

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan  
CPH TechOps  
Monday, 12 March 2018 at 12:15 AST**

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

Zoe Bonython: All right. Guys, you ready, I think we should kick it off now. All right. So all right, so can we please start the recording, thank you so much.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, Zoe, did you say we started the recording, or, yeah okay. Then welcome everybody to the ICANN 61 Tech Ops meeting, my name is Marc Anderson, I'm your co-chair and your other co-chair, I'll let him introduce himself.

Tobias Sattler: Hi, I'm Tobias Sattler from United Domains, also called (unintelligible) this group. We would like to thank Verisign for this lovely lunch.

Marc Anderson: Our pleasure, glad to sponsor that and glad we could get the Tech Ops group together here at ICANN 61. If you're not aware, this is a newer group, this is a new initiative formed by the contracted priority houses to give the technical people in registries and registrars a forum to talk and collaborate and work on issues where there are touchpoints between the registries and registrars.

We had an excellent session at ICANN 60, it was well attended and you know we've generated some good momentum in this group. So Tobias and I have been very encouraged by the discussions and the progress we've had so far, and we look to continue that here today.

There are some new faces in the room, so we want to take a moment to go around and give everybody a chance to introduce themselves, put everybody on the spot, especially hopefully if you're in the middle of food, we can interrupt you there. So I see you guys have your mouths full, so I'll start there on that end of the table. If you just introduce yourself real quick and who you work for.

Jody Kolker: Jody Kolker, GoDaddy.

Richard Merdinger: Richard Merdinger with GoDaddy.

Roger Carney: Roger Carney with GoDaddy.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase, Amazon registrar.

Vlad Dinculescu: DNS Africa.

Tim April: Tim April, Ackerman.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1 und 1.

Neal McPherson: Neal McPherson, One on One.

Kristian Ørmen: Kristian Ørmen, Larson Data.

Peter Larsen: Peter Larsen, Larson Data.

(Yasmine Irma): I haven't joined the group yet, but I will be joining, (Yasmin Irma), Amazon Registry. I'm sorry, I'm actually the registrar secretariat, not RSG secretariat, I should say.

Sherry Hildebrand: Sherry Hildebrand, Mark Monitor.

Janelle McAllister: And Janelle McAllister from Uni Registrar.

Ben McIlwain: Ben McIlwain, Google Registry.

James Galvin: James Galvin, Phileas Registry.

(Brick Wilhelm): (Brick Wilhelm), Verisign.

Marc Anderson: Is there anybody else in the back of the room that wants to introduce themselves, especially people that came late? Fair enough. Thank you and welcome everybody again. We're going to run through the agenda real quick. You know, obviously welcome and introductions.

We want to talk about the future of Adobe Callison rotations. We started off with sort of an initial stab at a rotating schedule. We had a hard time figuring out a time slot that would work for everybody, so a compromise was a rotating schedule. We agreed to try it out on a trial basis to see how it was working and that we would re-evaluate. Just an opportunity to give feedback on how that's working and talk about the future of the scheduling.

One of the first topics that really kicked off this discussion group was the registry maintenance notification, so that's on the agenda. We'll talk about that a little bit. And then the second topic that we brought up was the standardized registry repository, that's the standard reporting repository, I think we should say. So that's another topic of discussion that we've tackled.

We're going to switch the next two items there, five and six. We want to talk about domain name transfers under current IRTP and the upcoming GDPR, and I want to acknowledge that, you know, I think everybody in the group's probably aware, but I want to acknowledge the letter that the Tech Ops group sent out, Tobias sent it out end of last week and we got an acknowledgement from (Acram) that he'd received it and that letter, if it hasn't been posted or

ready, it will be posted to the GDPR site, the ICANN sort of blog site where they track all the correspondence related to GDPR.

So that letter came together quickly, and timely, I think it was good to get a marker out, raise awareness on this issue, and give us a discussion point. I think it's an excellent win for the Tech Ops group, and so congratulations and my appreciation to everybody that contributed to that, I think that's something we can pat ourselves on the back for.

Also the GDD summit topics and topic leaders. In May we have the GDD summit coming up, and ICANN staff has recently posted what they call a preliminary agenda for the GDD summit. And the Tech Ops group in particular is given an opportunity to contribute sessions and topics to this most recent GDD summit. And so we want to take advantage of that, make sure we're well represented and that we have sessions and topic leaders for those sessions, perhaps most importantly to facilitate the discussion. So we'll try and spend some time talking on that.

I also want to talk a little bit about, under any new business. We have two new business items we want to bring up. Both of them are GDPR-related. If anybody was in the room for the closed session of the contract party house on GDPR yesterday, you know a couple of topics came up related to Tech Ops group. So, time permitting, you know I think we have pretty full agenda here but time permitting, I want to talk about two other items.

One of them is around the topic of anonymized access or web form access to registrants. And so under the GDPR cookbook model has been, you know, raised as one of the possible solutions and in the contract party house GDPR session yesterday, it was discussed that this is, there are implementation considerations that should best be left to the Tech Ops group or Tech Ops-like group.

So I think we should consider stepping up to the plate on that one and proposing solutions to this. Really discussing the possibility of solutions on this one.

The other topic is also GDPR-related, came up at the contract party house meeting yesterday, and it's on disclosure of data under GDPR. So there are some circumstances where a registrant may choose to disclose additional information or may be interested in disclosing more than the minimum amount of data. And there isn't, you know, there isn't a baked-in mechanism, or there isn't a mechanism we've implemented today where a registrar can communicate to the registry that there's additional data that they want to display. Jody, you want to jump in there?

