security stability advisory committee published SAC 51, and in that advisory, they recommended ICANN community to [inaudible] replacement protocol for WHOIS.

Later, in October in that same year, the Board adopted the advice and pass a resolution doing that. That also requested start to work with the community to develop a roadmap to implement these recommendations, which was done and published in 2012. At the same time, in the IETF side, in 2012, the community formed a working group to develop a replacement for the WHOIS protocol.

And that later becomes RDAP. In 2015, in the IETF, this protocol was finalized and published as [inaudible] as they are called in IETF. And on the ICANN side, back on the ICANN side, in June 2015 we started working with the community to develop what we call gTLD profile, gTLD RDAP profile, which was intended to map features to exist in policy and to conduct the requirements.

And that, the first version of this profile was published in 26 July 2016. And was included as part of the consistent level and

display policy. However, a few days later, the stakeholder groups needed request for consideration regarding the conclusion of RDAP in these policy, among other things.

So Cyrus mentioned before, following that work was done with the community to revise that policy, and removing the requirement to implement RDAP and the profile, and that was published last February 1st, that closed the issue regarding the consistent level and display, however now we need to find a solution for how to go about implementing RDAP.

So, this session is 2%, a new proposal which we would like to discuss with you some feedback, hopefully find a mutual agreement to move forward. So, the proposal, the idea would be to require implementation of RDAP on a contractual basis, this is something that was requested in a request for reconsideration. So, for getting about the policy.

And in the, we will forget about the idea of having a profile, and instead, we will simply point out that, from our three and a half registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement, there are certain technical requirements in the respected the specifications that defined registration data directory services that set up services, currently consistent of [inaudible] WHOIS and web WHOIS, with the future addition of RDAP as the tier service that is part of the setup of the RDAP services.

So, we think the requirements that are describing those specifications apply, so we would like just to call attention of the contractual parties that they need to consider that when implementing, for example, to consider that certain fields are required, certain fields are optional. There are certain queries that are specified the need to be responded to, etc.

And the idea will be also, the profile, we still think there are certain things there that are useful, so what we will do there is to say, we recommend you to implement the profile, but again, it's just a recommendation, not a requirement. We think there are some useful things there, and there is a slide later that describe those things.

Additionally, we in that requirement to implement RDAP, we will specify that the contracted parties can experiment with additional features on top of the technical requirements existing in their respective agreements. So, if they would like to play with some new feature, they will be able to do so.

And so, one thing to note here is that, some people may think that this is, doesn't look like a full production, implementation of RDAP. So, in recognizing that, I just wanted to point out that there would be [inaudible] in the future where they, if they were interest in the community to work the [inaudible], having a more consistent output, for example, among the contracted parties,

that could [inaudible] through at least the two [inaudible] that are described there, and policy development work.

For example, the [RSPP?] that is ongoing. They could take, if they were interested in doing so, the finding out a more consistent output of the RDAP, or there is another option, of course, contracted negotiation between ICANN and the contracted parties, for example, in the case of the registries, there is a provision in the [inaudible] that applies to most of the gTLDs, that allows either ICANN or the registries to initiate an organization, I believe, every year.

So, that would be a [inaudible], and in the case of the registers, well, it would be whenever there is an opportunity to update a dozen, 13 RAA. But again, this was in case they were interested in the future to work towards a more consistent output on RDAP, or any other features that may be of interest.

So, this is the proposal. And just to give you an idea, what are the things that were in the profile, that cannot be, we could not find a mapping in the agreements. So, these are the most important things. There were more than 15, but these are the top 15, and within the top 15, we highlighted the top five that they may be, that the community may want to especially consider in the future for, as an organization.

For example, number one, it's very important in the context of the privacy discussions that are ongoing. Make up a series of meetings in this Copenhagen ICANN meeting. And so, this issue, if in the future, there were the necessity to for a register to pass the information to the registry, the contact information, and then they profile had a solution for that, and a requirement for the register to offer another service, in that case, and there was a standard, a mechanic as defined in the profile that would allow for a reference to be pass a point into the register RDAP service for a given name.

That is something that would be lost in this case. And number two is something that the IP particularly pointed out in the public comments that was of importance, that seems to require a secure, the use of a secure transport only, which would allow authentication of [inaudible], this is ITTPS protocol.

So, that is something that we could not map to an existing requirement in the contract. Number three, is support for IDN inquiries in Unicode and responses. Our reading of the RDAP standard is that that's a feature that is optional. In the profile, this was a requirement that was put on early one in the [inaudible] list space to support.

Number four, is the reporting requirements for RDAP. This is for those of you that are familiar, if you are not, you should know

that registries are required to report to ICANN, and ICANN in return publish that in the ICANN webpage, certain numbers in the case of WHOIS and web WHOIS, I believe it's a number of qualities, and I can remember what else.

And the idea would be to have similar reporting requirements for RDAP, and this could, for example, help inform the discussion, a future discussion to perhaps retire port 43. For example, if we start to see a trend in which port 43 qualities are going down, and other qualities are going up, and reach certain threshold that would need to be defined in future discussions.

And that calling for those decisions in the future. And finally, just on the top five, the use of DNSSEC for the, in the RDAP service. That's something, again, that we could not map as a requirement, and we'll be losing that. Yes.

CYRUS: So, just to be clear, I guess, for everyone, these are sort of the top components of the previous profile, that will now become recommendations for implementation as opposed to mandatory. Right, Francisco? And what's involved, for instance, the top five, what we consider to be sort of the more significant losses from the previous profile. Thank you.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Cyrus. In terms of the main features [inaudible] a little bit the discussion, we have been using this list, we think this is a high level list of the features of RDAP provides, that are features that you will not find in WHOIS. So, there are eight there. And the first four that are involved, those will remain with the current approach. Those would be still something useable that we are getting from RDAP. The next three, they will become optional elements that [inaudible] may implements, some [inaudible] may implement and others may not.

And finally, the last one, number eight, that would be something that unfortunately would be lost. In terms of next steps, as I mentioned before, this is just a proposal. This is just a starting of the discussion. And the next step that we intend to do is share this proposal with the registry holder group, the registry stakeholder group, with the technical community.