Jody Kolker: Well, I think it's, this is Jody, it's, I think there is, it's the disclose flag, it's in the contact EPP, it's an IETF. I think it's there.

Marc Anderson: Forgive me, I misspoke a little bit, I would say. Not that there isn't a mechanism, it's that we haven't implemented a mechanism. So I agree with Jody, I think there is a way to do it, but it's not something that registries or registrars have ever implemented to date, and there's, the EPP specification, it has some flexibility in how you could implement it, so I think this is a great opportunity for, you know, us to talk about ways that we could implement that to meet that particular use case. That fair?

So I think that covers our agenda. I'll pause there. Any other new business items that somebody wants to raise or any other topics under consideration? All right, hearing nothing, I'll assume that's a good agenda and we can proceed. But I'll, looking at the agenda, future of Adobe calls and rotations, I'll just leave it open. Does anybody want to comment on how it's working, how it hasn't worked, and give any input on what they would like to see as far as how we handle scheduling of the calls going forward?

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking, so yeah, I think it works really good, I would just stick to it. Any other ideas?

James Galvin: Why, thank you. Yeah I mean if you're just looking for support or comments, I think we obviously want to keep meeting. I would offer that as we seem to be increasing our agenda of topics, it might be useful to think about meeting more often than once a month, and especially we're assuming we're going to have a discussion here about GDD summit topics, it feels like there's an opportunity for something significant. And the summit is, you know, there's only two meetings that we stick to a monthly meeting between now and the summit, and not even clear to me that we would have the main meeting given that the summit is coming up.

So it seems like trying to find a way to bump our schedule of them up a bit, even if that's just biweekly, would at least get us two meetings and it just feels like we're beginning to create a cadence here of topics to talk about. So monthly feels a little too short, thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, and just a reminder for everybody, please state your name for the transcript and people online before you speak, I'll try and remember to do the same. Sorry, we have a hand down there?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau with Google. So I walked in late, so if this has already been put on the agenda, please chastise me. I noticed that we have transfers in GDPR on the agenda. But it strikes me that this isn't the only operational issue that's going to require coordination under GDPR, given how complex just the transfer problem is, I don't think we're going to like fix all of them in this meeting, but I think a useful task for this particular meeting at ICANN, given that we have a wider audience, would be to just develop a list of what the other sort of problems and interaction points are to sort of seed our agendas for other meetings.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough, thank you Stephanie. Can I ask for feedback, Jody, you want to go ahead.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody, I was just going to echo what Jim said, too, I think we should have more meetings. Not once a month but biweekly would be better. I think it keeps everybody on task a little bit better and keeps it going.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, and from my perspective I think it does help develop a cadence and getting into a rhythm, and you know sometimes it just helps having the same time blocked off on your calendar as well. Can I ask specifically about the time slots. The time slots we picked were sort of designed so that, you know, both, sort of we recognize that both time slots should work for East Coast and West Coast of the Americas, realizing one of the time slots would be more favorable to Europe, and one of the time slots would be more favorable for Asia.

So realizing, for those of you in Europe and Asia, I'd be particularly interested to get your feedback, you know did it work? So anybody want to talk to that at all? Go ahead.

Neal McPherson: Neal, for the record. So one of the European registrars, at least one of the calls, I think it started at 11 at night, and I think that's fine, I think if people were having issues there would be loud complaints in the Europeans here.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias for the record. So do we actually have someone that's only participating at the late time slot? So from Asia? I guess we should check that. If there is no one really participating from that region, then we should skip the invitation.

Neil McPherson: I think, Neal again, the new staff take people in Australia, right? So it's ...

Marc Anderson: Yeah, we don't have New Star in the room but I think that's affectionately the New Star time slot. Yeah, so I think we've beaten this horse enough, so I

think you know maybe we can follow up and make sure that that other time slot is in fact benefitting people in Asia, since we don't have any of them in the room representing us, we can take that offline to follow up.

I think we have a proposal to schedule more regular meetings and I'm certainly supportive of that. Initially there was a concern that we wouldn't generate enough topics to, getting laughter in the room, to keep a more regular cadence, but clearly that's not the case. We have no shortage of topics, so I think we can take that action item to schedule more regular meetings.

So let's move on to the registry maintenance notification. Tobias you want to give us a, caught you full mouthed. Let's give Tobias an opportunity to update us on the status of that.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias for the record. So the thing is that we already have the ITF draft currently, or I currently have an update for that, but I can't submit it right now. So I think the slot for submitting a new draft is opening by the end of next week. I will then submit it, the new draft, and I think we are good to go to actually move it forward to the ITF (unintelligible) working group, so that we can finally see how things will evolve from there.

So because right now the discussion that's happening on the mailing list, off list, is just between me and the other people who are already working ITF records group, so I think it's almost time to move it on.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Any other comments on the status of that? Okay. I do want to raise one item on that one, and this is sort of on behalf of my colleague (Jim Gould), who I don't see online and was not able to attend in person. He pointed out to me that that, you know, ICANN is working on a similar problem in their monitoring API.



So in the monitoring API that they have, they've also developed a mechanism for registries to notify ICANN when there's a maintenance of the registry, and so Jim pointed out to me that, you know, really these are two solutions to the same problem. Both ICANN and registrars are looking for a programmatic or API way of knowing when registries take a maintenance. I guess anything other than an e-mail notification there.

And so this is, I think this is something, speaking from a registry perspective we certainly want to avoid having to implement something twice, and so you know we'd like to look at is there an opportunity to combine these two things or look for synergies. I think from a registry perspective we'd be more likely to get adoption and implementation of this if it serves both purposes. I'm not familiar with either of these solutions enough to speak to them technically, but you want to go?

Roger Carney: Hi, this is Roger, I'll talk to Jim next week about that and I'll try to synch those two up. Tobias will actually post that draft by the time we're in IATF anyway, so I'll synch up with (Gould) and see where we can go from those two things.

Marc Anderson: Excellent, thank you, and Jim will be at IATF, I think that will be a good opportunity to synch up. Like I said, seems like there are two items looking for a, or two initiatives trying to solve the same problem, and if we can find some synergies I think everybody benefits there.

Any other comments on registry maintenance notification? Okay. Moving on, so the standardized registry repository, this is a topic that was brought up around the reporting I think not just the reports but the mechanism for delivering those reports from registries to registrars. And do we have anybody that wants to provide an update on that one?

Neil McPherson: Hi, it's Neal. Yeah, exactly, so we've posted the proposal to the registrar Tech Ops group, there was no real feedback there, we changed a couple of little thing and then posted to the CPH group. We got some good feedback on the

discussion list, so currently what we've got out there is a small short survey for registrars trying to answer a couple of the questions that were belayed around on the list, the concerns of a couple of the registries had with regards to, you know, priority of the different reports, storage of reports, et cetera.

So yeah, hopefully we'll have some feedback maybe in the next week or so on that survey, and then we can communicate what came out of that, see how we can move things forward.

So I think officially what we're trying to do with this is keep the topic of the repository separate from the topic of the different reports, because each report we definitely need to spend some time on individually. Having said that, we probably also need to think about what's going to be in that repository, what kind of reports are going to be there. But yeah, the main focus for sure is on the repository itself and not the reports. The reports we need to have separate topics for each report going forward.

Marc Anderson: Great, thank you. I look forward to seeing the results of that survey. Any other comments on that one? All right. I'd like to comment on that actually, so switching hats again. You know, I think this is a great opportunity and then thank you for the proposal on that one.

You know, as a registry we don't always have great visibility into you know, what is actually being used and you know, what's the information or the mechanism or the, you know, the value that we're providing in those. So I think this is a great opportunity for us to leverage this, you know this Tech Ops group and you know, we look forward to working on you know, on coming up with better definitions of what information you would like to see, how you would like to see it delivered. So I think this is a great use of the Tech Ops group. So thank you.

Any other comments before I move on? All right. So reminder, we're switching up the agenda, and I gave sort of a little bit of a sneak peek when

we were introducing the agenda, but we're going to go on to the domain name transfers under IRTP and the upcoming GDPR, turn it over to you for an update.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias for the record. So in our last call we were discussing that we want to comment or put something together regarding domain name transfers under the current IATP, and possible impact that GDPR has on it. And therefore we set up a letter that we sent to Akram actually I want to thank all the people that were actually contributing to that. So we had a lot of input from Stephanie, (Alexamder), (unintelligible) and Jody and (Josen) as well as James.

So we put that together really quickly, and sent it last Thursday to (Accram), he acknowledged that he got this letter and they will publish it on the ICANN website. So the thing is, how we are going to proceed from there, there's also this thing that we want to talk about future transfers as well. I think that would be more beneficial to talk about that when we come to the GDD summit topics. But for now we proposed this interim solution to (unintelligible) and well, on looking forward what ICANN is going to respond regarding that.

But I guess it will take some time for them to actually get back to us on that. So there's a letter saying that came up in discussions regarding the domain name transfers and the registrant changes was if ASAC would be or might be interested in this topic. So I have short discussion with James last night and I also read out to (Ben Butler) from GoDaddy, both are in ASAC, what they think about that, because the thing is that we actually figured out if we would raise this question through our chairs to ASAC to get a comment from ASAC, so just a question to this group. Do we want to actually involve or try to involve ASAC on that?

James Galvin: So James Galvin for the record, since my name was used in vain. Just to be clear about what we would ask ASAC for, in my opinion, certainly open for discussion here, is that we could ask for advice on the efficacy of a

mechanism that we would like to choose. You know, ASAC will very carefully not want to engage in policy development in general. They usually draw a very hard line on that issue. So they won't tell you what the answer is.

But if we have an answer that we want to ask them about and ask for an opinion about it, I think that we could get a response to that kind of question and in that sense. So as we start talking about things like how to use the off code and its relationship to what features it does or doesn't provide in the space, then I think that's a useful question to ask just to get an opinion, and that might be a good thing for us if we find that useful.

Otherwise there's always the risk that they comment afterwards, especially if there's something that's especially bad about it, I suppose. Anyway, I hope that's helpful, thanks.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, Jim. It's Marc Anderson for the transcript. Just want to point out in chat (Dan Wright) is asking about the survey, this might be for you. You know, he didn't see it, so he's asking where it was sent. So and then (Dick Gordon) is pointing out that the ICANN solution is for the most happy, ICANN's monitoring solution is not from the registry systems, so that's ICANN's API for their monitoring of the registries.

And then back to domain name transfers. Any other follow-ups on that? I do want to echo what Tobias said, I know a lot of people worked real hard on putting that letter together in very short order. That was a heavy lift in a short amount of time. Stephanie, Alexander, Roger, Jody, Jonathan, James, or Jim I should say, everybody else that contributed to that, thank you.

Like I said, I think that was a, you know, a nice win for the Tech Ops group, the ability to come together with a letter like that in short order and you know, was done with the full support of both, chairs of both contracted parties. You know, so that was no small effort from everybody involved and in particular Tobias, who I think going into that underestimated the amount of work that

would be involved in that, but really did a great job pulling that together. So thank you and congratulations to everybody on that one.