And provide some time for discussion and feedback, and then we intend to [inaudible] the proposal as needed. And depending on what we, the type of input we obtain, we will consider we need to do public comment or not. In any case, the aim here is to use the existing policy implementation calendar, recognizing that this is not policy, but still, we think it's useful for the contracted parties, and keep using that as setup dates in which the contracted parties roll out changes related to, let's say, ICANN requirements.

And so in this case, we will aim to have the proposed way forward, agreed before one of us, 2017. So, we can request implementation by then, and if we reach it before, we will provide the request to the contracted parties before, with an aim to have an effective date of 1 February 2018, when the service will be live.

And, I think that's it for me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Francisco. I guess just to summarize, and help keep me honest here, Francisco. What we are proposing here is a soft setup what was proposed before. We believe the subset of the proposed features for the RDAP protocol, are backed by contractual requirements, and/or policy.   So, from that perspective, I think it hopefully addresses some of the concerns that were raised before.

And then the other thing that I think is important to note is that, registry operators can actually on top of this minimum requirement, actually experiment with different features, within the live service of RDDAP, based on that reduced profile. Is that true?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes. Contracted parties will be allowed, with this proposal, to add other features, as a test in their services, if they want to experiment with different access, for example. We know that it is interesting in various members from the community to, starting how that will look like if we're going to have in the future, standardized mechanics for different access, that is interesting to the community to play with that.

So that will be allowed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, this could really beneficial in informing policy development, the RDSP and so on. Okay, thank you. Let me go to my panel, first, Maxine, if you give us a moment to see if anyone wants to chime in with any comments or ideas, feedback.

JOE WALDEN: Yeah, thanks. This is Joe Walden from VeriSign. So, I appreciate the update on the work that you've done here. I guess I'm just… First, I would like to ask a couple of questions, and maybe we can use those as a discussion point. So, I think it was slide six where you had that list of, was that the one? Yeah, that.

Okay, so if this is the proposal, and it's going to be based on contract language, I guess I'm trying to understand what that

EN

looks like in the form of, how do you pull the trigger on the, kind of invoking the contract language.

So, I guess I'd be interested to see how we develop that language, and make sure that we understand what, how the points you have here, and on the next slide, really get conveyed into what you're telling registries that they'll have to do to implement that, because the language in the contract is pretty basic.

I mean, it just says that registries will implement RDAP once the protocols have been set, but there is also a commercial feasibility standard that's there as well. So, it would be interesting to see how that language gets drafted, because you know, I'm looking at it as, you know, there is not a separate set of SLAs. There is not a separate set of reports.

So, there are other things that aren't included in here, and I know that when we met last time in Hyderabad, I brought up the fact that VeriSign has a reference implementation that's available, that we've opened to the public. Scott [inaudible] has published a couple of things on there. I've got copies of, just a little summary sheet on there that talks about what we've done from an implementation, but I obviously want to make sure that, you know, what we're proposing to require registries to implement, is one consistent with the contract language.

I always like to go back to that baseline. But is also helping us implement RDAP in a way that is going to be viewed as a positive and successful implementation for the community. You know, I think that the fear that I've had for a while is that, we just don't replicate the sins of WHOIS, and then box ourselves into a corner, where we have a service that we put into production, and then it's very difficult, and I appreciate the language about the optional experimentation.

I think that's part of the languages I'm looking for, for how we are able to characterize that. So, there are a number of points there. So, I guess one is the language, and I guess the other one is the specific task, or task but reference in the contract to implementation with a commercial feasibility test.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Sure. This is Francisco Arias from ICANN organization. Just quickly, I'm not a lawyer. I would prefer not to get into the [inaudible] on the contract, but my understanding from our legal team is that, the issues is, in a specification for this paragraph two where it talks… It was language that was specifically added to, in regards to RDAP and sort of at VeriSign for the agreement.

You were the first that adopted this, back into 2012, I think, or 11. So, the idea would be to use that language to invoke the implementation of part of that, and as I mentioned, when I was

putting this [inaudible] in our interpretation is that specification for, defines the RDS services, the registration directory services, as a set of services, not just one.

It's currently WHOIS, and web WHOIS, and RDAP will be the third addition, for that part that I mention. So, our interpretation is that the next set of requirements, in regards to, for example, what fields should be there, it's something that applies to RDAP, the type of qualities that have to be responded, and a couple of other things.

We think that applies to RDAP. All the RDAP services in short.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, Francisco. I'll also go on the record saying that I'm not a lawyer either, I'm just making the point that we make sure that we run those, you know, the hurdles, and get all of that cleaned up, just to make sure that we're all on the same page.

CYRUS: Thank you. Jim and then to Jordyn.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Cyrus. Jim Galvin from Afilias for the record. So, on the same slide that you had up here for Joe, you make a distinction   between   technical   requirements   and

recommendations, and then we conveniently saw a nice slide about recommendations, and I just want to make sure that I correctly understand, you haven't yet told us what the technical requirements are going to be.

And if that's correct, is there any chance that you could say a little more about what those will be at this time?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Francisco here. Francisco from ICANN organization. So, we're not entered into develop set of requirements. What we meant by technical requirements is, we will simply point to the contracted parties to your agreements to say, please remember that RDAP is one of the services, therefore all of the requirements that apply to the other RDS services apply to RDAP. That was what we meant by the technical requirements.

JIM GALVIN: Then one quick follow-up comment to that. And maybe this builds a little bit on what Joe was saying, you know, I'm certainly not a lawyer and I don't like to play one either, but since we're talking about words that are in the specification, I'll talk about them too, just for comment purposes.

You talk about the second paragraph of specification four, and how it seems specific to RDAP and the requirements there, and

that would tend to suggest that all of what applies to WHOIS would also be added to that paragraph and apply, but I think I make the observation that everything else that's in specification four is very WHOIS specific, without question.