Okay. One more chance before we draw a line on the, on transfers under GDPR? I do, I guess before we move on from that, I want to ask is there any other expectations or anything else we can do besides sending the letter? Do we want to try and initiate any discussions or any other outreach? What kind of follow up or next steps do we want to look for as a group? So I guess I'll throw that out there as a question. Does anybody have any ideas? You know, I think the letter puts you know, raises awareness of the issue and throws it out there, but is there more we could do or want to do as a group at this point? That's fine if nobody has any answer.

Tobias: Tobias for the record. I think we should think about that if we want to involve ASAC on that. So if we want to do that, then we need to find the right question that we can actually ask.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sorry, Marc, I know I'm like directly sideways to you. I think there's an open question in how we implement transfers because this is going to be like fundamentally different if there's a reliable pass-through e-mail mechanism that could be used to support the transfer. Or if the solution around how to provide a pass through to the registrar looks more like a web form, in which case it couldn't be used to support a transfer.

Do we think it makes sense to like pause design of this and pause decision-making around this until there's more clarity on a solution there? Or more useful to treat it as separate problems? I know there's concern based on some of the side discussion we had in pulling together the letter about whether this is going to be implemented in a standard way in a desire to have a solution that doesn't just fit some implementations but all of them. But it strikes me that the problem would be a lot simpler to fix if there was reliable pass-through e-mail versus not, and we haven't had that preliminary discussion.

Mac Anderson: Jody, then Jim.

Jody Kolker: Sure, I think that the process we're proposing doesn't rely on the e-mail address to be passed to the gaining registrar, so there's no pass-through e-mail. Maybe I'm missing something.

Stephanie: Sorry, I guess my question is a little bit different. If a pass-through e-mail was available, would we think that presents a preferable and more elegant solution?

Jody Kolker: Can you explain an example of a pass-through e-mail and how it would work? I'm a little confused.

Stephanie: I'm thinking it would be similar to how transfers work currently for a party using a privacy service.

Jody Kolker: It would still require that to be passed up to the registry, and I'm not sure that the registry will always have the correct information. I mean, are you saying that the gaining registrar still has to get the pass-through e-mail?

Stephanie: Yes.

Jody Kolker: From my perspective, this is Jody, I would rather gaining registrar doesn't have to do anything with an e-mail. The losing registrar has to get the FOA, and no e-mail has to be changed from between the losing registrar to the gaining registrar.

Stephanie: Yeah.

Jody Kolker: That's my preference. But, you know.

Stephanie: And we're sort of balancing two things, like on the one hand we think given that there's likely to be different models for how registries and registrars implement GDPR, that might be the only way to do it in a single standard way across everyone, so I understand that ask.

We're just trying to balance that with the, like additional security that's provided by the gaining registrar FOA, and I think there's like a workable hack if you were still providing that e-mail address. But I agree that without knowing what that's going to look like and how consistently that's going to be implemented that it's a bit hard to design or conceive of.

Man: Sorry, I'll just say real quick I know, I have a little bit of a cue, so I promise I'll get to everybody.

Richard Merdinger: And I'll go quickly and say that while I appreciate, this is (Rich) from GoDaddy, I appreciate the backward compatibility element of having a pass-through e-mail is convenient, it still is essentially providing a portal to the inbox of the registrant to the entire world. So I'm not in favor for that reason.

Marc Anderson: Stephanie, you good?

Stephanie: Yeah, I think so.

Marc Anderson: Jim did you want to go before...

James Galvin: So, James Galvin for the record. I guess, I want to make sure that there are two questions on the table, right? I mean, there is the question of what to do in the short term before May 25 and there is the longer-term discussion of what we really want to do with transfers. And I believe, it occurred to me to ask this question because when you were talking about asking for ASAC's advice, I want to say a little more about that, but what I say will vary as to which one of those two questions you want me to speak to that issue on. Are we talking about the first question of a short-term solution or ...

Man: The short term.

James Galvin: Yeah okay. So we have this letter and we have proposed the thing that we want, and I think that as I think about the ICANN process for all of this, we're dealing with an issue which is a contract in which we're looking to change that contract in some significant way, and we want that to be uniformly changed. The assumption I guess with this having come from the Tech Ops group that we have some fairly significant consensus support for this being the right solution, that will always be an interesting question.

And it occurs to me that there might be some value in if we want to ask for additional support for such a contractual change that should just sort of happen and be applicable to everyone, getting support from ASAC might be useful and the way in which we would ask for that support is to indicate that, I think, my suggestion is, you know the original policy was intended to cover, you know, the following principles, right? It had the following requirements that it was trying to meet, especially from a security point of view.

And it is the request of this group and the consensus of registrars supporting and others supporting this particular change that this change still meets those requirements. And, you know, we would be asking for an opinion about that as a way to get additional support to ICANN and all of the legal discussions that will have to go on as to whether or not they're going to support this.

You know so we're trying to say that the principle of what was there before is still there and you know, present it to them in that way, and that would probably be a useful thing. We might want to wait and see what kind of a real reaction we get from ICANN on that, of course where you know, I mean maybe they'll just go along with this and it'll be fine and none of this is necessary. And we also have this whole timing thing, you know, everything has to be done by May 25 and so you sort of run into this issue. How long do



we wait to see what kind of real reaction we're going to get from ICANN before we try to continue to throw more support of them?