I mean, I don't know. I guess everything is subject to interpretation, but all of the requirements on the RDS, and what it tells you to do about, you know, display it and print it in this way kind of language, you know, obviously, none of that applies to RDAP, but it was built expressly to not have those kinds of requirements and rules.

So, it just feels to me… I just put that out there as a point to think about, as we develop language and think about the legal interpretation of these things. I prefer to go back to the first paragraph in specification four, you know, which simply talks about being able to provide alternative formats and protocols. You know, I mean, as appropriate.

And I think that that opportunity exists. And I think rather than just trying to point directly at the registry contracts and registry agreements, we're going to have to take a step back and think about what requirements we really want in RDAP, because I don't think they're going to be the same as WHOIS. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Jim. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so I'll make three points. The first is, we'll continue this legal discussion amongst the panel of technical experts, which is, I think it's important to look at… I agree with a lot of what Jim said about parsing… I parse specification four in a very similar way to what Jim does. But I think it's actually helpful to look at it as three chunks.

There is the second paragraph which says, hey, when, once the IETF is done making a new protocol, you guys can tell us that we have to do a new protocol. There is commercial feasibility element that Joe spoke to, which you know, maybe we need to wrap our heads around. But I think we're all in agreement that you guys, that the IETF has indeed created a new protocol.

And therefore, you know, ICANN has some ability to sort of tell us that if it's commercial feasible, that we have to be implementing it. Then there is the… Beyond that, as Jim says, there is a bunch of very WHOIS specific requirements. I mean, if you look at one dot one, it says, the format of responses shall follow a semi-free text format, outlined below.

So, that's clearly not applying to RDAP, because RDAP, I don't think, has a semi-free text format. And so, I think it probably

stretches a little too far to imagine that a set of requirements that is applying to WHOIS, is intending to be an exact mapping to a successor protocol. And so, it seems to me… I'll note the last thing, I would note about the structure of specification four, is that the first few words in specification four say, until ICANN requires a different protocol, registry operator will operate a WHOIS service available via port 43, and a web based directory service.

So, that implies to me, that if we consider this the replacement for WHOIS, carrying all of the requirements for WHOIS, then we get to turn off WHOIS. Because I only have to do that until you guys have given us a successor to WHOIS. So, that maybe is fine too, I guess, if we just wanted like sort of force cram WHOIS into RDAP and say, that's what it is.

But, now I'll segue into my non-legal points for a bit. Which is that, I think RDAP is a wonderful protocol. It gives us many opportunities to do things that are not like WHOIS, and it would be a huge mistake to try and just take all of our WHOIS requirements and say, let's make RDAP like that.

And instead, I think if you guys focused your reading on the contract on that second paragraph that just says, hey, tell the registries that they should go and implement RDAP, I think I'm generally hearing around the room, like registries are

implementing it, interested in implementing RDAP. Joe has already spun up a version of RDAP. We've open sourced the version of RDAP.

You know, we would be delighted to run RDAP. The only reason I don't have a production of RDAP service right now is because you won't let me, because I would have to do a [RSEP?] or something like that, in order to do it today. So, I'd love to get a notice from ICANN, saying hey, go and implement RDAP, and I will.

But I think it gets complicated once you start adding the… Oh, and make it like WHOIS. And so, I would suggest a really fast way of getting this out there, is if you guys just sent a note saying, hey, go implement RDAP. I think a lot of us will sort of jump to attention, and start working on that.

Joe is right, we have to work through this commercial feasibility language, but we would love to get at it. And then if we want, we can have a follow-on discussion about which of the WHOIS requirements we want to start mapping into RDAP, and sort of parsing, if you guys really think there is a policy contractual requirements that we want to be shifting over, I think we can have an ongoing conversation about that.

But I think that conversation is going to take a while. And I'd like to turn on my RDAP service like tomorrow, if I could. You know, I

think getting a lot of operational experience with production in RDAP services would be really helpful for the technical community, and for the RDS PDP that's going on right now.

So, the sooner we sort of make that happen the better. And therefore, the fewer discussions that we have to have in advance of it would be better as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Jordyn. Let's go to Andrew Sullivan, and then David Conrad.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: This is Andrew Sullivan. And I guess as mentioned in the beginning, I am for two weeks remaining, the chair of the IAB, after which, I'm done with that. But I'm not speaking for them. Most importantly, never speaking for the IAB.

So, I agree with the concerns… I mean, I very strongly agree, and the IAB has published some stuff about this saying we're concerned about reusing all of the horrors that are in WHOIS, that are there because of the brain damage in the WHOIS protocol. That said, I am persuaded that ICANN has made a policy that is completely dependent on the rules that were invented in order to solve the brain damage in WHOIS.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

And so, I am sympathetic to the problem that the staff have, that they have to conform to consensus policies, when they're trying to get registries to do things. The consequence of that, and by the way, those of you who are interested in shoving along the policy change, could come and join that PDP and try to inject some sanity into the people who want to discuss tentative language for four hours, as opposed to getting on with the work.

But that's a policy problem, and this is just, how do we take the things that we, the policy that we've already got, and use it for RDAP? I agree with the concerns that the, there is a lot of language in the current specification that is about formatting and so on, I don't know, maybe a style sheet will help.

But you know, that is sort of horrible, that problem. But the core thing here is the opportunity to do the other stuff that you can already do with RDAP. And I think that maybe if what registries and registrars, I should have said, I also work for DINE and we are a registrar, but you know, of course, since we're only a registrar, we won't have to implement this, so I'm creating work for somebody else.

If registries sort of embrace this and used the room that is being created here, to implement some of the additional stuff, maybe this will convince the policy people, who are dragging their heels

over WHOIS, that there is an opportunity here to build something that is really useful and genuine.

So, despite my great reservations about implementing the mistakes that are in the WHOIS policy in RDAP, it still feels to me like, you know, half a glass. And I want to try to get some deployment of this before it's too late. So, I would encourage people to try to see this as an opportunity to build something real, despite the fact that you've got to carry along your own broken WHOIS server.