I don't have an answer for that, but I think that's the right way to frame the question for ASAC and I would suggest that if we're going to get any pushback we probably want to get that support or see if we can get it anyway and ask for it. So thanks.

Tom Keller: Yeah, Tom Keller for the record. Going back to Stephanie's question, if there's an e-mail trust nothing changes. However it looks like, right? If there's an e-mail trust we can pass through, the process itself is not touched. But I think all we do with the current proposal is to plan for a situation where an e-mail trust will not be available anymore.

I think for that it's correct and I think we need to wait for what the policy outcome will be, of the GDPR process, but there is very strong assumption that e-mail addresses will go away in that context. So if something comes to your mind, where we say we need to go through more planning for other scenarios in e-mail scenarios, you know I would be very interested to hear what that might be.

Volker Griemann: Yes, Volker Griemann from Key Systems speaking, originally I was a very big fan of the pass-through idea, but my thinking has since evolved away from that simply because of the fact which (Rich) already said, that it's a direct pass-through to the registrant, which means that all the spam would get forwarded, that will mean that the forwarding address will very quickly be added to spam filters and that would mean that certain messages would not get through at all, and we would be offering a service that we could not effectively offer all the time.

There would be down times all the time with spam, anti-spam protections adding us to lists so that there would be certain issues that a web forum would simply take away because that filters a lot of the spam out already.

A pass-through e-mail add assumption would also assume that all registries change their systems to accept links, web links in the e-mail field. We cannot assume that to be the case, that everybody's going to be ready with that at the time. So what our thinking at Key Systems is, is that we present a link that's formatted like an e-mail address so everybody looking at that e-mail address will see immediately this is not a valid e-mail address, this actually a description of how to get to the web site, where to send the web form.

At least that's what we're currently thinking of implementing at this stage, because that will have no compatibility issues with registries that are not ready in time. We also need to make sure as a second point that we reach out quickly to those registries and registrars that are not generally participating within ICANN to make sure that they also implement this system that we're proposing in this letter.

I mean, us agreeing on this here at ICANN is nice and fine but if there's 50% of registrars and registries, smaller registrars do not even engage here, and we need to make sure that this system works for everyone and everyone will be able to implement that at a certain date X and then we will be able to switch over to the new system. Otherwise we'll have chaos anyway, even if we have a new system that works for those that participate because it won't work for those who don't.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, couple hands there, there, and there.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. I just want to kind of respond to what Jim was talking about, about the ASAC idea. I personally would hold off on it until we get a negative response back. The letter was meant as a notification, it wasn't meant as an ask. So until they come back and slap our fingers or hands or whatever, I don't think that we have to take people's time to actually get another support mechanism. It's just my opinion, again I thought the letter was more of a notification and not ask, so.

Ben McIlwaine: Yeah, two things, just speaking on a personal level, this is Ben from Google. I have lots of domains and I've never gotten anything to the Whois e-mail addresses other than worthless spam, so I'm in full agreement with everybody else, that it's just garbage and I prefer it not to be available at all. So I actually like privacy services because then I know all the e-mails to my Whois e-mail addresses are coming through a single e-mail address, which I can just killfile, so it's great.

And then secondly, there's one mechanism that I haven't heard discussed yet that is already effectively implemented by everybody that can be used by a registrar on either side of the transfer to always get the correct contact e-mail for the registrant, which is EPP info commands. So can do a domain info command and see what the contact ID is, and then do a (unintelligible) command to get the e-mail address, and at least in our system any authenticated registrar is able to log into the system and can send EPP commands, can always see at least that little bit of information about any entity in the system.

So this doesn't require new web forms like (unintelligible) time to create a new standard for web forms with this new open ID repository in time to enable authenticated RDAP for like different tiered stuff, but just simple (unintelligible) I think Jody and (Rich) look ready to comment and respond.

Marc Anderson: Okay, we're going over there first. You're getting deferred to.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. So (Ben), we've heard that comment a couple of times. I think you might have talked about it before this, and what we found is that not all registries work the same. Some of them don't allow you to see the contact information, if you're not the registrant of record for that contact.

The second issue with it was, I think this was raised by somebody else, I think it might have been by (unintelligible) saying that you can't count on that

information being correct at the registry. If some registries may be sending in technically valid information, but it will never get to the registrar, or registrant. So they may mask all that information that will go to a black hole, and then we would never be able to reach the registrant for that. I'll let Roger add on there.

Roger: I was just going to add on, and I'm sure some registries do allow you to look this up, but once GDPR goes in place, how many of those registries are going to stop allowing that?

Man: So it's basically just on the registrar level, then you have to talk to each other and get the info on the registries never enrolled?

Man 1: If I can just, the thing about a privacy proxy that, a registry will create the contact ID, you know, pull the privacy information in then associate the main name and contact ID locally, and then even if you do an EP command, you look at the privacy proxy information anyway. So you're not getting the right information that you want. So you have the main object that has got registrant with ID that say ABC, you do an EPP contact info (unintelligible) you can have the privacy information back, and that same information is then also spread on Whois. So I'm not seeing where you see a difference in information within the contact object itself.

Marc Anderson: So we've got quite a queue going, hit a hot topic and I also just want to acknowledge, we've sort of hit on two issues I guess, you know, so we're, we've got the GDPR transfer issue but this also overlaps a little bit with the proposal under GDPR for either anonymized access and, or a web form. So we're sort of touching on two issues here that are quite closely related, which is, we're certainly fine but just want to acknowledge that. I'll get to you guys, but you've been waiting, so thank you.