And you can, you know, sort of maybe not maintain it very well, and make the RDAP service the thing that is really, really valuable to people because if those additional features are there, maybe people will start to use it, and then the moment the policy changes, everybody can switch over.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's actually [inaudible] for Jordyn. So, I appreciate the interest in deploying RDAP, that is expressed by many of the folks here. But as you're aware, RDAP requires an operational profile. And, you know, to be able to useful at all. And my impression in talking with various [inaudible] within the registry communities, is that there are different views as to what that profile is.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

EN

So, if ICANN were to come out and just say, well, you know, okay, you have to deploy RDAP. And leave it up to the registries. How would you be able to ensure interoperability of the different clients to the different servers, based on the fact that people would mostly likely have different profiles?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jordyn, you wanted to respond?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I'm happy to respond. Maybe Cyrus, I have a related set of points that I'll put myself in the queue for, as opposed to jumping the line and responding to David. So, I guess I'm not suggesting that you would guarantee the sort of interoperability we're talking about. I also, I guess, would suggest that, I don't view ICANN's mandate as one being to guarantee technical interoperability of registration protocols.

I think the IETF has a technical mandate, and they've created a nice protocol, and if they wanted to create additional requirements around RDAP, they would be free to. But ICANN doesn't necessarily need to. And we have the ultimate interoperability fall back, which is WHOIS, which already exists today.

And I think the technical community in general, doesn't need ICANN telling it what to do in order to get interoperability across all sorts of protocols that exist out there. We work it out the same we do all sorts of other interoperability issues. We get together, and we talk about things, and we figure it out.

And you don't necessarily get there on day one of like every new protocol and just like magically everything interoperates. Like people sort of try things, and you talk, and iterate, and over time, you converge on solutions that make everyone happy.

CYRUS: Thank you. We go to Jim, and then we open it up with Maxine.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Cyrus. Jim Galvin for the record. So David, I guess, let me say what Jordyn was saying. I think he and I, we think the same thing here, but say it a little bit differently. I would ask what you're looking to interoperate, because the RDAP protocol certainly does interoperate. It already exists. You know?

I mean, we at Afilias have a RDAP server that stands up an expandable service on one of our TLDs. It's not there for all of them. So, I mean, the interoperability is there, certainly you can make a query and you can get a response. I suspect, and I don't want to put words into your mouth, so you can clarify this if you

want to and say more, is that what you're talking about is you want to make sure everybody gets the same response for, you know, a specific type of query.

And my reaction to that is, that's what the RDS group is there for. And maybe my comment to the rest of the community here is, although WHOIS, it appears to give you mostly the same stuff all the way around, I think that we all know, or at least anybody that has actually looked at it, realizes that, you know, there is a certain variability in what WHOIS responds with also, even today.

The registry agreements are not all completely uniform. They are for the new gTLDs, because they had one contract that you started with, but for all of the legacy things, they are all different. So, there is some variability that is in the back there. And the other question I would have is, I just, you know the RDS group is talking about the profiles, about what is going to be responded, and privacy requirements are going to come to bear on that.

And so, it's a foregone conclusion that you will not be getting the same response for the same query at every registry. I mean, I don't know what that's going to look at down the road, because the RDS group still has probably… Well, I'll be optimistic and say another year of work. Okay? But, you know, that's my comment. What are you trying to interoperate? And I think that

we're overstepping here because we're stepping into what that particular consensus policy process is supposed to be doing for us. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, trying to look at things from the first principles, right? The intent of RDAP is, the intent of the registration data system as a whole, is to be able to provide registration data to the community for whatever purposes that the community decides is appropriate, right? And we can get into discussions about what that actually means.

However, the concern that I have is that you may have registries who return the registration data that's similar to… Assuming that there is no mechanism by which an operational profile is defined, and you know, as my understanding, we have approached folks in the IETF and say, hey, how about [inaudible] a profile?

And they said, not our job. It's not part of the protocol specification. But my concern is that, you know, one registry can provide information that sort of corresponds to one extent or another, to have WHOIS information. And one can simply return back a 200 code and say, well, we've implemented the protocol.

And at that point, I wonder about the use of RDAP, right? Because if you're unable to rely on RDAP to return essentially similar information, across the registries, then the users, the people who are trying to make use of RDAP queries, will simply not rely on them. And they'll continue to use WHOIS, and we will never get away from WHOIS.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: A quick response, Cyrus, if I may. I mean, I think David, what you're putting on the table is the privacy debate, which has to happen here, which we have never really had in the ICANN community.

DAVID CONRAD: No, I mean, people depend on the WHOIS data, well, that's because it is there. The RDS group and the work that it's doing is, may decide that whatever you thought that you were doing at the WHOIS data, you can't do anymore. Okay? And so the profile is going to be trend and made much more restrictive.

And it will be other mechanisms that will come into existence, that will give you access to the data. And I'm just concerned that we should not get ahead of that process, by saying that this RDAP service is to look like WHOIS, is to [inaudible] what that consensus policy process is supposed to do for us.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

At the other end of the extreme that you specified is, well maybe I would just respond with an error, and it's true that's protocol, but what we want is a much more minimal profile instead, is what you return, rather than [inaudible] what we want this consensus policy to develop for us.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just very quickly. [Inaudible]. But just very quickly. My understanding, which may be wrong because I'm also not a lawyer and I don't play one on the net, is that RDAP is an access mechanism to registration data. As is WHOIS, as is web WHOIS. So, the privacy discussion, yes, I agree, it will occur, but it will impact the registration data, not the access mechanisms.

You're wrong, it effects all of it. So, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let's go to Andrew, then we go to Maxine. It's still a panel discussion, Maxine. I'm not trying to disregard you.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: This is Andrew Sullivan again. So, I really want to push back on this idea that it's ICANN's problem to worry about whether registries are returning data, such that people decide they prefer

the RDAP system to WHOIS. While the systems are running in parallel, I don't see why ICANN ought to care about that.

It seems to me that, you know, VeriSign for instance, has stood up a RDAP system, even with the crappy non-distinguishing arrangement that we've got with this profile, there are still significant advantages to using RDAP. You get internationalization for free, you get something that is parse is a reliable way. You might have differential access, such that, you know, the old bulk WHOIS crap that registries run, can be retired in favor of something that you can access here, and you can access in real time, and so on.