Tom Keller: Thank you. Tom, speaking for the record. So I think we're kind of mixing two topics here, so I think we have our proposal on one hand, which is in a room

where we want to fix a problem if e-mails are going away, and I think that's the only thing that's really feasible in the amount of time we have in our hands, so it's not really touching the process heavily, it's just gets read basically up on the e-mail. We can debate whether that's needed and whether that is an additional security measure or not.

And then there's the topic of we come next to, which is GDPR summit topics, basically, you know, where we can talk about how a transfer should look like. Totally agree that what we do currently is not the best thing and maybe there should be other ways. I know that there's lots of registries out there in the CC world that do a much better job, and solving that issue, and that can be on many stages basically.

That could be over (unintelligible) info codes or whatever, you know but I think that needs to be discussed in depth, and the question we need to answer today is what we're going to do if we end up with our e-mail, I think it will be a proposal by ICANN what to do finally, on Thursday, and if that kind of says that it's either e-mail or web form, it's probably more likely to be web form, to be honest, then we have to follow up with ICANN on whether we can actually go forward with the process or not, because we've never done that.

That's a hard deviation from our contract. It's in the IRA, so we have to abide to sending these e-mails. So if we want to step away from it, we need to ask ICANN as a contractor whether they would give us an allowance basically to go forward with the process.

Marc Anderson: Thank you. Down there.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just more notice about the idea of allowing URLs in e-mail field. Imagine situation where someone intentionally registers something which leads you to some quite nasty site full of malware and things. You will have another layer, so I would recommend you not to allow URLs other than your own web form there. Thanks.

Volker Griemann: Yes, Volker speaking for the record. Tom is absolutely right, there are certain issues with setting aside the contract, and this is not just a contract, this is also policy and I have in my memory no case where ICANN has agreed to set aside policy that has been agreed by the community without community agreement to set aside the policy.

So that's something that ICANN will be very, very hesitant to do. We might get lucky, but we cannot expect it to happen overnight, and second point is I would suggest that would mean that we would have to trust all registrars. If we make data available to a request by a registrar, that would mean that we would have to trust all registrar.

Now setting up a registrar is pretty easy, I mean if you look at drop catchers, they have hundreds of thousands set up. They set up new ones every minute. The main tool is a registrar, so anyone who's interested in harvesting the data would be able to simply set up a registrar then use that access to harvest the data again, and that would be a very big loophole that I would be very hesitant in opening up.

Roger Carney: Did you want to go? This is Roger. Just to hit on what Volker mentioned, ICANN did give us a stay this year, yeah, that we can bend the contract and policy for some time. It was not defined what time it was, but they did give us that. When I was reviewing the transfer policy, it really is not a whole lot different than what we're proposing. One of the big things is the gaining registrar says it has to use Whois. If that was changed to say they can get from wherever, there's nothing in the transfer policy that really needs to change. That was the only thing that is contradictory to what we're doing.

(Rick Wilhelm): (Rick Wilhelm), Verisign. As it relates to getting the data from EPP, setting aside the very fair comments that you were making there Jody about the accuracy of the data, as a technical mechanism EPP as a registry got a lot more control, a lot more control and a lot more audit ability over what goes in

and what comes out, what kind of requests come in and what kind of requests go out the door via EPP than one does over Whois.

Whois is very much an edge service, which is deployed out to the cloud and at least in probably most folks' implementations, those edge nodes are generally pretty dumb and whereas when you're dealing with EPP requests, at least we as a registry have very fine-grained control over what's happening at that transactional level and tremendous visibility about what someone is doing.

And if there is behavior that one might consider quote unquote sketchy regarding possible mining attempts, even drip feed mining that someone is doing, it's way more visible there than something under Whois, which, it's way more visible under EPP than it would be under Whois, just by very nature of the protocol and level of monitoring and security that that's under. All very fair points that you made, but that's something I'd just offer.

Marc Anderson: Okay, great discussion. I don't have, unless I missed somebody I don't have any more hands in the queue. All right. So are we ready to draw a line under, can't resist. Go ahead.

Man 2: So I just have one further comment. I know that I asked for this to be added right at the end of the comment period, (Tobias), so I apologize for this. Kind of a I guess a hangover problem, let's say. Let's just say, after I asked you to put it in there I started to have second thoughts about this and Roger had pointed out some good topics here.

Allowing a registrar to do an auto nac on a domain name that they have not gotten an FOA on, I think could lead to just really bad actors denying every transfer away, and I think that we've seen that in the past and that's probably why this FOA exists. Tom is raising his hand. So I'm not sure that it's a good idea to have that in there, and I know that I asked for you to put it in there, but I'm kind of stepping that back and I'm just curious on anybody else's thoughts

on that, on removing the auto nac by the registrar after four days. Because I feel that if we implement this, there may be registrars that will only implement that, and that's it, and we'll wind up with bigger problems than we have now, unfortunately.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller for the record. I wholeheartedly agree. We've been there years before when we came up with all this crazy policy and there was a part of it actually to get people away from auto nac, and we shouldn't go back there. Even if it's just an interim solution we don't know how much interim there will be, and yes, you should only nac if you have the consent of the customer to actually do so.

We have enough mechanisms in place to make sure the transfer is not ambiguous or someone else fraudulent. I agree as well that there needs to be more safeguards with reversing, all that kind of stuff, that's something for us for discussion and summit, but let's leave it with an ack, an auto ack and not an auto nac.

Marc Anderson: Okay, thank you everyone, that was a good discussion and again we really sort of touched on two topics there. But we also you know brought up the topic of the GDD summit, which is sort of our next agenda item here. So as I said at the top, you know with the May GDD summit coming up, we have an opportunity to spend a significant time together as a group talking about some of these issues, and you know I think the hope is that you know, the extra time will give us an opportunity to roll up our sleeves and work on actual solutions, you know, as a joint Tech Ops community.

So I'll throw the floor open, anybody want to talk about you know, particular topics of interest and also (Yvonne)'s here to lead some of these topics. You know, I think everybody's aware of this, but you know, previous due to these summits, you know one of the, you know one of the challenges was, you know people were willing to throw out topics but not necessarily lead or



moderate those topics, and so the quality of the GDD summit suffered a little bit as a result of that.

So we want to make sure for the topics we do have, we also have volunteers to lead into or moderate those topics. So with that great buildup, anybody want to start?

Tobias Sattler: Tobias for the record. So we have two topics here that we should discuss during the GDD summit. One was the standardized registry reporting repository. I guess Neal already volunteered for that. And the other is domain name transfers, and I think that there in GDD we should talk about the future of domain name transfers and I think Tom volunteered for that, thank you. So are there any other topics we would like to discuss during our Tech Ops sessions?

Tom Keller: Tom for the record. So I think one thing we, so yes I will do that. Not an issue. It's something, you know, we want to solve. One thing we probably should be talking about, it's the format, whether we want to have like a format like this but all sit at one table and debate or should be looking more like workshops.

We had that format at the last GDD that we could get actually break out in groups of five to ten people and do that without a mic where a lot of people way more, helps for participation, actually. So we just have people feel comfortable speaking in the mic in a language that's not their own, and I think we should accommodate that and maybe change the format a bit, see however we can do that, you know We never did that before, but what I know just (unintelligible) groups it's during the ICANN meeting last was much better and much better participated.

So I think that's where we need to spend some thought maybe today, or maybe we can leave it to the topic leaders to, however they like.

Roger Carney: This is Roger. This was about the future transfers? Since we'll be done with the interim, everybody will have the solutions by then, right? Okay. I think that's a great idea to actually maybe change the format and get into more of a debate or, you know roundtable discussion versus, I think that's a great idea.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, and before we go on to the next comment, I just want to do a quick time check. We're at 1:17, so we've got a little more than ten minutes left, doesn't leave us a lot of time but that's why I think this has been a good discussion. We do have the room available longer, so he's nodding, we have at least until two but we also at 1:30 there's a session on a walk-in cross-community session on walk in the shoes of a registry, I think it is, also getting a thumbs-up, so I imagine that's a topic of interest to many of us in the room, including myself.

But I will point out we do have the room available past 1:30. Couple hands, I'd like to get to Neal first as he's the other kind volunteer for one of our topics at the summit, so please go ahead.

Neal McPherson: Neal for the record, happy to take on the repository topic and see if we can move forward there. I would like to suggest maybe we attack one of the standards reports we want to see in that repository. So my suggestion would be the transaction reports. I found there's a lot of demand from registrars to have some standardization there. It would be great to have a session on that topic, and I can lead that as well.

Man 3: Yes, one topic that comes to mind would be troubleshooting for anything that might go awry after GDPR, that's before GDPR, but we should have some procedures in place that we would be able to quickly act when we see that certain processes are not working as we intended, certain processes are breaking down.

One example that I'm thinking of right now is when registrar and registry both decide to opt for web forms as a replacement for the e-mail address. The

registrar sends an e-mail address forwarded as, a website address format as an e-mail address to registry. The registry then translates that e-mail address in another web form, so that web form will send to the e-mail address that never existed. That would be a worst-case scenario for example.

How do we deal with scenarios like that, that we haven't envisioned at this time, how can we fix these quickly without having to involve the entire community but to be seen as proactive when something goes awry, if something goes awry.

Marc Anderson: Thank you, and I'll ask would you be willing to chair or facilitate such a session?

Man 3: I would, however I'm not 100% certain that I will be able to attend the GDD summit.

Marc Anderson: Fair enough. Jim, were you in the queue?

James Galvin: So thanks James Galvin for the record. I guess I have two topics that I would like to suggest for consideration. One which I'll call maintenance of the registry/registrar relationship. For the registrars in the room, you'll remember in the relatively recent past, Afilius tried to go through the process of having registrars change their passwords and other credentials for access to the registry across all of our TLDs.

This was, on the one hand one might think of this as relatively straightforward. You know, call you up, please change your credentials or Whois the new ones, let's go. This turned out to be rather interesting process, to say the least. Lot of challenges came from it.

I think what I would like to suggest for a topic is, at this stage maybe a bit more of a brainstorming session, because we ran into multiple challenges in doing this. I mean, it's not just about the idea that we wanted the credentials

changed. You find out very quickly that some of the contact information that you have is outdated, because you've never had a reason to use it or verify it or confirm it, and that just made this problem really, really hard and very difficult.

So what we'd really like to do is open up the door for kind of a working together and say "Okay, you know, how could we improve this process?" I mean, clearly registrars, for yourselves you have to maintain this information. We'd like to figure out what can we do so that we can all work better together to keep this information up to date, to facilitate these kinds of things as well as contact information more generally.

I don't want to get too far down the path of solutions, but that's sort of the problem space and rather than us trying to design something, it feels like, you know, registrars, I think it's something which would be of interest to you, too. Let's try to find something that we can all work together and endorse and create. So that's one, and I saw a hand pop up and I can toss my other one out, or you want to deal with that topic first?

Marc Anderson: Let's go, I think some people are itching to comment so let's go to comments before we go to your second comment.