There are advantages to that system. And VeriSign's system will develop the reputation as being better because it has got this RDAP access. And other registries that return 200 every time, are just going to, you know, people are going to stop using it. We saw that with the RIRs. That was the reason that RDAP got standardized, right? Because the RIRs came along and ARIN said, hey we stood this thing up, and like half of our queries overnight moved over here, and that wasn't true for other RIRs who didn't have such a service.

People continued to use WHOIS there, but people knew hey, if I'm querying ARIN, I'm going to go here. So, I think that we can actually allow, you know… Admittedly, there are a lot of

registries now, but it's still only thousands. You can keep track of like who has got what.

And I think that we could allow the consumers to make these distinctions themselves, during this period when you're running both services, because people will learn pretty quickly which one works well and which one is garbage.

I don't see any problem with that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Andrew. Maxine, you're up.

MAXINE: Maxine [inaudible] for the record. Just a few small items. First, it was quietly controversial item of expiry date, between, because registers think that expiry date is this day, and the registrars think something else. And they violently disagree with [inaudible], even working same companies.

So, do we have any kind of implementation of we want to show both dates and cause confusion, or show one date and cause confusion, or show the other date, and cause confusion? Because the registrant, all they need is to understand when they have to pay to still have control over the domain.

And it's the first item, expiry date, between registry and registrars. The second item is a kind of waiver for our RSEP or fast track RSEP for RDAP, because current way is like roll of pain, so if you want to allow registries to start mingling with RDAP, it's a good idea to let them do it, like simpler way.

And the third thing is quite important, because I think we might need a transitional period where both services works, and by the end of the period, on old WHOIS pages, there is an announcement. Please be aware that these protocol is not working anymore, but you can read here about this protocol, you can go to the new server of this registry there, and like frequently last question.

Because, we as registrar, we spent many years educating judges, how to properly look into WHOIS, how to understand fields. And that's, I recommend you to, not to [inaudible] but because I think that there is a strong need of engagement with public safety working group, law enforcement, at least Interpol because they will, might relay information to local police, yeah, to the federal police agencies all around the world.

And the GAC, because GAC, they're representatives of telecom industry, regulators, and/or telecom or telecom ministries. And both just need to know what to expect from the players. So, please don't [inaudible] the educational part, and that

EN

engagement part, because stopping WHOIS without no hints how to use the new system, overnight, it will be a nightmare.

Imagine how many calls registries and registrars will receive next day from the local police departments. We just don't have call centers big enough for that. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Maxim. I think I have Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks. So, I realize, I wanted to say two things. I think the first is, I realize that I didn't lead off by saying... I actually think this proposal is a significant step forward from where we were in Hyderabad. I think, as Andrew points out, this allows a lot more ability to innovate and understand the benefits of RDAP, then where we were with the previous operational profile.

So, I want to thank Francisco for allowing us to make some progress here. But secondly, I want to take issue with the concept I think I heard from both Andrew and from David, which is that, we have a bunch of policy that somehow applies to RDAP. I just fundamentally don't think that's true.

We have a bunch of policy that applies to WHOIS today, and we have WHOIS, other than my sort of half-hearted suggestion that

if you really want this to be the succession to WHOIS, then we don't have to run WHOIS anymore. I don't think what we're talking about here is the sort of immediate…

We want this to become the successor to WHOIS, but we're not calling this a substitute for WHOIS. So, I think the anticipation is, registries are going to continue running WHOIS, and so all of that existing built up policy, and the expectations of the community to have access to a particular set of data, until the RDS PDP completes its work, that all exists still, and it all runs on the old protocol.

And in the meantime, we've got a fancy new protocol, and we don't need to encumber it with any of the requirements for the old protocol, because there is, none of the… So, I'll make two sub-points here. The first is, there isn't very much sort of defined WHOIS policy.

If you look at the WHOIS review that happened a few years ago, they weren't around searching for it. And they couldn't find… You know, they said there is a lot of contractual language, but when we go and like look for the policy, it's kind of hard to find it. There are some, but it generally doesn't delve particularly deeply into like the format and response, other than saying things like there should be a consistent format, which we have now.

But there is definitely not a specification of exactly what that format should be like. So, even in the case of WHOIS, I think it's a little hard to sort of discover exactly what it is, but beyond that, none of the policy that I'm aware of, that relates to WHOIS, says WHOIS or its successor protocols. Says just data services in general, it says it's the WHOIS policy.

And so, let's make that the WHOIS policy, and then we have a separate current policy development track going on, that's going to set what the policy for RDAP looks like, and once that's done, then all of the registries will happily adopt it, because we're, well, I don't know…

It doesn't even matter if we happily adopt it. We will adopt it, because we're obliged to through our contracts, but in the meantime, we've got a huge opportunity to understand the capabilities of this new protocol, and the less of the [inaudible] that we bring over from the WHOIS regime, the more likely it is that we're going to get good outcomes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Jordyn. Let's go to Mark, then we go to Andrew Newton online, Jim, and then Bobby.

MARK: Mark [inaudible]. So, RDAP protocol, the RFCs are essentially a container. It doesn't go well beyond a container. There are no details of what you do with it, inside it. So, if we're saying, you know, you support RDAP, you could use RDAP for barcodes, for anything you want, right? The profile that was published last year, actually described what you have to do within the container.

And I just give, you know, just an example, the RFC says you could have, attach an object events, right? And the type of events is the final string, whatever string you want. And then, you user of the container protocol define the events you want with the right string.

So, the profile says, the string registration means an even of the, you know, registration of the object, right? The string expiration, therefore, if we don't use that profile or similar things like that, then you would end up registry one, using the string registration. Registry two, using registrations. Registry three, using, you know, tell me, right?

Therefore, there will be completely mess as actually worse than what we will have with right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Mark. Let's go online to Andy Newton. Let's test the communication channel. Andy, can you hear us?

ANDREW NEWTON: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, go ahead, please.

ANDREW NEWTON: So, I'm not… I want to say that I'm not completely familiar with all of the ICANN processes that have surrounded RDAP. I'm very familiar with RDAP itself. And just as an observer, not speaking for my employer, but just as an observer, it seems to me that there is a lot of back and forth that may not be necessary. And someone mentioned that maybe it would be great if ICANN can tell the registries, hey, just go out and do this, and we're not going to penalize you.

And I think that would be a good way of starting. If it could be said that the registries can attempt to implement RDAP, if they do it in good faith. And that would be great. I want to speak directly to what Mark just said about the profile. And I did read the ICANN profile when it came out, I believe it was last year.

In my opinion, I didn't see anything that was all that onerous, but then again, I don't run a domain registry, so there may be things that are in there. But the actual protocol itself does have certain restrictions about what you can and cannot put in there, and you can't just say, registrations versus registration. There are protocol registries themselves with the IANA for certain events.

And so, while RDAP is a container, it does restrict what things can be said and cannot be said. And they are specific to both domains and IP addresses. Finally, I'm not sure where this wording about commercial and feasibility comes from, I've seen it. It was put on an IETF list, and that kind of strikes me as a little ridiculous.

As Andrew Sullivan said, the RIRs have implemented RDAP, some of the RIRs are not very well, they're not huge organizations with thousands of programmers or anything like that, and for the RIRs to have gone out and done this, and over a year ago, I think all five RIRs have this deployed now for over a year.

It kind of speaks to the fact that it's not commercially feasible. The other, there are issues. There are things that we had to overcome, and in fact, we're now in talks about having a much

more unified output for RDAP, but it doesn't mean it's commercially feasible. That's all I have to say.

CYRUS: Thank you, Andy. Let's go to Jim and then Bobby and then Joe.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Cyrus. I also, Jim Galvin for the record. I want to take a step back, like Jordyn did. I realize we all sort of just jumped in to speak about the slides, and first take a moment to thank Francisco and to thank you. I mean, I know that this has been a bit of a painful discussion, and we've had a number of public sessions about all of this.

But I am very hopeful and satisfied that we are making forward process here, and this is a good thing. And I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion about it. So, you know, with that in mind, and knowing that we really are very supportive of what's happening here, I do want to say that actually, we at Affilias would be happy to implement RDAP, not just obligated to do it.

We're looking forward to it very much. You know, I mean, as a global organization, we have many of these kinds of issues, internationalization issues to deal with. And so, we're excited to be able to provide this in a more effective way for the

community at large. Which kind of brings me to part of what concerns me. I have two comments, I think, that I want to leave on the table, as the concerns where we need to continue some dialogue.

You know, one is exactly what the technical requirements are. I think that it was Jordyn who was using the phrase, he used the phrase of being encumbered by the original WHOIS. And I think that's really important in this context. I mean, we can have legal fights if you want, you know? I mean, you want our lawyers to fight with our lawyers, you know, I suppose we can do that.

I mean, the registries can sit here and have some fight about what some of the details are. But in the end, it's really about the community, and it's about what they want, and then it's about how we are driven by consensus policies. I mean, in the end, those are the two things that matter the most.

And RDAP is something new and different. It doesn't… Its deployment is not there today, WHOIS is what's there today. So, when I look at what the community wants, I'm thinking to myself, well you know, let's roll out RDAP, but let's doing it right without being encumbered by all of the mistakes that we made in the past.

Let's take a nice step wise kind of deployment process, and look for a way to make it happen. And I very much do want to make it

happen. I mean, I want to stress that again. And I really think that, you know, many of the registries would like to do something with RDAP too. I mean, we'd really would like to do it right for a variety of reasons.

So, I'm not sure what is driving, I don't hear the community driving us towards needing to encumber ourselves with what we did with WHOIS. And we can have all kinds of discussions about how to do that, or how not to do it, you know, who has got the bigger lawyer, I suppose. But the second comment that I make then, in that space is, I also don't want to get in front of the consensus process that we have.

I mean, we are in this community and ICANN community in general, driven by the work product by consensus policies, and I think it's important to keep that in mind. And I really am being sensitive to that process, and recognizing that we should not get in front of it, and give ourselves a chance to work that process.

I realize we've been having WHOIS discussions for 10 years, and hopefully, it won't go on for another 10 years. It will be a smaller number of years this time around. But we do have a group that's making productive progress. And we should let it do that, and use a more [inaudible] approach to how we roll out RDAP, given that we're just doing it to ourselves for the moment, because I

don't hear the community, people standing up at the microphone and say, you know, you've got to have RDAP today.

You know, we're doing this voluntarily, knowing that we have to, we're going to have to, and we want to. So, thank you.

CYRUS: Thank you very much Jim. Let's go to Bobby, if you could introduce yourself for the transcript, and then we go to Jim.

BOBBY [FLAME]: Sure, thanks, Cyrus. This is Bobby [Flame], FBI and also public safety working group. One of the things I just wanted to comment on, obviously public safety, we're agnostic about specific technologies, but we're looking for the fast and reliable data that goes behind it, to perform our mission.

But one of the things I thought of to build on what Maxim was saying, and also, a little bit on what Andrew was saying, is there a possibility for a pilot program? In other words, roll that out for maybe a year to see what are the strengths and weaknesses, obviously, with community, the registries and registrars in particular, looking at it, put it through its paces, where you're committed to moving forward, but you're not committing to a specific implementation of one particular platform of RDAP until you're confident that it is meeting it's needs and requirements.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good input, thank you. Let's go to Joe, Roger, and then Jordyn.

JOE WALDEN: Thanks. Joe Walden from VeriSign. So, I'll first respond to Bobby. So, we do have… We have a pilot, I think I mentioned a couple of times, so I'm happy to talk to you about that. I do want to go back to the discussion about interoperability. I think that when we look at, when we talk about that, I just want to understand what people are talking about, because I think Jordyn is exactly right.

Interoperability is something that the technical community managed on their own. If you look at things, and we talk about RFCs that we have to comply with in our agreements, you know, we don't get into the level of specification of how to implement those in most cases. We have gone down that path with some of the WHOIS specifications about what's required, what's optional.