Volker Griemann: Yes, Volker speaking for the record. I mean, there's an easy solution already out there. Go to radar, look at what the registrars placed in the ICANN database, and if that data is also outdated there's a way to complain about that to ICANN because a registrar is obligated to keep his radar information up to date. If not, then it's a contractual relation. Of course, I realize you don't want to have, be the initiator of a compliance action against one of your customers, but that is the process that's currently in place.

James Galvin: I fully accept that, you know ICANN is a central location for some set of data, and I think that needs to be part of the discussion, as to whether or not that is the solution. Because if it is the solution, then you know registrars need to

agree to that and we need to understand that that's how we're going to keep things up to date. So, yes. Another comment, or my next topic?

(Rick Wilhelm): This is (Rick Wilhelm) from Verisign. There's a 80/20 problem that Jim has not stated but is in the back of his mind or maybe in the front of his mind. The people that are the issue are not the ones that are within earshot right now.

So this is actually when, if I can sort of chime in with what Jim is saying, and I'd be in support of this even though Jim and I didn't coordinate in advance, the issue is we would, we the registries would seek help in figuring out how to reach the people that are not in this room, because we don't have a problem reaching you.

And while Jim mentioned changing passwords, we went through some stuff over the last fall where we were doing some other stuff related to security that those of you who work with Verisign probably recall, and for a lot of you it was a no-brainer, and for a number of folks if you would look through my inbox you would be astonished about the amount of drama, some relatively simple stuff, technical stuff, sort of like Jim's password change, ours was different, would have caused. So we would be in agreement with this. But again, we recognize it's not, you know, we know where to find Volker, right?

Man 4: Yeah, I definitely think it's a good topic to you know spend an hour or two discussing, you know. And again, maybe part of it is just how do we reach everybody if that is the solution, so.

Marc Anderson: Any other hands before we go on to Jim's next topic? No? Okay, go ahead Jim.

James Galvin: So I'm not really sure what to call this, but you know it's kind of variously TLD transitions, TLD configuration kind of topic. There is some discussions going on in the ITF related to TLD configurations, but the transition issue, I mean I know that registrars are very pained when the registry service provider on the

back end changes for a given registry operator. And would really like to have again another sort of open discussion for you know, how can we make that better, you know, what really are the kinds of problems that you see, let's sort of get down the sort of requirements and objectives we're trying to reach to that would make that helpful for you, and would really like to open up that topic and see what you've got to say. So that's it, thanks.

Marc Anderson: Before we go to that one, I just want to recognize in chat, we had a comment from Dan Wright, I'll paraphrase that by saying a two-way street as far as that communication between registries and registrars and so a fair point I think from (Dan), and I think we have some comments on the second topic.

Man 5: A transition topic, I know there was some effort to do this at the last TLD as well, and we did speak about it exactly what you're mentioning. I'm not sure what happened with that input, because that was very valuable input, I mean we're talking minimum timelines, we're talking communications, we're talking differentiations, specifications and implementations. I don't what that just disappeared to.

James Galvin: And I can tell you that I don't either, and so that's why we should pick this up and use that as the baseline to start the discussion, thanks. Before I go to Jody, I agree, you know I think one of the impetuses for this Tech Ops group was that you know we had great discussions at the GDD summit and then nothing sort of followed up. And so that was certainly one of the genesis for formation of this group. Go ahead.

Jody Kolker: This is Jody. So I was going, to Jim's second point I was waiting for him to make, then I was going to bring up the same thing that Jim brought up. We do need, I think we need that topic to be covered again. I do know what happened to the second one or what happened last year, I was put in charge of it and never got it done.

This little GDPR thing got in the way, well actually (Elaine Pruitt) and I, we did do some work on it, but then there were so many different things that were coming up with groups, we didn't know how to approach it. And it kind of became analysis paralysis, whatever you want to call it and never got it done. So I'll take the heat on that. But you know, this is something that I'm very interested in getting done, so.

Man 5: So you're volunteering to lead this topic at GDD?

Jody Kolker: Sure.

Man 6: You know, I just have to say, that's interesting. I mean I sort of automatically assumed as you're offering suggestions for topics that you get nominated to lead, but I'm very happy that we found a way to delegate that.

Jody Kolker: I would be, I'd be happy to co-chair it together, with you.

Man 6: We can figure it out together.

Jody Kolker: All right.

Man 7: Jim, so first topic still open, so you're going to lead this topic? Thank you.

Sherry Hildebrand: Sherry Hildebrand from Mark Monitor, and I just want to say we're happy that you're going to lead that transition topic, because it is a major pain point for registrars at the moment, so.

Marc Anderson: Okay, just time-checking real quick.

Zoe Bonython: We can't keep recording after 1:30.

Marc Anderson: So Zoe tells me that we can't keep recording after 1:30, so what we'll do is we'll officially end the meet, wrap the meeting at 1:30. We do have the room

until 2, if anyone wants to stay in the room for any follow-up conversations or if any of the co-chairs for GDD summit sessions want to collaborate, great opportunity to do so. But I'll give, do you have a last word? No? I'll give call, any last words until we officially wrap the session?

Okay, thank you everyone, great participation today. I think we have some good action items. Most importantly, I think look to the mail list, where we'll see about scheduling follow-up meetings and we'll look to get a more regular cadence, you know since we have enough topics to keep us busy. We want to keep the momentum going and generate some good discussions heading into the GDD summit in May. So on behalf of Tobias and I, thank you everybody and enjoy the rest of ICANN.

Zoe Bonython: Thank you, you can stop the recording.

END