But if I look at EPP as an example, every registry has an EPP implementation, but I think you can talk to any registrar and find out that they're not all identical. You know, the response code you get for a certain use case, may vary depending on which

registry you're querying. Now, both of those can be compliant and to the RFCs, but they may be different.

And if we're driving, if we think that there is a need to drive to identical, that every implementation is identical, then I think that gets to some of the points that Andrew was making, and I think that becomes a more difficult implementation, and I don't think that necessarily supports what we're trying to do as a community.

So, I think we just want to be very careful when we talk about some terms like interoperable and what expected results look like, because I don't necessarily think we seem to be referring to that in this concept of everything being an identical response. And I don't think that's necessarily appropriate.

I wanted to also address a point that Maxim raised earlier, about the expiration date. We had a lot of discussions in the early days on, are we going to display registry expiration date, registrar expiration date, reseller expiration date, all of those, none of those. What is the right solution? And I think that really leads us to a concept of authoritativeness of the data, and the data providence.

So, if I'm querying, because I don't know necessarily if I'm talking before [inaudible], if I'm just querying the service, I don't know the intent of that individual that's doing the querying. I

don't know what you're trying to get out of it, but if you just query for an expiration date, and you query the registry, then I can give you the authoritative response on the expiration date of that object from the registry.

If you query the registrar, you may get a different date, but you knowingly query the authoritative source and get the authoritative answer. That really is a way to resolve some of the data synchronization and consistency issues that we know that we see in the WHOIS service today.

And I'll also go on the record as saying that, I'm not an economist, but I think that we still do need to go and understand that commercial feasibility test. So, you know, while it's clearly something that people can do, I think just because you can do something, doesn't necessarily mean that you should, and we have to understand the full impact of that, so I really am looking for understanding, how do we move forward from here.

We've come a long way, and I want to understand what the plan is for how we move forward, and I think our recommendation has been that we continue to get permission to deploy in a pilot, and not be bound to a contractual obligation that I think constrains us, and it makes it more difficult than before.

EN

And I appreciate the work that went into this to try and address that concern, but I think that's the way forward for us.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Joe. Do you want to respond to that very quickly David Conrad?

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, very quickly. So, the ICANN organization's role is to facilitate the community in moving forward and trying to, you know, do this internet thing, and the specific limited technical arena that…

Part of the challenge that I feel, and it may just be me, is that we're in sort of an uncomfortable position of trying to address both the requirements of the registries and the registrars, and trying to facilitate a specification of a registry data protocol. But at the same time, there is a community of users of that data that want to move forward, want to…

Actually, they want access to the data, and WHOIS has, you know, infinite known issues, and they're looking for a better solution. The interpretation that I have had, is that in order to address both communities' needs, there needs to be a consensus as to how the protocol will work.

At some level, to facility the ability of people to actually make use of the data, because to me, it's sort of pointless to stand up a service that provides random garbage. And I think the goal of the efforts that we've been trying, that the organization has been trying to do here, is to facilitate discussion to come up with the solution for the access to registration data in a way that's actually useful to people.

That's the inter-operability that I'm talking about.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you David. Let's go to Roger and then Jordyn and then Alex, then we should probably close the queue and try to get some summary of the discussions going.

ROGER: Thanks. This is Roger [inaudible] with Go Daddy. I just wanted to confirm for Joe, no, EPP is not the same. It is different at every registry. So, none of this stuff is the same. Actually, I just had two points, and I think everybody is actually hit on most of them, but the community aspect, that you just mentioned David and that Jim kind of talked a little bit about, I'm not sure that the community is looking for the exact same thing that comes out of WHOIS.

They may want something different, you know, they want internationalization that RDAP can give, but the suggestion here is to provide them the exact same thing they're getting today, and it doesn't seem like that fits what the community is asking for. And my second point is, that several people, even Mark, brought this up was, the profile language.

There was a profile written last year, quite a bit of language was put in it. It sounds like that has been draft and thrown out, and none of that language exists anymore. So, we don't know what to do with expiration date and things like that. The other piece that we worked quite hard on, with some time is, the requirement that registrars only have to provide a RDAP server for thin registrations.

That was in that profile language, that is no longer in existence, obviously. So, I'm concerned that that requirement doesn't exist anymore, and would like to discuss that further.

CYRUS: Thank you. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks. So, I'm going to react a little bit to what David said as well, which is, you know, I think we're all in agreement there are two sides to this. This is the publishers of data, and

consumers of data.   I totally agree with Roger though, that I don't think it's the case that anyone thinks that what we want is just WHOIS v2.

And you know, the only consumer data that we've heard from, in this discussion at least, which is Bobby, you know, seems to be sort of on the same side of the discussion as the rest of us, which is just like, let's try to figure out what the capabilities of this thing are…

I'm sure Bobby thinks that there are all sorts of things that we could do better than WHOIS, and in the meantime, he's got WHOIS, and can continue to use that while we do, you know, his pilot or whatever…   However we want to think about the model in which registries have greater flexibility to sort of figure out what the best opportunities are here.

We can call it a pilot, we can call it RDAP implementation phase one, whatever.   But we've got the Next Gen RDS PDP coming along.   That's where that community discussion is happening. That's going to converge on a set of requirements that are going to apply to RDAP, but that discussion will be a lot more fruitful if it's informed by a variety of approaches to implementation by registries.

And I think experience from the RIRs seem to prove that out, right?   We've got three different implementations of it.   One of

them worked really well. And now the RIRs are talking to each other to figure out how to make it as, you know, as successful and for the others as it is for ARIN.

And you know, we could replicate that on the registry side as well, but we're just not going to get that if we have to start in a place where we're talking a lot of [inaudible] from the WHOIS regime, and replicating it into RDAP. So, you know, like I said, I want to move as fast as possible, I think you guys can get us started by sort of telling us to do this, with the minimal set of requirements as possible.

And we can continue to have this discussion. I'm delighted to continue to talk both in the contractual sort of process that through the PDP, and you know, whether we want to interpret like different formats and so on, as specification four says. But we can talk about other approaches to it as well.

The phase one of this should be just like get going guys, because we would love to do that. I think we're all really interested in getting some operational experience here. And the more requirements you guys try to layer on, the more sort of hard this conversation becomes, and the slower it is that we actually get any experience.

CYRUS: Thank you. Alex, and then we'll summarize.

ALEX: Thank you everyone. Alex [inaudible] from [inaudible]. I have two points. One is a smaller one. I really appreciate the option to do experiments in the new protocol without going through a complicated policy process. So, I appreciate the option to experiment [inaudible] that you indicated in the earlier slides.

The second point, let me put it that way first, I'm trying to keep legal considerations out of [inaudible], by heart. And so, I was thinking about the commercial feasibility of implementation. It's definitely an easy protocol to implement right now, because essentially it's like stand out, stock, components, it's a different format. There is a couple of open things.

But it's not like rocket science. However, what I'm seeing that, we are seeing increased requirements, with regards to privacy. And let me try to formulate it as neutral as possible. There are other users of that data who would require a different level of access, that would sort of collide with the level of privacy that some people require in use of that data.

So, that leads me to the point that, once we get to the point, we need differentiated Xs in RDAP. The question of commercial feasibility, becomes a little different, because this would require,

obviously, quite a massive authentication, authorization, and security network that would like be a massive infrastructure of who gets access to what kind of data.

And I think, at that point in time, the commercial feasibility of that single component of RDAP, is maybe more relevant that the commercial feasibility of the RDAP protocol itself.

CYRUS: Thank you, Alex. We're almost out of time, we're actually out of time. But I want, I don't want us to leave without sort of having at least some indication of a direction that we all can happily pursue. So, I'm going to challenge my panelists with the following questions, starting with Jim.

So, starting tomorrow, Jim, you're an ICANN employee, in charge of implementation of RDAP and enforcement of contracts, and all of that. What would you do? You have one minute.

JIM GALVIN: I would quit. [Laughter] That was whispered into my ear over here from the side, but in all seriousness. I'm 100% behind rolling out a production RDAP service, but I'm very much stressing the desire for a very minimalist profile for responses. And also, the option to then experiment then in anyway, without

any kind of escalation with other profile responses, and differentiated access, or the kinds of services based on the progress of the RDS PDP working group. Thank you.

CYRUS: Thank you. Roger? [CROSSTALK]

ROGER: It's the same question, okay? I think I would have to take a look at it as, providing, you know, the best solution to the community. And to me, providing the same thing in a different wrapper is not the best thing for the community. We're going to make the community change to get the same data.

So, I mean, if I was at ICANN, I would be looking at the community to say, okay, you want something new, but it's not this proposal. It's something different.

CYRUS: Thank you. Joe? And [inaudible] is in the room, just so you know.

JOE WALDEN: I take the fifth amendment. No. I think quitting is the right idea. No. But I think it is being able to coordinate with the community on developing a pilot, which would include registries, registrars,

	RIRs, as well as end users and make sure that we have an opportunity to develop a, you know, a reference implementation. Kick the tires on it. And continue to move forward.
CYRUS:	Andrew.
ANDREW SULLIVAN:	Thanks. It's Andrew Sullivan. I guess, probably what I would do is, you know, ask registries to do whatever it was that the legal people said is consistent with their existing contracts. I'm alert to the problem that the contracts and the policy all have all kinds of references to specifics of the way WHOIS works. I would also write a memo suggesting to people that in future, they would not write policy that is so nailed to a typical protocol, particularly one as bad as WHOIS.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	Yeah, I haven't said much yet, but I'm also a WHOIS user. And I've looked at… And we have a lot of work to do, because I looked at the prototypes that VeriSign and Affilias have put up, and although they are technically great, they leave out the contact information, which makes them substantively useless.

So, the RIRs, RDAP is successful because there was never any question that they were publishing all the same information that they had with WHOIS. There is no way, there is no issue of redaction and stuff. So, I think until we can resolve this issue of actually providing the information that the users need, the experiments are okay but they're not going to be very useful.

CYRUS: Thank you. Andy Newton on the phone.

Did we lose Andrew? Let's go to Jordyn while we work out the glitch with Andrew.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, the reason why they don't include data right now is because we can't. Once again, that's a new registry service that we have to ask ICANN for permission to do.

CYRUS: But you work for ICANN.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. I'm just explaining, that's why. I would do almost exactly what Francisco is proposing with one caveat, where I would do a second thing. So, if I consulted with the lawyers, as Andrew is proposing, they would allow me to, what I would do is send a

notice to registries saying, you have 135 days to implement this new protocol. Please do it.

And then I would separately publish the profiles as a set of recommendations, which I think is everything that Francisco is planning to do, except for Francisco is also planning to include a thing that says, and by the way, you have to, you know, keep in mind special agent force still applies. So, I would just leave out that last sentence.

If for some reason you felt like you couldn't do that, I think plan B is the sort of pilot plan, which is figure out a way to just enable registries to do it without actually having to file a [R SEP?]. And then we can continue this discussion of what the mandated thing ought to look like, while registries at least have the flexibility to be allowed to put real data in, if we want to.

Our implementation, our open source implementation uses the ICANN profile, right? So, if we turned our thing on today, it would look exactly like what Francisco actually wants. I just don't want to be forced to do it because I want to have some flexibility to try other things out, if that turns out not to be the winning design. And so, you know, I think we start to get real experience, not just with other concepts, but with the exact good profile that Francisco developed, but we can't get there

EN

until the registries are actually enabled to start putting real data into the thing, and we'd love to do that.

CYRUS: Thank you. David Conrad or Francisco, any last words? Very good. With that… Oh, Andy, go ahead.

ANDREW NEWTON: Yeah, I would just echo everything Jordyn just said. I think if registries were allowed to pull in at least [inaudible] and play with it, that would be a very good first step.

CYRUS: Thank you very much. With that, I would like to thank all of my panelists for their lively debate and all of the attendees and participants. This session is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]